CHAPTER -IX

CONCLUSION

Section -1

THE HISTORICAL-EVOLUTIONARY APPROACH IN GHURYE'S WRITINGS

On the occasion of the 60th birthday of Prof. Ghurye, the Economic Weekly wrote, "Few are competent in this country or abroad to assess the contribution of Prof. G.S. Ghurye in the wide field which he has traversed with such conspicuous success in the 60 years of his life."¹

The range of Ghurye's interest is encyclopaedic. From Shakespeare to Sadhus, from art and architecture to folk-gods and goddesses, from sex and marriage to race relations - Ghurye had made his peregrination, took interest in and left his mark on, the multiple aspects of what may broadly be called 'culture'. The time span and the area which he covers in the process is equally impressive. His abiding interest is in the course of world civilization in general and in Hindu civilization in particular. While discussing the major civilizations which have originated and operated outside India, he has covered the Mesopotamian and the Egyptian civilizations, the major branches of Indo-European civilization and also the subsequent evolution of this civilization in Europe. But Ghurye's special point of interest is in

the evolution of the Indo-aryan civilization in India. Starting from a description of Indian society as it emanates from the Vedic literature, he has covered the latest trends and developments in such a civilization. While unravelling the history of this old civilization of about 4000 years, he has analyzed various aspects like the origin and evolution of caste, the evolution of Indo-aryan family structure and its connections with the Indo-European family structure, the evolution of Religious consciousness, of ideas of Gods and Goddesses, of specific institutions like asceticism, gotra etc, and of the role of cities and of individuals in securing cultural integrity. Analysis of the diverse aspects of the evolution of Indian social history and culture thus constitutes the major preoccupation of Ghurye.

Ghurye has been concerned not merely with the past evolution of Indian society and culture but also with its present tensions and problems. He is very much disturbed over the fact that the 'oldest civilization of the world' is showing signs of fissures and cracks. As early as in 1932, while analysing the operation of castes in India, Ghurye discussed the changes brought about in the institution of caste by British rule. That was a sharp departure from the current ethnological orientation of anthropological literature and it was not received well by the academic community.\(^2\) His second major work, *The Aborigines—so-called—and their Future* was largely devoted to the problem of the integration of the tribes into the

larger Hindu society. It was related with the problem of nation-building in future India. In three other books, viz., Social Tensions in India, Whither India? and India Recreates Democracy, his 'trilogy on Indian political society', he has analysed with dismay the 'fissiparous tendencies' in modern India and the role of our political leaders in grappling with the problem of national integration in this vast and complex society. The most recent of his published work, The Burning Caldron of the North-East, is yet another evidence of his interest in contemporary developments.

This vast dimension and depth of Ghurye's writings has baffled many a sociologist of today. As a sociologist his path has been very unconventional indeed. 'The task of a sociologist, according to him, is to explore the social history of the past. Very significantly, he observed to the present author, History and sociology are almost the same. "History puts its emphasis on political history and wars, while a sociologist has his focus on social history. The greatest historian of English society, G.K. Travelsan, was a sociologist because he gave us a picture of British society". In order to know India's social history, he relies heavily on the classical religious texts and scriptures. Ghurye was initiated to sociology through the reading of Westermarck's History of Marriage. His contact with Rivers, Haddon, G.E. Smith and others quite convinced him that India had much to tell the world about early social institutions and

5 Interview with the present author on 16.1.79.
their development. So, for Ghurye, there was no question of doing sociology without the help of Indology. Considering this background of Ghurye, D.P. Mukherji paid tribute to Ghurye as the 'only Indian sociologist today' whilst others are 'sociologists in India'.

It is undeniable that when a sociologist is engaged in analysis of the evolution and growth of social institutions in India, he has to draw heavily on Indological materials. Considering this close relation between sociology and Indology, Dumont and Pocock observed, "In our opinion, the first condition for a sound development of a sociology of India is found in the establishment of the proper relation between it and classical Indology ... It should be obvious, in principle that the sociology of India lies at the point of confluence of Sociology and Indology". From this perspective, Dumont himself, in his Homo Hierarchicus, has built up a model of Indian civilization which is based on a non-competitive ritual hierarchical system. Dumont's basic postulates and conclusions have been widely criticised, but there is no doubt about his original contributions in the field of Indian sociology. But the question is what should be a sociologists' point of departure in analysing Indological materials? To use the Indological materials properly and to put them in a proper perspective, a sociologist should be very precise from the methodological standpoint. Otherwise, the line of distinction between sociology and Indology may be blurred. As we have seen in the previous chapters,

this has occurred sometimes in Ghurye's writings and this was a major short-coming in his writings.

Profound knowledge of Sanskrit literature provided Ghurye's forte. One finds an unmistakable evidence of this phenomenon in all of Ghurye's writings. Ghurye said to the present author, "Throughout my life as a sociologist, I have always tried to use my knowledge in Sanskrit literature in all its branches to enlighten the past social history .... I am a firm believer that whoever wants to do sociology of India in particular, must have a thorough grounding in Sanskrit literature". Knowledge of the classical texts and contact with Rivers directed Ghurye to make research on the early social institutions and civilizational history of India. The interest was more augmented by the then M.A. Syllabus of Bombay University which included papers on civilizational history.

Ghurye also firmly believed that, in the Indian setting at least, there is no scope for making any distinction between sociology and social anthropology. He said to the present author, "Sociology and social anthropology should not be different. When I read first, in 1920, Westermarck's *History of Human Marriage*, I had come to the conclusion that sociology or the study of social institutions was dependent on what generally was social anthropology. I went to Rivers because of this conviction and it further convinced me that social anthropology is not much

10 Interview with the present author on 10.1.79. On the point of the relation between knowledge of Sanskrit and Indian Sociology, see D.P. Mukherji's address in R.N. Saksena - Sociology, Social Research and Social Problems (1961), p. 23; But see, also, D. Harain - Hindu Character (1957), p. 33.
different from sociology and that its method and its subject-matter was
necessary for sociology .... In the Indian situation one cannot make any
difference unless one goes into gymnastics with some concepts". In India,
with its huge number of groups in all stages of culture there is no room for
distinguishing and clearly separating social anthropology and sociology.
K.P. Chatterjee and Ghurye, both students of Rivers and attached with
the two most important Universities in the formative periods of the develop­
ment of sociology, did not observe any such distinction. Ghurye writes on
the point, "It augurs well for India that if, in Bombay, sociology includes
social anthropology, in Calcutta, social anthropology is extended to include
sociology to some extent as perhaps the source of inspiration came from the
same teacher." 12

This opinion of Ghurye regarding the advisability of not making
any distinction between sociology and social anthropology, has been widely
accepted. With social anthropology today taking up the study of peasant
communities and of complex societies and civilization, the traditional
frontier between the two disciplines has collapsed. M.N. Srinivas is a
strong supporter of this view and discusses how the two approaches were
combined in the writings of Durkheim. He says, "I hope we in India will
come to look upon training in social anthropology as an essential prelimi­
nary to undertaking sociological studies - to some extent this is the

11 Interview with the present author on 11.1.79.
Also, Vidyarthi, Sahay and Dutt - Aspects of Social Anthropology in
13 D.N. Majumdar - 'Role of Sociologist in India' in R.N. Saksena (ed.) -
Sociology, Social Research and Social Problems in India (1961),
pp. 33-34. Bennett and Wolff - 'Toward communicatiion Between Sociology
and Anthropology' and D. Mandelbaum - 'The Study of Complex Civilizations'
in W.L. Thomas (ed.) - Current Anthropology (1956), pp. 329-30 and
pp. 203-25.
It may be contended that there are some broad lines of distinction between sociology and social anthropology and that in the West the two disciplines have in practice retained their separate identities notwithstanding what we have said above. But in India, from the very beginning, the two disciplines operated in close relationship with each other. The objective situation in India was such that there was no scope for making any such distinction. Beteille rightly says, 'the division of labour between sociology and social anthropology emerged in Britain or the United States under specific historical conditions and was then transferred to other countries where conditions were different. There is no ground to believe that what appeared reasonable and appropriate under certain conditions will always appear to be so.' Beteille further says, 'the distinction between sociology and social anthropology thrives on a dichotomous view of the world ..... In India, unlike in America or Australia, the distinction between tribal and non-tribal society is vague, unclear and, in the end, arbitrary'. It may be said that among the founders, Ghurye provided the lead in breaking the barrier between the two disciplines in India.

Thus Sanskritic and Indological background and anthropological orientation of sociology provide the three prominent intellectual strands in Ghurye's writings. And all these approaches have been admirably fitted into

16 A. Beteille - Ibid., p. 17. I.P. Desai also says that both the disciplines in India operated within a broad evolutionary framework and so 'in-terms of theory there was nothing to distinguish between anthropology and sociology' - I.P. Desai - 'Craft of Sociology in India' in Economic and Political Weekly, vol. XVI, no. 70 (1981), p. 248.
his evolutionary framework. D. Pillai says, "one wonders what would have been the course of sociology in India if Ghurye had not been trained in anthropology and Sanskrit at the same time. He put a hold hyphen between Indology and Sociology, and stood against any segregation between social anthropology and sociology." 17

We have seen in the preceding Chapters that diffusionism constitute the broad theoretical framework of Ghurye. The key words: in this respect are diffusion, acculturation and integration. The diffusionists believe that most of the culture-traits are borrowed from outside and that there is little indigenous growth. R. Linton says, "the service of diffusion in enriching the content of individual cultures has been of the utmost importance. There is probably no culture extant today, which owes more than 10 p.c. of its total elements to inventions made by members of its own society." 18 It is considered that the task of the social or cultural anthropologist is to delineate those traits which were thus diffused. Among the chief proponents of this theory we can mention the names of Rivers, Perry, D.E. Smith etc. Of them, Perry went to the extreme of tracing all the cultural traits back to the Egyptian Civilization.

Ghurye could not support such an extreme position. He said to the present author, "I do not whole-heartedly support Perry's theory ...... but there must have been some influence of Egypt. Otherwise, how can there be exactly similar practices throughout the world?" 19

18 R. Linton - The Study of Man; An Introduction (1956), p. 325.
19 Interview with the present author on 10.1.79.
Rivers was more moderate and effective. In the *History of Melanesian Society*, he made an attempt to reconstruct history and social organization to show the lines of culture-contact and diffusion. He showed how "all the chief institutions of Melanesia, its dual organization, its secret societies, its totemism, its cult of the dead ... have been the direct outcome of the interaction between different and sometimes conflicting cultures". A number of Anthropologists, e.g. Boas, Wissler, Lowie, Kroeber, etc. were influenced by Rivers' method and worked it out in the case of aboriginal cultural history of America. Some diffusionists, again tried to apply the theory to explain the Australian aboriginal culture. Their point is that many of the culture traits of the Australian aboriginals can be explained with reference to the Tibetan-Hindu culture of the Indian region. Similarly, Margaret Hodgen has attempted to analyse the role of diffusion in the history of English civilization from 2500 B.C. to the present century.

Diffusionism played a very important role in the early years of social anthropology in India. Ghurye, as we have seen in Chapter V, carried on his early investigation to substantiate this viewpoint. Others, like K.P. Chattopadhyay, Benoy K. Sarkar, Radhakamal Mukherjee, D.P.Mukerji, were all influenced by this approach. K.P. Chattopadhyay applied Rivers'

---

method of historical reconstruction in some of his essays. He also subscribed to Evolutionism and held that the course of evolution is from simple to complex structure. Irawati Karve was also influenced by this approach and she tried to apply it in the sphere of Hindu social organization. Again, a few diffusionists of the Austrian school such as Koppers, Fuchs and Ferreira attempted to understand the culture of a few tribes in India in terms of diffusion of traits. One may say that social anthropology in India upto the 1940s was completely dominated by evolutionism and diffusionism with the only exception of A. Aiyappan, who was a student of Malinowski.

Ghurye's commitment to Rivers was more than ordinary. It prevented him from looking beyond Rivers even when the attack against diffusionism became more and more widespread. Ghurye was not a functionalist. Marxism did not have any influence on him. The Parsonian theory of social action appeared to him to be a false abstraction. And Ghurye did not have any knowledge of Max Weber either. Rivers' influence on Ghurye was so overwhelming that he looked to other sociological writings of the period with a sense of disregard and even contempt. Srinivas says on the point, "Ghurye seemed to be completely under Rivers' intellectual...

28 For a criticism of the diffusionist approach, see, Malinowski - 'culture' in Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences (1933), vol. IV, pp. 621-45.
Ghurye admitted this fact in an interview with the present author on 12.1.79.
influence even during the period I knew him, 1936-44. He even defended Rivers' espousal, along with Elliot-Smith and Perry, of the theory of the origin of important cultural phenomena such as mummification in widely separated parts of the world. His attachment to his master made him harsh towards Malinowski who had criticised Rivers' Kinship algebra.31

It would be wrong to say that Ghurye was not aware of the theoretical formulations of the functionalist school.32 But functionalism, according to Ghurye, is based on unbound premises. One can not understand the present without reference to the past. Functionalism gives too much importance on the present and ignores the relevance of historical evolution. Ghurye says, "Functionalism gives a wrong approach. Functionalism is against diffusionism and that fails to give you a historical background. Function cannot be explained without reference to history". Further, he says, "I have not very much cared to follow Radcliffe-Brown because he was a functionalist .... Rivers' method combines both functional and historical ones. He studied institutions both in time and in space. It is both functional and specific. That method also subsumes the study of institutions on a historical basis. Rivers' theory is the safest and best and I have tried to follow that. Moulded as I am in Sanskrit literature and Indian history ...... I naturally prescribed the historical-cum-comparative

32 D. Narain says that Ghurye was indifferent to the Western theoretical development but he was not ignorant of them. D. Narain - 'G.S.Ghurye' in Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences (Biographical Supplement, 1978), p. 238.
method as the proper method for all social studies of mine." Thus Ghurye is of the opinion that Rivers is the greatest anthropologist of all time.

But the significance of the 'functionist revolution' in the sphere of sociology can not be denied. A sociologist's task is to understand the present day organization and the past is relevant only to the extent it serves this goal. Functionalism provides a theoretical formulation which corrected the exaggerated conception of history propounded by the diffusionists. In spite of its many limitations, it has certainly helped us to understand social organization and functioning in a better way. Srinivas has indicated how, when he was collecting data on the Goorgs under the guidance of Ghurye, he was acting like "a conjectural historian and a collector of discrete ethnological facts without being able to integrate them into a meaningful framework". Ghurye's failure was that he refused to take into consideration the significance of later theoretical developments in the field of sociology.

But before we indict Ghurye on this count, we have to take into consideration the prevailing niche of sociology in the early 20th century. When Ghurye took up sociology, Comte, Spencer, Hobhouse, Durkheim etc were the accepted masters of sociology. Surely, there was a lot of distinction among them. Comtean and Durkheimian lines of social

---

33 Interview with the present author on 13.1.79.
34 C. Levi-Strauss has offered his panegyrics to Rivers thus: "Actually Rivers, whose genius is largely ignored today, employed both types of interpretation (social-psychological and historical) simultaneously; since his time no one has said anything not anticipated by that great theoretician." Levi-Strauss - Structural Anthropology (1963), p. 163 Fn.
analysis were poles apart. But the common feature of all of them was that they accepted a broad evolutionary framework of analysis. And the interests of sociologists were also global in nature. Ghurye accepted this dominant trend of analysis. It would be wrong to say that Ghurye was not amenable to western influence. Only this much can be said that he had a different set of masters than those who came later. Sociology has subsequently grown into a more and more specialized discipline. Ghurye failed to keep pace with changing time but in his own way he contributed something definite.

A.R. Desai, whom the present author met to ask about Ghurye's contributions, had this to say: "Ghurye supported the broad theoretical formulation then strong in Great Britain. Evolutionism was the main tenet at that time. Comte, Durkheim, Hobhouse and others were the main personalities in the field of sociology. Sociologists were not only concerned with the origin and evolution of separate institutions, they were also concerned with such macro-aspects as culture, civilization, law of history, progress etc. Ghurye inherited this tradition. He developed an evolutionary type of sociology which did not fit into any particular school. In fact, schools in that sense, did not develop at that time. Because his horizon was so vast, he did not bother about any particular theory. In fact, theory-building as a fool of explanation of social reality came into prominence at a time when Ghurye had already fixed up his mind and that is the reason why Ghurye did not enter into any theoretical discussion." 

36 of I.P. Desai - 'Craft of Sociology in India' in Economic and Political Weekly, vol. XVI, no. 6 (1981), pp. 197-98. Desai holds that a sociologist in that period knew less and less of more and more whereas the sociology that we are aiming at is a specialization and the sociologist a specialist.

37 Interview with the present author on 9.1.79.
Thus the accepted notion of sociology in those days was totally different from what we have now. I.P. Desai says, "the single societies were studied as the part of the whole humanity via the concepts of culture and civilization. Ethnology, archaeology, linguistics and such other disciplines contributed to the identification of each society as a whole in terms of its culture and civilization and helped place it on a scale of development". The first generation sociologists were all versatiles in the different fields of human activity. Sociology was a generalised discipline in those days.

Naturally, evolutionism provided the broad framework of Ghurye's sociology. The next question is, is there any central theme in Ghurye's writings? Is there any thread which binds all the diverse writings of Ghurye and give them a common focus? In the opinion of the present researcher, we can trace out such a common focus in Ghurye's writings. He thinks that a grand historical process of acculturation has been going on in this country since the time the Vedic Aryans entered into India. It is this process of acculturation which has provided unity to this vast country and which has helped to keep together a people who had heterogeneous racial and cultural background. Hinduism has remained at the centre of such unification process. Brahmical ideas and values have formed its core element and they have, in course of time, been spreaded to a people who were originally vastly different from each other. This 'cultural unity' has been maintained and consolidated with the passage of time.

Ghurye calls this the process of acculturation. It is fascinating for a sociologist to note how this process has operated and Ghurye's endeavour has been to analyse this process. As he says, 'being convinced that there was an over-all cultural unity in the Hindu population, I wanted to study what it was like. Finding that a process had been going on from north to south, from east to west, I went on thinking on it further and further. That led me on to the study of Indian society."

It was Herskovits who first systematically applied the concept of acculturation in the realm of sociology. Broadly, acculturation refers to those phenomena which occur when people of different cultures come into continuous contact, resulting in subsequent changes in the original cultural pattern of either one or both of them. Acculturation, in this sense, has been in continuous operation in Indian history. Ghurye thinks that the central values and norms of Hinduism, as cherished and upheld by the Brahmins, have provided the broad framework within which the acculturation process has worked in India. The process has not been a smooth one. Internal schisms have appeared, the challenge of other religions, like Buddhism, Jainism and Islam, has been felt, there have been long periods of degeneration and decay in Hinduism, but through the ages, Hindu religious ideas and norms have bound together people who originally hailed from a heterogeneous background. If one wants to understand the basis of cultural unity in India, one must keep in mind this historical process.

---

39 Interview with the present author on 11.1.79.
Consistently with this theme, there are three aspects of Ghurye's writings on Indian society. First, a detailed analysis of the diverse facets of Hindu culture and of the ideas of religious and social thinkers. Second, analysis of the different social and religious institutions and their role in maintaining social unity. And third, the operation of this process in recent and contemporary period. In the previous chapters, we have made a critical assessment of Ghurye's writings in all these three spheres. The broad evolutionary theme which has been developed through all of Ghurye's writings may be discussed here.

The Indo-aryans who entered India in about 2500 B.C., linguistically and culturally formed part of a wider racial group known as the Indo-Europeans. The Celts, the Anglo-Saxons, the Teutons, the Romans and the Iranians also originated from the same common stock. Because of their common ancestry these separate groups 'retained sufficient common structure and content to enable the 19th and 20th century philologists to group them together.'

Ghurye makes a big attempt to analyse the structural and cultural affinities of the Indo-aryans with other branches of Indo-Europeans, particularly, with the Anglo-Saxons. He shows that, in respect of caste, division of people into caste-like groups is a fairly common attribute of all the branches of the Indo-European peoples, though the peculiar condition of India gave birth to caste in its present form.

Even the class organisation among the British people, the Anglo-Saxons, resemble caste-form, endogamy being their common trait.\textsuperscript{43} Similarly, the extended family also is not something unique in India. By making a wide cross-cultural study, Ghurye shows that "the family organization in primitive Indo-European culture was of an extended type in structure and bi-lineal in kin-affiliation ..... The Indo-European family was, in all probability, a unit comprising four generations".\textsuperscript{44} However, the cultural affinity is most noticeable in the case of language and religion, the two important aspects of social organization. Regarding linguistic affinity, Ghurye notes, "The languages which are quite positively regarded as members of the Indo-European family of languages .... are spread from Lithuania on the Baltic in the north to the river Godavari in the south, from Scotland in the North-West to the mouths of the river Mahanadi in the South-east and from Ireland in the west to Chinese Turkistan on the one hand and Assam on the other in the east."\textsuperscript{45} In respect of religion also, their are numerous traits which are shared in common by the Indo-Aryans and the people belonging to other groups of the Indo-European Civilization.\textsuperscript{46} Thus the attempt to reconstruct and analyse the common cultural foundations of these various branches of Indo-European Civilization forms an important part of Ghurye's writings.

Coming to the analysis of Indian cultural history, Ghurye discusses the role which the Indo-aryans and particularly the Brahmans, the most intelligent and energized group among them, played in maintaining

\begin{itemize}
\item Ghurye - \textit{Caste and Class in India} (1957), pp. 269-70.
\item Ghurye - \textit{Family and kin in Indo-European Culture} (1955), p. 39.
\item Ghurye - "Early Indo-Europeans and their cultural Environment" in \textit{Vedic India} (1979), p.2.
\end{itemize}
cultural unity in India. He shows that caste system as it emerged in India is a 'Brahmanic child' originating from the Brahmanic practice of endogamy, an institution which was intended to maintain the 'racial purity' of the Brahmins.\(^47\) He shows that gotra organization is essentially Brahmanic in origin. It emerged in India among the Brahmins and that some of the Brahmanic institutions gave birth to it, viz, the earlier system of family-exogamy prevalent among them, the 'Sapinda' rules, the cult of the manes etc.\(^48\) Again, the three supreme Gods in Hindu religion, Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva, are the creations of Brahmanic mythology. The ultimate emergence of the Pentad or the complex of five deities viz., the Sun, Shiva, Vishnu, Devi and Ganesa is the result of the 'syncretic endeavours' of the Brahmins. This constitutes Ghurye's theme of analysis in two of his books.\(^49\) Finally, the leadership which the Brahmins have given in rejuvenating Hinduism in crisis periods, their role in spreading Hinduism among others - all these lead one to the conclusion that cultural unity in Hinduism, nay, in India, is essentially the result of the Brahmanic endeavour.

The question is, how could the Brahmins, who constitute so small a portion of population, could spread their influence and their cultural organization among others? The process is a fascinating one and Ghurye calls this the process of acculturation. Following Ghurye, we can discuss the operation of the process with reference to the spread of caste ideals and values in India.

When the Indo-aryans came to India, there were no castes among them - there were only three well-defined status groups. Gradually the Brahmins set themselves apart from others and made a virtual monopoly of priestcraft. They included the indigenous people as Dasas or Shudras and gave them a very low status. They projected a very high image of them in society. Ultimately, the Brahmins were crystallized into castes when they prescribed endogamy for them. All these occurred when the Indo-aryans were confined to northern India. Hence, Ghurye says, caste in India is a Brahmanic child, cradled in the land of Ganga and Yamuna and thence transferred to other parts of the country. 50

This Brahmanic practice of endogamy was, in course of time, adopted by other social groups. It gave birth to a full-fledged caste system. And the process through which these Brahmanic ideas were accepted by others is termed as the process of acculturation by Ghurye. The immense prestige and social superiority of the Brahmins led other groups to imitate the Brahmanical practice of endogamy. 51 The same influence operated behind the spread of the Brahmanic gotra system and the Brahmanic Gods. 52 It is important to note here that Ghurye claims that Srinivas's concept of Sanskriticization is nothing new and that it is subsumed within the process of acculturation noted by Ghurye. 53 In spreading these Brahmanical ideals, particularly in the South, the role of the various dynasties was also very hopeful. 54 In this way Ghurye shows that the Brahmanic influence acted 

51 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 178.
53 Interview with the present author on 16.4.79.
54 Ghurye - Caste and Race in India (1969), pp. 244-47.
the nucleus of caste organization. It is not Ghurye's contention that the indigenous groups and people did not influence the process at all but, says he, the essential direction of the process was provided by the Brahmins. Whatever synthesis had occurred, was controlled by the Brahmins.

In the previous chapters, we have analysed this theory of Ghurye and we have shown that the Brahmins did not enjoy such an unassailable position as assumed by Ghurye. We have also seen that the institutions and customs of the various groups of indigenous people form a very important component of the 'cultural heritage' of India. In fact, one can raise a basic question regarding the advisability of using the term 'acculturation' to denote the process indicated by Ghurye since acculturation is basically a two-way process. But the process discussed by Ghurye implies that there has only been a percolation of Brahmanical ideas and values to others.

It is with this view of the nature of cultural unity in India that Ghurye enters into the discussion of modern Indian society. To him, religion has provided the base of social unity in India. We have seen that though Ghurye has identified the major problems or tensions in modern India in a correct manner, his diagnosis and his suggestions are not much convincing and lack in sociological depth. Religion provides only a fragile basis of national integration. Indian unity can not be based on cultural homogeneity based on the traits of a single religion. It is a problem of managing

the complexities of a multi-lingual, multi-caste, multi-religious and multi-layered civilization. As Srinivas says, it is true that a person may identify himself with a particular caste, village, region, state or religion. But these loyalties may represent a hierarchy of values and may not necessarily threaten Indian Unity.

Ghurye fails to recognize that a qualitative change in the dynamics of Indian unity has occurred in modern India. His knowledge of India's past, instead of helping him, has stood in the way of this realization on his part. Admitting that the past is important for present, the question is, how much of the past is useful for this purpose? And what should be the sociologists' method of looking at history? Failure to appreciate Ghurye properly stems from the fact that Ghurye could not solve these questions in a satisfactory manner.

Nevertheless, with his deep knowledge of Hinduism, Ghurye has contributed significantly in some spheres of sociology at least. His writings on caste, on kinship terminologies, on the social factors behind the creation of Gods and on the Sadhus, come immediately in our mind in this connection. In other spheres, he has unearthed huge data and this has certainly benefited the world of sociology. The present writer asked Ghurye to comment on the statement that his books are a jungle of facts. Ghurye replied calmly, "Look, the statement 'jungle of facts' is much preferable to a nicely planned garden of fancies... and any discriminate reader can turn these facts into fruit-bearing garden if he is willing to do so."

59 Interview with the present author on 13.1.79.
Section - 2

GHURYE AND CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY

To date, Ghurye has thirty publications to his credit besides a few articles. Of these, only five books were published by him before 1950, the year which is generally accepted as the dividing line between 'traditional' and 'modern' in the history of sociological development in India. Yet Ghurye is regarded as one belonging to the earlier period, a 'precursor' or a 'pioneer'. This is due to several reasons. First, the most constructive period of Ghurye's influence was felt up to the 1950's so long as he was connected with the Department of Sociology, Bombay University. Second, after 1950 the orientation of Indian sociology changed - it began to grow in specialized directions and became more susceptible to the dominant theoretical trends of Western sociology. Radcliffe-Brown, Malinowski, Parsons, Weber were the new masters. It was at this time that the American sociologists became more and more interested in the Indian situation and started doing and encouraging community studies. Ghurye remained unaffected by these changes, he became a misfit in the new world of Sociology. Third, Ghurye's writings continued in the old historical-evolutionary lines. So, it appears that Ghurye's inclusion in the pre-1950 period as a pioneer is fully justified.

Srinivas and Panini - 'The Development of Sociology and Social Anthropology in India' in op.cit., p. 181. .
61 Ghurye's autobiography, I and Other Explorations gives a vivid account of his reaction to these new developments. At one place, Ghurye speaks of the 'Ford Foundation Occupation of New Delhi', p. 164.
So far as the development of sociology in India is concerned, we can make a division between the three distinct stages of its development. The first concerns the period from 1773-1900, when there emerged a definite tendency to analyse the functioning of various social institutions in a scientific manner. Many attempts were made at this period to study society in an empirical and positivistic manner and to correlate the functioning of various social institutions. The Asiatic Society in Calcutta, for example, encouraged such type of empirical research.62

This systematic reflection and research on social questions, begun in the third quarter of the 18th century, had two important directions. First, some prominent intellectuals and social reformers of the period began to raise fundamental social questions. Their greatest asset was the possession of a rational and inquisitive mind with the help of which they were all contemplating the social reality of the time. Prominent among them were Damodaranroy (1777-1833), Akshay K. Dutt (1820-1886), Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar (1820-91), Bhudev Mukhopadhyay (1827-1894) and quite a few others.63 Bengal was the centre of this renaissance. Second, it was at this period that many important academic and professional societies were established. They provide evidence of the sociological tradition of the period. The Asiatic Society of Bengal (1784), the Academic Association (1828), the Tattva Bodhini Sabha (1839), and the Bethune Society (1851) were examples of such academic bodies. In other parts of India, too, similar academic bodies and Journals were initiated.64

63 For a detailed analysis of their important contributions in the realm of Sociology, see, Dutt Gupta - Ibid., pp. 48-81.
64 See, Christine Dobbin - Urban Leadership in Western India (1972), for an account of such bodies in Bombay, pp. 53-77. Also, S.C. Dube - Indian Sociology at the Turning Point: Presidential Address to the Indian Sociological Conference, 1976, pp. 4-7.
The activities of these societies and journals bear enough evidence to dispel the notion of the lack of scientific attitude toward social phenomena in India before the 20th century. As a result of contact with the west there developed in India a tendency to critically examine the indigenous social institutions and customs. That gave birth to a favourable climate which facilitated the subsequent growth of sociology.  

But there were certain inhibiting factors also which went against the development of sociological tradition. The discipline was still in search of its identity. The scope of interest and the method of enquiry were too diffused and individualized to give birth to a well-coordinated discipline. The numerous studies on Hindu social life covered too wide a field to be termed strictly sociological. And as the subject was not professionalized, there was no central tendency of the subject. "It is not before sociology finds its place in the curriculum of studies in the university that it becomes scientific in method and coordinate in its treatment." So this stage has been described as the 'proto-professional' stage of the development of sociology.  

Ghurye belongs to the next period. Sociology was included in the curriculum of the Bombay University (1919), Calcutta University (1921) and Lucknow University (1921). In this period, the discipline was professionalized in the sense that academicians directed and controlled

---

67 But, see Dutta Gupta - op.cit., pp. 208-9, 295-98 where she shows that sociology was introduced in Calcutta University in 1908.
researches in the discipline. The important personalities in this respect were G.S. Ghurye who was in Bombay University, R.K. Mukherjee and D. P. Mukerji who were in Lucknow, Benoy K. Sarkar, L.K.A. Aiyer and K. P. Chattopadhyay who were in Calcutta University. These persons have been regarded as pioneers in the field of Indian sociology. Each of them contributed in his own way to the development of sociology. It would not be proper to make any comparison among them. We can only note here certain general tendencies which influenced the writings of this period and show how these factors operated in relation to them and how Ghurye was influenced by them.

To understand the role of these pioneers better, it would be worthwhile to consider the role of the British rulers in encouraging socio-anthropological investigations into the conditions of the people. Right from the beginning of the 19th century, the British administrators, missionaries and travellers were engaged in collecting data on social institutions and customs. The data thus generated immensely influenced the future course of sociology in India and enriched the empirical tradition in Indian sociology. But the motives of these investigations were to facilitate and ensure effective colonial administration in this country. The works of the British administrators-cum-scholars posted in different parts of India fall in this category. Thus Risley, Dalton and O'Malley in Eastern India, Russell in Middle India, Thurston in South India, Crooks in North India wrote encyclopaedic inventories about the condition of the people of their respective regions.68 This close association of

68 L.P. Vidyarthi - 'Two Hundred Years of Social Anthropology in India' in Vidyarthi, Sahay and Dutta - Aspects of Social Anthropology in India (1980), pp. 10-11. Also, D.N. Majumdar - Progress of Anthropology in India, 1911-46 (1947), pp. 3-10.
sociology and anthropology with the colonial masters explains why sociology and anthropology did not have much respectability in the days of freedom struggle. In fact, it may even be contended that the University Departments in sociology and anthropology were established at this time with the hope that it would help the cause of the British administration. Sociology had a period of stunted growth in British India since it was made to serve colonial interests. Bottomore had, perhaps, this aspect in mind when he said, "in order to flourish, the discipline of sociology requires a general atmosphere of freedom, which it was not possible to have in a colonial country".

It is against this backdrop that the pioneers' contribution is to be understood. Most of them were nationalists in orientation, if not actively involved in politics. Their conception of sociology was that it should be distinctively Indian in orientation and should be a tool for the advancement of society. Ramkrishna Mukherjee says, "the advancement of sociology was not a mere vocation to most of the pioneers; it was almost a mission". Not that the pioneers were averse to western intellectual influence. But they thought that considering the peculiarity of Indian social structure and tradition, Indian sociology should have a distinctive

shape of its own. D.P. Mukherjee lamented, "It pains me to observe how our Indian scholars succumb to the lure of modern scientific techniques imported from outside ....... In the intellectual transactions which are taking place, it seems that we have no terms to offer, no ground to stand upon."^73

The nationalist orientation of the pioneers influenced their conception of the nature and goal of sociology in India. Radhakamal Mukherjee held that whereas the west is characterized by class-conflict, in the East there is integration or communality of interests. As such the nature of sociology must also be different here. D.P. thinks that a sociologist's task is to analyse Indian culture and tradition through the dynamic process of its evolution. He has endeavoured to show how changes in Indian tradition have occurred due to changes in the economic and political situation. Benoy K. Sarkar, again, was more explicitly a nationalist. The basic theme of his study was to show 'the positive background of Hindu sociology', to dispel the persistent general belief that Hinduism is other-worldly in nature. S.V. Ketkar, whose was the first structural analysis of caste system in India, held the view that Indian nationalism must be strengthened by linguistic distinctions: an aspect of Indian social reality which impressed the political leaders much later in the 1930's and the social scientists later still after the 1960's. K. P. Chattopadhyay, who, like Ghurye, was a student of Rivers, showed a rare concern for contemporary social problems as his works on Famines (1946), on the state of education (1946, 1962) on the condition of the workers (1947, 1952) etc. will

And Ghurye, as we have already seen, has given enough evidence of his 'Indian' orientation in his choice of themes and in his analysis of the problems.

Again, these pioneers did not accept the contention that sociology does not have anything to do with value-judgement. Indeed, if anything, therein lies the utility of sociology. Sociology increases one's understanding of society and as such a sociologist is better placed to indicate his value-preferences as compared with others. Radhakamal says, the strength of sociology in India lies precisely in its linking up of social with ethical and spiritual values. In fact, the dominant cultural ethos of the time did not believe in any value-free social science. As such, the concept of values permeated the writings of all the pioneers, including Ghurye. The goals set by them vastly differed from each other. Their analysis of the nature and purpose of social organization also were different. They tried to understand the complex reality from historical, contemporary and futuristic perspective. It would be simplistic to contend that the pioneers were all opposed to western empiricism, as contended by many. Their approach reminds one of Myrdal's statement that 'Social Sciences have all received their impetus much more from the urge to improve society than from simple curiosity about its working.'

79 See - Srinivas and Panini - op.cit., p. 196.
82 G. Myrdal - Value in Social Theory, p. 9.
This concern of the first generation sociologists with values and with the question of goals of society goes against the 'empirical' orientation of modern sociology. But that does not mean that they were speculative and anti-empirical in orientation. In fact, it may be contended that the founders were nothing if not scientific and diagnostic in their orientation. I.P. Desai says, "The founders of sociology in India were neither unsociological nor unscientific .... while dealing with practical problems they were not merely concerned with social reforms but also with the change in the type of society. These were their concerns precisely because they were sociologists. We are free to disown them. But we should also be prepared and willing to be disowned as sociologists and scientists by a generation after us."  

Another important fact about these pioneers - and this has also proved to be a handicap for the development of Sociology in India - is that they did not have any common point regarding the subject-matter of sociology. "Sociology in the thirties and forties was still very much what individual sociologist wrote and taught."  

About Radhakomal, Ramkrishna Mukherjee said that his approach was not multidisciplinary but transdisciplinary. He came to sociology from economics but ended in metaphysics. A. K. Saran has scathingly criticised Radhakomal by saying, "His writings are extraordinarily loose and repetitious and full of undigested ideas. Inconsistencies, confusion and self-contradictions.

---

85 Interview with the present author on 26.2.79.
The criticism appears a bit too harsh but it can safely be asserted that sociology as it has developed today has not been on Radhakamal's lines.

The same may be said about Dhurjati Prasad Mukherji. D.P. - as he was affectionately called - was most effective as a teacher but not so as a research guide or as a systematic and methodical writer. D.P.'s claim that 'Sociology has a floor and a ceiling, like any other science, but its speciality consists in its floor being the ground flood of all types of social disciplines, and its ceiling remaining open to the sky' is enough to prove his conception of sociology. D.P. was concerned with knowledge as a totality and he spoke against the narrow vivisection of knowledge. 'Economics had to be rooted in concrete social reality, that is, it had to be sociological; sociology had to take full cognizance of cultural specificity, that it, it had to be historical; history had to rise above a narrow concern with the triviality of the gone-by events through the incorporation in it of a vision of the future, that is, it had to be philosophical.' Of all the pioneers, D.P. was intellectually most profound and personally most effective. But D.P. himself did not care to elaborate his own method by any substantive work.

86 A.K. Saran - 'India' in Roucek - op.cit., p. 1021.
89 This was admitted even by Ghurye, who is generally non-chalant about Indian sociologists and their writings, in an interview with the present author on 11.1.79. Also, Ghurye - I and other Explorations, p. 121, where he says that D.P. was "very strong on the theoretical and conceptual side of sociology."
As compared with them, Ghurye appears to be more constructive in his influence. There were many faults in Ghurye's conception of Indian culture, theoretically also Ghurye's position was not convincing. Yet this method was within the easy reach of his students and it provided valuable initial impetus for the development of sociology. Unlike his contemporaries, Ghurye knew where he could be most effective and with rare diligence and professional devotion, he employed himself to the task. This paid rich dividend for Indian sociology. The data which he marshalled on caste, on tribes, on family and kinship terminology, on religious institutions and Hindu Gods, on costumes and architecture and on the evolution of village communities in traditional India - have profoundly enriched sociological literature in India. It seems that thematically Ghurye was closest to D.P.'s exhortation that Indian sociologists should first and foremost be concerned with Indian tradition. Srinivas rightly commented that Ghurye went as far as empiricism could take him. "Time will show that Ghurye was far ahead of them all (R.K. Mukherjee, D.P. Mukherji, D.N. Majumdar) or rather a much bigger figure than all of them .... D.N. Majumdar and R.K. Mukherjee, not so much D.P., were the people who introduced field-work tradition .... D.P. was an excellent teacher as many of his students will tell you. But all these things were combined in Ghurye".  

The credit for professionalizing sociology in India, in the main must go to Ghurye. There were other pioneers of sociology in India who have done valuable work - it will be invidious to mention names - but no single person did as much as for sociology as Ghurye.

---

90 Interview with the present author on 7.1.79.
It seems that one institutional factor helped Ghurye very much in his mission of building up sociology in India. This was the early introduction (in 1943) of a full 8 paper course on Sociology at the M.A. level. Even before that one could get his M.A. degree in Sociology through dissertation and in 1936, the Ph.D. degree in sociology was first instituted. As Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology in Bombay University, Ghurye was thus in a position to organize the sociological World. Contrasted with it, in Lucknow, there was only one paper in Sociology as part of the M.A. Economics course. In Calcutta, there was a paper on sociology in the Economics Department first. Despite the presence of Benoy Sarkar, who was a great teacher, systematic research on Sociology did not have any institutional support. The Anthropology Department, from the very start, concentrated on tribal studies at a micro-level. Thus Bombay was in the forefront of Indian sociology. And Ghurye's catholicity in his interests and methods helped the discipline very much. The dominant trend of research at the time of Ghurye was ethnographic in character. Ghurye, on the other hand, was in favour of an integrated approach. All these factors helped the cause of sociology in India.

92 See Srinivas and Panini - op.cit., p. 189.
Section - 3

GHURYE AS A TEACHER

While paying tribute to Dr. D.N. Majumdar, T.N. Madan observed, "the Department ( of Anthropology at the University of Lucknow ) and the students who passed out of it to spread out into the far corners of the country, like his earlier pupils, are the greatest contributions. Majumdar has made to Indian Anthropology". Nowhere is the statement more applicable than in the case of Ghurye. Ghurye's students are the greatest proof of Ghurye's contribution. The present author interviewed M.N. Srinivas, A.R. Desai, Neera Desai, Y.B. Damle, Ramkrishna Mukherjee, Dhirendra Narain, J.V. Ferreira and Andre Beteille on the contributions of Prof. G.S. Ghurye. All of them admit that Ghurye's effort in promoting the cause of teaching and research is his most significant contribution in the field of sociology. Ghurye's autobiographical work, I and Other Explorations bear out clearly how much importance he gave to teaching and research in his academic career.

Ghurye took charge of the Department of Sociology in 1924 as Reader and Head of the Department. He was appointed a Professor in 1934. He retired in 1959 - after 35 years of continuous teaching. He retired from service career but he did not cease to be academically active.

His last research student submitted thesis in 1971. During these about 50 years span he supervised 80 theses. Of these, 40 theses have been published as books. Between 1959 (when he retired) and 1970, 14 of his research students got Ph.D. degrees, a feat which may not be possible for a sociologist during his entire life. Many of these theses have been highly original and have been acknowledged internationally. The present author met Ghurye when he was 86 years old and he found Ghurye remembering the name, place of origin and research topic of each of his research students. This was indicative of the importance which he gave to research work.

As a teacher, Ghurye was very serious and meticulous in preparing his lecture notes. Many of his students have testified that his lectures were heavily documented. The academic seriousness with which Ghurye prepared his lecture notes can be testified by the fact that many of his subsequent books were based on the materials which he collected for his class lecture. *Family and Kin in Indo-European Culture, Cities and Civilization, Occidental Civilization, Sexual Behaviour of the American Female* are the examples. Ghurye sincerely believed that the greatest reward of a teacher lies in the academic success of his students. He was equally available to the students both inside and outside the class. Srinivas says, "Ghurye took trouble over the preparation of his lectures but I found them dull and repetitious. In contrast to his lectures, he was stimulating in informal talk. He talked about all things including sex and he was frank and uninhibited. I got into the habit of dropping into his
room whenever I had a doubt or difficulty and Ghurye was generous with his
time .... There was no doubt about his dedication to his teaching and
research."  

As a research guide, Ghurye was more impressive and more successful. Three aspects are to be considered here. First, the impressive list of his successful students. Second, his 'pupil coverage', attracting students from a wide geographical area. And, third, the impressive variety of the topics of research done under him.

Ghurye constantly whipped up the research-interests of his students and thought that field-work constitutes the life-blood of sociology. He created an intellectual milieu in which 'writing a paper or a book came to be looked upon as a very natural thing to do for all research students and staff-members.' A.R. Desai said, the real contribution of Ghurye lies in the fact that he sensitized others about the need of doing research. He created a 'sociological awareness'. The various themes on which his students did work were directly related with the fact that Ghurye made them aware of the deep sociological relevance of those themes. The 'second generation' of Indian sociologists was largely his creation. Some of his successful students have become household names in the field of sociology.

---

97 Based on the present author's interview with A.R. Desai on 9.1.79.
The names of his students which come to one's mind in this connection are M.N. Srinivas, K.M. Kapadia, I. Karve, K.T. Merchant, I.P. Desai, A.R. Desai, Y.B. Damle, D. Narain, M.S.A. Rao, K.N. Venkatarayappa, A. Bopegama, M.G. Kulkarni, K.C. Panchnadikar, M.L. Sharma, D.B. Unwalla and many others. The noted Marathi Folk-culturist, Durga Bhagwat, also began as his student. Undoubtedly, sociology in India would not have been what it is but for Ghurye's persistent research interests in diverse fields.

Ghurye always insisted that Research Fellowships are meant for collecting primary data. In his mission of collecting ethnological data from all over India, Ghurye was ably supported by his students who came from all parts of the country. He encouraged these students to take up study of their own regions. Literary and archaeological data, folk-songs and folk-cults, data on customs, manners, rituals - anything which would yield data was encouraged by him. Srinivas said, "when you try to assess Ghurye, don't think of the existence of the ICSER, don't think of the existing UGC. There was no institutional support - it was a single-man affair - he constituted a one-man institution of Indian ethnography."

Naturally, the topics of research done under Ghurye's supervision are most varied, covering almost every branch of sociology.

---

98 I.P. Desai has given a vivid account of how he was assigned to collect field-data as a research-scholar under Ghurye. See, his 'Craft of Sociology in India' in Economic and Political Weekly, vol. 16, no. 6 (1981), p. 198.

99 Interview with the present author on 7.1.79. Also see, D. Narain, op.cit., p. 278.
We give below an account of the broad areas of these researches and the number of Ghurye's Ph.D. students in each of these areas.100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of sociology</th>
<th>No. of M.A. and Ph.D. Theses done under Ghurye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sociology of Art</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sociology of caste</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social causation</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social change</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sociology of child Development</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sociology of class</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Community studies</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Crimes and Criminology</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Culture and Personality</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cultural studies</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Social Demography</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Social Ecology</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sociology of Education</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sociology of the Family</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sociology of the Handicapped</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Social History</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Industrial Sociology</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Sociology of knowledge</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Sociology of Leisure</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Sociology of Mass Communication</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Sociology of Migration</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 The data in this regard has been collected from the Souvenir published on the occasion of the Golden Jubilee Celebration of the Department of Sociology, Bombay University in 1969 and a 'Handbook of Information' published by the Department in 1978-79. The present researcher was helped by Ghurye in the preparation of this list.
Two things are of importance in connection with Ghurye's supervision of research work of his students. First, Ghurye strictly separated his own range of interest from those of his students. He has not produced any work in collaboration with his students. Second, Ghurye allowed his students maximum academic autonomy - as regards the choice of area and as regards the method and approach which would do justice to the topic under study. It is because of this catholicity on the part of Ghurye that it has been possible for his students to excel in many directions. Marx and Weber, Parsons and Durkheim, Malinowski and Singer - any body could influence their theoretical framework. It was exactly this type of versatility which was required. So Ghurye's lack of any theoretical orientation in the narrow sense of the term, proved to be a boon in disguise for sociology in India. Damle has said to the present author, "(By default) Ghurye promoted autonony among his students by

101 Ghurye proudly mentioned this fact to the present author on 13.1.79."
not imposing any theoretical framework ... On stratification (Damle's area) if I made any statement all that he wanted that you must quote proper authority." 102 Prof. Dhirendra Marain has similarly commented on this aspect of Ghurye's research attitude and added that this type of autonomy is not granted to the research students by the present day masters of sociology. 103

A.R. Desai's thesis on the origin of Indian nationalism was done under Ghurye from the Marxist standpoint in an academic milieu which was generally indifferent to that approach. And Ghurye is farthest from Marxism - he represents the bourgeois liberal tradition. 104 While narrating his experience, Desai says, "It has been my experience that Ghurye was a liberal and tolerant guide who allowed people to carry on researches on matters of their own choice. I went to him and said that I want to carry on Research on this topic from the Marxist standpoint and this thing was made very clear to him at the outset. He readily agreed. Ghurye stood for logic and facts and if the conclusions are consistent with them and if the lines of argument are systematically developed then he won't question even if he would not personally agree with those conclusions ..... He never interfered with my exploration - he would go even further, if I was inconsistent with my logic then he would point it out and suggest how the case can be made. This liberality was something and

102 Interview with the present author on 21.7.79.
103 Interview with the present author on 6.1.79.
104 Ghurye's *Culture and Society* (1946) is the best example of it.
it can not be found even amongst the notable sociologists today. They would take only those students who would support their viewpoint."  

Ghurye showed the same liberality while guiding the thesis of Mr. Athaide's 'The Extent of Rational Thought in Educated India'. Prof. D.P. Mukherji, who was an external referee of this thesis, had wondered how Ghurye could have tolerated such a communist as Mr. Athaide.  

One last point about the service Ghurye rendered to the cause of his students. Though in his own works Ghurye does not reflect much awareness of the modern western sociologists, many notable sociologists have acted as the external referees of the Ph.D. theses of his students. Thus R. K. Merton, MacIver, Parsons, Mandelbaum, Ogburn, Sorokin, and others have acted frequently as examiners of the research theses of many of his students. Their comments and appreciation have acted as a morale booster to his students and have profoundly helped in the formation of their subsequent theoretical orientations. It is a pity that while many of these western sociologists have highly appreciated Ghurye's works in their personal communication to Ghurye, they have remained generally indifferent to Ghurye in their own substantive works.

105 Based on the author's interview with Prof. A.R. Desai on 9.1.79. Prof. D. Narain says, Ghurye was an exacting adviser but did not impose his views. Few have equaled him and none has surpassed him in India in this respect. See, D. Narain, op.cit., p. 258.

Section - 4

GHURYE AS AN INSTITUTION-BUILDER

Ghurye's own nature and personality does not make him quite fit as an Institution-Buildér. A strong egoist and highly temperamental in nature, Ghurye could and did "cut others by his tongue". 'Populism' has never been Ghurye's cup of tea. He had his own view of life and world. He stood for certain values and he would never compromise on them. In Ghurye's world there are only two alternatives, either unquestioned loyalty or opposition. He would do everything in earth for the man whom he loves but is annoyed and provoked by slightest criticism. He would gracefully withdraw and sever all connections with the person or organization which would not toe his line. This is a major reason why Ghurye has exiled himself from the sociological world today. Such a nature mulitates against the institution-building capacity of a man. Yet the very fact that Ghurye gave highest priority to academic values and chaired the University Department of Sociology for 35 years helped him to create and sustain some academic institutions.

The most notable example of such endeavour of Ghurye is the establishment of the Indian Sociological Society in 1952 and the publication of the bi-annual 'Sociological Bulletin' as the official journal of the Society. Since that time up to September, 1966, Ghurye functioned as the key man behind the Association and the Journal.107 Considering the

107 For an account of the functioning of the Association up to 1966, the year Ghurye resigned as President of the Association, see his I and Other Explorations, pp. 132-35.
key role of the 'Association' and the 'Bulletin' in pulling together the sociological fraternity in India and considering that the 'Bulletin' continues to be the most important Journal of the Indian sociologists, this must be regarded as an invaluable contribution of Ghurye to the cause of sociology in India. During this long span of his fifteen years' association with the Bulletin, Ghurye published many special numbers of the Bulletin, made others to write articles on matters of sociological import and most important, made it a serious academic Journal. The 'Sociological Bulletin' not merely bears evidence of Ghurye's organizational ability, but also Ghurye fed the Bulletin regularly with his academic output during these years. From 1952 to 1965, no less than 15 articles of Ghurye were published in this Journal.108 Some of them were serious research articles and have since been published in book form.

Yet during the time of Ghurye's association with the Journal, the 'Bulletin' was primarily an exponent of the 'Bombay School', as it is sometimes called, or the Western Indian Sociologists. Lucknow and Calcutta, the two other centres, had their own Journals and there was not much close relationship among them.109 It was only in 1966 that these parallel centres were brought together and a meeting of the first 'truly representative gathering' of the Indian sociologists was held in


109 Ghurye has said to the present author that when he started the Journal, 'the whole of North India was against it excepting D.F.' - Interview on 13.1.79.
Bombay. But Ghurye began to feel alienated as he felt that I was not pulling more than my weight in the cooperative endeavour as I had till then done. He severed all connections with the society and the Journal. Even the articles which were meant to be continued did not appear since then. This speaks of the peculiar temperament of Ghurye which we have discussed earlier.

Besides the Sociological Society, Ghurye had also been associated with various other academic bodies and institutions. He was elected president of the Anthropological Section of the Indian Science Congress in 1935 and the President of the Ethnology and Folklore Section of the Oriental Conference in 1937. He was the President of the Bombay Anthropological Society from 1944-50. He was also an Executive Committee member of the International Sociological Association in 1950. In the late 1950s and 1960s he was also offered membership of various International bodies.

So we think that while assessing Ghurye's contributions, these four aspects should be taken into consideration. First, his approach to Sociology, his theoretical framework of sociology and its

111 Ghurye - 'I and Other Explorations', p. 154.
112 In interview with the present author, Ghurye stated the reasons why he dissociated himself from the Society and expressed his bitterness over the way in which the 'Society' and the 'Bulletin', are being run at present.
linkage with the prevailing sociological milieu; second, Ghurye's speciality and contribution vis-a-vis his contemporaries; third, Ghurye as a teacher and a research-guide, his role in sensitizing others about the relevance of sociological research; and fourth, Ghurye as an institution-builder. As we have seen, in each of these aspects, Ghurye laid significant contributions. He sowed the seeds in many respects and the posterity is enjoying the rich harvest. It may be rightly said that no single person did as much for sociology as Ghurye. Ghurye created an hospitable climate for sociology in India by his research dedication and academic orientation. He fully realized the many sided potentials of sociology for a complex society like India. He emphasized that sociology in India must have a fully 'Indian' orientation. Sociology in India would not have come to its present shape without Ghurye.