The study of culture has a perennial appeal both for anthropologists and sociologists all over the world. There are two conflicting views on the growth and accumulation pattern of culture. One theory maintains that in any community culture grows quite independently of similar events happening elsewhere or that culture grows predominantly with reference to local needs and local situation. The other group believes that culture grows by diffusion. A single invention or discovery is made at one place and ultimately this cultural trait diffuses throughout the world. The diffusionists maintain that there is a definite pattern of this diffusionist route and by studying the remnants of the culture of the various primitive people, we can discover the missing link. An anthropologist thereby predominantly engages himself in the task of cultural reconstruction.

The most ardent advocate of this diffusionist school was Sir G.E. Smith. He was of the opinion that every contemporary society or civilization may be traced back to one original source, 'which must clearly have been the Valley of the Nile.' Malinowski, on the other hand, took a more moderate stand and declared that the very posing of the question —

diffusion or independent evolution - is a wrong one. "Every cultural
achievement is due to a process of growth in which diffusion and invention
have equal shares ... the process is always one of adaptation ..." He
declared that culture is not a heap of trinkets which can be peddled
across oceans and round continents. Diffusion and internal development
therefore play complementary role in the process of culture development.

The Diffusionist theory of culture came to Ghurye via Rivers. Rivers
was tremendously influenced by Smith. E.R. Leach says, "Rivers'
uncritical acceptance of Smith's dogmatic and wildly exaggerated assertion
is a matter for astonishment. Nearly, all of Rivers' later anthropological
writings, including the very important History of Melanesian Society (1914)
and Kinship and Social Organization (1914) show Smith's influence to a
marked degree." Ghurye was tremendously influenced by Rivers. Srinivas
has corroborated this phenomenon. Srinivas said, "He even defended Rivers'
espousal, along with Elliot Smith and Perry, of the theory of Egyptian
origin of important cultural phenomena such as mummification in widely
separated parts of the world." 5

Two articles of Ghurye bear evidence of this phenomenon. 'The
Disposal of Human Placenta', published in 1937, examines the practices of
human beings with regard to the disposal of discards of human body like

2 Malinowski in op.cit., p. 27.
3 Malinowski - A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays (1944), p. 213.
4 E.R. Leach - 'W.H. Rivers' in International Encyclopedia of Social
Sciences (1968), vol. 13, p. 227.
5 Srinivas - 'Itineraries of an Indian Social Anthropologist' in Interna­
It is important to note here that K.P. Chattopadhyay, another student
of Rivers, was also profoundly influenced by Rivers' approach. See, in
particular, his 'History of Indian Social Organization' in Journal of
Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1955; Some Approaches to the Study
of Social Change, Poona 1959, and Ancient Indian Culture Contact and
first-cut hair, nailpairings, first-fallen teeth and the after-birth. Frazer and Smith were of the opinion that the origin of totemism is to be traced to the belief that the external soul of man finds its abode in the placenta and so the method of its disposal is a very important cultural trait. The purpose of this article of Ghurye is, as he says, "to compare the methods of disposal of the human placenta in the different regions of the world to see if they shed any light on the problem of diffusion of culture." 7

Of all the methods of the disposal of human placenta in India, there are two which are most uncommon, viz., the method of simply throwing it away and that of water-burial. Ghurye mentions that there are four other methods for the disposal of the after-birth which are followed in four well-demarcated regions. 8 First, the most widespread practice is to bury it, placing it in an earthenware pot or on a leaf. Second, there is the method of burying the after-birth and place some fire on it so that it is dried up and preserved. The third method is to hang it on a tree and the fourth one is that of burning the after-birth.

The belief underlying all these methods is that there is some connection between the placenta and the child and so it must be carefully disposed. The placenta is the repository of the spiritual essence or the external-soul of the child. 9 In some cases, it is even taken as a medicine for fertility. It is interesting from the standpoint of cultural history

7 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 95.
8 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 150.
9 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 155.
and culture-contact that this belief is there not only in parts of India but also in Java, Siberia, parts of China and in New Guinea. ¹⁰

This hypothesis of culture-contact can be further shown by the locational analysis of various regions following the same or similar practices. More or less contiguous areas follow the same practices with regard to the disposal of human placenta. This suggests that there must have been some form of contact between these people in the past and that some form of migration took place. Dr. Mandelbaum, to whom Ghurye sent his Paper, had this to add on this aspect, "... the most common method of disposing of the after-birth in North America is by hanging it on a tree or shrub ... This fits in with your demonstration of the prevalence of this method to the north-east of India, thus making a continuous distribution across the Berring Straits and far down into the Americas." ¹¹ This is how Ghurye tries to substantiate the culture-contact theory with reference to a particular cultural trait.

The other Article, viz., 'Megalithic Remains of India' was written by Ghurye as a part of his doctoral dissertation under the guidance of W.H.R. Rivers. ¹² Rivers, as Ghurye himself says, was a great advocate of the historical approach to and ethnological analysis of, culture. This article is an attempt "to test Elliot Smith's hypothesis and/or to test the diffusionist viewpoint in relation to this complex of culture traits." ¹³

¹⁰ Ghurye - Ibid., p. 160-61
¹¹ Quoted by Ghurye - op.cit., p. 170 fn.
¹³ Ghurye - Ibid., p. 224.
Ghurye's finding is that the theoretical formulations of Smith are essentially correct. He admits that the conclusions made by W.J.Perry are 'wild generalizations' but the hypothesis of 'heliolithic culture' made by Smith has not only been ethnologically proved, it has also been accepted by other anthropologists and historians of civilizations. The 'Megalithic remains' in India have been divided by Ghurye into ten parts and each of these parts shows elements of diffusion. Thus referring to the Rock-cut tombs, which is one variety of megalithic remains in India, Ghurye says that "it strangely recalls the Egyptian conception of the house of the dead..." 14 Again, referring to the use of shells for ornamental purposes in Dolmens, he says that "it lends some support to the theory of Prof. Elliot Smith that the Dolmens are ultimately derivable from the funerary monuments of Egypt." 15 Ghurye also enters into the question of the age of the Indian dolmens. By analysing the structure of these dolmen and by other circumstantial evidences, he shows that the megalithic monuments of India must be as old as 1000 B.C. Ghurye concludes "Thus it is clear that we have to look for the origin of Indian structures... towards Egypt." 16 The entire megalithic civilization of ancient India, according to him, grew out of culture-contact. It also acted as a radiating centre which influenced other civilizations in other parts of the world.

Indian funerary practices also substantiate this point. Ghurye wrote an article on this aspect as early as in 1923. He clearly states, "In dealing with this subject (viz., funerary practices of India), I have a special purpose. I am trying to explore what affinities there are between

14 Ghurye - Ibid., pp. 229-30.
15 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 236.
16 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 271.
Egyptian and Indian funerary practices. Secondly, I shall deal with the orientation of the dead body, either in cremation or burial, as this is an important item in the analysis of culture-contacts."\(^{17}\) We may illustrate this point with reference to Ghurye's treatment of the method of disposal of the dead body. Among the Indians (Hindus), the dead body is cremated and not preserved like the Egyptians. But these same people take special care of the bones after the body is burnt. Again, the body is annointed or besmeared with preservatives before it is cremated. Ghurye says, "It is hard to understand the necessity of applying oil to the corpse and then washing it unless we recognise in the practice Egyptian influence."\(^{18}\) Similar influences can be traced to numerous other practices which lead Ghurye to presume the validity of culture-contact theory developed by Rivers and Elliot Smith.

But this type of diffusionist theory, as we know, has been quite outmoded in modern times. The diffusionist theory has been criticised mainly on two grounds. Firstly, it was supposed that diffusionism worked only in one direction - from west to east. The diffusionists believe that the savages are without initiative and ascribe all cultural development to a 'chosen people'.\(^{19}\) So it has got a racial connotation. The diffusionist theory, though encouraging a particular type of social research, ultimately ended in a sterile controversy. It is impossible to reconstruct the past history of preliterate primitive cultures from their imperfectly known present. The data on the processes involved in the development of culture

\(^{19}\) V. Childe - *Social Evolution* (London:1951).
are so limited that we cannot know which one is more important - diffusion or invention. Culture, it transpires, is highly resilient in character and it would be naive to assume that the savages are too ready and eager to blindly adopt the foreign cultural elements however developed these elements may be. A. Aiyappan says, "Rivers was beginning at the wrong end when he made his hypothetical reconstruction of the history of Melanesian and Polynesian cultures for he himself (Rivers) says, 'It is only when our present knowledge is far more extensive and exact than at present that we can hope to disentangle the exact part which motives of different kinds have taken in the genesis of social customs.'"

These being the limitations of the diffusionist approach, it would be too much to expect that Ghurye's articles written from that approach would help us to understand the process of cultural evolution in India. In fact, a particular cultural trait does not exist in isolation nor is it imported in that way from outside. The nature and functioning of culture is to be understood in the context of the whole gamut of the culture complex. It is here that the evolutionists fail and the functionalists offer more satisfactory tool of analysis. So Ghurye's analysis of the 'Egyptian affinities' of particular culture-traits leaves much to be explained. Keeping in mind the various limitations of such an approach the present anthropologists and sociologists are not much interested to pursue research from this approach.

Cultural diffusionism is essentially an anthropological theory which is concerned with the nature of culture-contact operating principally among the preliterate people. But this exogenous factor is largely inadequate to explain all the facets of culture in an on-going and relatively more developed society. It appears that Ghurye lost his interest in the pure diffusionist theory subsequently for two reasons. Firstly, with the passage of time, attacks on this theory became more and more pronounced and it became impossible for him to defend the theory in its pure form. Secondly, the diffusionist approach has been applied to explain the traits of preliterate cultures, mostly of tribals and primitives. The early Indian anthropologists who were influenced by this approach did their researches in the tribal field. But Ghurye became more and more concerned with the process of evolution of Hindu civilization which has been termed as a 'complex civilization'. And Ghurye thought that for analysing the dynamics of culture in such a long historical civilization, the process of acculturation is more relevant than the process of diffusion. Cultural unity in India is the result of a long historical process of development.

23 Studies in the acculturation process working in Indian Society are nothing new. N. Dutta Majumdar's The Santals: A Study in Culture Change (1955) and Surajit Sinha's The Acculturation of the Bhumi of Manbhum (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1956) bear enough evidence of the influence of Herskovits, their teacher, who first systematically defined 'Acculturation'. Some of K.P. Chattopadhyay's works are also relevant here. However, all these are concerned with the study of the changes occurring among tribals. Ghurye's work is a significant departure from this trend.
Hindu Brahminical culture provides the dominant theme of this unity. People who had a very different cultural background, e.g., those living in the South or the pre-aryan inhabitants of northern India ultimately accepted this culture. Ghurye thinks that the challenging task of a sociologist is to analyse this complex acculturation process in India. Ghurye says, "India ... has been the home of many ethnic stocks and cultures from pre-historic times. At the dawn of her history, the cultural differences in her population appear rather great. Nevertheless, the process of assimilation of smaller groups of different cultures into larger ones of more or less homogeneous culture has been steadily going on."  

Ghurye's major preoccupation has been to analyse the broad course of this evolution. In his analysis of caste, Ghurye has shown how caste system was developed by the Brahmins and how it spread to other sections of the population. The operation of the process of Hinduisation also provides the general backdrop of his analysis of the tribal phenomenon. Let us now see how Ghurye analysed the cultural assimilation process operating between the Northern and Southern parts of India. Vedic Aryanism, as he has shown, provided the unifying thread between these two parts of the country and it was carried over to the South by some outstanding individuals. Analysis of this process, Ghurye thinks, is vital for knowing the

bases of cultural unity in India. Ghurye has devoted himself to this task in one of his recent works. With the help of literary, epigraphical and ethnographical data, Ghurye shows how Agastya and Skanda, an Aryan sage and Aryan God respectively, played a crucial role in this process of acculturation.

Agastya, a Rigvedic sage, is perhaps the earliest Indo-Aryan visitor and settler in South India during a period antedating 600 B.C. The onerous task of spreading Vedic and post-Vedic Aryanism into the South which the Agastyas performed has been recognised both in the Ramayana and the Mahabharata. Ghurye explodes the myth of an individual Agastya and maintains that there is a long line of Agastya-lineage.

The acculturation process in the South began long before Rama went there and it began with Agastya. Agastya became particularly successful in his task due to two reasons. First, in his missionary zeal, he did not make any distinction between the Aryan and the Dasa, or the Brahmin and the Shudra. Second, the association of Agastya and his lineage with some of the Pandyan Kings of Tamil Nadu made the task easier. Agastya spread Aryan Brahmanic values not only in South India but also much further south-east into Indo-China and Indonesia.

If Agastya was a man turned into a God, it was Skanda, the God himself, who travelled from North to South to accelerate this process of acculturation. Skanda's influence in the North continued upto 600 A.D.

26 Ghurye - *Indian Acculturation* - Agastya and Skanda (1977). I. Karve has divided India into two broad cultural regions - the North and the South - with some sharing the cultural traits of both. Karve - 'India as a Cultural Region' in T.N. Madan & G. Saxena (ed.) - *Indian Anthropology* (1962), pp. 536-56.
28 Ghurye - *op.cit.*., p. 56.
after which there was an increase of the influence of Ganesa. Most probably, Ghurye holds, Skandia went south with Agastya. He began to receive royal patronage from various dynasties. Before the 5th Century A.D. this royal patronage became so extensive that numerous temples of Skanda were built up in the whole area.

In Tamil literature of the period also, we find evidence of this phenomenon. Prof. Nilkanta Sastri said, the literature of the Sangam period "represents the final result of a long process of syncretism." And from that time onward, Skanda became the most popular god in Southern India. The position today is that, as Srinivasan says, 'Every South Indian village and now every place where a South Indian lives - in Ceylon, Malaya and other places - has a shrine for this deity'. Thus the career of Skanda, says Ghurye, is 'an epitome of the process of acculturation.'

But as is evident from Ghurye's discussion in other places, this acculturation process was not a complete one. Seeds of disintegration were also noticeable in the process. The very name of 'Subramanyam' or 'Murugan' given to Skanda 'suggests an opposition between Tamilnad and North India.' Ghurye even says that there are good reasons to believe that Murugan was an old deity of the Tamilians. "If Murugan should prove to be not only an early Tamil deity but also almost prehistoric, the episode would stand out as the first triumph of Tamilian resurgence."
As regards Agastya, there was always a resentment among the Tamilian elites that Agastya was a North Indian individual, having Sanskrit as his mother tongue. The reconciliation was brought about by making Subramanyam the Guru of Agastya. Study of this acculturation process thus enables us to discover the seeds of disruption also. As we shall see in a later chapter, the analysis made here provides a key to the understanding of the tension or cultural gap between the North and the South in contemporary India. The present rivalry or cultural gap between Northern and Southern parts of India is, according to Ghurye, due to the fact that the acculturation process, though operated smoothly in some spheres, could not remove all their differences. The differences, lying dormant for centuries, have now cropped up and this accounts for much of the tension between Northern India and Southern India.

36 Ghurye - Indian Acculturation, p. 73.
Section - 3

CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION

We have seen that, according to Ghurye, culture constitutes the central or the core element for understanding society and its evolution. In fact, culture is a totality involving the entire heritage of mankind. "Culture is the integrated system of learned behaviour patterns which are characteristic of the members of a society and which are not result of biological inheritance."37 A study of culture would therefore mean a study of all the variegated aspects of human behaviour through norms, values, social institutions, religion, art, architecture, etc. Ghurye is concerned not only with detailed analysis of cultural foundation of Hindu society, but also analyses, with remarkable ease and mastery, the course of cultural evolution of the 'Indo-European' people and the cultural configuration of the 'Occidental Civilization' from medieval to modern period. Ghurye's abiding interest was to analyse the course of cultural evolution and the nature of heritage which mankind has derived from the past.

As compared with many of his contemporaries, Ghurye was decades ahead in many respects. We have seen in our chapters on 'Castes' and 'Tribes' how he proved to be prophetic in foreseeing certain unhappy trends in those spheres. Ghurye made original suggestions in many respects. These were largely ignored by the academic and political elites

at the time they were made but now some of these issues are coming up again. For example, at the Tenth International Conference of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (ICAES), held in 1978, the Indian Anthropological Association made a plea for the creation of a 'National Museum of Man' in Delhi. This, according to them, would give an excellent idea of the course of cultural evolution of mankind. Many of us do not know that it was Ghurye, who, as early as in 1946, urged the necessity of establishing this type of Museum through a small brochure entitled "Museum, Illustrating Cultural History of Mankind" (Indian Institute for Educational and Cultural Cooperation, Bombay 1946). He urged that such a Museum would make a cogent presentation of the history of civilization or the cultural history of mankind. This will enlighten people about the cultural inter-linkages between various groups and will strengthen the bond of unity.

Ghurye was prompted by this belief that there is a 'common heritage of modern civilization' and that civilization is a 'collective endeavour of humanity'. Many of his works which are apparently unconnected, may be better understood, if this perspective is taken into consideration. Ghurye holds that behind the rise and fall of civilizations, there has occurred a 'steady growth of culture'. Cutting across the vicissitudes of civilizational growth, there are certain values which have been established as final and sacrosanct. These values have been termed by Ghurye as the

38 The Times of India (Bombay) 10th Dec. 1978.
39 The relevant data in this respect have been received from Dr. Ghurye himself through a personal communication.
'foundations of culture'. He delineates five such values or foundations of culture. These are: 1) Religious Consciousness; 2) Conscience; 3) Justice; 4) Free Pursuit of Knowledge and Free Expression; and 5) Toleration. Ghurye took up the ambitious plan of analysing the process of development of these values in different civilizations. Two books have come out as a result of this endeavour of Ghurye, viz., 1) Religious Consciousness (1965) and 2) Shakespeare on Conscience and Justice (1965).

Religious consciousness as a value manifested itself in the work of man almost at the dawn of history. But the values of Conscience and Justice are comparatively of recent origin. They emerged in medieval period in Europe. The role played by conscience in the Protestant Revolution particularly in England has been profound and Ghurye analyses the works of Shakespeare to show how the values of conscience and justice have been repeatedly emphasised in his works.

Of these two books, Religious Consciousness is really vast in its scope. Ghurye examines here the evolution of the religious ideas in three major civilizations, viz., the Hesopotamian, the Egyptian and the Hindu. He discusses their Gods and shrines, temple architecture, mythology, their philosophy of life, their idea of the evolution and their views on life after death. The discussion on Hinduism is really encyclopaedic where we find Ghurye at his full flair. He discusses the evolution of Hindu view

40 Ghurye - Religious Consciousness (1965) - 'Preface', pp. v-vi.
41 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 1.
42 See, Ghurye - I and Other Explorations (1975), p. 204.
of cosmology and cosmography, the Hindu view of personality, the Hindu view of life after death, the Hindu view of God-head, etc. But the discussion is narrative and not so much analytic. For example, he shows that in Manusmriti some of the cosmological faiths are different from those of the Upanishads. He shows that 'compassionate humanism' formed the core of the Bhakti religious movement as it was developed by the Vaishnavites. But he does not discuss in what specific social situation such new religious ideas emerged and with what effects.

If 'Religious Consciousness' falls short of our expectation, the disappointment is more acute in the other book 'Shakespeare on Conscience and Justice'. Certainly the work is an example of Ghurye's deep knowledge of Shakespearean literature. True, the book is 'a significant contribution to the history of the concepts of Conscience, Justice, Authority and Power'. But the discussion lacks the insights of a sociologist. Ghurye propose to analyse 'Shakespeare's role in grafting Conscience on English Christian culture' ('Shakespeare on Conscience and Justice', p. 50), but in the process he only makes such assertions as 'Shakespeare has used the word 'Conscience' at least one hundred and twenty-five times in his plays' (p. 23) or that the word 'Justice' occurs not less than 144 times in the plays of Shakespeare' (p. 189) and the like. Ghurye quotes Green as saying "No individual can make a conscience for himself. He always needs a society to make it for

Quoted by Ghurye 'I and Other Explorations', p. 205.
But we are not enlightened in any way on this social genesis of the idea and contents of Conscience by reading Ghurye's book. The sarcastic comment by R.S. Khare, made while reviewing his book 'Two Brahmanical Institutions: Gotra and Charana', may as well be applicable here. "The conclusion reached on p. 18 is as final as the one on p. 310." After reading this book we are not in a better position to understand how the two concepts have acted as the 'foundations of culture'.

As culture provides the foundation of society, any effort of people towards social reconstruction must necessarily be a case of cultural reconstruction. Ghurye is extremely disturbed over the disintegrationist trends and the tendency of cultural degeneration in modern times. He wrote his book Culture and Society with this end in view. Ghurye here purports "to correct at this hour of ....... national reconstruction the unbalance of science and humanities if India were not to be caught in the retreat of culture." As in other fields, here also, Ghurye appears as a sociologist of national integration.

In searching an answer to the question of the nature of culture, Ghurye makes a detailed analysis of the writings of such stalwarts as Emerson, Arnold, Morley, Clive Bell, Whitehead, Russell and others. He discusses the lines of cultural reconstruction in India so that she can meet growing crisis of the age. The prestigious British Journal, Nature, commented

46 Ghurye - op.cit., p. 16.
48 Ghurye - Culture and Society (Bombay: 1947).
on the book thus, "although his otherwise somewhat discursive survey of 19th and 20th Century thought gives no clear answer to the questions 'what is culture?' and 'what is civilization?', he may well have helped his readers to find their own answers." 50

Ghurye turns his attention to the growth-pattern of civilization in different parts of the world. "Civilization is the sum total of social heritage projected on the social plane." 51 As civilization is an attribute of the society, different societies can be differentiated with reference to their civilizational attainment. Depending on the state of civilizational attainment, we can divide societies into four grades, viz., 1) civilized, 2) highly civilized, 3) very highly civilized and 4) completely civilized. Of course, this division does not imply either a lineal or a cyclical theory of development.

Ghurye makes four general conclusions with regard to the nature of civilization. Firstly, as yet there has been no society which has been either completely civilized or very highly civilized. This is true even of the Gupta Civilization of India or the Athenian Civilization which excelled in various aspects but had deficiencies in other aspects. Like J.B. Bury, he warns us against 'the illusion of finality'. Bury says that in the long train of the ages, ideas succeed one another, hold allegiance of multitudes for a time, pass into the heritage, and make way for novel conceptions of the great mystery 'the ultimate design of the universe'. 52

51 Ghurye - op.cit., pp. 2-3.
Secondly, Ghurye believes in the law of continuous progress. History is a march toward perfection. So to him, social evolution also implies social progress. There is a similarity in this respect between Ghurye on the one hand and Comte, Spencer and Giddings on the other. Even L.T. Hobhouse, of whom Ghurye was a student at a time, has used the term 'Social Development' to imply both evolution and progress. Ghurye says, "Very high civilization is a state for the future to achieve. And may I point out that therein lies the truth of the theory of progress, therein centres the hope of mankind ... ?"

Thirdly, the gradation of civilization is also correlated with the distribution of values. In a high civilization, the humanitarian and cultural values will be accepted by a wide cross-section of population.

Fourthly, every civilization, high or low, possesses some distinctive attributes - some psychological qualities and manner of functioning. Kroeber rightly termed it as style, 'a coherent, self-consistent way of expressing certain behaviour or performing certain kinds of acts'. Such total pattern or style, once crystallised, gives a culture its distinctive character. This style, Ghurye thinks, is a very subtle factor, but a factor which imparts consistency in the orientation of the people in their fine arts, in their decoration, dress and food and in intellectual activities.

53 L.T.Hobhouse - Social Development (London 1924), Ch. IV.
Also, J.K.Folsom - Culture and Social Progress (New York : 1928).
54 Ghurye - Culture and Society, p. 14. cf. "The present is never an end, the past and the present are our means. Only the future is our end. Thus we never live; but we hope to live ...." Pascal Pensees.
Ghurye also speaks of the 'non-contemporaneity' of past civilizations. There have been periods of rise and fall of civilizations in the history of mankind. Civilization is a collective endeavour in which the contributions of different individuals and different societies have been uneven. This theory has been developed by Ghurye in full details in his *Occidental Civilization*. S.D. Pillai says that in this book he "examines the non-contemporaneity of past civilized periods and explores it in relation to Europe." Western or occidental civilization, which is a mighty structure, is a product of the contribution made by different European states at differential rates.

It is important to note here that there are astonishing similarities of treatment and subject matter between Ghurye and Kroeber in this respect. The procedure which Kroeber followed to analyse and measure the nature of cultural growth was the study of the number and rank of men of creative genius. Kroeber thought, as Sorokin says, that "the appearance of a galaxy of creative geniuses of the first rank at one period and their quantitative and qualitative decline at another period can be taken as a good index of the flowering and decline of creativity in a given cultural compartment for the periods considered." Following this method, Kroeber sought to study the growth pattern of culture in different civilizations, past and present. Ghurye himself recognizes the great work done by Kroeber though he says that Kroeber's influence on him was very marginal.

For analysing the growth pattern of Occidental Civilization, Ghurye takes up a historical period, from A.D. 1300 to A.D. 1925, within which the "essential features of occidental civilization grew up." The creative activities which have collectively given birth to this civilization may be located in 9 separate areas - Painting, Sculpture, Architecture, Literature, Drama, Opera, Science, Philosophy and 'Other thought'. The nations which participated in this civilizational process are Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Iberian Nations, i.e., those who spoke in Portuguese and Spanish, Scandinavian nations, the Netherlands, Slavonic nations and the United States of America. Again considering the nature of creativity this total period may be divided into six parts: 1) 1300-1600, 2) 1600-1725, 3) 1725-1770, 4) 1770-1825, 5) 1825-1870 and 6) 1870-1925.

On the basis of the contribution made by different nations in each of these different fields, Ghurye makes a definite ranking order of these different nations. We cannot afford to discuss it in details here. We present here the conclusions of Ghurye's discussion in two particular fields, viz., Painting and Literature. In the field of painting, the differential contribution of various nations may be presented through the following graph, prepared on the basis of Ghurye's line of discussion.
CONFIGURATIONS OF CULTURAL GROWTH

CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE FIELD OF PAINTING - 1300 AD - 1925 AD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1300-1600</th>
<th>1600-1725</th>
<th>1725-1770</th>
<th>1770-1825</th>
<th>1825-1875</th>
<th>1875-1925</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOURTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. FRANCE =
2. BRITAIN =
3. GERMANY =
4. ITALY =
5. IBERIAN NATIONS =
6. THE NETHERLANDS =
7. THE UNITED STATES =
From the above Table, it is found that different European nations have climbed or descended to different positions in different periods by virtue of their contributions in the field of Painting. To begin with, Italy produced the most talented painters in the period 1300-1600 led by such giants as Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Raphael, Titian, Giorgione and Tintoretto. The second, third and the fourth places were secured in this period by the Netherlands, Germany and the Iberian nations respectively. In the next period (1600-1725) the Netherlands rose to eminence. Belgium and Holland produced among them a strong contingent of painters some of whom could be regarded as the greatest of all time.
France also came out with some outstanding artists in this period whereas Italy descended to the fourth position. The third period, i.e., 1725-1776 is comparatively barren. First, second and third positions in this period were secured by Britain, Italy and France respectively. The fourth period also continued to be comparatively barren. Britain managed to continue her lead. Inspite of the turbulent period of French history, France improved her position to the second. France elevated its position to the first in the next period (1825-1870) whereas Britain occupied second place. In the next period (1870-1925) the lead established by France over European painting continued and became more strong. Thus we find the ascendancy and decline of various European nations in this period in the field of painting.

In the sphere of literature, the situation may be expressed through the following graph:

---

62 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 22.
CONFIGURATIONS OF CULTURAL GROWTH

CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE FIELD OF LITERATURE — 1300 AD—1925 AD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1300-1600</th>
<th>1600-1725</th>
<th>1725-1770</th>
<th>1770-1825</th>
<th>1825-1870</th>
<th>1870-1925</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOURTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. FRANCE = 
2. GREAT BRITAIN = 
3. GERMANY = 
4. ITALY = 
5. IBERIAN NATIONS = 
6. THE NETHERLANDS = 
7. SCANDINAVIAN NATIONS = 
8. SLAVONIC NATIONS =
The graph shows that different European nations have contributed differently at different periods of European history. Thus the first position has been respectively claimed by Italy (1300-1600), Britain (1600-1725), France (1725-1770), Germany (1770-1825), Slavonic Nations (1825-1870) and the Scandinavian Nations (1870-1925). The second position goes respectively to Iberian Nations (1300-1600; 1600-1725), Germany (1725-1770), Britain (1770-1825) and France (1825-1870; 1870-1925). Another interesting feature follows from
this graph: individually as nations France and Britain have all along maintained their predominant position in the period under study.  
Similar graphs may be presented on the basis of Ghurye's discussions on the contributions made by various nations in other fields, viz., Sculpture, Architecture, Drama, Opera, Science, Philosophy and other activities. Ghurye's main point is that Occidental Civilization is the result of collective but differential contribution made by different nations at different periods. The first rank in any civilizational activity is rarely held by any one of the groups in the successive periods .... Second, third or fourth ranks similarly change owners.  
Ghurye shows that the so-called parallelism in the development of Civilization theory is false. The collective nature of occidental civilization may be shown with regard to the contribution made by the most important nations, France, Britain, Germany and Italy by showing their ratings in one period 1870-1925.

---

63 Ghurye - Ibid., pp. 70-78.
64 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 186.
CONFIGURATIONS OF CULTURAL GROWTH

ACHIEVEMENT SCALE OF FOUR NATIONS DURING 1870-1925.

Painting Sculpture Architecture Literature Drama Opera Science Philosophy "Cliff The Jet"

FIRST
SECOND
THIRD
FOURTH

1. FRANCE =
2. GREAT BRITAIN =
3. GERMANY =
4. ITALY =
Two conclusions can be made from the above account. First Ghurye says that Occidental Civilization is a collective endeavour in which various nation-groups have made their contributions at different periods. In no period one nation has achieved first eminence in more than five of the nine civilizational activities. Second, the share

---

65 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 190.
of the countries belonging to the Indo-European language group is the most. Of these countries again, the contributions made by France, Britain, Germany and Italy are most noteworthy. Ghurye says, "Modern occidental civilization in its history from about A.D. 1500 to about A.D. 1925 is predominantly the creation of France, Britain, Germany and Italy, with other groups contributing off and on." Though Ghurye does not explain the reasons behind this differential contribution, it appears from the trend of his discussion that civilizational achievement is somewhat connected with the racial characteristics of the people in question. But how and why it is so - has not been discussed by Ghurye. The point is that without such an endeavour, the entire exercise becomes meaningless from the sociological point of view.

If this is how we are to identify a civilization, what is culture and what are its points of distinction with civilization? The two terms, Ghurye says, have often been used interchangeably and those who have made distinction between the two are not all agreed regarding their exact meaning. To Malinowski, culture comprises of inherited artefacts, goods, technical processes, ideas, habits and values. While sociologists and social anthropologists have made culture a central concept, they have not given the same importance to the concept of civilization. And many have used the two terms interchangeably. Bottomore says, "civilisation has remained largely a historian's term and is often used

66 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 189.
67 B. Malinowski- 'Culture' in Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences (New York, 1933), vol. IV, p. 621. Also his A Scientific Theory of Culture, (1944), pp. 36-43. Hoebel, in his Anthropology : The Study of Man (1972, p. 6) says, "culture is the integrated system of learned behaviour patterns which are characteristic of the members of a society and which are not the result of biological inheritance. Tylor has also made such a broad view of culture in his Primitive Culture (1871).
to describe what anthropologists would refer to as culture'. But Toynbee has used the term 'civilization' as an attribute of developed societies as distinguished from the primitive ones. MacIver says that 'our culture is what we are, our civilization is what we use'. Cultural attainment and excellence is related with individual capacity whereas to them, civilization is what is possessed in common by a particular society or a number of societies.

Ghurye shares this latter opinion that culture is a matter of individual attainment. Culture and civilization are related in the sense that the more the individuals excel in their individual attainments, the richer will become the civilization. Depending on individual capacities, people can be divided into 'absorptive practitioners', 'appreciative practitioners', 'enthusiastic disseminators' and 'adventurous creators' of culture. The relationship between individual capacity, level of culture and grade of civilization may be expressed in the following tabular form:

---


69 A. Toynbee - A Study of History (1934-56), vol. I, pp. 147-49; MacIver - The Modern State (1926), p. 325. The Oxford English Dictionary defines the term culture exactly in this sense. Culture is "the training and refinement of mind, tastes and manners: the condition of being thus trained and refined: the intellectual side of civilization".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civilization</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades of Civilization</td>
<td>Levels of Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilized</td>
<td>Cultured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Civilized</td>
<td>Highly Cultured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Highly Civilized</td>
<td>Very Highly Cultured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Civilized</td>
<td>Completely Cultured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to improve the general level of cultural attainment of the people, Ghurye makes two suggestions, viz., to rationalize and popularize humanistic studies as an antidote to scientific and mechanical studies and to ensure the autonomy of the universities, the institution of imparting higher education in society. Ghurye discusses in detail the crisis of humanity in the 20th century. Though there has been an advancement of civilization on the corporate plane, on the individual plane there is very little evidence of standards, of sense of values and of creativity. The basic reason for this, according to Ghurye, lies in the fact that man has been cut up from his past and tradition. While the spirit of innovation and novelty are good, change must not be so sudden
as to uproot man from his social moorings.\textsuperscript{71} The imbalance can be corrected only by a suitable change in the education system and by restoring the value of humanistic studies in universities.

Ghurye enthusiastically supports Newman’s theory that university courses should be organised on the basis of the priority of liberal education which aims at the cultivation of intellect as such.\textsuperscript{72} He says that it is essential that humanistic studies must be very highly developed in the universities.\textsuperscript{73} Universities are not only the disseminators of existing culture, they also create a new culture based on ideas and values which are rooted in the past.\textsuperscript{74} Ghurye holds that only by a suitable reorganization of our educational system, particularly the system of university education, we can save our society from impending disaster.

Throughout his book, \textit{Culture and Society}, Ghurye shows his faith on the capacity of human mind to withstand any type of challenge and to think and act in terms of future. He approvingly quotes Emerson thus, “the true test of civilization is, ... the kind of man the country turns out.”\textsuperscript{76} Rightly was it pointed out in the Review of the book in \textit{Nature}, “He (Ghurye) has not entirely lost that faith in the power of man to preserve the best of his old culture while creating from his own spirit a new culture.”\textsuperscript{77}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{71} Ghurye - \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 96-97.
\item \textsuperscript{72} Newman - \textit{The Idea of a University} (1912), p. 101.
\item \textsuperscript{73} Ghurye - \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 210-211.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Ghurye - \textit{Cities and Civilisation} (1962), p. 197.
\item \textsuperscript{75} On this point, see \textit{Academic Freedom and Indian Universities} in S.P. Aiyer - \textit{Modernization of Traditional Society} (1973), pp. 243-44.
\item \textsuperscript{76} Quoted by Ghurye - \textit{op. cit.}, p. 54.
\item \textsuperscript{77} \textit{Nature}, 7th May, 1949 (\textit{vol. 165}), p. 703.
\end{itemize}
Analysis of Ghurye's discussion on the nature and importance of culture amply reveals his conception of the task of sociologists in building up society. A sociologist's task is to offer concrete suggestions for shaping the future of his society. He must have his value preferences and he must indicate the ways to solve the crisis of the contemporary society. Sociology is useless unless it is goal-oriented and unless it can suggest some lines of social reconstruction. I.P. Desai has corroborated this phenomenon. "Ghurye's view was that all that sociology could do was to create an enlightened public opinion. It was not that only sociologists marshalled evidence for different views ; but he did have a view of his own to bring about the desired change in society." Ghurye's Culture and Society is the example of such an endeavour on his part.

Ghurye's approach to the analysis of culture and civilization may be compared with those of Spengler, Toynbee and Sorokin who are of the opinion that the basic unit of historical study is not mankind as a whole but a particular society or a particular type of civilization. And culture is the cornerstone of such an analysis. As Sorokin himself says, this may be regarded as 'Macro-Sociological Totalitarian Theory' of culture in Sociology. But, by and large, his discussion on the point is speculative and it is endowed with ethical purpose. Ghurye's work is comparable with Clive Bell's but Bell's major preoccupation is with civilization and not with culture and cultured individual. Ghurye again corroborates the general process of deterioration of values which Spengler has made in his

80 Clive Bell - Civilization (1928).
Decline of the West (1918) but what distinguishes Spengler from Ghurye is the former's apocalyptic vision of the western civilization. Spengler saw the history of peoples and nations as governed by an organic process which pass through the stages of birth, maturity and decay. Ghurye had never to smart under such pains so far as Indian civilization is concerned. Again, like Toynbee, Ghurye believes that a civilization, in its growth period, produces a creative minority, whereas in its disintegration period, it fails to do so. But Ghurye lacked that grand historical vision which so obviously gave Toynbee's works a distinctive shape.

The more relevant question from the standpoint of sociology of culture is, is culture a totality? What is the relation between culture and structure? How is it that a particular society successfully negotiates cultural change whereas another fails to do so? Answers to these and many other questions cannot be found in the writings of Ghurye. Unnithan and others say, "a minority of senior generation of Indian sociologists could be included among those who have an acute awareness in their works of the integral nature of Indian society and its culture .... Prof. D.P. Mukherji, Prof. G.S. Ghurye and Prof. R.K. Mukherjee belong to this category of sociologists. (But) in the works of these sociologists, one does not find a conceptual framework to study structure and change in Indian society and culture."

---

Unnithan et al. - Towards a Sociology of Culture in India, (Prentice-Hall, 1985), P. 16.
Ghurye has stressed upon the importance of university education. But a university, like other social institutions, is part and parcel of the general fabric. Mannheim says that the state of culture of a society is directly related with and dependent on certain social factors. How do they stand in relation to each other in India? How can we change our society by restructuring university education only when we know that a very small minority undergoes this type of education and there is a vast gap between the 'elites' and the 'masses' in India? Again, Ghurye has not given any importance to the economic factor. Is the 'Decline of the West' a result of the derision of values or a 'crisis in capitalism'? Engels in one of his major works has developed his general scheme of social evolution by analysing the transition from one stage to another with reference to the changes in the economic conditions. Even if one does not agree with this viewpoint, it is undeniable that rise and fall of civilization, changes in the pattern of culture and the values can never be understood without reference to the economic factor.

Section - 4

CITIES AND CULTURAL INTEGRATION

There is a view current in some circles of sociologists in India that an understanding of Indian society requires its explanation in terms of rural social institutions. They deny the sociological relevance of urban life and institutions in the Indian situation. There are some others who maintain that there is no dichotomy between urban and rural life in India as both of them are aspects of the same civilization. D.F. Pocock, who holds this view, says that the "assumed dichotomy between village and city, of peasant and city dweller ..... is a false one becomes clear when, moving to the level of relations, the dichotomy disappears." But the relevance of cities in our society, both past and present, can never be denied and therefore an increasingly large number of sociologists are currently engaged in the study of urban life and institutions.

The proportion of our urban population in relation to the total population may be small - 19.87% as revealed by the 1971 Census - but as said by Ashish Bose, "the fact remains that India's urban population (about 80 million) far exceeds the total population of any country in Europe (excluding the U.S.S.R.) and the net gain in the urban population in


India during the last decade alone was roughly equivalent to the total population of Yugoslavia."^85

Urban studies occupying such an important place in present day India, it is very natural that it has received a serious attention of a pioneer sociologist like Ghurye. Ghurye's interest in the study of cities dates back to his very early days when he came under the influence of Patrick Geddes. Ghurye's interest in the field was a direct outcome of that. As he says, "Having had to work for an assignment made by him (Geddes) at that time (1919) to write an essay on Bombay and having gone through his book for that purpose, entitled "Cities in Evolution", I had some latent interest in the subject of cities and their vicissitudes."^86 This Geddesian influence became evident particularly in two spheres: first, like Geddes, Ghurye also viewed the city as a mirror of civilization. Second, the comprehensive survey made by Ghurye on the growth pattern of the city of Bombay in the last hundred years^87 and his suggestions and recommendations for its improvement, reveals his interest in the field of city-planning. His suggestions in this field remind us of the work made by E. Howard, the founder of the Garden city movement. ^88 Ghurye was also a great teacher in the field of urban studies. Under his active interest and supervision, a generation of sociologists was created who carried on research work in various aspects of urban study. Important among them are M.S.A. Rao, I.P. Desai, A. Bopegamage and others.

---

^87 Ghurye - Ibid., pp. 222-282.
^88 E. Howard - 1901 Garden Cities of Tomorrow, (1898).
The urban field has been subjected to multidisciplinary research in which geography, public administration, economics, criminology, demography, etc., besides sociology, have contributed. Amongst the sociologists also, different writers have approached the problem from different angles. Some are more interested in the demographic aspect while some others take the ecological approach; some are interested in the question of 'urbanism as a way of life' whereas others are interested in the question of urban social structure; some are interested in the question of urbanization as an aspect of change whereas others are interested in the historical and comparative analysis of the growth of cities in different civilizations. So it is important to delineate Ghurye's field of interest in this area. He is not so much interested in the question of the social effects of urbanization or in the question of urban social institutions as such. In line with his general theoretical orientations, he views cities as the centres of culture and civilization. The major function of the city is to perform a culturally integrative role, to act as the point of focus and the centre of radiation of the major tenets of civilization of that age. 89

For the development of this thesis, Ghurye takes a historical and comparative approach and analyses the role which the major cities have played in different civilizations of the world. He shows that most of the civilizations have, at least at the concluding part of their career, reared up a great city which acted as the standard of cultural excellence of that

89 Ghurye - op. cit., p. 193.
civilization. Ghurye says, "(in 1949) I presented some facts about some of the ancient cities. They are Memphis, Thebes, Babylon, Athens, Rome, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Patliputra or Patna. In a small compass, I presented their credentials to be considered the concrete images of their respective civilizations." 90

It is interesting to mention here that this cultural role of cities has also been emphasized by other writers. Thus Redfield and Singer discussed in detail the processes of primary and secondary urbanization. Primary urbanization, according to them, is essentially orthogenetic in which Little Tradition is developed into Great Tradition. The early cities were of this kind where the folk culture was transformed into orthogenetic civilization. 91 Milton Singer applied the concept in relation to Indian civilization. As M.S.A. Rao says, "Viewing civilization both as societal and cultural structure, he emphasizes the conception of Indian civilization as a coherent structure of rural networks and urban centres which at the same time acts as the medium for the mutual communication of Great and Little Traditions." 92 But Singer's view of the role of cities in a changing society is not identical with that of Ghurye. Ghurye has spoken of the importance of cities as cultural centres. But the fact is that with changes in social structure, the role of cities as cultural transmission agencies also change. Redfield and Singer have shown the differences between cities which are orthogenetic in nature and those

90 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 115.
which are heterogenetic in nature. L.P. Vidyarthi has applied this
theme to a field situation. He has shown how the great traditional complex
of Gaya changed its character in course of time being affected by the new
and modern network of communications. It may be said that awareness of
this dynamic role of cities is absent in Ghurye’s approach.

So this is Ghurye’s general theoretical orientation with
regard to the function of cities. Ghurye’s work here can be compared with
such great names of city-historians as Weber, Toynbee, Geddes, Mumford, etc.
All of them have viewed civilization in terms of cities. For example,
Mumford says, “There is one function that the city alone can perform,
namely, the synthesis and synergy of the many separate parts ... only
by functioning as social magnate have the larger metropolitan centres
survived”. Similarly, Gordon Childe, an eminent old-world historian,
has used the term ‘Urban Revolution’ to describe the process by which
preliterate agriculturists living in villages came to form larger and
more complex aggregates. The city is the archetype of this new civiliza-
tion. Thus the views expressed by Ghurye on the relation between cities
and civilization can be traced back to some other distinguished luminaries
in the field.

Of course, according to Ghurye, as cultural centres and as
representatives of civilization, cities by themselves are not as much impor-
tant as the bigger ones among them - the million mark cities or the

93 Redfield and Singer - ‘The Cultural Role of Cities’ in op. cit., pp. 23-60.
Redfield - ‘The Social Organization of Tradition’ in Far Eastern
Quarterly (1953), pp. 13-41; Singer - ‘The Social Organisation of
Indian Civilization’ in Diogenes (1964), pp. 84-119.
94 McKim Marriott - ‘Changing Channels of Cultural Transmission in Indian
Civilization’ in L.P. Vidyarthi (ed.) - Aspects of Religion in Hindu
95 L. Mumford - ‘City: Forms and Functions’ in International
metropolises. Though Geddes used the term 'city-region' or 'conurbation' to designate the vastly expanding London city, it was Iglunford who elaborated the idea of metropolis or megalopolis to designate cities where there are more than a million inhabitants. Ghurye divides cities into three categories: 1) one-lakh cities or great cities; 2) three-lakh cities or super cities; and 3) million mark cities or 'metropolises'.

While analysing the data regarding the growth of such cities, Ghurye shows that the growth-rate has been uneven in case of different types of cities. Between 1920-21 to 1960-61, in 14 countries the great cities have increased by 230% whereas the supercities increased by 220%. But the most important and significant change has occurred in relation to the million mark cities or metropolises. India with 7 such cities - according to the 1961 Census - is a polymetropolite country. Of course, the number of such metropolises is not a very important index of the nature of urbanization of a country. India's seven such metropolises account for only 5.6 p.c. of her population whereas Britain with 3 such metropolises provide for 19.6% of her population.

Ghurye gives emphasis upon the functional aspect of these metropolitan centres. He holds that the function of serving the needs of cultural integration, which is performed by cities in general, is more particularly done by these metropolitan centres. So the general law of correlation between cities and civilization equally holds good in modern times. More important than that, Ghurye accepts and substantiates

Jefferson's "law of the primate city". In most of the countries which have developed metropolises, the first city is far more important and populous than the second. London, New York, Paris, Berlin, Moscow are the examples. The capital metropolis today in most cases act as an economic, political and cultural metropolis.

If we scan the history of past civilizations, then also the relation between those civilizations and their metropolitan centres will become apparent. All the past great civilizations nurtured such centres. Making an exhaustive discussion through seventy pages, Ghurye establishes this point that such cities provided rallying ground of the cultural tenets of these civilizations.

Occasional examples may be cited to show that the connection between cities and civilization is not so inevitable. Citing examples from the Steppe land of Asia, S. Figgot has shown in 'Role of the City in Ancient Civilizations' that the growth of cities was not an inevitable outcome of the emergence of some civilizations. Rene Millon also gives examples of how "there may be civilizations without cities, cities without civilizations". But these are just exceptions and they do not affect the general picture.

Coming to the Indian situation, Ghurye finds that in ancient India, its civilization was not represented by its capital metropolis. Pataliputra was a metropolis of Imperial India because its population

exceeded one million. But in spite of its metropolitan size it could not act as a cultural metropolis. Its official religion was Buddhism which was not the dominant religion of that time. Hinduism readjusted and remodelled itself as a result of the influence of Buddhism. A new synthesis was the result and according to Ghurye, it may be called 'Epic Brahmanism'. This new culture was sponsored by the Guptas which became the true representative culture of India. But the Guptas had no royal power to create a metropolis comparable to the Mauryas. As a result there was no capital metropolis of India to act as the focussing point and integrating centre of this culture. The Indian civilization which emerged as a result was a collective pattern, a consortium, made up of the regional specimens of Epic Brahmanism.

Ghurye makes a detailed discussion regarding the position of Delhi as the capital of India. It is true that Delhi had been India's capital for a far longer period than any other city. But in spite of this, Delhi could never become the metropolis either from the standpoint of culture or from population-size. The reason was that 'Delhi was the capital of an exotic empire and civilization'. Ghurye's opinion is that Muslim culture was never integrated into Indian civilization and that the Muslims established themselves as conquerors trying to impose their culture forcibly upon the Hindus. A Capital cannot become a metropolis...unless

102 Ghurye - op.cit., p. 215.
103 Ghurye - op.cit., p. 217.
104 Ghurye - op.cit., p. 182.
it represents and acts as the centre of the culture of the territory. And this is what happened in relation to Delhi in medieval India. In post-independent period also, Ghurye thinks, there was no logic for Delhi being chosen as the capital because culturally, economically and politically, it was never in an advantageous position. Economically, it is in a weak position because its industrial output is very low. Politically, its proximity with the Pakistan border, makes it strategically vulnerable. And culturally, 'Delhi is the citadel of Muslim culture'.

"India's Delhi is neither a cultural-intellectual nor an economic-industrial one, and is in population size - just a little bigger than one-third of the biggest city of the country, viz., Greater Bombay." In a long and detailed discussion covering about sixty pages, Ghurye presents the case for Bombay and tries to show that its cultural excellence, its economic position and its 'locational advantages' make it fit to be accepted at the 'unofficial metropolis' of India. Anyway, Ghurye's discussion amply shows what, according to him, a metropolis should be like, what should be its functions in relation to cultural integration and what are the factors which influence its location and its development.

Ghurye also makes a scathing criticism of Toynbee's 'laws' by which he (Toynbee) tried to explain the location and growth of capitals in India. A.J. Toynbee's large scale comparison of civilizations in his

---

105 Ghurye - op.cit., p. 192.
106 Ghurye - op.cit., pp. 219-220.
A Study of History lists more than 20 different civilizations. This impressive survey of all civilizations has been vigorously criticized by scholars for mistaken historical reconstruction, for lapses of detail and for untenable theoretical assumptions. Ghurye says that 'Toynbee's generalizations about Indian civilization lack both competent knowledge and imagination'.

Ghurye finds Toynbee's conclusions with regard to Indian capitals unacceptable. His so-called 'laws' of the location and migration of capital cities are based on incorrect historical facts and forced and spacious pleading. If there is at all any 'law' in respect of the development of the capital cities, that is the law of their growth near the centre of cultural development. This is how Ghurye analyses the role of cities from the functional standpoint. The historical role that the cities have played is that they have served the function of cultural integration of a society. Culture, civilization and cities are to be viewed in relation to one another and no one can be treated in isolation.

Ghurye's interest in cities is not merely historical. He also undertakes a detailed analysis of the location and developmental pattern of cities in India in post-independent period. As cities uphold the culture of a region, a certain portion of a territory inhabited by a certain number of people needs a city. The geographical pattern of distribution of cities is a matter of importance from this standpoint. H.S.A. Rao says, "In Ghurye's writing the geographical distribution of cities is seen in the context of economy and ecology of the regions, a point of view which enables

one to see the city in the social setting of a wider region." By and large, Ghurye says, the survey of the growth and location of cities in post-Independent India shows that they are still inadequate to meet the necessities of social and cultural integration. Firstly, the 1951 Census shows that there was one great city for about 18,000 sq. miles and for about 51 lakhs of people and this is grossly inadequate for 'socio-economic integration'. Secondly, the inadequacy again becomes apparent if we keep in mind the proportion of the population of our great cities in relation to the total population of the area. Thirdly, the territorial distribution of our cities shows that even this small number is not evenly distributed in all the parts of the country. Of course, Ghurye admits that successive census returns show a distinct advance in regard to this question of territorial distribution. While analysing the distribution of cities in different parts, Ghurye makes valuable suggestions and full as they are with sociological insights, they provide valuable clues to our planners and administrators. For example, with regard to West Bengal he says, "West Bengal's great cities are centered so far south, that though their population is larger, .... their location is defective." It has now been accepted by all the experts that this locational disadvantage of the cities of West Bengal stands in the way of smooth development of all its parts. But the situation is better in some other parts. Cities in Tamil Nadu and Gujrat, are very well located for adequately fulfilling integrative functions.

Ghurye's general conclusion is that "the Plans do not appear to have affected materially the extent and strength of urbanization" and so our plan directions and orientations should be suitably readjusted.

111 See for example, A. Mitra - Calcutta - India's City (Calcutta-1963), pp. 30-56. Also S.K. Kunshi - Calcutta Metropolitan Explosion (1977), pp. 91-106.