LANDMARKS IN DEVELOPMENT OF

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Economics
Banking Sector Reforms

Sociology
Women's Studies
Social Psychology

Political Science

Colonial Encounters

Editor

M. V. Nadkarni

**Landmarks in the Development of
Social Sciences
During the
Twentieth Century**

GULBARGA UNIVERSITY LECTURES

LANDMARKS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCES DURING THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Editor

M V Nadkarni

Preface

Scientific knowledge advanced at an unprecedented pace during the twentieth century. This involved many paradigmatic shifts as well as through a process of differentiation and specialization. Even from the nineteenth century itself, particularly its second half to the first half of the twentieth century, a series of disciplines came to be defined as constituting distinct areas of knowledge, each with its own scope, technical terms and concepts and methodology. Sciences got separated from social sciences and came to be known as natural sciences. Natural sciences got further divided into life sciences and physical sciences and as they become more complex, branched out further. Thus, separate disciplines developed like botany, zoology, microbiology, physics, chemistry, geology and so on. Social sciences also fragmented into sociology, economics, political science, psychology, history, human geography and so on. Sciences which had to deal with real life issues and applied problems divided into applied fields of knowledge like biotechnology, engineering, computer science, banking, management and so on. When any two or more of the sciences needed close interaction to address to real life issues, the fields of interaction themselves grew into separate fields of knowledge like bio-chemistry, bio-technology, environmental sciences, women studies and defence studies.

The growth of scientific knowledge has been so phenomenal, so immense, and so complex, that it has become difficult to make sense of what it ultimately amounts to. It has become necessary to take stock of this growth even if not in a detailed way. It was with this view that I took the initiative to launch a series of lectures to review landmarks in the development of different disciplines during the twentieth century by eminent scholars under the umbrella of Gulbarga university. This was also a part of our activities in 2000 which the university declared as *Quality Improvement Year*. These lectures were aimed at extending the intellectual horizons of both teachers and students, and to stimulate them to

take a holistic and comprehensive look at their own discipline by understanding how it has developed. It was also our intention to publish at least two volumes based on these lectures, one comprising social sciences and the other natural sciences. By providing these reviews together, it was hoped that the barriers between disciplines would be reduced by enabling readers to see developments and changes in social sciences/natural sciences.

I am happy that the volume on social sciences is ready, consisting of seven essays. It does not intend to provide a fully comprehensive view of all developments in each discipline, nor even to cover all social sciences. Nevertheless, it is our hope that the seven essays here do give a feel of the major landmarks in the development of social sciences.

Both in organising this landmark series of lectures and in the publication of the volume, the university has received very valuable help from the State Bank of Hyderabad, whose grant of rupees one lakh made this venture possible. In addition to this one-time grant, we also made use of the State Bank of Hyderabad endowment for annual lectures. Dr. C.Rangarajan's lecture was organised under this endowment. The lectures by Prof. Maithreyi Krishnaraj and Prof. K.Raghavendra Rao were organised under the endowment in memory of Late Mrs. Piloo Homi Irani. These three lectures were organised by Prasaranga of Gulbarga university. We are grateful to the State Bank of Hyderabad for their timely grant and also to the donors of these endowments for their kind help.

Personally, on my own behalf and on behalf of Gulbarga university, I express my hearty thanks to all the seven eminent scholars who delivered the learned lectures at our university. They have admirably accomplished the difficult task of covering a wide canvas through a lucid and readable presentation.

My thanks are due to Mr Md. Qayamuddin, Stenographer, for diligent typing.

We hope that both the teachers and students of social sciences will welcome this volume and benefit from it.

M V Nadkarni
Vice-Chancellor
Gulbarga University
Gulbarga

Contents

Contributors

M Basavanna retired as Professor and Chairman of the Department of Psychology of Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati in 1993. He was a member of the editorial boards of several journals on psychology. His latest book *Dictionary of Psychology* has been published by Allied Publishers in 2000.

Maithreyi Krishnaraj is well known for her contributions to women's studies. She was Professor and Director of the Research Centre for Women's Studies at SNDT Women's university. Her focus has been on women's development and feminist theory. Her major books are: *Women and the Household Domain* (ed. Sage); *Gender, Population and Development* (co-ed. OUP), *Ideas, Ideals and Real lives* (co-ed; Orient Longman), *Women and Society* (co-authored, Ajanta), *Essays on Women in Science* (authored, Himalaya) *Gender in Economic Theory and Practice* (co-authored, Ajanta).

M V Nadkarni Vice-Chancellor, Gulbarga University, Gulbarga since February 1999. He was earlier at the Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore, as Professor of Rural Economics from 1976 to 1981 and as Professor of Ecological Economics from 1981 to 1999. He was President of the 55th Annual Conference of the Indian Society of Agricultural Economics at IRMA, Anand, in 1995, and the first Editor of the *Journal of Social and Economic Development* till February 1999. His recent books are: *Poverty, Environment and Development* (co-ed, UNESCO, 2001), *Pollution Control in the South and North* (co-authored, Sage, 1997), *Planning for Social and Economic Development* (co-ed, Sage, 1992), *India – The Emerging Challenges* (co-ed, Sage, 1991), *The Political Economy of Forest Use and Management* (Sage 1989), *Farmers' Movements in India* (Allied, 1987).

C Rangarajan, a practicing economist of international repute, has been the Governor of Andhra Pradesh since November 1997. During the crucial period when economic reforms were initiated, he was the Governor of the Reserve Bank of India between December 1992 and November 1997. He gave a major thrust to financial sector reforms. He was a Member of the Planning Commission from August 1991 to December 1992, and a Member of the Tenth Finance Commission. He obtained his Ph.D degree in Economics from the University of Pennsylvania, USA, and taught there and also at the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce and at the Graduate School of Business Administration, New York University. He was at the IIM Ahmedabad for well over a decade and half, and a fellow at IFPRI, Washington; a member of the Economic Advisory Council of the Prime Minister between 1985 and 1991; President of the Indian Economic Association in 1988 and of the Indian Econometric Society in 1994. He is Chairman of the National Statistical Commission set up to reform the Indian statistical system. He is a recipient of several awards. Among his recent books are: *Perspectives on Indian Economy (2000)*, *Indian Economy: Essays on Money and Finance (1998)*, *Agricultural Growth and Industrial Performence in India* (1982).

B Surendra Rao, is Professor and Chairman, Department of History, Mangalore University. He obtained his Ph.D from Mysore University and taught at Vivekanand College, Puttur and then at Mangalore University. He specializes in modern Indian history and historiography. Among his books are the Second volume of *Karnataka History* (GenEd.B Sheik Ali), *Coorg Invented* (1997). He has presided over the modern India section of the Indian History Congress held in Kolkata in January 2001.

K Raghavendra Rao, is a noted political scientist and also a poet in english. He taught english at Madras Christian College and at Toronto, and taught political science at the University of Gauhati (1955-59), Karnataka University (1959-67 and 1975-84), at Mangalore University as Professor (1984-88). He was UGC Emeritus Fellow (1990-92), Executive Editor of the modern Indian literature project of the Central Sahitya Academy (1989), Fellow of the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla (1993-96); and Population Consultant to UNDPA (1974-79). He has published research papers on Indian writings in english and political theory. His creative writing in english includes a collection of original poems, a collection of poems by Bendre translated into english, and translation of Byrappa's classic Kannada novel 'Parva' into english. His books include *The Road Taken* (Calcutta, 1990), *Religion, Society and State in India* (Delhi 1987),

Imagining the Unimaginable Communities (Hampi, 2000). Currently, he is Director, Indian Institute of Marxist Theory and Practice, Hubli.

U Sankar, obtained his Ph.D. in economics from the University of Wisconsin, Madison in 1967. He held faculty positions at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, and University of Madras. He is now Honorary Professor at the Madras School of Economics. He has published books/papers in econometrics, industrial economics, public utility economics and agricultural economics. He was President, Indian Econometric Society 1993-94. He is Chairman of environmental economics course and curriculum committee of the World Bank – MOEF capacity building programme in environmental economics. His major books include: *Environmental Economics – A Reader* (UNP 2000), *Controlling Pollution – Incentives and Regulation* (co-author, Sage 1997), and *Economic Analysis of Environmental Problems in Tanneries and Textile Dyeing Units* (Allied, 2000).

Yogendra Singh, Professor Emeritus at the Centre for the Study of Social Systems, School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. He is a former President of the Indian Sociological Society, and has been a member of the Research Advisory Committee of the Planning Commission and the ICSSR. He has also been the Convenor of the National panel on sociology of the UGC. He has received the Swami Pranawanand Award for his contribution to research in sociology and social anthropology by the UGC, and National Nehru Award for his contribution to social science by the Madhya Pradesh government. He has been a visiting professor at McGill University, Montreal, Canada; Stanford University, California, and MSH, Paris. He has lectured at several universities in Europe, Japan and South Asian countries. Some of his publications include: *Modernization and Indian Tradition; Indian Sociology; Social Conditioning and Emerging Concerns; Social Change in India and Culture; Change in India: Identity and Globalization.*

Introduction

1

*M.V. Nadkarni**

Social Sciences vis-a-vis Natural Sciences

A.K. Dasgupta made a very insightful observation regarding economics. What he said about economics is equally relevant to all social sciences. He said "It is of the nature of economic science that it deals with events and phenomena which not only change complexion over time but do not also occur at all places." (Dasgupta 1983: 3-16). Galbraith also made essentially the same remark: "...economic ideas are always and intimately a product of their own time and place; they cannot be seen apart from the world they interpret. And that world changes .... so economic ideas if they are to retain relevance, must also change." (Galbraith 1987: 1-2).

While natural sciences aim at discovering universal laws, valid for all time and places, it would be improper for social sciences to do so merely to emulate natural sciences and acquire the status of 'hard sciences'. This is because human society which is the object of the study of social sciences is hardly the same at all time and places. Human institutions change from time to time and also vary across places. The emergence of the corporate enterprise and trade unions, the universal acceptance of the values like equality and liberty and consequent inclusion of increasing population of the marginalised sections including women in the political and social mainstream, decolonisation and independence of many countries, the spread of democracy on a wide scale, the evolution of Knowledge Age and other events, have simply been epoch making. These changes during the twentieth century offered a great challenge to social sciences.

As a result, there were significant changes in paradigms of scientific research. First, the notion that in order to be called a science a discipline ought to give universal laws valid for all time and places, had to be given up. What constitutes a scientific inquiry, underwent a change in perception. The debate on the scientific status of social sciences was settled more or less favourably for social sciences during the 20th century. Ernest Gellner presents the following traits characterising sciences as broadly holding good for social sciences as well. They are:

1. "The presence of well articulated hypotheses and their systematic testing.

2. Precise quantitative measurement, and the operationalisation of concepts.

3. Careful observation by publicly checkable methods.

4. Sophisticated and rigorous conceptual structures and great insights.

5. Shared paradigms, at any rate over sizeable communities of scholars, and persisting over prolonged periods" (Gellner 1984: 584).

Each social science may not have all these traits. Nevertheless, as Gellner further observes, "The aspects of social life that are inherently quantitative or observable with precision (e.g. in fields such as demography or social geography) are indeed investigated with precision and sophisticated techniques; we know on the one hand that sophisticated and elaborate abstract models are developed in various areas and serve as shared paradigms to extensive communities of scholars (e.g. economists); and on the other hand, in spheres where conceptual apparatus is not so very far removed from the areas of common sense, we nevertheless know that a well trained practitioner of the subject possesses understanding and information simply not available prior to the development of the subject. In all these senses, social studies are indeed scientific" (Gellner 1984: 584).

However, social sciences do not pass the test of capacity to make accurate predictions, which most sciences do. "The sophisticated abstract models do not firmly mesh in with empirical material. The powerful insights are not consensual." (Ibid: 584). They are better off in providing an ex-post explanation, but even here consensus is rare. But this is more due to the complexity of human society. Within limitations, subject for example to a *ceteris paribus* clause, social sciences – particularly economics – have achieved a fair amount of predicting power. Sciences like meteorology also have a similar limitation in prediction power.

However, as Scott Gordon rightly says, "A comparison of 'social science' with 'natural science' in a general way is not likely to be very informative, since the various social sciences differ greatly among themselves, and so do natural sciences" (Gordon 1991: 33). Some of the individual social sciences can, however, be compared with some of the natural sciences, as Gordon observes further. Thus, Economics resembles Physics more than Biology does. Similarly, parts of Sociology are analogous to parts of Biology.

Just as there are significant differences between social sciences and natural sciences, differences are no less significant within social sciences and even within natural sciences. There just cannot be one unifying integrated science which can explain everything. If one attempts to do that, such a person will have to go well beyond the realms of science itself. The plurality of sciences, especially social sciences, is on account of both the complexity and diversity of the social/economic/political/institutional world. The challenge of social sciences has been to understand this complexity and diversity and arrive at coherent, credible and verifiable generalisations. These generalisations can give some prediction power, but within severe limitations. Such generalisations can only be statements of tendencies. For example, sociology can enlighten us on what type of social environment can produce a good scholar but not all individuals in such an environment may actually become good scholars.

The challenge faced by the social sciences is further made more difficult because of the role of values which the social scientist believes in, consciously or not. If different social scientists believe in different values, they cannot have the same approach to their investigation and analysis, and they cannot have the same generalisation. We can even face the paradox of two social scientists studying the same society/economy/polity/institution at about the same time and place, but coming up with diametrically opposite generalisations. What is truth for one may be plain falsehood for another! In spite of all the progress in social sciences and refinement of techniques of research during the twentieth century, the social sciences have not got over this challenge.

As we approached the 21st century, the plurality of approaches increased in social sciences rather than narrowed down. Up to about 1960, a few major theoretical and ideological approaches could be clearly identified both in economics and sociology where theorising was perhaps stronger than in other social sciences. By the end of the century, however, the scene became far more complex involving difficulties in even clearly drawing the lines between different theories

and approaches. This was further accentuated by a greater tendency to rely more on particularist approaches than on generalist approaches, and grand theorising became a thing of the past.

This may be attributed to our world social and economic system itself becoming more and more complicated. However, we should also note that the social world has at the same time been so changing that there is a marked tendency towards homogenisation in important respects in spite of cultural and linguistic differences. One of the major characteristics in the twentieth century is that there is increasing acceptance of certain common values like equity, freedom and democracy, and desire to eliminate hunger and poverty. One can now add ecologically sustainable development among such shared values. These values and beliefs may not have been implemented in actual practice, but they are at least accepted universally as desirable.

Another characteristic of the twentieth century which has promoted certain amount of consensus is the path of modern economic development taken by many countries which in spite of its diversity has many common features. The models of cars and aircraft may vary, but almost all countries have them now. Newspapers and TV programmes may be in different languages, but people in almost all societies on the modernisation path use them. And so do they use telephones and computers. The impact of the consensus about the desirability of modern economic development is so wide that even relatively less developed countries are already experiencing a similar economic transition (in the form of rising share of the service sector in national income) and demographic transition much before the presently advanced countries experienced them at corresponding levels of development. During the first eight decades of the 20th century, the differences between countries and societies were still conspicuous, which started narrowing down later in some important respects.

Will this trend also narrow the differences in approaches to theorising or generalising in social sciences? It is hazardous to hastily conclude on this, but there seems to be some trend towards consensus along with important differences persisting. One of the examples of this is the role of the state in the economy about which there were sharp differences earlier. While several countries like India believed in a key role for the state in the planned development of their economics, several leading economists still emphasised the role of free market mechanism. The role of private enterprise and free market mechanism is receiving now increased emphasis again so much that even the sectors which were the main

domain of the state are now being increasingly entrusted to private enterprise. As between the ever contending sisters, viz. equity and efficiency, efficiency is getting more loving attention. The fall of Soviet Union boosted this trend further. However, any tendency towards consensus may not be sustained if conditions in the following respects deteriorate instead of further improving: (a) world peace, (b) social justice, and (c) ecological balance.

Major Schools

There is a high correlation between the type of approaches adopted in social science research on the one hand and empirical conditions prevailing and the values that get prominence as a result on the other hand. This became very evident during the twentieth century, particularly in relation to economics. But this is observed even in other social sciences also.[1] Marxism became prominent when the evils of capitalism became prominent. When capitalism stabilised and made many more comfortable, neoclassical economics stole the limelight.

Though Karl Marx (1818-1883) belonged to the 19th century, he was quite a dominant figure in social sciences of the 20th century as well. Many social scientists who looked at disparity and exploitation in the society/economy/polity with more than academic concern and considered it as the primary problem to be addressed, became Marxists.[2] They exercised a wide and significant influence both on social sciences and on polity during the 20th century. To mention a few of them: *Vladimir Lenin (1870-1924), Leon Trotsky (1879-1949); Rosa Lux-*

1. It is necessary to distinguish between approach or broad methodology on the one hand and techniques or methods on the other. Statistical techniques like sampling can be used in different approaches. Similarly participant observation is more a method than a methodology. Both a Marxist and a liberal can use participant observation, using different approaches to their investigation. As Fritz Machlup says, "Methodology is neither a study of 'good' method nor study of 'methods used' but rather a study of reasons behind principles on the basis of which various types of prepositions are accepted or rejected as a part of the body of ordered knowledge in general or of any discipline" (Machlup 1978).
2. Apart from social scientists, others like Mahatma Gandhi also felt concerned about such problems. Martin Luther King in USA and Babasaheb Ambedkar in India focussed on the problem of deprived and oppressed communities in their respective countries though they were not Marxists. It is not intended to convey here that only Marxists had such a concern.

emburg,, T.W. Adorno, Louis Althusser, Georg Lukacs, Jean-Paul Sartre, Herbert Marcuse, Antonio Gramsci, Andre Gunder Frank, Samir Amin, Paul Sweezy, Oscar Lange and Maurice Dobb and Immanuel Wallerstein. They were social scientists, rather than sociologists or economists or political scientists in a narrow sense, as they had the vision of the whole society including the economy and the state. They adopted the Hegelian Dialectics as their methodology as Marx did, but fine-tuned and adapted it to suit the problem at hand. Their methodology is also called as the Historical Materialism or simply Marxian Political Economy. This enabled them to analyse class structure vis-a-vis production and capital accumulation conditions and to identify emerging contradictions within the economic system of not only single countries but also in the world capitalist economic system. They also provided a vigorous critique of the mainstream economics (see, for example Hunt and Schwartz ed. 1972; Bharadwaj 1978). Since socialist countries had also emerged during the 20th century inspired by the thoughts of Marx and Lenin, some of them like Oscar Lange and Maurice Dobb analysed the problems of economic planning in socialist countries. This inspired in turn some of the Third World Countries like India to adopt central planning as a means of accelerating economic development. The fall of the Soviet Union and some other socialist countries should not make us underestimate the influence and relevance of Marxist thought and methodology. Being warned by what could happen under uncontrolled private enterprise, the capitalist countries developed welfare measures such as social security and took special care to control at least conspicuous exploitation of the working classes through regulation of working hours and providing minimum wages. It was thus that the predicted collapse of capitalism was averted, apart from being helped by the rise of countervailing power of trade unions and sharing by the labour in the capitalist countries in the spoils of colonialism.

Marxist methodology influenced Indian social scientists as well. Though the scope of their analysis was fairly wide, two main issues of debate were the nature of the Indian state, and the mode of production in Indian agriculture. The identity of left political parties was determined by the ideological stance taken by them in relation to these issues, especially the first. The stance ranged from dubbing the Indian state as an agent of western imperialism to regarding it semi-feudal or to out-and-out but independent/national capitalist. This ideological stance provided the basis for whether a particular communist party would support the ruling party or another bourgeois party, or the ruling political alliance or the rival alliance. The mode of production debate also was quite intense and long, a comprehensive review of which is available in Thorner (1982) and Patnaik (1990). Unfortu-

nately both the debates tended to be polemical and not much was achieved in developing credible empirical criteria and testing them, though sincere attempts were certainly made in this direction. The debate, however, had great policy significance. Only a hard class analysis of Indian agriculture, for example, could help in evolving a policy for land reforms or a proper price policy for agriculture. If agriculture is regarded as semi-feudal, there was no case for a positive policy of paying remunerative prices for farm produce, unless agriculture is first restructured to promote peasant capitalism. Since there was no consensus for quite some time about whether Indian agriculture was semi-feudal or capitalist, price policy was also subject to lack of clarity to some extent. Lest the syndrome of rich debate with poor outcome for policy should be considered as characterising exclusively Marxist debates, it may be remembered that there is no dearth of theoretical debates with even poorer outcomes and with no policy relevance in neoclassical economics. With all its limitations, the Marxist debate did focus attention on a few important methodological, as well as social and political-economic issues of policy significance in the analysis of Indian economy.

The Neoclassical or Marginalist economics developed during a 'placid' phase of capitalism (using A.K. Dasgupta's term). It evolved towards the end of 19th century itself and became so prominent by 1932 that Lionel Robbins defined economics as a whole in terms of neoclassical or positivist economics in his *Essay on the Nature and Significance of Economic Science*. According to him, economics is neutral between ends, and insofar as the achievement of any end is dependent on scarce means, it is germane to the preoccupations of the economist. Efficiency of resource allocation became the major concern of economics—a problem supposed to be solved by economics in value-neutral ways. Neoclassical and positivist economics are not identical, the latter being larger in scope, but they do overlap considerably. Positivists refer to values which they assume individuals – producers and consumers – to have, and make their assumptions explicit, but they claim themselves to be value-free. That is, they claim to make only value references and not value judgements. The positivist economics became the mainstream economics, for the most part of the twentieth century. The coverage of the positivist approach extended to other social sciences as well including Sociology and Human Geography.

The positivist school, especially Neoclassical Economics, lays great emphasis on the deductive method, an abstraction which led to excessive formalisation. This raised issues of relevance of mainstream economics to real life social and economic problems. The methodological distinctiveness of positivist school can

be better understood when contrasted with the Historical school and the Behaviorist school. Positivists claim that their generalisations have universal validity, while the Historicists assert that all generalisations in social sciences are historico-relative. Positivists regard their generalisations as objective and beyond class vested interests, which is rejected by the Marxists. While both a classical political economy and Marxist political economy gave a production theory of value, with value as the result of social division of labour, in neoclassical economics it is a subjective concept resulting from the mental evaluation of individual actors. Positivists reject the claim of Behaviorists that science should deal only with what is directly observable. According to positivists, economists' explanation even if informed by empirical facts, must ultimately refer to subjective valuation process based on deductive and abstract reasoning. Economic sociology is an example of Behaviorist school. It is concerned with society or social groups and their behaviour. But positivist economics, especially neoclassical economics, is concerned with separate economic actors like consumers and producers. While the key concept of neoclassical economics is equilibrium suggesting harmony between conflicting groups, the struggle between vested interest groups is the key concept in economic sociology and also the Marxist school (Swedberg 1987: 3)

Thanks to Marxist Political Economy, Economic Sociology, and increased awareness that property right itself is mainly an institutional matter, institutional constraints on the operation of the economy began to receive more attention. This gave rise to the New Political Economy which became an interface area joining economics, political science, sociology and law. The focus here was on the relationships between Market and the state and on public choice in an institutional setting where vested interest groups contended with each other, not necessarily within the confines of market framework. James Buchanan (1986 and 1987) can be considered as the main founder of this New Political Economy. Ideologically, the New Political Economy is closer to Neoclassical Economics and poles apart from Marxian Political Economy. As per Buchanan, what distinguishes a human being from animals is his/her propensity to trade, barter or exchange. A dog, even if it gets two bones, will not exchange one for biscuits or lend it at interest. But, according to Buchanan, market allocation of resources is efficient only if all contracts are voluntary and if all efficiency enhancing contracts are in fact realised. But whether these conditions are fulfilled depends upon the institutional structure of the society and how transactions are carried out (Sandmo 1990). The New Political Economy has different schools of thought within it regarding the role of the state when faced with conflicting interest groups. The views range from regarding it as a predator to a puppet to a clearing

house or a play ground (battle ground) where political struggles between contending interest groups are settled. Though there is no consensus about it, the role of good governance is emphasised by even those who would assign a major role for free market mechanism. In the absence of good governance, costs, especially transaction costs, would be quite high and often unpredictable, making it difficult for market mechanism to operate.

Differentiation vis-a-vis Integration

Though a few interface areas of studies like Institutional Economics, New Political Economy, Economic History, and Women's Studies developed during the 20th century, the dominant trend was one of differentiation and specialisation. As observed by the Gulbenkian Commission Report, by 1945 the social sciences were clearly distinguished on the one hand from the natural sciences which studied non-human systems, and on the other from the humanities, which studied the cultural, mental and spiritual production of "civilised" human societies (Wallerstein *et al.* 1996: 32). The social sciences themselves were further differentiated, with sharp lines drawn between economics, sociology, political science, history, psychology and law. As the Gulbenkian Commission further observed, 'the runaway' expansion of the University system ... created a structural pressure for increased specialisation simply because scholars were in search of niches that could define their originality or at least their social utility ... And the economic expansion funded this specialisation' (Ibid: 34). Nevertheless, with universal concerns for development and modernisation becoming more dominant, interaction between social sciences also increased, producing new areas of study like economic sociology, political sociology and New Political Economy. Even 'the distinctiveness of their methodological approaches seemed to diminish' (Ibid: 46).

The social sciences also faced a lot of criticism mainly because they acquired a dominantly western hue, zealously emulated by social scientists in the Third World as well. The criticism came both from the western scholars as well as those in the Third World. It was on the ground that social sciences were by and large euro-centric in their assumptions and policy implications and tended to ignore the problems of deprived sections of people including women and the non-western concerns. The criticism also challenged the ontological distinction made between humans and nature. There was thus a call for opening up and restructuring the social sciences to meet these criticisms. That is how the Gulbenkian Commission headed by Immanuel Wallerstein was set up to report on how this could be done.

The Commission made four recommendations as a few practical steps for restructuring. They are: (1) 'The expansion of institutions, within or allied to the Universities, which would bring together scholars for a year's work in common around specific urgent themes ....' (2) 'The establishment of integrated research programmes within university structures that cut across traditional lines, have specific intellectual objectives, and have funds for a limited period of time (say about five years)...' (3) 'The compulsory, joint appointment of professors' (with a second department)... (4) 'Joint work for graduate students' (for example, students seeking doctorate in a given discipline to be required to take a few courses in another discipline too, with a bearing on the doctorate topic). (Wallerstein 1996: 103-5).

Economics

The increasing awareness of the need to take into account perspectives and insights from across diverse disciplines compelled a senior economist in India, P.R. Brahmananda, to provide a new definition of economics. Lionel Robbins defined economics in 1932 as a science concerned with the allocation of scarce resources among competing ends. Brahmananda, on the other hand, defines economics as 'the science which analyses the nature and implications of the transactions of self-interested, utility seeking, rational human beings individually, in groups or together, subject to constraints in various historical, geographical, social and political settings' (Brahmananda 2000: 85). The new definition takes into account the developments in the nature and scope of economics that have taken place after the second world war. The definition has to be interpreted broadly to cover concerns about economic and human development of groups as well as countries over time and also in relation to nature. The welfare concerns of economics are now extended to cover the interests of future generations as well.

There has taken place a tremendous growth in the scope of economics during the 20th century, altering its nature and methodology also in the process. Probably the growth of economics – both theoretical and applied, is unparalleled among social sciences. It is comparable with what has taken place in natural sciences like physics and chemistry. U. Sankar, in this volume, has undertaken the challenging task of conceptualising the growth of economics as a discipline, identifying the major developments in it. He presents a brief review of major areas of economics – utility theory, production and markets, welfare economics, macro-economics, and growth and development. Sankar also refers to the development of institutional economics, economics of information and environmental

economics. An interesting thing about the growth of economics during the decade is that besides rigorously developing utility theory and theory of Firms' behaviour under different conditions based on efficiency and welfare considerations at micro level, economics rapidly expanded its scope to cover the macro level too.[3] Once this was done, employment, stability, economic growth and development became the major considerations rather than efficiency in a narrow sense. Even market efficiency was subject to close scrutiny, taking into account the possibility of market failures.

Economists like Amartya Sen gave attention to issues of major concern to developing countries – poverty, inequality and famine. Becker extended rigorous economic analysis to cover areas hitherto regarded as exclusive territory of sociologists, such as economics of marriage and family, and economics of crime and punishment. It is noteworthy, as Sankar observes, that economists not only made their analysis more and more rigorous, but also developed testable propositions, making their findings and conclusions amenable to empirical verification. This brought economics closer to natural sciences like Physics. Economics also developed an enormous sophisticated database for analysis which stimulated other social sciences too to do likewise. Evolving the Human Development Index which consists of both economic and other criteria of development is an important milestone in the development of social sciences during the 20th century, which helps social scientists and policy makers to monitor the progress of different countries in a meaningful way. Sen's call to shift the emphasis from 'Commodities' to 'Capabilities' was an important paradigmatic shift for economics, which brought the discipline closer not only to other social sciences but also to philosophy and ethics (Sen 1987). Other Indexes also followed suit like the Gender Development Index and the Transparency Index. The national income accounting of different countries was also made more comparable.[4]

Emergence of environmental/ecological economics is one of the exciting developments in economics. Its coverage and importance for policy have grown

---

3. Keynes developed macro-economics mainly in the context of developed countries. The applicability of his theory and presciptions for developing countries was questioned by economists like VKRV Rao (1952a, 1952b). Development Economics later emerged as a branch of economics mainly to deal with the problems of developing countries.
4. One of the earliest to raise the problem of non-comparability of national incomes was VKRV Rao (1953b)

so much that it is much more than a branch of welfare economics now. It deals with both types of environmental problems – depletion of resources and negative externalities like pollution. Environmental economists particularly in the neo-classical school, believe that these problems could be significantly solved through right pricing whereby the environmental costs are borne by those who generate them, and thus internalised; and through right project appraisal under which full social costs and benefits including environmental costs are properly reckoned. Economists have developed techniques of valuing these costs and benefits, so that they can be duly incorporated in project appraisals, and used in price determination to the extent feasible. This has made it possible also to make 'green' national accounting, so that national income accounts are corrected for depreciation of natural capital and environmental costs. The environmental awareness has now grown so much that the goal of sustainable development is universally accepted at least in principle.

There have been some attempts to distinguish between humanistic economics and utilitarian economics. The former is largely normative in character, trying to devote resources to meeting basic needs first, before satisfying luxury needs.[5] It needs central planning by a benevolent group who hold certain values like human dignity for all, equality and so on. It would involve changes in the nature and functioning of the whole institutional framework which characterises a capitalist market economy. Utilitarian economics, on the other hand, is positivist in character, which regards central planning even by a benevolent group as ineffi-cient and welfare reducing, rather than welfare enhancing. Its main motto is sat-isfaction of wants and maximising utility, and the goal is met through market mechanism. While competition is the key principle for utilitarian economics, persuasion (if it fails, compulsion) based on co-operation is the key principle of humanistic economics. Humanistic economics is considered to be more relevant to developing countries, while utilitarian economics is considered to be more rel-evant for the economically and socially advanced countries.

Humanistic economics is not new. The essence of socialist experiment was to provide an alternative to capitalist market economy, with the goal of satisfying

---

5. Kurien, for example, distinguishes between a need-based economy and want-based economy, the latter being promoted by free market mechanism (Kurien 1978). Also see B.Sarveswara Rao's Presidential Address at 65th Annual Conference of the Indian Economic Association in 1992 (reprinted in Rao *et al.* 2000: 461–481); Lutz and Lux 1979.

needs rather than wants. Several countries following the Soviet Union tried it for several decades. However, the experiment could not be sustained in the face of fierce competition with capitalism. Moreover, however noble the intentions of a `benevolent' group in charge of central planning may be, it tends to degenerate into a dictatorial selfish elite, suppressing basic democratic values in the name of providing bread for all. For human progress, it is evident, we need both the humanism of humanistic economics and efficiency principle of positivist economics. The market mechanism need not be left free like an untrammelled horse, but can be tamed to follow certain values and rules commonly agreed to. While market mechanism can be given due scope to reduce the need for an over-burdened bureaucracy, a democratic state can legitimately intervene to set right the failures of the market.

India was very much a part of the development of economic thought during the 20th century. Several prominent economists contributed both at the level of theoretical work and also at the applied level specifically in relation to the Indian Economy. To mention a few of them: Amartya Sen, VKRV Rao, D.R. Gadgil, V.M. Dandekar, P.R. Brahmananda, Pranab Bardhan, C.T. Kurien, B.S. Minhas, Jagdish Bhagwati, T.N. Srinivasan, Sukhamoy Chakravarty, K.N. Raj, M.L. Dantwala, Krishna Bharadwaj, Amit Bhaduri, Prabhat Patnaik and Kaushik Basu. There was rich debate on several issues, both theoretical and applied. The major themes discussed on India were: nature and requisites of planning in India, role of heavy industry vis-a-vis agriculture, price policy, distributional implications of the Green Revolution, size-productivity in Indian agriculture, disguised unemployment, role of small and cottage industries, mode of production, measurement of poverty, strategies for poverty alleviation, population policy, liberalisation and globalisation. The rich debate has been tried to be captured in an early review by Bhagwati and Chakravarty (1969), and subsequently in *A Survey of Research in Economics* by ICSSR in seven volumes, and by Terence Byres (ed. 1998).

While the above cited were academic contributions, political thinkers and statesmen also contributed a good deal to the development of Indian Economic thought. The most outstanding. of them was Mahatma Gandhi. He not only led India's struggle for Independence successfully through a non-violent Satyagraha movement, he gave also deep thought to India's social and economic problems. He brought new perspectives and fresh thinking to social sciences, especially economics, so much that his school – Gandhian Economics – can be cited as a major contribution to the economic and political thought of the world. His was

humanistic as well as democratic economics in the best sense of the term. The tragedy of Gandhian economics was that it was coached in such simple terms that it could be understood by all including even the unlettered. As it was not addressed to professional economists alone, it failed to acquire a 'scientific' status. When Gandhi spoke of Shramdan (voluntary contribution of labour) for rural development, the economists were unimpressed. But when, much later, Ragnar Nurkse expressed the same idea in terms of savings potential of disguised unemployment, it was regarded as a pioneering contribution to development economics. Gandhian economics is based on two basic integrated value premises. First, satisfy your need, but not greed. Second, the right to employment, livelihood and human dignity should take precedence over the need to make profits. Yet, he did not believe in communism. He would allow private enterprise and market mechanism, and also democratic and decentralised state intervention in the best interest of the society, especially the poor and the deprived. More than state intervention, he called upon owners of private property to regard themselves as trustees rather than owners, with the private property operated for the welfare of the people. Though Gandhian economics was regarded as too idealistic for the practical world by many economists, its relevance has revived again in the context of the environment crisis.

In the early theories of growth in classical economics, C. Rangarajan points out in this volume, the role of finance was largely ignored. Growth was seen to be influenced by real factors, and'there was lack of explanation of how savings were transformed into investment. The same neglect continued in neo-classical economics too. However, since 1970s, the importance of the financial sector in the growth process has received more attention both in economic literature and in policy making. Rangarajan shows how financial development increases allocation efficiency of capital.

Globalisation of banking operations and universalisation of banking has promoted financial integration of separate individual economies and has raised the question of how banking operations can be supervised. Globalisation of banking operations requires that prudential standards are uniform across countries, as observed by Rangarajan. To meet the requirements of universalisation, UK, Japan, Korea and other countries have adopted single regulatory institutions covering insurance and banking.

The emergence of finance as a factor in economic growth is double edged. It can promote growth and also crises. After the East Asian financial crisis, macro-

prudential indicators of health and stability of financial systems are being developed, different from parameters of the strength of the real economy. Even a strong real economy can become vulnerable to financial crises.

India also has undergone major reforms in the financial sector along with Economic Reforms since 1991. Rangarajan has explained them with clarity and lucidity. He points out that financial sector reform has to be a continuation process, to see that economic growth is not derailed. As he observes, 'while the first phase of reforms focussed on removing the external constraints bearing on the functioning of banks and introducing internationally accepted prudential standards, the second phase must stress on the organisational effectiveness of banks. ...ultimately the aim should be to create a dynamic financial system which can, on its own, respond to the changing environment and also correct its mistakes'.

Banking and finance constitute an essentially applied aspect of economics, almost like what telecommunication is to physics. But economics too is a very mundane science. At higher levels of economic growth, economics has to take note of growing institutional complexities involved in growth process and internalise them. The contribution on Banking Sector Reforms provides an interesting example of how economics and economic policy are facing this task.

Sociology

As in the case of economics, sociology in the 20th century was influenced by the development of theories during the 19th century. The influence of the past theorising was much more during the first half of the 20th century. The classical thinkers and theoreticians were more interested in society in its comprehensive sense including the economy and polity. The influence of the positivist approach was also evident insofar as these thinkers were interested in deriving natural, universal laws (as in sciences) in terms of which society and social evolution could be understood. August Comte (1798–1857) came up with his Laws of the three stages to explain social evolution. According to him, mankind progressed from a *theological stage* dominated by religion, through a *metaphysical stage* in which abstract speculative thinking was prominent, and then to a *positivist stage*, when modern science emerged based on empirical research giving verifiable findings.

Karl Marx (1818–83) and Friedrich Engels (1820–95) were also influenced by the positivist view of historical change of the society. The Marxian account of stages of this change was in terms of primitive communism, Asiatic Mode of Pro-

duction, slavery, feudalism, capitalism, socialism and communism – the last two stages yet to come during their time. The transitions from one stage to another was through a dialectic process, arising out of contradictions between a long term development of forces of production (technological change) and social relations of production involving intensified class struggle. Underlying these changes before socialism, there was also the process of 'alienation' by which the labouring class lost control over the social forces including technological change, which only intensified their exploitation. Though both Marx and Engels belonged to the 19th century, their thoughts and methodology deeply influenced may sociologists, historians and other social scientists during the 20th century. The social and agrarian structure was mostly analysed in terms of social classes, which was obviously a result of their influence. Thus in the analysis of both social structure and social change, the influence of Marxist methodology was evident during the 20th century. 'Marx also emphasised the social and political nature of knowledge, a theme that was developed by twentieth century sociologists' (Davis 1995: 1325).

Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) took up the theme of social evolution in a Darwinian perspective and treated it like biological evolution. According to him, societies, like biological species, develop from a relatively indefinite homogeneity to a state of more definite, complex, coherent heterogeneity. In the process, relatively simple societies become more and more differentiated, specialise in different functions, and become more interdependent. More than his theory of social evolution. Spencer's contribution to modern sociology was in the systematic compilation of anthropological data and development of comparative anthropology (Gordon 1991: 414). Spencer's 'conceptualisation society was based on concrete material advantages of division of labour... He extended Adam Smith's discussion (on this theme) beyond the area of private economic activity to the achievement of collective objectives by means of social organisation' (Ibid: 435-6). 'His idea that social evolution is inevitably characterised by movement from the use of coercion to reliance upon the spontaneous mechanism of organisation ...is a prominent theme in the historiography of the modern west... Spencer approached the study of social institutions from a utilitarian point of view.. That is to say, he studied their structures in terms of functions they perform in social organisation... 'Structuralism' and 'functionalism' in contemporary sociological theory are, in essence, a continuation of Spencer's view of social institutions' (Ibid: 436).

With Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) and Max Weber (1864-1920), the theories of 'social evolution', including Spencer's, went into a decline. Weber par-

ticularly rejected evolutionism by arguing that the western society was historically unique and its experience cannot be generalised to cover all societies and derive universal laws of social evolution. Western society, he observed, was characterised by modern science, modern capitalism and rational law, which was unique (at least at that time). The rejection of the concept of social evolution gave rise to the concept of social change, which was more general and neutral (Encyclopaedia Britannica 1990, vol. 27: 417).

Durkheim looked upon sociology as the foundation of all social science including history, politics, law and economics. He was critical of the individual-istic orientation of economists. 'The attempt to derive "laws" for any area of social phenomena by deduction of postulates about individual "human nature" was for him, so wrongheaded as to deserve summary dismissal' (Gordon 1991: 440). He argued that modern society was not falling apart in spite of the growth of individualism, as it was held together by division of labour and economic dependence on each other. He thought that class conflict was a temporary abnor-mality in social development. Unlike Marx, he looked upon the state as a media-tor ensuing smooth development during modernisation. (Craib 1997: 15).

Though Weber wrote on a variety of topics like major religions including Hinduism, music, law, general economic history, authority and. leadership and bureaucracy, he is remembered for two major contributions - development of methodology of social science, and his thesis that Calvinist theology played an important role in the development of modern european economy or capitalism (Gordon 1991: 458). In his view, Sociology could not be a science in the same way as physics; the social sciences are sciences because people behaved ration-ally and it was possible to construct rational explanation of their actions (Craib 1997: 18). According to Weber, the task of the social scientist is not one of explaining the whole of social reality. All social theories are thus limited in scope. Hence Weber was in distinct opposition to the Grand Sociology of Comte, Marx and Spencer (Gordon 1991: 474).

Max Weber has considerably influenced economic and political philosophy in the 20th century, particularly through his advocacy of free market economy and opposition to bureaucratisation. He thought that the struggle between power groups and the tendency towards bureaucratisation of modern societies was mod-erated by the operation of free market economy. According to him Modernity was the process of increasing dominance of rational calculability, but it also pro-duced disenchantment. He could see the shortcomings of capitalism, and felt

concerned especially about the iron cage of capitalism in which we would all be caught. The bureaucratisation of business enterprises, shifting effective power from the owners of capital to managers of capital, was viewed by Weber with great concern. But he saw no alternative to capitalism because socialism and communism would be worse in terms of increased bureaucratic domination. (Craib 1997: 18, 232–260; Gordon 1991: 486-7).

In spite of the rejection of deterministic theories of social evolution, the idea of social change continued to fascinate social scientists and historians during the 20th century. Unlike the theories of social evolution, the new theories of social change did not claim to encompass all societies and much attention was given both to variation between societies as well as to interaction between them and mutual influences. Economists developed theories of business cycles, where economic change was conceived not in terms of one long linear path but in terms of cycles. In his monumental work on *A Study of History*, published in twelve volumes between 1934 and 1961, Arnold Toynbee, expounded the idea of life cycles of civilisations.[6] Other examples of non-linear changes are provided by the theories of demographic transition and environmental transition. Long term population growth takes the shape of a S-shaped curve in the theory of demographic transition: with a stagnant or slowly growing population in the first stage (pre-modern, pre-industrial) when both birth and death rates are high; rapidly rising population when death rates decline but birth rates do not; population growth tapering off with birth rates declining and coming close to death rates in the third stage. Similarly as per environmental transition theory, there is little damage to environment in the pre-modern pre-industrial stage; damage is high in the initial stage of industrial growth; and then damage declines as clean technologies develop in response to improvement in environmental awareness following attainment of higher levels of income and education.

Interestingly, economists also have significantly contributed to the understanding of social change, particularly in the context of modern economic growth. Most prominent of them is Simon Kuznets. In his monumental work on *Modern Economic Growth* (1966),[7] he not only brought out the main structural changes in the economy that occurred during the course of economic growth, but

---

6. A new edition of the entire work in a revised and abridged form is also now available
   (Toynbee 1995).
7. An abridged adaptation of his original work of 1966 is available (Kuznets 1966).

also the main ideas that ruled which had tremendous social significance. The three structural changes during economic growth pointed out by Kuznets are by now well known: (a) the movement from agriculture towards non-agricultural production and services, (b) redistribution of population between the countryside and cities (urbanisation), and (c) redistribution of workforce from agriculture to other sectors. He also pointed out; that besides these structural changes, new institutions emerge and old institutions decline. What distinguished modern economic growth was the extended application of science to problems of economic production, which could therefore be called as the Scientific Era. A practical use of science through technology would not have taken place without changes in social institutions and world views.

The world views associated with modern economic era, as expressed by Kuznets, are secularism, egalitarianism and nationalism. Secularism means concentration on life on earth and assigning an important place to economic achievement. It replaces the earlier value system which regards life on earth as a brief transitional era deserving little attention. Egalitarianism means a denial of natural differences among human beings, except as they reveal themselves in human activity. Kuznets points out to the intimate connection between science (which demands evidence that can be tested), secularism (which makes life on earth man's main concern) and egalitarianism (which makes every human an equally valued participant in human community). It is the increased power over resources which science provides to man that is the basis of the view that humans are in charge of their own destiny (secularism). This increased power erased the need for imaginary arguments to justify higher economic returns to an upper class minority. Economic inequality that remains is acceptable on purely rational grounds, with higher income linked to higher productivity only. These views contributed greatly in bringing deprived classes into the mainstream, and made possible a larger flow of talent and energy to economic production and growth. However, economic growth, at least up to the 20th century, was also associated with nationalism. Economic growth required special efforts at the national level to mobilise productive resources, to organise the economy for best results, to find markets and to protect local industries. However, economic growth is now also leading to globalisation which could subdue, if not eliminate, nationalism.[8]

---

8. Interestingly, Marxist social scientists have analysed the world capitalist economy as a single unit of analysis, treating development and underdevelopment as counterpart processes. See for example, Frank (1975), Wallerstein (1974, 1980, 1989).

With a decline in interest in grand theorising, there was more encouragement to study particular societies and social changes therein. As such, even if influenced by western analytical methods, Indian sociology developed even before independence with its own flavour of philosophical reflections. Yogendra Singh has presented an interesting account of how Indian sociology developed during the 20th century. Several eminent personalities contributed richly to its development as a vigorous and sophisticated discipline beginning with Patric Geddess in Bombay University in the early part of the century. He was followed by stalwarts like G.S. Ghurye, Radhakamal Mukherjee; D.P. Mukherji and D.N. Majumdar; who laid the foundation of the profession in India by the mid 1950s. Singh has explained the significance of the contribution of each of them. He observes that after the end of the second world war, the United States of America became a source of influence for social science replacing Europe in conceptual and the theoretical orientation. At the same time, the initiation of planned development and changes brought about in the Indian countryside as a result opened up a vast area of research problems for sociologists. This challenge was taken up by new stalwarts like M.N. Srinivas, S.C. Dube, Ramakrishna Mukherji, A.R. Desai and others. The village studies by them focussed on both static and dynamic aspects of rural social order and received international acclaim. Analytical concepts of M.N. Srinivas, like the Dominant Caste and Sanskritisation, went beyond professional discourse and became almost household words. Social change in India was captured by Srinivas in terms of *sanskritisation and westernisation* (Srinivas 1966). This was a different analytical framework compared to the concepts of marginalisation and proletarianisation used by Marxists. A process diametrically opposite to marginalisation, which may be called the *broadbasing process*, under which deprived or marginalised categories come into the economic, political and social mainstream, has also been in operation in India (Nadkarni 1997).[9] Social movements, especially peasant movements as an instrument of change in agrarian society also captured the attention of several sociologists. To ascertain the impact of social movements on the structural, political and cultural dimension of society, studies on caste, class and power came into vogue during the 1970s and 1980s. Farmers' movements (post-Green Revolution) on new issues like agricultural price policy (in contrast to earlier issues like security of tenure) also received sociologists' attention (for example, Dhanagare 1990, 1999). There is also an

9. Social mobility is cognate to broadbasing process, but not identical with it. The former covers both vertical and horizontal mobility, while the latter focusses on vertical mobility. While social mobility is concerned mainly with individuals, broadbasing is concerned with groups or communities.

analysis of the new farmers' movements integrating economic, political and sociological dimensions (Nadkarni 1987). There are also a large number of studies of urban areas and urban fringes which contributed to a better understanding of urban social structure and dynamics. Not only sociologists but also economists and geographers such as V.L.S. Prakasa Rao contributed to this.

Singh observes that the decades of 1980–2000 witnessed further differentiation and crystallisation of new theoretical perspectives to focus upon multiculturism and postmodernism. This has made Indian sociology more reflexive, cognitive and interpretative. The impact of technological changes and changes in economic policy also came under the scrutiny of Indian sociologists. Singh concludes that Indian sociologists will now have new challenges, for example, analysing the impact of the Economic Reforms including liberalisation and globalisation.

The account of the development of sociology above would suggest that mainstream sociology, like mainstream economics, ignored the interaction between human societies and nature. Social anthropology and human ecology, however, studied human societies across the globe in relation to nature, analysing how they adapted to nature as well as changed nature. This has also been a traditional area of research, a very readable and an interesting example of which is provided by John Reader (1988). Recent Indian sociologists like Ramachandra Guha have now taken interest in this area, analysing sociological aspects of the environmental crisis and have developed social ecology as a separate area of study.

Women's Studies

Women's studies emerged as a separate discipline first in North America and Western Europe in the middle of the 20th century. Maithreyi Krishnaraj (MK, henceforth), herself an important contributor to the development of the discipline in India, has presented an interesting account of its growth during the century with special reference to India. The intellectual inspiration to the emergence of the discipline came from 'feminism' – a movement for the adoption of equal rights for women.[10] MK observes that a great deal of inspiration came from the

---

10. As MK points out, feminism took birth in the 19th century itself under the influence of Enlightenment Philosophy and liberalism. J.S. Mill argued that marriage and motherhood could not be their only vocation. The book by Marx and Engels on 'Origin of Family, Private Property and the State' (1884) was also a source of inspiration for feminists. Later Marxists like Rosa Luxemburg and Alexandra Kollantai raised the issue of sexual division of labour within proletarian homes.

experience of fighting for women's rights and women's emancipation. The discipline got a further boost with the declaration of International Women's Year (1975) and International Women's Decade (1975-85). Incidentally, the year 2001 is recognised as Women's Empowerment year to focus on Women's Empowerment, a task yet to be achieved.

The initial work in the area dealt with arguments for women's rights followed later by theoretical explanations for causes of women's oppression. This paved the way for women's studies as a discipline. MK argues that women's studies qualifies as a discipline as it has a specific set of conceptual tools, a distinct theoretical vocabulary, and a well defined analytical framework. Its subject has a well defined scope and methodology (perhaps more than in the case of economics and sociology). The discipline has created new social theories as systematic explanations for specific questions affecting discrimination against women and their lower status.

Two important and inter-related contributions of women's studies to social sciences are the 'social' analysis of sexual division of labour as the basis for women's oppression, and the concept of 'gender' differentiated from 'sex'. The relations between men and women are also 'social', and not just nature driven. While 'sex' is treated as a biological concept, 'gender' is a social concept. It was in this light that scholars of women's studies probed into the origin of patriarchy, understood as asymmetrical power relation between men and women. There have emerged different theoretical orientations, some of which as identified by MK are Marxist-Feminist, Feminist-anthropologist, and psycho-analytical. By 1980s, however, there has been a shift from 'grand theories' to more specific analyses. For example, the impact of Economic Reforms in India has been a subject of scrutiny with a feminist perspective.

Much before the end of the 20th century, women's studies has 'proliferated across the globe, has acquired legitimacy, increased in depth and scope and has found a readership and market in publishing', as MK observes. The acceptance of the discipline in Indian Universities was quicker than in other Third World countries, and also compared to a developed country like Japan. In this respect, India has been much ahead of several other countries. The discipline is alive and kicking, responding to and influencing the action front. The issue of women's reservation in the Indian Parliament has raised the question of a class and caste structure within women and has challenged the unstated assumption that women are a homogeneous class.

Women's studies as a discipline is essentially inter-disciplinary in orientation, drawing from sociology, economics, psychology, law, political science, history, human ecology, demography, culture studies, literature and fine arts. In the course of its own development, it has influenced other sister disciplines in social sciences. MK observes that evolving 'gender' as a critical and central variable was a paradigmatic shift in social sciences as a whole, and not in women's studies alone. This variable has entered other social sciences too. The influence of women's studies has also weakened the force of the argument that value-neutrality is the hall mark of a science including a social science. It was the ideological commitment to the cause of women's equality with men which lies at the root of this discipline. It is interesting that both Marxism and liberalism have equally influenced the course of the development of the discipline.

Social Psychology

Psychology is a behavioural science. Social Psychology, as a branch of psychology, studies the nature and causes of individual behaviour in *social* situations or social context. In this volume, M. Basavanna presents a lucid account of the growth of the discipline during the 20th century. The discipline could be said to have started with the publication of *An Introduction to Social Psychology* by William McDougall in 1908. But from a contemporary view of the nature and scope of Social Psychology, the real beginning of the discipline was in 1924 when Floyd Allport's book on *Social Psychology* was published. Allport emphasised the value of experimentation, in research, which makes it a rather unique discipline in social sciences.

The growth of the discipline was phenomenal during the second half of the 20th century. During the fifties, the focus was on the influence of groups and group membership on individual behaviours. Basavanna gives a brief account of how the discipline developed subsequently. According to him, two important trends shaped the discipline during the last quarter century. One is the cognitive perspective involving efforts to apply knowledge about processes such as memory. and thinking to the task of understanding social behaviour. The other is increasing concern with the application of the principles and findings of social psychology to a wide range of practical problems. Basavanna feels that the concern with applied aspects will be stronger in future. The role of emotions on social behaviour will also receive more attention. He feels that social psychology will also have a multi-cultural perspective, since sciences themselves are multi-cultural and heterogeneous.

An interesting aspect of Basavanna's narration of major contributions made to social psychology is the account of actual experiments carried out to find how individual behaviour is influenced, how their impressions and attitudes are formed, in what situations individuals are more effectively persuaded, where they resist persuasion and so on. The tools and findings of social psychology can be used for a public cause by groups and individuals for the good of the public. They can also be used for misleading the public and for launching sales campaigns for private benefit. In this sense, social psychology is value-neutral! Moreover, if individuals can be misled, the assumption of rationality of individual human behaviour made in other social sciences also comes into question. There is obviously a need for more dialogue between social psychology and other social science disciplines.

Political Science

Political Science, along-with Public Administration, can be considered to be the oldest of the Social Sciences, its originals going back to the pre-Christian era of Plato in Greece and Kautilya in India. Even modern Political Science can be traced back at least to the 17th Century, when Thomas Hobbes claimed to be the founder of Politics as a science and came out with several path breaking publications such as *The Elements of Law - Natural and Political* (1640), *The Citizen* (1642), and *Leviathan* (1651). He can be credited with starting Psychology too as an empirical science, since his political theory was closely interrelated with his analysis of human psychology. Hobbes is known for his theory that to achieve the common goal of self-preservation of all, individuals surrender their individual rights to form a commonwealth through a covenant or contract and the commonwealth is represented by a sovereign who enforces the covenant. Such a legitimacy of an absolute sovereign was however soon questioned in the second half of the 17th century when John Locke's *First Treatise on Civil Government* and its sequel, *Second Treatise on Civil Government* were published. The two treatises rejected patri-archalism in politics, argued for a constitutional government and upheld the right of people to revolt against bad governance. It may be recalled that *The Wealth of Nations* by Adam Smith, regarded as the father of Economics, came nearly a century later in 1776,[11] and the six-volume work of August Comte, father of sociology, *The Positive Philosophy*, came out during 1830–42. Locke's concerns with property, government and revolution, and interconnections between them continued to agitate the minds of social scientists and political thinkers for two or three

---

11.The same year as the American Declaration of Independence.

centuries more: Political philosophers like Voltaire, Rousseu and Diderot played an important role in the development of political science, who demolished the idea of 'legitimate' dictatorship or despotism, and inspired the French Revolution of 1789. This not only changed the government but laid the foundation for a new society based on the ideas of 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity', which was the war cry the French Revolutionaries. The subsequent failure of the French Revolution and the rise of absolute monarchy under Napolean Bonaparte could not obliterate the contribution of the French Revolution.

The Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels was a major landmark in the 19th century in the development of political science and praxis as well. As Doren (1991: 262) puts it, Marx 'w .s wrong about the political future. He was not wrong about the character of the world that was emerging'. The Abolition of Slavery in the United States in 1865 through the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution was another milestone which gave a further boost to the idea of equality. Doren regards it as the nineteenth century's greatest achievement (Doren 1991: 277). This was not only a major political event, it also influenced the ideology of political science.

By the beginning of the 20th century, both Marxist-Socialist and liberal ideologies were well set, and both – in their own separate ways – agreed on the dignity of human beings and the need to protect it. Both significantly influenced the course of political science during the 20th century. Liberalism emphasises freedom of individuals, their right to liberty and possess property, and the rule of law. For Liberalism, the state is not an end in itself but a means to hold the society or the polity of individuals together. Since individual rights can conflict with each other, the state has to provide a social framework under which the conflicts can be reconciled in a compromise under the rule of law. The dignity of human beings is protected when they can exercise their rights under such a rule of law, in framing which they themselves have participated. Thus the idea of democracy is also inherent in liberalism. Socialists, especially the Marxists, on the other hand, point out that all individuals are not equal under economic liberalism, since those who hold property exploit those who do not. They focus more on the need for equality which is achieved in a classless society when private property is abolished. They believe that it is the mutual cooperation on equal terms to realise human needs for all which ensures human dignity for all, and not unbridled pursuit of self-interest as under economic liberalism characterising capitalist economies. To the dismay of Marxists, however, capitalism showed unexpected resilience, since a new liberalism which tried to ensure at least minimum security and welfare for all replaced the earlier unbridled liberalism, especially after

the second world war. There was attempt to reconcile liberal democracy with
socialist ideals to the extent possible within the framework of capitalism. How-
ever, the constraints of capitalism and the need to achieve efficiency in the eco-
nomic system proved to be a strong compulsion which made several countries to
go back from welfare capitalism to the path of free market mechanism during the
last quarter of the 20th century. The Thatcher-Major Reforms in Britain, the rise
of Reagonomics in USA, and the Economic Reforms in India since 1991 and in
China even earlier, reflect this tendency. During the course of these develop-
ments, political theory and praxis have, in general, closely interacted with each
other, influencing mutually, may be sometimes with a lag. Interestingly, right
from the beginning, Political Science could never be value-neutral and was
closely concerned with praxis and ideology.

K. Raghavendra Rao presents an interesting account of how political science
developed amidst and responding to the tensions between different schools of
thought; especially liberalism and Marxism. As Rao points out, perhaps the first
landmark during the 20th century was Wallas' *Human Nature in Politics* (1924)
where he challenged the rationalist assumption of positivist social science and
asserted that human beings do not necessarily always act rationally in terms of
ends or means, and still maintained that even this human irrationality has to be
grasped through a rational methodology. The First World War disproved,
according to Wallas, that man is not moved by 'enlightened self-interest'. His
main critique of existing political science was that it lacked a credible and sys-
tematic conceptualisation of human nature.

Two separate traditions developed in Political Science from the early part of
the century. As per Rao, the British tradition tilted towards historical and legal-
formal approach, while the American tradition tilted towards pragmatic prob-
lem-solving approach.[12] Indian political science at first followed the British tra-
dition, but there were also other streams like the nationalist and Marxist.

---

12. Thus a lot of work has gone into finding out 'how government actually worked in all
    its branches and on all levels; how government offices were manned, what the
    background of men and women in public office was, what their interest and their
    expectations were; how parties were run, campaigns financed, elections manipulated,
    pressure groups organised, influence exercised; how conditions and institutions at
    home compared with those abroad; what the net effect of governmental efforts was
    and what the waste; and sometimes also, what alternatives there were for what was
    being done or planned'. (Brecht 1970: 5).

While Gandhi believed in *Gram Swaraj* or decentralised self-governance, several Indian political thinkers, like Nehru, came under the influence of Laski and other spokesmen of Democratic Socialism and believed in parliamentary democracy. They believed that the liberal state in a parliamentary democracy could produce socialist reforms.

This later gave place to the ideology of free market economy under the leadership of USA. Rao thinks that the theory of modernisation and development which flowered in the 1960s and the subsequent globalisation discourse are essentially in one continuum. Though student movements in several countries challenged liberal theory, they dr nct seem to have affected the onward march of globalisation. Rao observes that earlier dogmatic liberalism is now replaced by revisionist liberalism in such works as Rawl's neoliberal *A Theory of Justice* (1971). The disenchantment with the state in advanced capitalist countries has generated a tradition of anti-statism which questions the 'moral legitimacy' and the 'functional adequacy' of the modern capitalist state, as Rao says. It also rejects universal categories, emphasising history and local contextuality. Rao observes, "in this, they have affiliation with post-structural and post-modernity discourses. In the West, political science today represents an exciting but unsettled field, full of opportunities for theoretical innovation." We have thus a complex situation in Political Science, akin to Economics and Sociology - a situation of several conflicting ideologies and theories co-existing at the same time, each enlightening particular aspects of political realities whose relevance may vary from place to place.

Historiography

B. Surendra Rao's paper here deals with how historiography has shaped itself during the course of its 'Colonial encounters'. Historiography means the craft or the way of writing history, as distinguished from history which is the study of the past as a systematic discipline.[13] Of all the civilisations, 'China can claim the oldest historical tradition on earth', dating back to more than a millennium before Christ (Wright 1968: 400). An interesting feature of Chinese historiogra-

---

13.'Historiography is different from the collection of historical evidence, the editing of historical sources, the exercise of historical thought and imagination, the criticism of historical writing, and the philosophy of history, but it is related to all of them and overlaps some of them. It is also different from the history of history writing....(but) in recent decades the term "historiography" has increasingly been used to mean the history of history writing' (Hexter 1968: 368).

phy is the view that human and natural events are interrelated in a coherent whole, resulting in more attention given to recording natural catastrophes than in other historical traditions. They also had a cyclical conception of political history, with polities having 'sequences of birth, youth, maternity, senescence and death' (Wright 1968: 402). The court historians had the responsibility of writing up day-to-day events at the court and studying reports received from outside the capital. They also from time to time edited and digested the daily records into chronological accounts of a dynastic period (Ibid: 403). Modern institutions like the Universities and Institutes developed from the early part of the 20th century for the study and writing of history. After the communist rule started in 1949, much attention was given to the study and writing about peasant rebellions against the old feudal order and identifying 'sprouts of Capitalism' which would have bloomed into China's own capitalism but for the intrusion of foreign imperialism (Ibid: 406). Islamic and Japanese historiography also have a long history and have contributed significantly to world historiography. Taking these facts into account, the East seems to have dominated historiography at least till the modern age, much more than the West.

Though India had the tradition of Puranas in the ancient period, they were 'marked by obscurity, exaggeration, paucity of authentic data and neglect of topography and chronology' (Ghoshal 1961: 2). However, the 12th century work by Kalhana, Rajatarangini, a Kashmir Chronicle, was path breaking. It was a much more authentic and dependable work of historical writing. Subsequently, it was Muslim historiography which dominated the Indian Scene. 'The Muslim writings provided a historical picture of India not available among any other community in India until recent times' (Gungwu 1968: 421). Two great Muslim historical works left an indelible mark. One is *Tarikh-i-Ferozshahi* by Ziauddin Barani, completed in 1357, and the other is *Akbar Namah* by the Mughal historian Abul Fazal (1551-1602) during the regime of the emperor Akbar (1556-1605). A section of this work, *Ain-i-Akbari* 'is regarded as the classic study of the institutions and workings of an empire at the height of its extent and power' (Gungwu 1968: 422).

Wang Gungwu observes that the growth of modern historiography in Europe coincided with the expansion of European activities in Asia. However, it was only when Western Science and culture were consciously taught that India and South Asia were influenced by the Western historical methods. This was in the second half of the 19th century (Ibid: 423). The founding of Asiatic Society in Calcutta by William Jones in 1784 heralded a serious study of India's history

and culture. European Scholars took to the study of Sanskrit texts as well as Buddhist literature as a means of understanding India's past, especially the pre-Muslim period, and brought out edited versions of several of them along with translations. The establishment of Indian Universities with History as an important Department greatly encouraged the writing of History. As Surendra Rao explains in the volume here, 'engagement with colonialism and summoning back the fond as well as disagreeable images of the Raj remained a major concern of historiography of modern India'. In the twentieth century, it took two different directions. 'The first was a more intensive appreciation of western scientific methods, especially following the brilliant archeological work on the Indus civilisation at Mohenjo-daro and Harappa. The second was a nationalist or anti-imperialistic approach, which in its extreme forms produced obscurantist and revivalist historical writings on the one hand and stimulated Marxist and other forms of radical historiography on the other.' (Gungwu 1968: 424).

The Indian scholars of history gave a lot more attention to Indian religious and cultural history than to British conquests. Indian response to the British rule, like the 1857 Sepoy Mutiny ('The First War for Independence of India'), and the social and economic changes that occured under the British rule also received focussed attention. Historians like R.C. Majumdar, H.C. Ray Chaudhury, Nilakanta Sastry and K.M. Panikkar contributed significantly to the writing of Indian history. The 11-volume work on *History and Culture of the Indian People* prepared under the General Editorship of R.C. Majumdar, published by Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan between 1951 and 1969 was a landmark in history writing after the publication of *Cambridge History of India* published in six volumes between 1922 and.1932.

Marxist historians like Irfan Habib threw new light on Moghal India from a left perspective. They inspired the writing of subaltern history, the history of common people as they were affected by feudalism and colonialism, and their resistance to exploitation. It was Antonio Gramsci (1971) who first used the term 'Subaltern' to study the role of masses in moulding historical events. The main intention of this approach is to correct the elitist bias in the writing of history. Quite a few outstanding works came out with this approach in India, the most noted being the 10-volume work on Subaltern Studies.[14] Surendra Rao has given

---

14. The first six volumes of this were edited by Ranjit Guha published between 1982 and 1989, the remaining ones edited by others published between 1992 and 1999, all by Oxford University Press. The title of the full series is *Subaltern Studies - Writings on South Asian History and Society*.

a lucid account of their contribution. Economic historians also analysed the beginnings and progress of commercialisation and capitalist development in India tracing them back to the medieval period.

Another area of the influence of the. British was in recording local history. The Imperial Gazetteers for various districts documented local history, culture, customs and economy. The District Gazetteers continued this tradition after Independence, periodically updated with the finding of new sources. These Gazetteers were very useful for local administration, and complemented the writing of history at the macro level.

This 'Introduction' has not done full justice to the contributions included in the volume. But I hope it will serve as an appetiser and enthuse the readers to savour the full meal. I have not confined myself merely to summarising the individual contributions here, but have attempted to provide the flayour of the individual disciplines. Readers may find the account of their own discipline quite familiar and brief, and also incomplete, but my intention has been to induce readers to take interest in the disciplines in which they may not have specialised. To help this, I have tried to bring out interconnections and common interests between different disciplines. It is neither possible nor desirable to have one social science which explains all social reality. Nevertheless, it would help us to understand social phenomena better if we keep in mind the interconnectedness of different social sciences. I trust that this volume will serve that purpose.

References

1. Bhagwati, Jagdish and Sukhamoy Chakravarty (1969) *Contributions to Indian Economic Analysis: A Survey*, American Economic Review, September, Vol. 59 (4, part 2, supplement), Reprinted in 1971 by Lalwani Publishing House, New Delhi.
2. Bharadwaj, Krishna (1978) *Classical Political Economy and Rise to Dominance of Supply and Demand Theories*, New Delhi: Orient Longman.
3. Brahmananda, PR (2000) '*A New Definition of the Nature and Scope of Economics*,' in Rao *et al.* eds. (2000) pp, 84-85.
4. Brecht, Arnold (1970) *Political Theory - The Foundations of Twentieth Century Political Thought*, Bombay: The Times of India Press.
5. Buchanan, James (1986) *Liberty, Market and State: Political Economy in the 1980s*, New York: New York University Press
6. Buchanan, James (1987) *Economics: Between Predictive Science and Moral Philosophy*, College Station: Texas A & M University Press.

7. Byres, Terence J (1998) *The Indian Economy: Major Debates Since Independence*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

8. Craib, Ian (1997) *Classical Social Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

9. Dasgupta, AK (1983) *Phases of Capitalism and Economic Theory and other Essays*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

10. Dhanagare, DN (1990) *Shetkari Sanghatana: The Farmers' Movement in Maharashtra Background and Ideology*, Social Action, 40 (4) Oct-Dec., pp 347-69.

11. Dhanagare, DN (1999) *The 'New Farmers' Movement in Mahrashtra and its Response to New Economic Reforms* in Oshikawa Fumiko (ed) (1999) South Asia under the Economic Reforms, Osaka: The Japan Centre for Area Studies.

12. Doren, Charles van (1991) *A History of Knowledge - Past, Present, and Future*, New York: Ballantine Books.

13. *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1990), 15th Edition, Editor-in-Chief: Philip W. Goetz

14. Frank, Andre Gunder (1975) *On Capitalist Underdevelopment*, Bombay: Oxford University Press.

15. Galbraith, John Kenneth (1987) *A History of Economics: The Past as the Present*, London: Hamish Hamilton.

16. Gellner, Ernest (1984) *The Scientific Status of Social Sciences*, International Social Science Journal, Issue No. 102 on Epistemology of Social Science.

17. Ghoshal, UN (1961) *Presidential Address, Part I*, in Indian History Congress, Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Session, Aligarh, 1960. Calcutta, pp 1-20.

18. Gilbert, M (ed) (1953) *Income and Wealth*, Issue III, Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes.

19. Gordon. Scott (1991) *The History and Philosophy of Social Science*, London and New York: Routledge.

20. Gramsci, Antonio (1971) *Selections from Prison Notebooks*, London.

21. Gungwu, Wang (1968) *South and Southeast Asian Historiography* in International Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, Vol-6, Macmillan and the Free Press, pp 420-27.

22. Hallinan, Maureen (1997) *The Sociological Study of Social Change*, 1996 Presidential Address, American Sociological Review, Vol. 62 (Feb. 1-11) pp 1-11.

23. Hexter, JH (1968) *The Rhetoric of History* in International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, vol.6, Macmillan and the Free Press, pp 368-393.

24. Hunt, EK and Jess G Schwartz (eds) (1972) *A Critique of Economic Theory*, Penguin.

25. Knapp, Terry J (1995) *The History of Sociology* in Magill (ed) (1995).

26. Kuznets, Simon (1966) *Modern Economic Growth: Rate, Structure and Spread*, Bombay: Vakils, Feffer and Simon.

27. Lutz, Mark A and Kenneth Lux (1979) *The Challenging of Humanistic Economics*, Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co.

28. Machlup, Fritz (1978) *Methodology of Economics and other Social Sciences*, New York: Academic Press.

29. Magill, FN (ed) (1995) International Encyclopaedia of Sociology Vol. II, London: Fitroy Dearborn Pub.

30. Nadkarni, MV (1987) *Farmers' Movements in India*, Delhi: Allied Publishers.

31. Nadkarni, MV (,I 997) *Broadbasing Process in India and Dalits*, Economic and Political Weekly Vol. 32 (No. 33 & 34). August 16-23, pp.2160-2171.

32. Patnaik, Utsa (ed) (1990) *Agrarian Relations and Accumulation. The Mode of Production Debate in India*, Bombay: Oxford University Press.

33. Rao, B.Sarveswara (2000) *Some Issues of Relevance in Mainstream Economics: A Few Comments*, Presidential Address at 65th Annual Conference of IEA in 1992, Reprinted in Rao *et al.* (2000) pp 461-481.

34. Rao, B. Sarveswara (2000) *Some Issues of Relevance in Mainstream Economics: A Few Comments*, Presidential Address at 65th Annual Conference of IEA in 1992, Reprinted in Rao et al (2000) pp 461-481.

35. Rao, RVR Chandrasekhara; A Prasanna Kumar and KC Reddy (eds) (2000) *Perspectives on Indian Development: Economy, Policy ahd Society* (Essays in Honour Of' Prof. B.Sarveswara Rao), Delhi: Sterling Publishers.

36. Rao, VKRV, 1952a, *Investment, Income and the Multiplier in an Underdeveloped Economy*, Indian Economic Review I (1) Feb.

37. Rao VKRV, 1952b, *Full Employment and Economic Development*, Indian Economic Review I (2), August.

38. Rao VKRV, 1953a, *Deficit Financing, Capital Formation and Price Behaviour in an Underdeveloped Economy*, Indian Economic Review I (3) Feb.

39. Rao VKRV, 1953b, *Some Reflections on the Comparability of Real National Income of Industrialised and Underdeveloped Countries*, in Gilbert (1953).

40. Reader, John (1988) *Man on Earth: A Celebration of Mankind: Portraits of Human Culture in a Multitude of Environments*, University of Texas Press, (Perennial Library Edition in paperback by Harper & Row, New York, 1990).

41. Sandmo, Agnar (1990) *Buchanan on Political Economy - A Review Article*, Journal of Economic Literature Vol. 28 March pp 50-63.

42. Sarkar, Sumit (1983) *Popular Movements & Middleclass Leadership in Late Colonial India: Perspectives and Problems of a History from Below*, New Delhi.

43. Sen, Amartya (1987) *Commodities and Capabilities*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

44. Srinivas, MN (1966) *Social Change in Modern India*, Bombay: Orient Longmans.

45. Swedberg, Richard (1987) *Economic Sociology: Past and Present*, Current Sociology. Vol. 35 (1).

46. Thorner, Alice (1982) *Semi-Feudalism or Capitalism? - Contemporary Debate on Classes and Mode of Production in India*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 17 (Nos. 49, 50 & 51)

47. Toynbee, Arnold (1995) *A Study of History* (The First Abridged One Volume Edition), Barnes and Nobles.

48. Wallerstein, Immanuel (1974, 1980, 1989) *The Modern World System*, (3-Vols.), New York: Academic Press.

49. Wallerstein, Immanuel *et al.* (1996) *Open the Social Sciences - Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences*, Stanford University Press, Reprinted in India by Vistaar, Delhi, 1998.

50. Wright, Arthur (1968) *Chinese Historiography* in International Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, Vol. 6, Macmillan and the Free Press, pp. 400-7.

Landmarks in the Development of Economics During the Twentieth Century

2

U. Sankar

Introduction

The twentieth century witnessed major developments in the discipline of economics. The motivations for the developments are (a) to generalise, or to make the existing theories more rigorous, (b) to search for alternative theories/ hypotheses to provide better explanation of observed phenomena, (c) to enrich the domain of economics by utilising important contributions in related disciplines, and (d) to apply economic principles in the design and implementation of economic policies at international, national and sub-national levels.

This paper reviews major developments in economic theory. The topics covered are: utility theory, production and markets, welfare economics, macro economics, and growth and development. The aim is to understand the developments in their historical contexts, to assess them in relation to the prevailing theories and to point out their fruitful applications.

Utility Theory

Cardinal Utility

The cardinal utility theory was popular at the beginning of the twentieth century. This theory assumes that utility is measurable, that is, the consumer can attach a

number for the satisfaction he derives from consumption of each additional unit of a commodity. Marshall developed a theory of demand based on the cardinal utility approach. He made the following assumptions: (i) independent utility, that is, the total utility derived from consumption of n commodities is the sum of utilities derived from the n commodities, (ii) the marginal utility of each commodity diminishes as the quantity consumed of each commodity increases, and (iii) the marginal utility of money is constant. These are strong assumptions. But these assumptions enabled Marshall to derive the proposition that the demand curve slopes downward in the price-quantity space, that is, the quantity demanded decreases as the price of the commodity increases.

Ordinal Utility Theory

The ordinal utility theory is due to Slutsky. Hicks (1939) developed the theory further. This approach does not require the assumptions of independent utilities diminishing marginal utility, and constant marginal utility of money. What is needed for understanding consumers' behaviour is ordering (ranking) of preferences for commodity bundles in a commodity space. Given two commodity bundles, $Q^a = (q_1^a, q_2^a)$ and $Q^b = (q_1^b, q_2^b)$ the consumer must be able to say whether he prefers Q^a to Q^b or Q^b to Q^a or is indifferent to Q^a and Q^b. The indifference curve is defined as the locus of all commodity combinations which provide the same level of utility. The slope of an indifference curve measures the rate at which the consumer substitutes commodity 1 for commodity 2. The important properties of indifference curves are: (a) they slope downward, (b) they are convex to the origin (diminishing marginal rate of substitution), and (c) they do not intersect each other. This approach assumes only that the ratio of marginal utilities, that is, the marginal utility of commodity 1 and the marginal utility of commodity 2 (negative of the slope of an indifference curve) diminishes as the individual consumes more of commodity 2 by giving up consumption of commodity 1.

The consumer's optimisation problem can be formulated as follows. Given a quasi-concave utility function reflecting an individual's preferences for n commodities $U(q_1 , \ldots , q_n)$, a set of prices $p_1, \ldots , p_n$, and money income, m, the problem becomes:

Max U $(q_1 , \ldots , q_2)$

Sub to $p_1 q_1 + \ldots + p_n q_n = m$

This is a constrained maximum problem. The first-order conditions for utility maximisation are:

$$U_i - \lambda P_i = 0, i = 1, \ldots, n, \text{ and} \tag{1a}$$

$$m = p_1 q_1 + \ldots + p_n q_n, \tag{1b}$$

where λ is the marginal utility of money. (1a) implies that for each commodity, its marginal utility divided by its price be equal to the marginal utility of money. In terms of indifference curve analysis, the slope of the indifference curve must equal the slope of the budget line at the optimum point. Given the budget set, the maximum utility is achieved at the point where the indifference curve is tangent to the budget line. The second-order condition for the maximum is that the indifference curves are convex to the origin. In the general case of n commodities, the utility function must be quasi-concave.

The $(n+1)$ equations can be solved for the $(n+1)$ unknowns, namely $q_1 \ldots, q_n$ and λ. The demand functions for commodities and marginal utility of money depend on all the prices and money income. Even without knowledge of the utility function it is possible to predict the effect of changes in the prices of commodities and money income on the demands for commodities and marginal utility of money. See Samuelson (1947).

Slutsky and Hicks showed how the price effect can be decomposed into substitution effect and income effect. Assume the individual is initially at equilibrium at the point (q_1^*, q_2^*). When p_1 falls, while p_2 and m remain constant, the relative price p_1/p_2 decreases and real income increases. The change from (q_1^*, q_2^*) to another point in the *same* indifference curve (q_1^1, q_2^1) where the indifference curve is tangent to the budget line parallel to the new budget line, represents the substitution effect. The change from (q_1^1, q_2^1) to the new equilibrium (q_1^{**}, q_2^{**}), where the indifference curve is tangent to the new budget line represents the income effect. The income effect can be positive or negative. If the income effect is negative then the commodity is called an inferior good. The substitution effect is always negative. If the income effect is negative and is larger (in absolute value) than the substitution effect, then the demand curve can slope upward. A commodity with an upward sloping demand curve is called Giffen good.

When there are more than 2 commodities, two commodities can be complements. Two commodities i and j are said to be substitutes, if the partial derivative of q_i with respect to the jth price, given the utility level, is negative; if the derivative is positive than the two commodities are complements.

The demand functions are homogeneous ~~in~~ ^{of} degree one in money income and prices which means that if money income and all prices increase (decrease) by a constant factor then, it will have no effect on the quantities demanded. The consumer has no money illusion. Another useful property is that the weighted sum of income elasticities must equal one. The Slutsky matrix, that is the matrix of partial derivatives where a typical element is of the form derivative of q_i with respect to p_j, holding utility constant, is symmetric. If there are n commodities, there will be n income elasticities and $n(n-1)/2$ price elasticities. Estimation of price elasticities, particularly cross price elasticities is a challenging task. Frisch ~~(1957)~~ showed that, with an additional restriction namely additive utility function, all cross price elasticities can be derived if estimates of income elasticities, own price elasticities and elasticity of marginal utility with respect to income are known.

The ordinal utility framework can be adopted/extended to analyse a number of interesting problems in economics. A popular application is a joint decision on consumption and labour supply. Tobin (1952) studied the problem of quantity rationing. Becker (1965) analysed both commodity purchase and time allocation decisions. One can also exploit the duality theory to arrive at an indirect utility function, expenditure function etc. For example, solving equations (1a) and (1b), one can write the demand functions as functions of money income and prices. If we substitute the resulting demand functions in the utility function we can write:

$$U \left[q_1^* (p_1, \ldots, p_n, m), \ldots q_n^* (p_1, \ldots, p_n, m) \right]$$

$$= U^* (p_1, \ldots, p_n, m)$$

The above equation is known as the indirect utility function. Utility or welfare can be written as a function of money income and prices. This approach forms the basis of economic theory of index numbers. For example, one can ask the question: if p_1 increases, while all other prices remain constant, how much compensation would a consumer need in order to maintain the utility level

achieved before the price change? The required increase in money income, Δm, is implicitly given by the following equation:

$$U^* (p_1 + \Delta p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n, m + \Delta m) = U^*(p_1, \ldots, p_n, m).$$

The indifference curve approach can be adopted to analyse choice problems in a two period model. Let C_1 and C_2 be consumption in periods 1 and 2 respectively and $U(C_1, C_2)$ be an intertemporal ordinal quasi-concave utility function. The slope of indifference curve (with C_1 in horizontal axis and C_2 in vertical axis) measures the rate of time preference. If the slope is calculated along a 45° line through the origin, that is when $C_1 = C_2$, and it is more than one, then a consumer is willing to give up one unit of consumption in period 1 only if he is offered more than one unit of consumption in period 2. One can formulate the optimisation problem as one of maximising an intertemporal utility function subject to a wealth constraint. For an elegant geometric exposition and lucid interpretation see Hirshleifer.

Expected Utility Approach

From Bernouli time onward for more than three centuries, mathematicians and economists were trying to develop a framework for decision making under uncertainty. As noted by Arrow (1971), in the static neoclassical models of consumer and producer theories, there is a one to one relation between action and consequence. For example, in the consumer theory an action is choice of a commodity bundle in the feasible set and the consequence is the utility derived from the bundle. Similarly, in the production theory an action involves choice of an input-output bundle, and the consequence is measured in terms of sale or profit. In both cases, ordering of actions is equivalent to ordering of consequences. When uncertainty is introduced into the model, there is no one to one relation between an action and a consequence. For example, in farming, for the same input application, there can be many levels of output depending on weather or other random factors.

The decision making problem under uncertainty can be formulated as follows. Suppose, there are n mutually exclusive states of nature and there are m possible actions. For each action A_i there are n possible consequences, $y_{ij}, j = 1, \ldots, n$. Let the probability of occurrence of jth state of the ith action taken be p_{ij}. Assume

all p_{ij}'s are known.[1] Ranking of actions involves ordering of the probability distributions. In a path-breaking contribution Von Neumann and Morgenstern showed that ranking of probability distributions can be based on the expected utility rule if the individual behaviour conforms to certain axioms. In addition to the axioms used in the ordinal theory of choice under uncertainty, certainty equivalence axioms and independence axioms are used. The certainty equivalence axiom asserts that any prospect has a certainty equivalent. The independence axiom implies that the utility of a consequence depends only on the associated income and not on the state.

The expected utility of action A_i is given by

$$V(A_i) = p_{i1} U(y_{i1}) + p_{i2} U(y_{i2}) + \ldots + p_{in} V(y_{in}) , i = 1 , \ldots , m.$$

Expected utility can be interpreted as a weighted average of utilities, with weight being probabilities. The expected utility rule assigns a real number to each probability distribution. Thus, ranking of probability distributions can be based on the expected utility rule.

The Von Neumann Morgenstern utility function is unique upto a positive linear transformation. If $V(y)$ is a utility function, then $W = a + bV$ is also a utility function when $b > 0$. The ordinal utility function $U(y)$ in Slutsky-Hicks framework is more general than the VNM utility function. If $U(y)$ is a utility function then $F(U)$ is also a utility function if $F'(U) > 0$.

An individual is a risk averter if $V''(y)$ is negative and risk natural if $V''(y) = 0$. A risk averter would be willing to exchange a risky prospect for a certainty equivalent by paying a premium. An individual has a house worth Rs. A. If fire occurs then value of the house is A-L and if there is no fire then the house value is A. Let p be the probability that fire occurs. Then the expected utility is given by:

$$pU(A\text{-}L) + (1\text{-}p) U(A) = y^e.$$

The expected value is given by:

---

1. We are considering a situation where an individual can assign objective or subjective probability for each state. Knight would call this choice a risky choice. He refers to uncertain situation when the relevant probabilities are unknown.

$$p(A\text{-}L) + (1 - p)A = \bar{y}.$$

$\bar{y} - y^e = \pi$ is the maximum premium he would be willing to pay for the fire insurance.

Markowitz and others developed the theory of portfolio choice. In this theory, the expected utility is a function only of mean and standard deviation of portfolio. The expected utility increases with the mean and decreases with the standard deviation. This problem can be analysed graphically in the mean-standard deviation space using the indifference curve analysis. The indifference curves in mean-standard deviation space, slope upward. The slope is positive because a rational investor will be prepared to accept greater risk (higher standard deviation) only if he is offered greater return (higher mean). So long as the returns on different assets are not perfectly correlated, by having a diversified portfolio (a portfolio with many assets), an individual can reduce the overall riskiness of the portfolio.

The portfolio approach is popular because it requires only information on means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients. It is well known that an analysis based only on the first two moments of a probability distribution is valid if (a) the utility function is quadratic or (b) the probability distribution is normal. A quadratic utility function implies that a risky asset is an inferior good. The assumption of normality is not valid because the distributions of returns on many assets are positively skewed. Arrow (1973) and Pratt developed absolute risk aversion and relative risk aversion measures. Arrow developed the methodology of deriving comparative static results using hypotheses about absolute and relative risk aversions in the expected utility framework.

Arrow (1964) developed the state preference approach. A commodity is denoted with three subscript, q_{ist} where i refers to location, s state of nature and t time. The state preference approach is more general than the expected utility approach. This approach has been useful in the formulation and analysis of general equilibrium models with financial markets.

Firm Behaviour

In the theory of the firm major developments during the twentieth century are (i) alternative specifications of production sets, (ii) alternative views about firm behaviour, (iii) market structure and industrial organisation.

Technology

The production models can be classified under (a) input output model, (b) linear programming or activity analysis, and (c) neoclassical models. The input-output approach popularised by Leontief (1953, 1966) assumes constant returns to scale and fixed input-output coefficients. Let a_{ij} be the amount of ith input required for producing 1 unit of jth output and X_j and F_j be gross output and final demand for jth product. Then the accounting identity is:

$$X_i = a_{i1} X_1 + \cdots + a_{in} X_n + F_i, \qquad i = 1, \ldots \ldots, n$$

The n equations can be written in matrix notation as:

$$X = AX + F$$

or $(I-A)X = F$

Given the final demand vector F, one can solve for the gross output vector:

$$X = (I-A)^{-1}F$$

The (i, j)th element of $(I-A)^{-1}$ gives the direct and indirect requirements of jth input required for producing one unit of ith output.

The advantages of the input-output model are as follows. It gives, in a summary form, inter-industry structure of an economy. For a planner, input-output technique is useful in checking consistency among sectoral targets. For a national income accountant, the method enables him to derive reliable estimates of value added for each sector. For a development planner, the technique is useful in estimating backward and forward linkages of an investment project. This technique has been modified and adopted to deal with issues relating to environmental impact assessment, manpower planning and structural changes in an economy overtime.

Linear programming technique was popularised in economics by Koopmans and Kantarovich. Unlike the case of input-output approach, there is more than one technique for producing an output. Each technique has one particular input combination. Linear programming technique has been used for allocation of scarce resources among different activities. It is also used for solving a variety of applied problems such as finding a cost minimizing budget subject to minimum nutrition requirements, scheduling problem in airforce, and transportation problem. Linear programming problems have duals which provide

information about the scarcity values (shadow prices) of limitational resources in resource allocation problems.

The neoclassical approach uses the production function concept. In the case of the production of a single product q using n inputs, the neoclassical production function is $q = f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. The function is assumed to be twice differentiable. Two interesting properties of the production function are substitution possibilities among inputs and economies of scale in production. In case of two inputs, Hicks (1932) defined the elasticity of substitution as percentage change in the input ratio divided by the rate of technical substitution or the input price ratio. If the elasticity of substitution is zero, then there is no factor substitution. This is Leontief technology. If the elasticity of substitution is infinite, then the inputs are perfectly substitutable. For the Cobb-Douglas production function $q = Ax_1^a x_2^b$ the elasticity of substitution is one. The Cobb-Douglas production function was popular in theoretical and empirical literature till 1960. A Cobb-Douglas production model based on the assumptions of perfect competition and profit maximisation, yields the result that the elasticity of output per worker with respect to real wage is one. Empirical research indicated that this elasticity can be different from one. For the model with CES production function the elasticity is constant but it can take any non-negative value. For the CES production function $q = A[dx_1^{-\delta} + (1-d)x_2^{-\delta}]^{-(1/\delta)}$, the elasticity of substitution is given by $(1/(1+\delta))$. δ can take any value between -1 and $\propto$. See Arrow, Chenery, Minhas and Solow (1961). Allen developed the concept of partial elasticity of substitution between any two inputs when there are more than two inputs.

A production function is said to be homogeneous of degree v when all inputs are increased by a factor k, output increases by a factor k^v. $v > 1$ implies increasing returns to scale, $v = 1$ implies constant returns to scale and $v < 1$ implies decreasing returns to scale. It is possible that returns to scale itself may be a function of output. Such production functions are called homothetic production functions.

Constant elasticity of substitution and homogeneous production functions impose apriori restriction on technology. If one wants a flexible characterisation of technology, one has to use flexible functional form such as translog.[2] For

2. In case of 2 inputs, the translog function can be written $\ln q = a_0 + a_1 \ln x_1 + a_2 \ln x_2 + a_{11} (\ln x_1)^2 + a_{22} (\ln x_2)^2 + 2 a_{12} (\ln x_1) (\ln x_2)$

properties and applications of flexible functional forms see Fuss and McFadden. This book is also a good guide to understand the applications of the duality theory in production, particularly the links among production, cost, profit and input demand functions.

There is also interest in the characterisation of technology for multiproduct firms. An interesting question is why do firms produce more than one product. Baumol, Panzar and Willig argue that economies of scope in joint production is a reason for the existence of multiproduct firms. Economies of scope arise when the cost function is sub-additive, that is the cost of producing two or more products simultaneously by one firm is lower than the sum of costs of producing each product by a separate firm. It arises because of cost complementarity. This means that the marginal cost of producing one commodity falls when the production of another product increases.

Goals

The standard behavioural assumption in the neoclassical model of firm is that the firm maximises profits. But in the consumer theory, the goal is maximisation of utility. When an individual is both a consuming unit and a production unit, can these two goals be reconciled? Hirshleifer, using the Fisherian framework, showed that under certain conditions, maximisation of wealth is a necessary condition for maximisation of discounted utilities overtime. The conditions are (a) the production set is regular, (b) investment opportunities are mutually exclusive and can be ranked on the basis of returns, and (c) competitive market conditions prevail. Under such assumptions, production decisions can be separated from consumption decisions. The work of Modigliani and Miller (1958) helped integration of production, investment and financing decisions.

The goal of profit maximisation has been questioned by several economists, where there is separation between ownership and management of a firm. Baumol suggested sales maximisation as a plausible goal. A few others developed the utility maximisation model of firm in which the manager's utility function depends on profit, sales, non-pecuniary returns etc. Simon rejects the assumption of an omniscient, rational and profit maximising entrepreneur. In his classic book (1947) and in many other works, he described the company as an adaptive system of physical, personal and social components that are held together by a network of intercommunication and by the willingness of its members to cooperate and to strive towards a common goal. He introduced the

concepts of 'satisficing' and 'bounded rationality'. He was awarded the Nobel prize in economics for the year 1978 for his research in the decision-making processes within economic organisations.

Markets

Most economics literature deals with perfect competition and monopoly. In the thirties Joan Robinson wrote the *Economics of Imperfect Competition* and Edward Chamberlain wrote the *Theory of Monopolistic Competition.* Chamberlain's theory, while realistic in capturing real world features like product differentiation and advertisement, was attacked by the Chicago School, particularly Friedman, on the ground that the theory has little predictive power. Bain's 'Structure-Conduct-Performance' paradigm has a powerful influence in the industrial organisation literature. Baumol, Panzar and Willig's work on the theory of contestable markets stressed the importance of potential entry in disciplining the behaviour of existing firms.

During the twentieth century the theory of oligopoly became an interesting applied area for mathematicians and economists working in the area of non-cooperative game theory. Nash formulated a solution concept with an arbitrary number of players and arbitrary persons. In the Nash equilibrium, all of the players' expectations are fulfilled and their chosen strategies are optimal. Harsanyi (1967, 1968) made notable contributions to games with imperfect information played by Bayesian players. He postulated that every player is one of several types, where each type corresponds to a set of possible preferences for the player and a subjective probability distribution over the other players' types. Every player in a game with incomplete information chooses a strategy for his type. Under a consistency requirement on the player's probability distributions, he showed that for every game with incomplete information, there is an equivalent game with complete information. Selten refined the Nash equilibrium concept for analysing dynamic strategic interaction. He developed a strategy to eliminate the uninteresting Nash equilibrium by introducing the concept of subgame perfection. The 1994 Nobel Prize in economics was awarded to Nash, Harsanyi and Selten.

Beginning with Stigler (1961), economics of information became an important area for economic research. Stigler introduced the cost of transactions in the shape of the cost of information and search. Akerlof's paper considered the implications of asymmetric information in market performance. The problem of

moral hazard is pervasive in the insurance literature while the problem of adverse selection is common in job markets. Simon's work on models of man (1957) generated a vast literature on principal agent problems with applications in many areas including landlord tenant contract, landlady-domestic servant contract, and employer-employee relationship.

We conclude this section by referring to the seminal article by Coase on the nature of the firm published in 1937. Coase asked the question why are there firms? Coase introduced the idea of transaction costs to explain why a firm exists. The transaction costs include the costs for preparing, entering into and monitoring the execution of all kinds of contracts. He considered two types of contracts, those which stipulate to the parties their total obligations or rights or both, and those which are incomplete. The firm consists of an array of incomplete contracts. According to him, a firm originates when allocative measures are carried out at lower total production, contract and administrative costs within the firm than by means of purchases and sales on the market. Coase's work stimulated research in the areas of industrial organisation and new institutional economics.

Welfare Economics

Welfare Optimum

Dupuit, a French engineer, suggested the sum of consumers' and producers' surpluses as a welfare criterion for measuring the net benefit of a public work. In a diagram with price on the vertical axis and quantity on the horizontal axis, this sum is given by the area bounded by the demand and marginal cost (supply) curves. Marshall popularised the concept of consumer's surplus. This concept is being widely used in many applications in economics.

According to Pigou, welfare can be approximated in terms of national dividend and national welfare increases when income is transferred from the rich to the poor. Pigou assumed diminishing marginal utility of money. Dupuit, Marshall and Pigou assumed cardinal utility of. money and interpersonal comparisons of utility .

Pareto suggested a welfare criterion which avoids measurement of utility as well as interpersonal comparison of utilities. According to Pareto, social welfare improves if it is possible to improve the welfare of at least one individual

without decreasing the welfare of others. The Pareto criterion is used in determining exchange optimum and production optimum. It is also used in general equilibrium models of welfare economics. A necessary condition for Pareto optimality is that the price of each good must equal its marginal cost. Pareto efficiency can be achieved in a decentralised manner via competitive markets.

Arrow and Hahn demonstrated that under certain assumptions, an economic organisation based on competitive markets can result in better allocation of resources than under any other alternative organisational form. They provided a general but rigorous proof of Adam Smith's invisible hand theorem. The Pareto efficiency properties of competitive markets attracted the attention of socialist economists such as Lerner and Lange. They recommended the application of the marginal cost pricing principle to publicly owned firms.

Market Failure

Arrow and Hahn also pointed out that in the presence of economies of scale in production, externalities in production and consumption and public goods, decentralised allocation based on markets may not satisfy the Pareto optimality conditions. Market failures can and do occur.

In fact there is a vast literature on economies of scale and externalities dating back to the twenties. Pigou argued that in the presence of externalities in production, private and social marginal costs (benefits) differ and hence the private optimum will differ from the social optimum. He advocated a tax on the polluter which is equal to the difference between the social marginal cost and the private marginal cost at the optimum level of output.

According to Coase (1960), negative externalities such as environmental pollution arise because of the absence of well defined property rights in many environmental goods and services and high transaction costs in reaching a solution via bargaining between the polluters and the pollutees. The Coase theorem states that while the assignment of legal rights is necessary for effecting market transactions, the ultimate outcome which maximises the value of production is independent of the legal position if the pricing system is assumed to work without cost. He advocated a role for the state in defining property rights for environmental resources and in mitigating transaction costs but rejected government intervention in the form of specifying standards or levying

taxes to correct the externality. It is difficult to define property rights for natural resources like air, water in lakes, rivers and oceans and scenic spots. The transaction costs in reaching a negotiated settlement between polluters and pollutees can be high when the number involved is very large and they are widely dispersed and measurement of the value of damages is highly uncertain. Hence, most countries have set up legal and administrative systems for environmental protection and adopted policies for prevention and control of pollution which range from command and control measures to economic/market based measures.

Economies of scale are significant in the provision of some public utility services. Until recently, electricity supply, telecommunications, and municipal water supply were regarded as natural monopolies in the sense that each of the services can be provided at least cost by one firm than by two or more firms. Countries such as USA preferred statutory private monopolies subject to regulation while UK, France and India preferred public monopoly form. Hotelling (1938) argued for pricing of utility services on the basis of long run marginal cost principle and recommended that the resulting deficits be covered by other taxes or tax on scarcity rents. Coase (1946) suggested a two part tariff – one part consisting of price equals long run marginal cost and the second part, a lump sum payment fixed in such a way that the total cost equals total revenue. When a utility maximises the sum of consumers' and producers' surpluses subject to a profit constraint, the resulting pricing rule is that the deviation between price and marginal cost must be inversely proportional to their own price elasticity of demand (Ramsey rule). Boiteux formulated a general equilibrium model with public and private firms. In his model, consumers maximise utilities and private firms maximise profits. The public firms face budget constraints. Boiteux derived the pricing rules for public firms. Ramsey pricing rule is a special case of Boiteux pricing rule. The utility pricing literature in recent years is also influenced by game theoretic literature, new accounting concepts and non-linear pricing.

In a classic paper Samuelson (1954) provided a clear distinction between private goods and public goods. In the case of a private good, aggregate consumption is the sum of individual consumption whereas in the case of public good, each individual has the same quantity of public good which is also equal to the total supply. Once produced, the marginal cost of supplying a public good is zero. Hence, the optimal price is zero. Free rider problem arises because each individual has no incentive to reveal his true preference for the supply of a

public good. Hence, decisions on the determination of optimal supply of public goods cannot be based on individual preferences as revealed in markets. A collective approach for decision making is needed.

In between private and public goods, there are merit goods. Income distribution considerations also enter into many public policy decisions. Public policies such as land reforms, tax reforms and price controls benefit one group of society and hurt another group of society. How can one say that the society as a whole gains as a result of the policy reform? Bergson used a social welfare function as an indicator of social welfare. If the function is well defined and has desirable properties one can maximise the function subject to preferences, technology and other constraints. This amounts to centralised planning. There is also the problem of aggregation of individual preferences. Arrow (1951) showed that given certain reasonable assumptions about individual preferences, it is not possible to derive a social choice rule without violating one or more of the assumptions.

Beginning with his monograph in 1971, Sen enriched the principles of social choice. He clarified the conditions which permit rules for collective decision making that are consistent with a sphere of rights for the individual. Also, Sen extended the domain of welfare economics by developing indices of welfare and poverty and enquiring into the causes of famines and studying public responses to famines.

Equity

The utilitarian approach is subject to criticism by some economists and philosophers. Rawls developed two principles of justice based on the social contract theory using the assumption that decisions about the future social state are made under the veil of ignorance. Rawls' maximum criterion leads to maximisation of welfare of the least advantaged in society. This criterion is very similar to Gandhiji's concept of *antyodaya*. Rawls criterion does not mean perfect equality, it only means equal opportunities for every one. If the service of an entrepreneur or a scientist will result in the betterment of the least advantaged in the society, then the entrepreneur or the scientist should be rewarded for his contribution to increase in social welfare.

The problem of depletion of exhaustible resources was studied in depth by Hotelling (1931). This problem raises the issue of intergenerational equity i.e.,

justice between generations. A concern for the future generation would mean slower rate of depletion of fossil fuels, preservation of bio-diversity and restrictions on the use of irreplaceable other natural resources. This requires a lower social discount rate. The concern for the future is articulated by the World Commission on Environment and Development in its advocacy of sustainable development. In terms of national income accounting, corrections have to be made for depletion and degeneration of natural resources. At the policy level, precautionary principle should be applied particularly in the matter of environment.

For a developing country like India with more than one third of the population living below the poverty line and unemployment persisting for decades, intra-generational equity assumes special significance. Concern for intragenerational equity necessitates a higher discount rate. Conventional macro indicators such as per capita net national product, rate of growth of GDP etc may increase with time, yet income distribution may worsen. Apart from different measures of poverty, human development indices now available take into account some aspects of human well being.

Macroeconomics

Path-breaking contributions were made in the field of macroeconomics and yet there is no consensus among economists on a macroeconomic paradigm which is suitable for understanding the functioning of an economy.

Classical Macroeconomics

The classical macroeconomic model assumes a private enterprise economy, competitive markets and flexible prices. In a simple one period model, the demand for, and supply of, labour determine the real wage rate and employment, and output is determined via a short-run production function. Say's Law of Markets (supply creates demand) asserts that aggregate demand is sufficient to clear the output market. Interest rate is an instrument in achieving equality between saving and investment. The quantity theory of money is used to determine the price level. Flexibility of prices ensures that all markets clear. Unemployment can, at most, be a temporary phenomenon because, if it persists, competition among the unemployed will lower the real wage rate and bring about full employment.

Keynesianism

John Maynard Keynes in his classic, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* (1936), criticised some crucial assumptions of the classical model such as flexible wage rate and product prices, Say's Law of Markets, and motivation for holding money. According to Keynes, aggregate demand, consisting of consumption demand and investment demand, determine national income. In the Keynesian model, labour demand function is derived, as in the classical model, from a short run profit maximisation model, but the labour supply function is not well defined. The equilibrium output may be below the full employment level of output. Involuntary unemployment arises when workers are willing to accept jobs at the ruling wage rate but some of them cannot find jobs. Money illusion in the labour market and downward rigidity of money wages prevent any movement toward full employment equilibrium.

Unlike in the classical model, interest rate may not act as an instrument to equate saving and investment. Keynes argued that demand for money depends not only on the transaction motive but also on precautionary and speculative motives. At a very low rate of interest, the demand for cash balances may be infinitely elastic (liquidity trap). Even though Keynesian macro economics is called short run macro economics, Keynes considers the role of time and uncertainty in affecting the demand for real investment and the demand for money.

Keynes' work is a break-through in macroeconomics for many reasons. In his view, the classical model provides no explanation of the occurrence of business cycles. His model captures some of the institutional features of a modern capitalist economy e.g oligopoly market structure in product markets, existence of trade unions, wage negotiations/contracts in money terms and the role of speculation in stock markets. Keynes developed a case for government intervention to stabilise income via fiscal and income policies.

Keynes' book, published immediately after the Great Depression, had a profound impact on many economists in the US and some Eurpoean countries. It influenced the New Deal Policy in the US. Hicks (1937), Hansen and Patinkin played a major role in simplifying Keynesian economics in terms of the now popular IS-LM model which facilitates comparative static analysis of the effects of changes in the exogenous variables on the endogenous variables of the model.

The Keynesian approach along with developments in national income accounting stimulated the development of macroeconometric model for testing ·hypotheses as well as economic forecasting. Tinbergen (1939) formulated a macroeconometric model to analyse business cycles in the United States. His book on the *Theory of Economic Policy* (1952) and *Economic Policy: Principles and Design* (1956) exerted great influence in the design of policies. Haavelmo's work on the probability approach to econometrics had a path-breaking influence in the development of econometrics. He considered the importance of how and why stochastic elements enter, and of drawing the implications of such assumptions for the appropriate statistical proceedures for both estimation and hypothesis testing. Klein (1950) built macroeconometric models for the United States to make short-term forecasts. Klein also helped reseachers in other countries to construct and use macroeconometric models for policy making.

Foundations of Keynesian Economics

The fifties, sixties and seventies witnessed theoretical and empirical research on (a) micro foundations of Keynesian behavioural relations, (b) IS-LM model as a representation of Keynesian economics, and (c) feasibility of using Keynesian framework in stabilising an economy.

The major developments in consumption functions are due to Friedman and Modigliani. Based on an intertemporal utility maximisation model and many assumptions, Friedman (1957) formulated the permanent income hypothesis. His work is a rare combination of economic theory, links between theoretical constructs and observable variables and fruitful empirical research. The prediction of Keynesian consumption function that as an economy develops, the saving income ratio would increase, did not hold for the USA. Friedman's theory states that the ratio of permanent consumption to permanent income is independent of permanent income. Modigliani and his coauthors formulated the life-cycle hypothesis based on micro theoretic foundations and studied their macroeconomic implications. Modigliani along with Miller made significant contributions to corporation finance in particular and financial markets in general. Tobin (1958) using the portfolio theory provided the rationale for Keynesian liquidity preference schedule. He applied the theory of portfolio choice in a general equilibrium theory for financial and real markets. His theory deals with how individual households and firms determine their composition of assets, and transmission mechanisms which transfer changes in financial markets

to households and firm's expenditure decisions. Haavelmo (1960) developed the neoclassical theory of investment behaviour.

Controversies

In a seminal article, Clower questioned the grafting of Keynesian economics in Walrasian framework as it was done in the Hicks-Hansen-Patinkin synthesis. Cambridge economists such as Joan Robinson and Kaldor and Leijonhufvud argued that the mathematisation of the General Theory and the synthesis violated the true spirit of Keynesian economics, particularly the dark forces of time and uncertainty affecting the behaviour of economic agents, and also various institutional features of mature capitalist economies. The new Keynesian economics uses the non-Walrasian disequilibrium framework with micro theoretic foundations. See, for example, Malinvaud.

Friedman was sceptical about designing policy prescriptions based on the Keynesian framework to stabilise an economy at the full employment level. He stressed our poor understanding of the functioning of economic system, lags in diagnosis of economic problems and decision lags, and the policy effects distributed over time. He reformulated the quantity theory of money and has become a champion of monetarism.

Using the data for UK manufacturing for nearly a century, Phillips showed a negative relationship between percent change in money wage and percent of unemployment. This relationship, known as the Phillips curve, highlights the policy dilemma, that is, trade-off between employment and price stability. Early empirical research showed that the curve was shifting to the right and the implication was that in order to achieve a given inflation target the society should opt for a higher rate of employment. The works of Friedman (1968) and Phelps showed that there was no long-run trade-off between unemployment and inflation, that is, the long-run Phillips curve is vertical.

The new classical school, of which the most well known exponent is Lucas, assumes economic agents are rational, prices are flexible and markets do clear. They use the rational expectations hypothesis, originally formulated by Muth. According to the adaptive expectations hypothesis, the hypothesis widely used in theoretical and empirical literature, expectations are based on the past information and in simple models the expected values can be written as a function of past values. In this approach expectation formation was exogenous to

the optimisation model. Under the rational expectations hypothesis, expectations are formed endogenously and hence the expressions for expected values do depend on the structural parameters of the model. Lucas and his colleagues have demonstrated that under the new classical macroeconomic model incorporating rational expectations hypothesis, macro economic policies will have the intended effects only when the policy changes are unanticipated by economic agents. The rational expectations hypothesis also raises basic questions about the current econometric estimation and testing proceedures.

An important development in macro economics was the formulation of open macro economy models to analyse the effects of trade and capital flows and alternative international economic systems on the domestic macro variables. Mundell made pioneering contributions in this area. This literature has also generated heated debates between monetarists and Keynesians.

Buchanan and his colleagues contributed to the theory of political decision making and public economics. Buchanan has transferred the concept of gain derived from mutual exchange between individuals to the realm of political decision making. According to him the political process becomes a means of cooperation aimed at achieving reciprocal advantages. His theory of public choice integrates political decision making and constitutional design into economic analysis and thus broadens the perspective of public finance economists.

In macroeconomics the controversies between classicals and Keynesians continue. These controversies centre around issues such as rationality on the part of economic agents, flexibility of wages and prices, expectation formation, lag in effects of policy and also behaviour of politicians and bureaucracy.

Growth and Development

Technical Progress

In the neoclassical framework, technical progress is introduced as a shift in production function. Let $q_t = F(K_t , L_t , T)$ where q_t , K_t , L_t refer to output, capital and labour respectively, at time t, and T time is the shift parameter. According to Hicks (1932), technical progress is said to be neutral if the marginal rate of substitution between capital and labour depends only on the capital-labour ratio. It means that in the isoquant diagram, along a ray through

the origin, which is a constant capital-labour ratio, the slopes of successive isoquants are the same. When technical progress is neutral the production function can be written:

$$q_t = A(t)f(K_t, L_t),$$

where $A(t)$ is an index of Hicks-neutral technical progress.

Solow (1957) wanted to identify the sources of economic growth in the US economy. Assuming the Cobb-Douglas production function with constant returns to scale and Hicks-neutral technical progress he expressed value added per worker y, as a function of capital per worker k and the index $A(t)$:

$$y_t = A(t)k_t^\alpha$$

where α is the elasticity of output with respect to capital. Under the assumptions of profit maximisation and competitive markets $(1-\alpha)$ is the share of wages in value added. Denoting $\hat{y}, k$ and A for the growth rates in y, k and A and $S_L = 1 - \alpha$, the share of wages in national income, he derived the following expression for the rate of growth of A(t):

$$\hat{A}_t = (\hat{y}_t - (S_L)_t \hat{k}_t)$$

Solow found that the conventional measures of capital and labour accounted for only one-eighth of the US growth during the first-half of the twentieth century. He attributed the remaining seven-eighths to technical progress.

Solow's results are based on a simple model of growth. It generated controversy and stimulated theoretical and empirical research.[3] It is argued that $\hat{A}_t$ is a residual measure which accounts for technical progress and all other factors not incorporated in the model. One view is that technical progress is embodied in capital or labour or both. Research was directed at the development of models which embodied technical progress, substitution of the Cobb-Douglas

---

3. Joan Robinson was highly critical about the concepts of aggregate capital and aggregate production function. For a survey of the literature on the capital controversy see Harcourt.

production function by CES, translog and other functions and construction of indices of technical progress/productivity without the use of production function.

Schumpeter had a different view of technological change. According to him, technical change is associated with major inventions and is not continuous. He assigned a catalytic role for the entrepreneur. Later researchers explored the stages from R & D to commercial application.

Development

Lewis (1954) developed a model characterising the dual economic structure prevailing in many less developed countries. The agricultural sector is viewed as traditional and the industrial sector as modern. With unlimited supply of labour he explained the process of development, particularly labour absorption in the industrial sector over time.

Kuznets, by a thorough comparative study of the economic performances of nations at different stages of growth, arrived at some empirical generalisations. Two important stylized facts based on empirical research supported by economic theory are (a) fall in the share of primary sector as an economy develops and (b) an inverted U shaped relation between growth in income and inequality.

Schultz questioned the commonly held view that peasants in less developed countries are not rational. He argued that given the technology and the constraints, they achieved their best. According to him, agricultural policies followed in many developing countries were biased against agriculture, and given proper signals and access to modern inputs including technology farmers could be expected to respond in their own self-interest and, in so doing, permit the agricultural sector to make a major contribution to overall economic development. He also emphasized the importance of investment in education and training in raising agricultural productivity.

Role of Institutions

Coase, North, Olson, Simon, Williamson and others have stressed the importance of institutions in improving the efficiency of an economy and in speeding up the development process. Coase (1960) stressed the importance of well-defined property rights on factors of production to facilitate mutually beneficial bargaining among private agents. According to him high transaction

costs retard market transactions and in situations when transaction costs are very high, markets cease to exist. He assigned an important role for the government in defining and enforcing property rights and in undertaking measures to reduce transaction costs.

North's study of the economic history of USA shows the important role of institutions in economic development. North (1990) does not regard innovations and technical changes as sufficient explanations of growth. These themselves are part of the growth process and cannot explain it. According to him 'institutions are a set of rules, compliance proceedures, and moral and ethical behaviour of individuals in the interest of maximising the wealth or utility of principals'. He poses the question as to why some countries are rich and others poor. According to him institutions 'provide the basic structure by which human beings throughout history have created order and attempted to reduce uncertainty in exchange. Together with the technology employed, they determine transaction and transformation costs and hence the profitability and feasibility of engaging in economic activity'.

Even though most of the economic policy literature poses the problem of whether the state or market can be depended upon to solve an economic problem, there is a fast growing literature on finding a non-government non-market solution to some classes of economic problems. Community-based organisations with democratic set up and incentive structures seem to offer cost-effective solutions for management of common property resources, provision of merit and social goods and environmental monitoring. Institutions are no longer treated as exogenous to an economic system. In fact, economists can play a major role along with other social scientists in designing new institutional structures for solving pressing economic and social problems.

At the global level, governments are relying on collective action mechanisms like multilateral negotiations and dispute settling mechanisms for solving trade issues, and protocols and conventions for reaching agreements on international water disputes, phasing out of ozone depleting substances, control of greenhouse gases and preservation of biodiversity. Cooperation among countries based on principles of efficiency, equity and stability are necessary for ensuring the sustainability of such arrangements.

Concluding Remarks

Credit should be given to the twentieth century economists for not only making

economic theories general and rigorous but also for the formulation of hypotheses amenable to empirical testing. Since 1969, the Nobel prize is being awarded every year. From 1969 to 1999, 41 economists have received the Nobel prize.

The boundaries of economic science are being extended. Arrow, Buchanan, Sen and others extended the frontiers of economics to cover social decision making and political economy. Sen extended welfare analysis to cover famines and other poverty related issues. Becker extended it to cover sociological aspects such as economics of family, discrimination in labour markets and crime and punishment. Coase and others saw the need for fruitful interaction between law and economics. Arrow extended tne domain to include problems in management science. Now many economists are interacting with natural and physical scientists to understand the linkages between ecological and economic systems. Economics is now being studied not only for the sake of knowledge but also for fruitful applications.

Not only do governments seek the advice of economists in such diverse fields as public finance, monetary theory, agricultural economics, industrial economics, international economics, finance, utility regulation and environmental economics, but even the corporate sector, international economic institutions and non-govermental organisations evince a need for them. Now economists are being called upon to initiate economic reforms, to design new policy instruments and even to recommend new institutional structures.

REFERENCES

Akerlof, G. (1970): The market for lemons: quality, uncertainty and the market mechanism, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 89.

Allen, R.G. D.(1938): *Mathematical analysis for economists*, Macmillan.

_____ (1951): *Social choice and individual values*, Wiley & Sons.

_____ (1964): The role of securities in the optimal allocation of risk-bearing, *Review of Economic Studies*, 31.

Arrow, K.J. (1971): *Essays in the theory of risk-bearing*, Markham.

Arrow, K.J., H.B. Chenery, B.S. Minhas and R.M. Solow (1961): Capital-labour substitution and economic efficiency, Review of Economics and Statistics, 43.

Arrow, K.J. and F Hahn (1971): *General competitive analysis*, Holden-Day.

Bain, J. (1956): *Barriers to competition*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Baumol, W. (1959): *Business behaviour, value and growth*, Harcourt, New York.

Baumol, W.J., J.C. Panzar and R.D. Willig (1988): *Contestable markets and the theory of industry structure*, Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovk.

Bergson.A. (1938): A reformulation of certain aspects of welfare economics, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 52.

Becker, G.S. (1965): A theory of allocation of time, *Economic Journal*, 75.

_____ (1968): Crime and Punishment: An economic approach, *Journal of Political Economy*, 76.

_____ (1981): *A treatise on the family*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Boiteux, M. (1956): On the management of public monopolies subject to a budget constraint, *Econometrica*, 24.

Buchanan, J. and G. Tullock (1962): *The calculus of consent: Logical foundations of constitutional democracy*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Coase, R. (1937): The nature of the firm, *Economica*, 4.

_____ (1946): The marginal cost controversy, *Economica*, 13.

_____ (1960): The problem of social cost, *Journal of Law and Economics*, 3.

Chamberlin, E. (1933): *The theory of monopolistic competition,* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Clower, R .W. (1965): The Keyneysian counter revolution: A theoritical appraisal, in F. H. Hahn and F.P.R. Brechling (eds). *The theory of interest rates*, Macmillan.

Debreu, G. (1959): *The theory of value*, New York: Wiley & Sons.

Dupuit, J. (1969): On the measurement of the utility of public works in K.J. Arrow and T. Scitovsky (eds), *Readings in Welfare Economics*, Irwin.

Fisher, I. (1930): *Theory of interest,* New York: Macmillan.

Friedman, M (1957): *A theory of consumption function*, Princeton University Press.

_____ (1968): The role of monetary policy, *American Economic Review*, 1968.

_____ (1953): *Essays in positive economics*, University of Chicago Press.

Frisch, R. (1959): A complete scheme for computing all direct and cross elasticities in a model with many sectors, *Econometrics,* 27.

Fuss, M and D. Mc Fadden (eds) (1978): *Production economics*, Amsterdam: North Holland.

Haavelmo, T. (1944): The probability approach in econometrics, *Econometrica.*

_____ (1951): *A study in the theory of investment*, University of Chicago Press.

Harcourt, G. (1972): *Some Cambridge controversies in the theory of capital*, Cambridge University Press.

Harsanyi, J.C. (1967,1968): Games with information played by Bayesian players, Parts I and II in *Management Science*, 14 and Part III in *Management Science*,15.

Hansen, A.H. (1953): *A guide to Keynes,* New York, McGraw Hill.

Hicks, J.R. (1932): *Theory of wages*, Macmillan.

_____ (1937): Mr. Keynes and the "Classics", *Econometrica.*

_____ (1939): *Value and capital*, Oxford.

Hirshleifer, J. (1970): *Investment, interest and capital*, Prentice Hall.

Hotelling (1931): The economics of exhaustible resources, *Journal of Political Economy*, 39.

_____ (1938): The general welfare in relation to problems of taxation and of railway and utility rates, *Econometrica*, 6.

Kaldor, N. (1960): *Essays on value and distribution*, London

Kantorovich, L.:. Mathematical methods of production planning and organization, in A.Nove (ed), *The use of mathematics in economics*, London: Oliver & Boyd.

Keynes, J.M. (1936): *The general theory of employment interest and money*, Macmillan.

Klein, L. (1952): *Economic fluctuations in the United States 1921-1941*, Wiley & Sons.

Knight, F (1921): *Risk, uncertainty and profit*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Koopmans, T.C. (1951): *Activity analysis of production and allocation*, Wiley & Sons.

Kuznets, S. (1966): *Modern economic growth: rate, structure, and spread. Studies in comparative economics*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

_____ (1971): Modern economic growth: findings and reflections, Nobel memorial Lecture in A. Lindback (ed) *Economics Sciences* 1969-1980: Nobel Lectures, World Scientific.

Leijonhufvud, A. (1968): *On Keynesian economics and the economics of Keynes*, Oxford University Press.

Leontief, W. (1953): *Studies in the structure of American economy: Theoretical and empirical explorations in input-output analysis*, Oxford University Press.

_____ (1966): *Input-Output economics*, Oxford University Press.

Lewis, A. (1954): *Economic development with unlimited supply of labour*, Manchester School.

Lucas, R.E. (1973): Some international evidence in output-inflation trade offs, *American Economic Review*, 1973.

_____ (1976): Econometric policy evaluation: a critique in K.Brunner and A.H. Metzler (eds.), *The Phillips curve and labour markets*, Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Malinvaud, E. (1977): *The theory of unemployment reconsidered*, Blackwell.

Rawls, J. (1971) : *A theory of justice*, Harvard.

Robinson, J. (1933): Economics of imperfect competition, Macmillan.

_____ (1962): Economic Philosophy, Chicago.

Samuelson, P.A. (1947): *Foundations of economic analysis*, Harvard University Press.

_____ (1954): The pure theory of public expenditure, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 64.

Schultz, T.W. (1964): *Transforming traditional agriculture*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Schumpeter, J.. (1961): The theory of economic development,. New York: Oxford University Press.

Selten, R. (1975): Reexamination of the perfectness concept for equilibrium points in extensive games, *International Journal of Game Theory*, 4.

Sen, A (1970): *Collective choice and social welfare*, SanFranscisco: Holden Day.

_____ (1973): *On economic inequality*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____ (1981): *Poverty and famines: An essay on entitlement and deprivation*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Simon, H.A. (1947): *Administrative behaviour*, Macmillan.

_____ (1957): *Models of man*, New York: Wiley & Sons.

_____ (1968): Administrative behavior in D.L. Sills (ed). *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol.1, Macmillan and the Free Press.

Slutsky, E. (1915): On the theory of the budget of the consumer, in G.Stigler and K.Boulding (eds.) *Reading in price theory*, Richard Irwin.

Solow, M. (1957): Technical change and the aggregate production function, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 39.

Stigler, G. (1961): The economics of information, *Journal of Political Economy*.

_____ (1971): The theory of economic regulation, *Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science*, Spring.

Landmarks in Banking Sector Reforms in India and Abroad

3

C. Rangarajan

It is well recognised that the financial sector plays a critical role in the development process of a country. Financial institutions, instruments and markets which constitute the financial sector, act as a conduit for the transfer of resources from net savers to net borrowers, i.e. from those who spend less than they earn to those who spend more than they earn.

The financial sector performs this basic economic function of intermediation essentially through four transformation mechanisms:

1. Liability-asset transformation (i.e. accepting deposits as a liability and converting them into assets such as loans);

2. Size transformation (i.e. providing large loans on the basis of numerous small deposits);

3. Maturity transformation (i.e. offering savers alternative forms of deposits according to their liquidity preferences while providing borrowers with loans of desired maturities);

4. Risk transformation (i.e. distributing risks through diversification which substantially reduces risks for savers which would prevail while lending directly in the absence of financial intermediation).

The process of financial intermediation supports increasing capital accumulation through the institutionalization of savings and investment. The gains to the real sector of the economy, therefore, depend on how efficiently the financial sector performs this basic function of financial intermediation. Banks form the core of the financial system in most countries. Thus, whether a country's financial system is efficient or not depends, in large part, on the efficiency of its banking system.

In the early theories of growth, advocated by classical economists, finance was largely ignored as a factor explaining economic growth. While growth was seen to be predominantly influenced by real factors, the missing link in these frameworks was the lack of an explanation on how savings were transformed to investment in the economy. The Keynesian school, while revolutionizing the thinking on the role of public policy in promoting economic growth, focused attention on the objective of maintaining short-run stability of output around the full employment level. The financial sector was assigned some role in this analysis to the extent that it incorporated an interest rate effect to support the investment activity in the economy. As a consequence, a regime of low interest rate, as the means to promote economic growth, gained ground. This provided the major motivation for institutionalisation of financial repression in a number of developing countries throughout the 1950s and 1960s.

The neo-classical growth theory also lacked a solid foundation on finance as it assumed that as long as saving continues, it takes the form of real investment. The impetus for long-term growth in this analysis was postulated to come from continuous improvement in technology and the growth of population. Although fairly convincing as an analytical tool to explain the growth process, the neo-classical literature failed to recognise the importance of financial innovation as a major endogenous source of productivity growth in an economy.

The importance of the financial sector in the growth process emerged as a major point of policy emphasis in the financial liberalisation literature in the early 1970s. The positive impact of financial liberalisation on growth is traced to the fact that financial development increases the allocative efficiency of capital by channelling credit to the sectors where returns are the highest. It was argued that elimination of financial repression leads to an increase in savings and the realization of a higher investment rate in the economy. It was also highlighted that liberalization of the financial sector promotes financial deepening by encouraging savings in financial assets and by increasing the volume of credit

flow in the economy. The relationship between financial development and economic growth received a new impetus from the rapidly growing "endogenous growth" literature, which provided a framework for the integration of the financial system into the theory of growth.

Reforms in Industrially Advanced Countries

While recognising the key role played by the banking system in augmenting savings and investment and thereby accelerating growth, developments in banking in the last three decades in the industrially advanced countries have raised concerns relating to the 'safety and soundness' of the banking system. Banking has become more sophisticated; the volume of transactions has multiplied and competitive pressures have grown. As a result of very rapid increases in telecommunications and computer-based technologies, a dramatic expansion in financial flows both cross-border and within countries has emerged. Along with these changes, consolidation, increased geographic spread of banks and the blurring of distinctions between various financial institutions have also occurred. Developments in technology, and in the pricing of assets, have enabled innovations and financial instruments that allowed risks to be separated and allocated to parties most willing and able to bear them. Thus, the menu of financial products has expanded enormously. For example, in the case of debt instruments, investors can now choose among structured notes, syndicated loans, coupon strips and bonds secured by a pool of other debt instruments. Another dramatic development is the growing use of financial derivatives. All these changes have undoubtedly created new opportunities, but they have also magnified risks. Close inter-dependencies among markets and market participants have increased the potential for adverse events to spread quickly. They have significantly increased the scope for, and speed of contagion.

Banks are highly leveraged institutions. The systemic risk attached to banking has always been recognised and that is why banks have been subject to controls of various types. It is reported that since the late 1970s, more than two thirds of all IMF members – industrial, developing and transition economies – have experienced banking crises. Some of the notable failures of individual banks since 1970 are those of Bankhaus Herstatt of Germany in 1974, Franklin National Bank of the US in 1974, Banco Ambrosiano of Italy in 1982 and Bank of Credit and Commerce International in 1991. To these, one must add the failure en masse of Savings and Loans Associations in the Eighties in the US. Between 1985 and 1995, 1,101 Savings and Loans Associations failed with total

assets of about $450 billion. The burden to the US Treasury for resolution costs alone was estimated at $136.6 billion.

The need to strengthen the banking sector had been keenly felt since the middle of seventies. Initially, the concern related to the fast geographic expansion of banks and the consequent blurring of responsibilities of supervisory authorities. In the aftermath of the failure of Bankhaus Herstatt, the Basle Committee on Banking Regulation and Supervisory Practices was set up in 1974 by the Bank for International Settlements. The Committee did not possess any formal supra-national supervisory authority. However, the Committee set out some important principles for improving the early warning systems and modalities for international cooperation in order to close gaps in the supervisory net. This came to be known as the "concordat." In 1983, the Committee issued the document "Principles for the Supervision of Banks' Foreign Establishments." In the early 1980s, the Committee was concerned that the capital ratios of the leading international banks were deteriorating just at the time that international risks were growing. To halt the erosion of capital standards of banks, capital adequacy ratio was prescribed in 1988. Under the system evolved by the Basle Committee, banks were required to hold different categories (tiers) of capital against assets and off balance sheet items, and different risk weights were attached to different types of assets. The Accord provided for the implementation of a minimum capital standard of eight per cent of risk weighted assets by end 1992. Since 1988, this framework has been modified. The capital adequacy ratio now incorporates market risks besides credit risks. Market risks arise from the open positions of banks in foreign exchange, traded debt securities, equities, commodities and options. While some have been critical of the prescription of capital adequacy ratio, in general, there has been an acceptance of this approach. The capital adequacy ratio is based on the principle that banks maintain a minimum amount of their own funds in relation to the risks they face in order to absorb unexpected losses and to compel owners and managers to run banks safely. More recently, in 1997, BIS developed a set of 'Core Principles for Effective Banking Supervision'. This provides a comprehensive blueprint for an effective supervisory system. These core principles, besides laying down procedures for effective supervision over banking, also lay down prudential rules and requirements.

After describing, in some depth, the various types of risks in banking, the core document deals with capital adequacy, credit risk management, market risk management, other risk management including interest risk and liquidity

management and internal controls. While these prescriptions are suggested in the context of the supervisory role of central banks or banking supervisory authorities, they essentially refer to practices to be adopted by commercial banks. The IMF and World Bank have taken more interest in the analysis of the functioning of the banking system in their country assessments. The Financial Sector Assessment Programme (FSAP), jointly launched by IMF and World Bank in 1999, is designed to identify financial system strengths and vulnerabilities of countries, and help develop appropriate policy responses. In April 1999, the Financial Stability Forum was set up to promote international financial stability through information exchange and international cooperation in financial supervision and surveillance. In addition, in 1999, a new forum known as 'G-20' was established comprising of not only the industrially advanced countries, but also the more leading developing countries like India. The Ministers and Governors of the G-20 meet to take stock of the global financial system. In substance, the endeavour has been to improve the soundness and safety of the banking system in the context of developments which have tended to increase the riskiness of banking. Besides prescribing a capital adequacy ratio, the emphasis has been on banks assessing their risks correctly and providing for them adequately.

Two aspects of banking development with which supervisory authorities in industrially advanced countries are concerned are (1) globalisation of banking operations and (2) universalisation of banking. Globalisation of banking operations requires that the prudential standards are uniform across countries; otherwise there can be "regulatory arbitrage." Cross country harmonisation in accounting and auditing standards and in disclosing information, becomes essential in this context. Globalisation of banking operations also raises some interesting questions regarding which central bank should come to help when a bank which has a world wide coverage runs into a difficult situation. The other aspects of the same issue are: Who should bear the cost of the safety nets and when should they be activated? Various institutional mechanisms are being thought of in order to bring about greater coordination among supervisory authorities.

Universalisation of banking has become a common phenomenon in industrially advanced countries. The repeal of the Glass-Stegall Act in the United States in 1999, has also made the US fall in line with the trend. With universalisation, the move towards setting up a common supervisor for all financial activities, has gathered strength. UK, Japan and Korea are some of the

countries which have recently adopted a single regulatory institution covering insurance, commercial banking and investment banking.

In the wake of the East Asian financial crisis, more attention is being paid to assessing the vulnerabilities of financial systems. An effort is in progress to develop macro-prudential indicators which will serve as indicators of the health and stability of financial systems. These macro-prudential indicators comprise both aggregated micro-prudential indicators of the health of individual financial institutions and macro-economic variables associated with financial system soundness. The aggregation of micro-prudential indicators may shed additional light on the soundness of the system, apart from showing how well individual institutions are functioning. Macro-economic variables that are relevant would include not only parameters that show the inherent strengths of the economy, but also factors that affect the vulnerability of the economies to capital flow reversals and currency crises. A set of indicators that the IMF has identified as appropriate macro-prudential indicators is given in the Appendix.

Volatility is an inherent feature of financial markets. Despite capital adequacy ratios and risk management principles being put in place, it is not possible to eliminate volatility. What can, however, be achieved is to keep volatility under control and contain the contagion effect and systemic risk.

Banking Sector Reforms in India

Banking sector reforms in India were an integral part of the economic reform package introduced in 1991. It may be useful to look at the reform measures in the area of banking by splitting them into two parts—those introduced in the period 1992–97 and those introduced subsequently. While undoubtedly, there is a continuity in the policies that are being pursued, the initial conditions have been different.

Reforms 1992–97

The financial sector reforms during this period took into account two factors. First, since the nationalisation of banks, there had been a considerable expansion in banking facilities. However, serious concerns had been expressed on the quality and efficiency of the services rendered and the viability and profitability of the public sector banks. Two, several steps had been taken in the eighties in order to make the banking system more responsive to the needs of the customers

and also to improve its efficiency. However, these steps were considered inadequate and were not sufficiently far reaching. A committee under the chairmanship of M. Narasimham, was set up and a logically consistent set of recommendations made by the committee provided intellectual support to the various measures adopted. While the recommendations of the committee were broadly kept in mind, the progress and content of the financial sector reforms were conditioned by the events as they unfolded in the real and financial sectors and the emerging perceptions relating to reforms.

Background

The nationalisation of the 14 major commercial banks in 1969 was an important landmark in the evolution of the banking system in our country. Six banks were further nationalised in 1980. The major impact of nationalisation was the spectacular expansion in the coverage of the banking system. The total number of commercial bank branches increased from 8262 in 1969 to 60,190 in 1991. Apart from this impressive increase in the number of branches, more than 50 percent of the bank branches were located in the rural areas. The period also saw a rapid increase in bank deposits and credit. The share of public sector banks in the total business of banking system was 85 percent. With respect to credit dispensation, the significant factor was the mandatory requirement to provide 40 percent of the net bank credit to priority sectors. The priority sector was defined as a composite of sectors such as agriculture and small-scale industry and classes of borrowers such as weaker sections. The priority sector credit, as a percentage of total net bank credit of the public sector banks, stood at 41 percent in 1991.

The performance of banks and other financial institutions is normally judged by the twin criteria of allocational efficiency and operational efficiency. Allocational efficiency determines how well the available funds are distributed among competing demands, while operational efficiency is reflected in the quality of service and operational costs. Allocational efficiency assumed overriding importance in the banking system in the seventies and eighties. But efficiency was judged largely in terms of social policy considerations. Credit allocation became a bye-product of planning and licensing. Operational efficiency results from the organisational effectiveness of institutions. Ultimately, it must get translated into the profitability of the institutions as well as better service to customers. It is this operational efficiency that was not given the necessary importance in the seventies and eighties. This was due to the

structural weaknesses of banks in the context of the mammoth expansion in a short period of time and policy directions. Gross profits (surplus before provision) of banks had been steadily declining and in 1989-90, such profits constituted only 1.10 percent of working funds. In fact, profits after provisioning stood at a level which became a cause for serious concern. In fact, several banks did not even make necessary gross profits for adequate provisioning. This is apart from the fact that the norms adopted for provisioning at that time were themselves not very strict.

From the mid-eighties, a number of policy measures were introduced in order to strengthen public sector banks. While the system of administrative structure of interest rates continued, some degree of flexibility was given to banks in fixing the interest rates on large loans. Attempts were made to give greater freedom to banks in determining the deposit rate. But these efforts had to be abandoned as the banks were not ready for such a change. Recognising the fairly large expansion of staff in commercial banks, steps were initiated to restrict further expansion. Some banks were clearly overstaffed, even judged by the average of the banking system, which itself was high. The health code that was introduced to classify loans according to quality was a precursor to prudential norms. Attempts at computerisation ran into severe problems, even though the eighties saw the initial first steps. In fact, the resistance to computerisation was pervasive and could be overcome only over a period of years. The balance sheet of the performance of the banking system, as it was in 1991, was thus mixed, strong in achieving socio-economic goals and in general widening the credit coverage but weak as far as viability was concerned.

Content of Reforms

It may be useful to look at the various measures that were introduced as part of Banking Sector Reform into three broad categories:

1. Policy frame work relating to external environment;

2. Improvements in financial health through the prescription of norms; and

3. Institutional strengthening.

Policy Frame Work

The external factors having a bearing on the functioning of the banking system related to the administered structure of interest rates, high levels of pre-emptions in the form of reserve requirements and mandatory credit allocation to certain sectors. Easing of these external constraints constituted an important part of the reform agenda.

The administered structure of interest rate was dismantled in various steps over a period of time. By the end of 1997, banks were free to determine the interest rate on all domestic bank deposits as well as on loans except for small loans upto rupees two lakhs and credit for export. This deregulation of interest rate also meant that the government had to borrow at more or less market determined interest rates. This facilitated the introduction of treasury bills of various maturities and paved the way for the use of open market operations as an instrument of monetary and credit control. The 'repos' market also emerged as a consequence.

The high levels of fiscal and monetised deficits had led to a situation in which the pre-emptions in the form of Cash Reserve Requirements (CRR) and Statutory Liquidity Ratio (SLR) had to be kept at very high levels. A significant aspect of the reform process was to reduce both types of reserve requirements which would have the effect of improving the profitability of banks through an expansion in the lendable resources. The CRR which stood at 15 percent in 1992 had been reduced to 9.75 percent by November 1997. Reduction in CRR was not a matter of simple fiat. It had to be calibrated carefully. The reductions in CRR and SLR could have moved faster, had fiscal deficit been confined to lower levels. In fact the fiscal deficit of the Central Government after coming down from 8.3 percent in 1990-91 to 5.7 percent in 1992-93, went up again subsequently.

The mandatory priority sector credit at 40 percent of net bank credit was not altered. However, the changes in the interest rate regime reduced the element of cross-subsidization that was inherent in the system. The scope of priority sector was also widened.

Improvements in Financial Health

As mentioned earlier, the profitability of the commercial banks was low and the

level of non-performing assets quite high. The first step that was necessary to improve the financial health of banks was to introduce prudential norms more or less in keeping with international thinking. Prudential norms were intended to serve two purposes: first, they would bring out the true position of the loans portfolio of a bank, and second, they would help to arrest further deterioration in the quality of loans. Prudential norms related to income recognition, asset classification, provisioning for bad and doubtful debts and capital adequacy. A proper definition of income was essential in order to ensure that banks took into account income which was actually realised. A clear definition of what constituted a "non-performing" asset was given. Without going into details, the prudential norms were steadily tightened over a period of time. In fact, the process is still continuing so that ultimately the Indian standards would be exactly the same as the international standards. One important element in the new norms related to capital adequacy. Banks were required to have capital equivalent to 8 percent of risk-weighted assets. The effective implementation of this norm required that the government bring in additional capital in the case of public sector banks. Over a five year period, the government contributed additional capital to the tune of Rs.16,000 crore. However, to avoid cash outflow from the government, these funds were required to be invested in special bonds. While there were alternative ways of restructuring the banks, this method was considered the most appropriate at that time. Introduction of capital adequacy norms would not have meant much if the government had not come forward to augment the capital base of the public sector banks.

Institutional Strengthening

An important aspect of the banking sector reform was to strengthen the institutional base of the banking system. These included a variety of measures such as the licensing of new banks in private sector, enabling the public sector banks to go to the market and augment their capital base, creation of Debt Recovery Tribunals to deal with loans owed to the commercial banks and the creation of an institutional agency like Ombudsmen to settle the grievances of bank customers. The concept of local area bank with limited territorial jurisdiction was also mooted, even though no concrete action could be taken during this period. The basic purpose behind strengthening the institutional infrastructure was to create a more competitive environment in the economy. The licensing policy relating to opening of branches by foreign banks was also eased during this period.

With the introduction of prudential norms and greater freedom given to banks, the need for a strong supervisory system also became necessary. The Reserve Bank of India had, over the years, built up a system of supervision over banks which relied heavily on on-site inspection. In the context of the compelling need to improve the supervisory system, the Reserve Bank of India brought about institutional changes within itself. A separate Board for Financial Supervision was created to concentrate exclusively on supervisory issues. The Board was also assisted by an Advisory Council comprising of eminent persons in the areas of Law and Finance. The Board for Financial Supervision itself included four members from the Board of RBI who had specialised in accounting, law, economics and management. On-site inspection was supplemented by off-site surveillance which required information to be supplied by commercial banks periodically in certain formats. Commercial Banks in turn had to bring about a number of changes in their institutional set-up. A greater emphasis on internal control systems became essential.

Reforms Since 1997

Banking sector reforms acquired a fresh stimulus after the publication of the Report of the Second Narasimham Committee. This committee, which was appointed towards the end of 1997 submitted its report in April, 1998. The committee, after reviewing the developments in the previous five years, had made wide ranging recommendations dealing with prudential norms, organisational structure of banks, human resources and technological developments and various other aspects to strengthen the banking system. In line with the recommendations of the committee, the Reserve Bank has introduced several measures and has quickened the pace of banking sector reforms. Using the same classification that had been used to discuss the measures introduced between 1992–97, a brief summary of the measures adopted since 1997 is given below:

Policy Frame Work

The cash reserve ratio which had been brought down to 9.5 percent in October, 1997 had to be raised against the back ground of the East Asian crisis. After reaching a peak of 11 percent in March, 1999 the CRR has been progressively reduced since then, reaching 8 percent effective April 22, 2000. While the cash reserve ratio has been raised from time to time for purposes of monetary control, the medium term objective of reducing the CRR has been maintained. It may be

recalled that in October, 1997 itself, it was decided to bring down the cash reserve ratio by two percentage points which, however, could not be implemented in the wake of the East Asian crisis. The interest rate structure has remained flexible and almost all rates both in relation to deposits and lending are now determined by the banking system. The bank rate and the repo rates serve as signals from the Reserve Bank of India.

Improvements in Financial Health

Capital adequacy norms were further tightened. Banks were required to achieve a minimum Capital to Risk Assets Ratio (CRAR) of 9 percent by March 31, 2000. It is reported that out of the 27 public sector banks, 26 banks have achieved this minimum. In addition, certain changes have been made regarding risk weights. A 2.5 percent risk weight for market risk for government securities has been introduced. The foreign exchange open position is to carry 100 percent risk weight. Norms relating to income recognition, asset classification and provisioning have been further refined so as to gradually move towards the international standards in the respective norms. Banks were advised to put in place a formal Asset-Liability management system with effect from April, 1999. Further, comprehensive guidelines were issued to banks to enable them to introduce appropriate risk management systems. As a move towards greater transparency, banks were directed to disclose additional information in the Notes to Accounts in the balance sheets regarding: (i) maturity pattern of loans and advances, investment securities, deposits and borrowings, (ii) foreign currency assets and liabilities, (iii) movement in NPAs, and (iv) lending to sensitive sectors.

Institutional Strengthening

Efforts were also directed towards strengthening the various segments of the money and security markets. Primary dealer network was strengthened by adding more primary dealers. Banks were advised to set up Settlement Advisory Committees for timely and speedier settlement of non-performing assets. The number of Debt Recovery Tribunals has been steadily expanded.

In the light of the recommendations made by a number of committees, amendments to several enactments which have a bearing on the functioning of the banking sector are being contemplated. Several steps have been taken to accelerate technological developments in banking. Reform of the deposit

insurance system is on the anvil. The Reserve Bank is providing support to the market through a new system called liquidity adjustment facility. Under this system, liquidity is injected on a daily basis if needed, through reverse repo-auctions and sucked out through repo-auctions.

Some Issues and Concerns in Banking Reforms

The path of financial sector reforms was not smooth. It had to steer its course in the midst of several controversies and arguments. While some felt that the financial sector reform process was not proceeding fast, there were others who were fundamentally opposed to the basic premises of financial sector reforms. The need to carry conviction with all had the effect of slowing the process. Another factor which slowed the process initially was the securities scam and the inquiry into the associated events. Since, in the minds of some at least, the scam was related to the liberalisation process, it was necessary to remove various misconceptions. The introduction of prudential norms and the need for banks to make adequate provisions, even in relation to past loans, resulted in the balance sheets of public sector banks showing loss. While this was inevitable when an important change such as enhanced provisioning was being introduced, it created a general sense of unease and this had to be taken into account while sequencing various measures. Legislative changes, which were required to support the reforms were becoming increasingly difficult after the initial years. Therefore, some of the desired changes had to be adjusted within the parameters and structure of existing laws. However, the process of legal changes is once again being given importance.

Monetary Policy Environment

While this is not the place to discuss in any detail monetary policy measures, it may be noted that the changes introduced in the interest rate and reserve requirement regimes were intended to give greater autonomy to banks in the disposition of their funds, while at the same time recognising that interest rate and reserve requirement were important policy instruments of the central bank. In fact, without these changes, financial sector reforms would not have meant much. The Cash Reserve Ratio (CRR) had remained high for long and the objective was to bring it down so that banks would remain competitive in relation to other financial institutions. However, the steering of the CRR on a downward path was not simply a matter of arithmetic. It had to be done in conjunction with other changes, including the development of alternative

instruments of control. For example, even though the Monetary Policy for the second half of 1997-98 had intended to take the CRR further down to eight percent, it had to be postponed because of exchange rate management considerations. Nevertheless, there has been a substantial reduction in CRR since 1992 and other instruments of monetary control were being simultaneously developed. Changes in the interest rate regime were a necessary part of the effort to widen the various money and financial markets. A well functioning government securities market is a prerequisite for the use of open market operations as an instrument of monetary control. Interest rates, even though they went up initially to higher levels - and this happened particularly at the time of turbulence in the foreign exchange market - came down subsequently.

Prudential Norms

The need for introducing prudential reforms has been accepted the world over. We need to fall in line with the international practices not only because our banking and financial system is getting integrated with the rest of the world, but also because these norms are inherently sound. The need to conform to prudential norms imposes a discipline on the financial institutions. It compels them to assess the applications for loans or proposals for investment carefully. Since banks are highly leveraged institutions, it becomes necessary to impose certain externally determined norms. According to most analysts, these norms must be treated as the minimum standards to be achieved. Each individual bank will have to determine, in the light of its own liability and assets structure, what the appropriate level should be in relation to each of the norms. At the time of the introduction of prudential norms, some had argued that in view of the very high levels of CRR and SLR, there was no need for additional prudential requirements. These arguments arose out of an inadequate appreciation of the respective purposes of reserve requirements and prudential norms. It has also been argued that the introduction of prudential norms had made banks credit-shy. They had shown a strong preference for investment in government securities because of the zero risk (initially) attached to such securities. In almost all countries, in the years immediately after the introduction of prudential norms, there has been a downsizing of the loan portfolio. This, however, does not constitute an argument against the introduction of prudential norms which only require banks to assess risks properly.

As mentioned in Section I, prudential norms themselves are undergoing change. Banks are required to adequately take into account various types of

risks. While there has been a steady progress towards international norms in India, we need to ensure that our norms remain close to the best international practices.

The prescription of prudential norms in the West started with the introduction of the capital to risk assets ratio. In India, too, we started with the prescription of the ratio at eight percent. Recently it has been increased to nine percent. The Narasimham Committee has recommended that it should be raised to ten percent by 2002. Capital serves an important purpose. It acts as a buffer to absorb losses. However, the answer to banking stability does not lie in the prescription of higher and higher levels of capital adequacy ratio. Given the conditions in India, the prescription of ten percent as recommended by the Narasimham Committee may be acceptable. However, beyond that, a higher ratio can be counter productive and can, in fact, create a 'moral hazard'. The need to maintain a higher ratio may push banks into acquiring assets which have a higher earning potential but also carry with them higher risk. Therefore, along with the increase in the capital adequacy ratio, banks must ensure that they have a proper system to manage risks. In the older textbooks on banking, the problem of the banker was treated as one of ensuring a balance between 'liquidity and profitability'. The old saying was "liquidity and profitability are opposing considerations." But what is emerging as important now, is the management of risk associated with the portfolio. This is what prudential norms, taken together, stress. Management of risk is much more important than providing for risk. In the coming years, the major focus of banks in India will have to be on how to evaluate and manage risks.

Credit to Agriculture

A question that is being raised from time to time is whether the financial sector reforms neglected special considerations relating to rural credit. The contention that rural credit was ignored during this period was a mistaken impression. As indicated earlier, the priority sector proportion was never reduced, even though the definition of priority sector to some extent was expanded. In fact, between 1991-92 and 1996-97, credit for agriculture more than doubled, increasing from Rs. 11,202 crores to Rs. 28,653 crores. With the reduction in CRR and SLR, the lendable base of the banks had also expanded. It is true that RBI stopped making allocation out of the LTO funds to NABARD. However, it is incorrect to draw the inference that adequate funds were not made available for rural credit. The general line of credit from the Reserve Bank to NABARD was increased

substantially during this period. It went up from Rs.3,350 crores to Rs.5,500 crores in 1996-97. Currently, it is at the level of Rs.5,700 crores. The Rural Infrastructure Development Fund was set up in April, 1995 with an allocation of Rs.2,000 crores to be contributed by banks who had not fulfilled the priority sector requirement. By the year 2000, the cumulative corpus of the RIDF (RIDF-I to RIDF-VI) touched Rs.18,000 crores. The capital base of NABARD expanded with the Reserve Bank of India making major contributions. The Government of India and Reserve Bank have been contributing annually Rs.100 crores and Rs.400 crores respectively since 1996-97, which are treated as advances towards the capital of NABARD. The effective capital of NABARD rose to Rs.2,000 crore as at the :nd of March, 1999. Also, a programme to recapitalise regional rural banks (RRBs) was introduced in 1994-95. The budgetary allocations to recapitalisation in 1994-95 was Rs.300 crores and, with annual allocations since then, the total now amounts to Rs.1,868 crores.

Financial sector reform is a continuous process. However, it acquired a special urgency and importance in India in the wake of the economic crisis of 1991. Recent events elsewhere in the world have shown why a sound and safe financial system is essential if the growth process is not to be derailed. While the first phase of reforms focused on removing the external constraints bearing on the functioning of banks and introducing internationally accepted prudential standards, the second phase must stress on the organisational effectiveness of banks. The areas which need improvement are known. Imaginative corporate planning, combined with organisational restructuring, is a necessary prerequisite to achieve results. Even as we make further changes to reform the banking sector, the ultimate aim should be to create a dynamic financial system which can, on its own, .respond to the changing environment and also correct its mistakes.

Annexure

Summary of Macro-prudential Indicators

Aggregated Micro-prudential Indicators	*Macro-economic Indicators*
Capital adequacy	Economic growth
Aggregate capital ratios	Aggregate growth rates
Frequency distribution of capital ratios	Sectoral growth rates
Asset quality	Balance of payments
Lending institution	Current account deficit
Sectoral credit concentration	Foreign exchange reserve adequacy
Foreign currency-denominated lending	External debt (including maturity structure)
Nonperforming loans and provision	Terms of trade
Loans to loss-making public sector entities	Composition and maturity of capital flows
Risk profile of assets	
Connected lending	Inflation
Leverage ratios	Volatility in inflation
Borrowing entity	Interest and exchange rates
Debt-equity ratios	Volatility in interest and exchange rates
Corporate profitability	Level of domestic real interest rates
Other indicators of corporate conditions	Exchange rate sustainability
Household indebtedness	Exchange rate guarantees
Management soundness	Lending and asset price booms
Expense ratios	Lending booms
Earnings per employee	Asset price booms
Growth in the number of financial institutions	Contagion effects
Earnings and profitability	Trade spillovers
Return on assets	Financial Market correlation
Return on equity	
Income and expense ratios	Other factors
Structural profitability indicators	Directed lending and investment
	Government recourse to the banking system
Liquidity	Arrears in the economy
Central bank credit to financial institutions	
Segmentation of interbank rates	

Summary of Macro-prudential Indicators

Aggregated Micro-prudential Indicators	*Macro-economic Indicators*
Deposits in relation to monetary aggregates	
Loans-to-deposits ratios	
Maturity structure of assets and liabilities	
(liquid asset ratios)	
Measures of secondary market liquidity	
Sensitivity to market risk	
Foreign exchange risk	
Interest rate risk	
Equity price risk	
Commodity price risk	
Market-based indicators	
Market prices of financial instruments,	
including equity	
Indicators of excess yields	
Credit ratings	
Sovereign yield spreads	

Source: Macro Prudential Indicators of Financial System Soundness, IMF Occasional Paper 192, By Owen Evans, al.

INDIAN SOCIOLOGY: RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

4

Yogendra Singh

Indian sociology, like most other social sciences in India has grown through an encounter with the Western philosophical and social scientific traditions. Its specificity in matters, both of the choice of concepts and theories and the substantive coverage of the problems for study, bear an imprint of this historicity. Nevertheless, sociology in India has also been deeply influenced by the numerous internal processes which signify the passage of India from a colony of the British to the status of an independent republic. Indian sociology, in various measures, embodies its theoretic orientations and choice of themes for observation and analysis, these historical forces which have constituted its 'social conditioning' (Singh: 1986). A sociology of knowledge perspective is, therefore, necessary to constitute and to comprehend the many trends and orientations with which Indian sociology began its growth in India during the colonial period; the new theoretic, methodological and substantive concerns which emerged following independence; the internal differentiation that sociology has undergone during the past fifty years and the challenges and opportunities that sociology faces in the future in response to the changing 'social conditions' in India and abroad.

The Pre-Sociological Beginnings

Sociology, before it took its place as a teaching discipline in the academic institutions in India, had emerged as a generalised social ideology which viewed social institutions from a scientific evolutionary viewpoint at a global level. This

was particularly so in the case of the societies with a history of past civilisation. In the colonial context in which many such societies were ensnared, sociology became, for the many intellectuals from these countries, an ideology of revolutionary social and political movement for emancipation from foreign rule. In the Indian case, this is illustrated by the publication of a journal, *Indian Sociologist* by Shyamji Krishna Verma, a non-resident Indian political and social revolutionary in Britain in 1905. In London, Verma came in contact with Herbert Spencer, the founder of British sociology. He was so deeply influenced by Spencer's sociological ideas that he established six fellowships for Indian students to study in Britain on the condition that they would go back to India after completing their studies, that they would not take up government jobs in India and would dedicate themselves to social service in their country. He also instituted a lectureship in the name of Spencer for which he donated one thousand pounds (Chaturvedi: 1985). The *Indian Sociologist* continued to be published from 1905 until the begining of the First World War. Even though inspired by Verma's closer contacts with Herber Spencer, it was not a professional journal. It published articles and commentaries on social, political and cultural issues which were of contemporary relevance and which articulated reformist and democratic revolutionary ideologies. The printer of this journal was sentenced in July 1909 and the journal had to migrate to Paris for its publication. Shyamji Krishna Verma was himself a scholar of distinction in Sanskrit and an established Indologist who was appointed a teacher of Sanskrit, Marathi and Gujrati at Oxford University. Even though Verma was deeply influenced by the contributions of Herbert Spencer, his own journal did not focus upon sociology, either as a discipline as enunciated by Spencer, or strictly on social and cultural issues within the frame of reference of sociological categories. The emphasis on social and political issues was a rather generalised one and issues discussed had a mix of the orientations of social reformism and political activism.

This orientation in sociological contributions in India. continued during the first two to three decades of the 1920s. Many Indian academics, trained in the European universities such as England, France and Germany, contributed to sociology directly and indirectly through their commentaries and exegeses on the writings of European sociologists and social anthropologists, particularly with reference to their views on Indian society and culture. In a way, this tradition had its basis in the cultural and intellectual renaissance in India during the middle of the nineteenth century. We may refer in this context to the contributions of Rammohun Roy (1772–1833), Ishwar Chadra Vidyasagar (1863–1902), Swami Vivekananda (1863–1902), Swami Dayananda Saraswati (1834–83),

Swami Sradhananda (1856-1928), Dadabhai Naoroji (1825-1917), Lala Lajpat
Rai (1865-1928), J.G. Phooley (1827-1888) and M.G. Ranade (1824-1901)
and several others who, through their writings and social movements, created
intellectual and social self awareness in the country about India's cultural and
civilisational strengths and yet pleaded for radical reforms in society in order to
encounter the challenges of Western civilisation and its colonial expansionism.
This period of Indian history is a precursor to many forms of cultural and politi-
cal social movements, and it also coincides with the beginning of the institution-
alisation of the university and college systems in India based on the western
pattern. The disciplinary foundations of many social sciences, including sociol-
ogy and social anthropology, were established during this period. This was fol-
lowed by the inauguration of early sociological writings by scholars in India,
either as a sequel to, or in response to the writings by western sociologists on
India or in response to issues of epistemology and history. Most of this type of
writing tends to be dialectical and exegetic. The contributions of B.N. Seal and
B.K. Sarkar could be mentioned in this context. In the case of the former, one
witnesses critical and discursive response to the comparative evolutionary treat-
ment of various societies and cultures, including that of India by British social
anthropologists and sociologists, which often reflected not only the wrong
premises in their treatment of other cultures or societies, but also carried unjusti-
fiable value loads. Seal refuted attempts to interpret the Indian social and cul-
tural reality from a reductionist evolutionary frame of reference, so common in
the early twentieth century contributions of western sociologists and social
anthropologists. He maintained that institutions could only be compared if they
were historically co-existent. Sarkar wrote extensively in response to the writ-
ings of German indologists and sociologists in whose writings one could clearly
discern biases of the 'orientalist frame of reference'. The contributions of Max
Weber on Hinduism and the culture and social structure of the Indian society
particularly   came   under   his   very   critical   analysis   (Singh Y: 1983;
Mukherjee: 1979). Similarly, many other social scientists such as A.R. Wadia
B.N. Dutta, K.P. Chattopadhya and S.V. Ketkar etc, created academic ambi-
ence through their writings for teaching and research in sociology either directly
or indirectly. One common stream of consciousness, however, in all these writ-
ings was that of historicity of the Indian civilisation and its distinct cultural and
social identity which was denied the centrality it deserved in most western social
science or sociological writings on India. These contributions were not strictly in
the domain of systemic sociological analysis of the Indian social and cultural
realities but indeed, these had a high sensitising effect on the Indian academic
scene to provide legitimacy to the teaching and research in Indian sociology.

Early Sociological Beginnings

The teaching of sociology as an academic discipline, though still imbued with deeper humanistic and civilisational orientations, started at Bombay University with Patric Geddes joining as professor of civics and sociology in 1919 where he served upto 1924 (Mairet:1957). Formalisation of sociology in terms of methods and conceptual framework began with his contributions, but in a much diffused and generalised form. Patric Geddes' major focus was upon viewing social reality from an oral, communitarian, global and multidisciplinary perspective. He maintained, 'our great need today is to grasp life as a whole, to see its many sides in their'proper relations; but we must have a practical a well as a philosophical interest in such an integrated view of life' (Mairet: p xi). Geddes had exposure to various disciplines in the sciences and humanities ranging from botony, zoology, mining, engineering to sociology. He was influenced by the works of the biologist Thomas Huxley and through him, that of Herbert Spencer the sociologist. He admired Huxley but disagreed with his emphasis to look at science from a purely amoral perspective. For this reason, he also admired the French sociologist August Comte, his positive philosophy and religion of humanity. He used to frequently attend the Cometist Church though it was laughed at by Huxley as "catholicism without Christanity." On this issue, Geddes differed from his teacher.

Later, he moved to Paris from England and was deeply impressed by the French university tradition, its centrality on the pursuit of what Geddes calls the 'morality of truth', 'morality of action', and the 'spirit of immeasurable literary, scientific and constructive endeavour'. Here, he was influenced by Fredric Le Play's writings on regional and ecological aspects of civilisation. Le Play's triadic categories of 'work, place and family' have deeply influenced Geddes' own schematisation of conceptual categories for the growth of regional cultures of societies, particularly his schema of 'work, place and folk'. Similarly, one could also witness the impact of Comte in Geddes' formulation of the diagramatic hierarchy of the sciences, with mathematics and logic being at the base, physics chemistry and biology in the middle and sociology (not social physics as Comte adumbrated) at the top. Geddes had schematically also worked out the boundary conditions in which sociology could closely interact with other sciences. In this case, he listed anthropology, ecology and statistics as the major disciplines for interactive integration with sociology. Geddes extensively used the technique of constructing 'property space' (in diagrammatic boxes) for generation of concepts and methods for sociological investigation. He emphasised the need for ethical,

regional and communitarian sensitivity in sociological studies, but his primary emphasis was upon practical outcome and social engineering. To this end, we find him in the role of a moral architect along with his focus upon the physical architecture of town planning. He consistently laid emphasis upon the regeneration of city life and ecological self-awareness in the planning of the social and cultural habitats at regional and global levels. Unfortunately, Geddes's entry into the Bombay university teaching department was of a very short duration and his sociological approach which had a strong blend of empirical methods with philosophical orientations could not get time enough to be institutionalised. Nevertheless, he was instrumental in his successor G.S. Ghurye going to Cambridge for research in anthropology and taking the charge of the Department on his return. Ghurye, a sanskritist and an indologist of great eminence brought to bear his scholarship together with that of anthropology in developing the pedogogy of sociological teaching at the Bombay University. This is reflected in the curricula for the teaching of sociology. It is also reflected in the research that Ghurye himself did or directed his students to undertake. In his own writings, we witness a creative blend of historicity with Indology, particularly, where studies of social structure such as caste, occupation and race are concerned. One can also easily see his emphasis on comparative historical treatment of the formations of social structure and culture with a unique sensitivity to the notion of civilisation. Ghurye contributed to sociological writings over several decades and his works cover a vast range of themes relating to the study of concrete structures such as rural and urban communities, social stratification, comparative cultural behaviours, processes of social change and social conflict, cultural styles (dress and fashion), and traditional social formations and sects such as the sadhus and sampradayas. He also made use of a multiplex of methodologies in these studies, ranging from diachronic historical observations of rural changes to empirical surveys and uses of historical materials and traditional-Indological texts. Even though empirical studies of micro-social systems do find a place in his sociology, his main focus has always remained on macro-historical and comparative studies. This tradition has been continued by his successors at Bombay university.

Apart from his individual research, Ghurye's larger contribution to Indian sociology lies in the training of a whole generation of very distinguished sociologists who gave leadership to the profession in the country, and contributed to its institutionalisation and modernisation as a social science discipline. These sociologists led the direction of research and teaching in the field of sociology during the decade of the 1950s which witnessed a massive expansion in the number of universities and colleges in the country.

Another equally important centre for the early growth of teaching and research in sociology has been Lucknow University, where the pioneering role was played by Radhakamal Mukherjee and his two distinguished colleagues, D.P. Mukherji and D.N. Majumdar. Radhakamal Mukherjee established the Department of Economics at the University of Lucknow in the early 1930s and introduced the teaching of sociology as a part of economics at the MA level. It is of interest to note that at both the universities of Bombay and Lucknow, the teaching of sociology was not imparted exclusively. It was integrated with civics and political science at Bombay and with economics at Lucknow university. This is understandable considering the fact that during the first two to three decades of the twentieth century the teaching of sociology as an independent discipline was confined to a few universities in England, Germany and France, and its curricular structure had a broad multidisciplinary social science perspective. Some of the major universities in England, such as Cambridge and Oxford, started departments of sociology much later during the1960s.

The contributions of Radhakamal Mukherjee, like that of Ghurye are stupendous and multidimensional. Radhakamal, unlike Ghurye, however, showed greater sensitivity to issues of sociological theory and methodology. Indeed, he is one of the earliest sociologist-economists in India to not only integrate the western theoretical and methodological paradigms in the studies of social and economic problems and issues in India, but also the one who clearly lays down the foundation of a distinctive Indian sociological paradigm and theoretic structure. His contributions have a wide range including the study of slums and industrial labour problems, regional economic structures, problems of the peasantry and agrarian economy, study of social stratification and caste (particularly using scalar methodology to measure social distance), study of the 'social structure' values and social ecology and a comparative philosophical treatment of civilisations. He undertook a critical and philosophical diagnosis of the emerging crises of human condition in the industrial societies and its civilisation. The reach of his sociological and economic concerns and his treatment of these problems is indeed unique among the Indian social scientists. His sociology reflects not only the endogenous consciousness and the Indian civilisational anchorage, rather he continually responds creatively to most of the contemporary philosophical, theoretical and methodological orientations and shifts in the paradigms of western social sciences and sociology. His lecture tour of the universities in America in the 1930s brought him closer to many significant American social science orientations of that time, such as the focus on social ecology, problems of urbanisation and its morphological character, the importance of regional and

institutional economics (such as in the writings of Commons, Veblen and Mitchell etc) and the utility of empirical survey designs of research etc.

But one of the most significant contributions that Radhakamal Mukherjee has made to sociology, the debate on which has since continued in one form or another, relates to his formulation of a general theoretical paradigm of social science and sociology from the perspective of the Indian philosophical traditions. It is a paradigm which attempts to generate a universal general theory for the study of social and cultural phenomena as an alternative to the western theoretical approaches in sociology. He offers an alternative worldview of sociology and social science drawn from the philosophical traditions of the Vedanta, Buddhism and Taoism. These traditions according to him are embedded in the values of universal humanism and ethical piety rather than in materialistic rationalism or positivism. Mukherjee is perhaps the only sociologist of his time in India who attempted this ambitious alternative philosophical paradigm for generating a universal theory of sociology and social science, both as a corrective and as an alternative to the western traditions of social science theory.

In his address 'A Philosophy of Social Sciences' (1958) he postulates an integral and interdisciplinary view of the social sciences including sociology and social anthropology) and diagnoses the dilemma of western social science in its one dimensional focus upon the analysis of the human condition and social phenomena from the perspective of rationalistic utilitarianism (product of the Enlightenment period) treating humans as 'homo faber' rather than 'homo symbolicus'. He accepts the relevance of the dialectical method of reasoning in the social sciences but refuses to confine it to 'dialectical meterialism'. He locates the roots of the dialectical methods in the Indian traditions of Buddhism and Vedanta philosophies. He finds their formulations to be more holistically embedded in logic for the scientific exploration of human realities. He also finds, in this context, the Taoist conception of being and self-identity to be integrally relevant. He writes:

"The philosophy of dialectical meterialism today promotes the universal notion of an inevitable pattern of development through struggles and conflicts of global revolution and war and subsumes all human progress within the dialectic of the economic movement. Modern evolutionary naturalism, Spencerian, Marxian or Bergsonian, reduces man's mind and values as passive entities manipulated mechanically by a vast process that he cannot intelligently direct or control. Evolution as revealed to modern thought has its many levels and dimensions in which persons, values and societies develop in nature. Values are creative and

not merely means of adaptation to the environment. The environment also changes, acted upon by human goals, values and ideals" (Mukherjee, R: 1960: 118, quoted in Singh, Y: 1986).

Mukherjee says that 'man thinks and lives dialectically. All social relations and behaviour and values that lie deep-seated in them embody polar principles and tendencies' but also that 'through the dialectic of the vedantic *neyti neyti*, Buddhist *sunyat* and Taoist namelessness, the self identifies itself in the reality and the supreme value' (ibid: 4). Mukherjee thus refutes the logic of reductionism implicit in the western social science formulations of the human actor and social institutions. He postulates, on the other hand, a view of the human actor as an eternal negotiator between the existential (deterministic) and the transcendent. This he achieves through 'the immanence in himself of the not-self, the neighbour, the whole universe' (ibid: 5). This ability alone justifies the status of human actor as 'homo symbolicus', as value-creating being rather than one involved in mere innovation of technologies to resolve the daily problems of existential survival and development. In his later contributions, Mukherjee, like P. Sorokin in the US, began to focus more on the study of comparative civilisations and his treatment of values and cultural traditions became more diagnostic rather than analytical. But his central concern for rendering western social sciences free from their positivistic and utlitarian anchorage through integrating in their paradigms correctives from the Oriental, particularly the Indian philosophical and civilisational perspectives remained intact. D.P. Mukherji and D.N. Majumdar, both colleagues of Radhakamal Mukherjee contributed richly to the teaching and research in sociology and social anthropology. Their approach in some ways could be termed as supplemental to the established orientation. For instance, D.P. Mukherji, like Radhakamal Mukherjee, acknowledges the relevance of Indian tradition and philosophy for arriving at valid theoretical and conceptual schemes for the study of Indian society. He, despite being sympathetic to the Marxian method and logic, disputed its categories and conceptual structures which, he thought, were largely western centric. He could see no relevance for many of its categories, for instance, the notions of class and modes of production as formulated in classical Marxism. Innovations were required in this regard for studying Indian social realities. Such categories for studying the Indian society, according to him, should be derived from Indian tradition and history. For instance, the traditional notions of community or *sangha* may be more appropriate to understand the social situation of rural and urban structures in India, rather than the notion of class. We see in this orientation a degree of similarity with Radhakamal Mukherjee's propositions. But there is a degree of

difference. D.P. Mukherji does not totally reject the Marxian contributions, particularly its dialectical logic enunciating the centrality of the processes of conflict and contradiction in the social processes of society. Similarly, D.N. Majumdar supplements Radhakamal Mukherjee's contributions to the development of the empirical tradition of research. But beyond this, we may not find many similarities. Majumdar was a trained social anthropologist, a student of B. Malinowski and an avid field observer of the tribes and tribal cultures in India. His concern was more towards capturing the realities of tribal cultures and social structure through ethnography and to observe its institutional linkages with the rest of the Indian society. His contribution to the ethnography of the Indian tribes is monumental indeed, but his theoretical interests hardly go beyond ethnographic comparisons. D.P. Mukherji, on the other hand, does reflect analytical-theoretical orientation in his writings, particularly when he uses the dialectical-historical perspective of 'marxology' as he preferred to describe his approach, for the study of the middle class structure and formation in India. He also examines the processes of social change and planning in the country and demonstrates the relationship between the Indian tradition and the western conceptual frames of analysis. But he does not show the same degree of interest, as Radhakamal Mukherjee did, in offering a general theoretical paradigm of sociology rooted in the Indian philosophy, history and traditions as a counterpoint to the western theoretical approaches. Trained in economics and history, and being a literary writer and novelist, D.P.Mukherji's approach to the teaching and research in sociology was more innovative and non conventional. This led him to write on many themes of sociology, such as music, art and culture which were not conventionally popular during his days but assumed greater significance later as sociology began to grow through institutional expansion and disciplinary specialisation.

The generation of sociologists from Ghurye to D.P. Mukherji who led its teaching and research from the 1920s to the middle of the 1950s, laid a very solid foundation of the profession in India. In their own writings this generation of sociologists was more encyclopaedic and macro-analytic in approach. The period of specialisation has yet to begin. But we must remember that even in the west, disciplinary specialisation and methodological sophistication in research began to gain momentum following the end of the second world war. These early beginners of Indian sociology pioneered the vision of sociology and social science as having a historical-civilisational anchorage. They felt acutely uneasy in accepting the positivistic, utilitarian and the general evolutionary constructions and premises of western sociology. They consistently introduced the

perspectives of historicity, culture and values in the formulation of sociological concepts and their theoretical underpinnigs. Their sensitivity to the methodological aspect of sociological research was open-ended and broadly inclusive of all available techniques and methods as found appropriate. Research methodology or technique was supposed to be a matter of preference for the individual researcher who, it was felt, should have maximum flexibility in devising and using tools for the observation, documentation and construction of social reality.

Institutionalisation of Sociology

Following independence, a new phase for the growth of Indian sociology was ushered in. Its main attributes were: first, the professionalisation of sociology; second, the emergence of new institutional support for its teaching and research (with the expansion of universities and colleges and funding agencies); third, with such growth a beginning in the specialisation in sociological research in terms of the choice of themes and methods began to take place; fourth, there was unprecented growth in methodological consciousness in the discipline, and the teaching of methodology began as a specialised course at most places; fifth, the emphasis upon the social relevance of the discipline particularly in the areas of development planning and social reconstruction of society gained greater ascendancy and finally, a debate on 'a sociology for India' began in a systematic manner. It began to be increasingly felt that Indian sociology should reflect not only the philosophical, historical and cultural specificities of the Indian society, but it should accordingly improvise and innovate upon the existing sociological concepts and categories largely drawn from western sociology.

Independence in 1947 released new historical forces and aspirations in the country. The country's political leadership, intellectuals and people were acutely conscious of the challenges of nation-building, development and reconstruction of Indian society. A Constitution reflecting the future vision of India as a republic was adopted. Within the framework of a mixed economy, a strategy for the planned development of the Indian economy and society was worked. The Planning Commission was set up to formulate the priorities and plans for national development. Within its framework, organisations and institutions were set up for the expansion of higher education in the fields of sciences, technology, management, engineering, medicine, social sciences and humanities. Several research councils were set up to augment its growth. A large number of national labarotories in various fields of science were set up; agricultural universities were established; several Institutes of technology came up in different parts of

the country and there was an unprecedented growth in university and college education.

The teaching of sociology began to expand as new universities and colleges were set up, contributing to the expansion of the number of teachers and researchers. In order to provide funds and to regulate the standards of teaching and research in universities and colleges, the University Grants Commission was set up. Funds for conducting research on policy related problems were also made available by the Planning Commission. Among sociologists and social scientists, the momentum to conduct research in areas of greater social and economic relevance was accelerated. The new focus upon research differed from that of colonial times. The Planning Commission sponsored a series of studies in urban sociology, rural and agricultural development, the nature of poverty, the social and economic conditions of the weaker sections, the scheduled tribes and scheduled castes etc. Most of these studies were prioritised on the basis of their relevance for planning and development and, in many cases, based on the need to generate bench mark data required for development projects.

These processes, together with other developments in the field of education contributed to the professionalisation of sociology and social sciences. Sociology was now taught in various universities and colleges as an independent subject and full-fledged sociology departments were set up in colleges and universities. Its teaching was no longer clubbed with either economics as at the Lucknow University, or with civics and political science as at the university of Bombay in the past. The Indian Sociological Society, which, for a number of years, had confined its membership to the sociologists of western India became an all-India association of Indian sociologists towards the end of the 1950s. The regional associations of sociology, particularly the one from northern India, sponsored by the sociologists of Lucknow university, merged with the Indian Sociological Society. The Society meets regularly and provides a national forum for teachers and researchers of sociology in the country. It regularly publishes a journal, *Sociological Bulletin* which is internationally recognised. It networks with the International Sociological Association of which it is an organisational member. These institutional processes of growth have broadened and deepened the national and international concerns of Indian sociologists towards many sociological issues which may range from the theoretical and methodological to those of choice of themes of relevance in teaching and research.

The professional growth of sociology has contributed to the modernisation and standardisation of its curricular structure. This has been supported by the University Grants Commission (UGC) which set up subject-wise National Panels of professors to periodically review, upgrade and modernise the syllabi in consultation with its teachers. The UGC National Panel of sociology undertakes and sponsors research projects, seminars, workshops etc to evaluate the state of the discipline and its profession to help in formulation of policies for the upgradation and modernisation of the curricular structure of sociology. With the high degree of regional diversity in terms of institutional standards and linguistic policies in teaching, the effort is to evolve a consensus on the modernisation of curricula by the participation of teachers of sociology from all regions of the country in the work of the National Panel. The empirical research in the state of the teaching of sociology and its profession in the country, also helps in formulating the issues that deserve discussion at the national level, and where the comparative international level of upgradation of sociology teaching and research are required. So far, the recommendations and suggestions made by the National Panels have been widely appreciated and incorporated in the syllabi of sociology in universities and colleges within the country. This has kept the curricula of sociology in India at a comparable international standard.

The UGC's efforts towards modernistion of the syllabi in sociology and improvement in the quality of teaching, teaching materials and aids cater mainly to the college and university levels of education. After Independence, sociology was also introduced at the secondary level of school education. Even otherwise, education at the primary and secondary levels of education in various subjects required institutional support for continual modernisation of the quality and standard of teaching. The National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) was set up to perform this task. NCERT has contributed significantly to the quality of sociology teaching at the secondary level in India through the production of text books, training of teachers and conducting workshops and seminars from time to time in the country. The fact, that sociology is being taught in India right from the secondary to higher degree levels, is a testimony to its professional growth and institutionalisation.

Impetus to the growth of sociology, particularly in the field of research gained new momentum when towards the end of the 1960s the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) was established. Its objective is to improve and promote the quality of research in social sciences in the country and to make funds and grants available for this purpose. It is also responsible for setting up

research institutes of social sciences in the Indian states and provide them funds
to undertake research. It offers fellowships and grants to teachers and students of
sociology to conduct their own research. It supplements the efforts of the UGC
which mainly looks after universities and colleges. The ICSSR, has made a great
impact upon the professional and disciplinary growth of the research in sociol-
ogy and social anthropology. So far, it has published three decennial surveys of
research done in India in the fields of sociology and social anthropology.

A significant aspect of the contribution made both by the UGC and the ICSSR
to the teaching and research in sociology is that their efforts sharpened the con-
cern for relevance in the evaluation and structuring of the pedagogy of the disci-
pline (see, Singh, Y:1984). Theoretical research apart, the focus on relevance
tends to be a common value frame promoted both by the UGC and the ICSSR,
the former seeks it in the curricula and the choice of research projects, and the
latter focuses primarily on the selection of the research themes and methods.
This is evident from the reports of the National Panels of the UGC in sociology,
social anthropology, economics, political science and geography.

We witness, in these reports, the sense of commitment of the profession of
sociology and social sciences to reach higher levels of achievement in the quality
of teaching and research. But we also observe that in matters of defining rele-
vance, most members of the profession show unanimity about the indegenisaton
of concepts and theories. Without erecting walls of separation between social
sciences in India and abroad, it is felt that along with creative adaptation of con-
cepts, methods and substantive discoveries made by social sciences in the west
and in other countries abroad, Indian sociologists and social scientists should
aim at evolving concepts and methods in tune with Indian historicity, its social
and cultural specificity and its goals of social and economic development. For
instance, the report of the economics panel says: "the standard economics is sup-
posed to explain the modus operandi of an idealised capitalist economy. The
Indian economy being any thing but that, the orthodox paradigms must perforce
collapse." Further, "most of the theoretical concepts evolved in the context of
developed industrial societies of the west are mechanically doled out to unsus-
pecting batches of students in this country. Not unnaturally, we find these rari-
fied tools of analysis to be of little avail in comprehending their own situation"
(Singh: 1979). A similar emphasis on indiginesation of concepts and methods in
teaching and research is found in the reports of the panels in sociology and polit-
ical science. Evidently, the notion of relevance as postulated by sociologists and
other social scientists goes beyond mere indigenisation of the concepts or meth-

ods. It also covers the choice of problems undertaken for research and enunciation of their research methodology. It is evident from the policies, both of the UGC and the ICSSR, which aim at promoting research in priority areas which are of national concern for social and economic development. The ICSSR constituted a standing committee of sociologists to promote studies on the educational backwardness of the scheduled caste and scheduled tribe students in various states of India, empowering the committee to commission sociologists from these states to undertake research on this problem. The need for this arose because fewer sociologists were observed to be undertaking research projects of their own choice in this area of natirnal concern. From time to time, the ICSSR in consultation with social scientists evolves the priority list of the areas of research which are funded on a preferential basis. In this category, we may refer to sociology of law, gender sociology, problems of the peasantry, minorities and deprived sections of society. Research on the problems of health, poverty and malnutrition and of the problems of people in remoter and more backward areas of the country, also receive priority. These priority areas are continually revised and updated.

Differentiation and Specialisation in Sociology

The processes of institutional recognition and professionalisation of sociology contributed to the enlargement of the range of research interests of sociologists in India. Its linkage with the policy planning and social and economic development reinforced this process. Historically, the end of the second world war had shifted the gravity of influence in the world of social sciences from Europe to the United States of America, where social sciences and sociology had made unprecedented strides in the applied areas of sociological research and brought about a myriad of innovations in research methodology. Even otherwise, the American sociological traditions had always had a relatively greater applied and policy oriented direction of growth in comparison to the European sociological tradition. This process of growth in American sociology logically resulted in the differentiation and specialisation in sociology. In fact, America has played a leadership role in this direction.

Thus, we witness a convergence of two types of influences of American sociology upon Indian sociology soon after independence. The first relates to the emergence of American sociology as a domineering influence upon European or even global sociology following the second world war, and second, its rich and unparalleled advances in policy oriented research methodology and techniques

accorded it a leadership role in sociology and social sciences. As a consequence of these developments, and also because in India the process of planned development had just started, the influence of the American sociology and social anthropology began to grow. Indian sociology increasingly came under the influence of American sociological and social anthropological conceptual and theoretical orientations.

The process of differentiation in Indian sociology at this juncture can be seen growing in two directions: first, in the expansion and diversification of the nature of the social, cultural and developmental problems which sociologists began began to study, and second, in the diversification and differentiation of methods and tools of research which were now available to sociologists and which sociologists and social anthropologists used increasingly. It may, however, be also pointed out that the emerging national concern for planned development of Indian society and the economy ranging from rural development, urban planning, empowerment of the scheduled tribes and scheduled castes, weaker sections and minorities to the industrialisation of the economy etc, had opened up a vast vista of researchable problems for sociologists and social scientists. The most urgent concerns in the early 1950s were, however, in the areas of rural development and agricultural modernisation to overcome the acute problem of food scarcity.

In thematic terms, therefore, the first major differentiation in sociological studies in India was between rural and urban sociology. The decade of the 1950s witnessed a proliferation in the studies of Indian villages. The pioneering work in this field was done by S.C. Dube, M.N. Srinivas, Ramkrishna Mukherji, A.R. Desai and several other Indian sociologists. A large number of American, and a few British and French, social anthropologists also contributed to the village studies in various parts of the country. The American social anthropologist, Oscar Lewis who studied a north Indian village (and had formerly studied a Mexican village) was also associated with the Indian Planning Commission as an advisor. These village studies overwhelmingly had an anthropological orientation. Most were observational, descriptive and holistic in terms of coverage. They attempted a reconstruction of village social structure, culture and customs, its economy and polity etc from an ethnographic perspective. Very few of them were analytical.

There were a few exceptions, however. M.N. Srinivas, while portraying the caste profile of the village, did make analytical use of a set of indicators of the caste status, such as ritual status, economic status, political status and status due

to numerical strength to arrive at the concepts of 'dominance' and 'dominant caste'. The dominant caste was defined as the one which enjoyed a high status on all these or a maximum number of these status indicators. Similarly, he used the cultural attribute of the lower castes imitating the ideology and way of life of the upper castes to formulate the concept of 'sanskritisation'. The attribute of the upper castes who imitated the lifestyle and values of the western civilisation, on the other hand, he termed as 'westernisation'. He made use of the concepts of sanskritisation and westernisation extensively and a whole generation of sociologists and social anthropologist to explain the processes of social change in India. Similarly, McKim Marriot used the term 'universalisation' and 'parochialisation' to explain the dynamics of cultural values and practices in the 'folk-elite' traditions in villages and towns. This conceptual distinction is based on the Chicago university anthropologists, Robert Redfield and Milton Singer's schematic distinction between folk and elite cultures based respectively on the 'little tradition' of the former based on oral culure and the written or the textual tradition of the elite, called the 'great tradition' of culture. Marriott maintained that the elements from the folk cultural tradition were continually lifted up from its local oral ritual or cultural context and were generalised or 'universalised' in the textual (scriptural) great tradition of India. This process he reported from his observation of the cultural institutions and practices in India. Several studies of folk cultural traditions soon followed.

Ramakrishna Mukherji's *Dynamics of a Rural Society* and A.R. Desai's (edited volume) *Rural Sociology in India* could be quoted as studies of the rural society which departed both methodologically and analytically from the above social anthropological treatment of the village studies. The former makes use of statistical data from various sources to generate conceptual categories of the class structure in villages and analytically posits them to unravel the problem of rural social structure and development from a quasi marxist perspective. The use of statistical data makes this study comparable to those in other regions and states of India, although Mukherji confines his attention to West Bengal. A.R. Desai in his book-length introduction to Rural Sociology in India explicitly makes use of the historical-systematic and Marxist methods of analysis for the understanding of rural society and its problem. Of course, he also refers to the contribution of a few American sociologists to the systematic methodology for the study of rural and urban phenomena.

Quite a few rural studies during this period were also conducted with the direct purpose of reinforcing the policies of rural development. This particularly related

to studies focusing upon the community development and extension services and the local panchayat institutions which were introduced by the government. Many American social anthropologists took part in such studies. In several studies, rural leadership, local political institutions and their historical role in rural self-governance were analysed. In this venture a number of political scientist also joined, and in the course of time these, and related studies contributed to the development of the behavioural school of political analysis and political sociology in India. S.C. Dube made a comprehensive study of the impact of community development institutions on rural society in India; among political scientists, the contributions of Rajni Kothari and Iqbal Narain are quite noteworthy.

A differentiation process within rural sociology emerged by the end of 1950s. It was first on methodological lines, between those who used anthropological and holistic methods for the study of a single village and those who used statistical survey data for the study of several villages using selected number of analytical variables. Between these two approaches were also studies of rural phenomena from a folk elite cultural perspective. Indra Deva and S.L. Srivastava have made an in-depth study of the folk culture of villages not only holistically or within a single village, but in a regional comparative perspective. Thus a distinction between micro-systematic and macro-systematic studies of rural realities has emerged. Differentiation also seems to have emerged between those who study villages directly with the purpose of impact analysis of rural development schemes launched by the state and those who undertake village studies for understanding its institutional structure and its processes.

A large number of urban studies were also conducted during this period although their scale and coverage could not be comparable to the rural studies. The Research Programme Committee of the Planning Commission sponsored more than a dozen and a half studies of cities in India. These studies, with a few exception, were based on a survey design standardised by experts in the Commission in order to generate comparable data which could be used for urban planning and development. Not only sociologists or social anthropologists but also economists, geographers and other social scientists were involved. These urban studies did help in generating data about the nature of urban social structure, its institutional organisation,the nature of urban services, land-use pattern and urban demographic features etc and only few of them such as the Calcutta survey by N.K. Bose contributed to our understanding of the cultural and sociological profile of urban life. These studies apart from contributing to urban policy planning helped in generating interest among sociologists to study urban phenomena in India from

its specific historical, institutional and cultural background. It also led to a number of studies of small towns and their socio-economic structure and processes. The studies which followed began to focus more on the rural-urban linkages in historical, institutional and structural-economic domains rather than on studying villages or cities individually as social isolates. G.S. Ghurye's study of the 'urban community' and M.S.A. Rao's study of 'fringe villages' belong to this tradition. The study of the structure and formation of urban life also underwent change as sociologists began to explore the specific rather than the general features of the urban social structure. A number of urban studies have concentrated upon the nature of the entrepreneurial classes in the cities. Satish Saberwal studied a town in Punjab to explore the structure and social mobility among the entrepreneurs whom he describes as the 'mobile men' and Milton Singer made a study of entrepreneurs in Madras. A number of studies of specific communities of traditional entrepeneurial classes have followed since then. These could be classified both in the categories of industrial as well as urban sociology.

There is a logical relationship between differentiation and specialisation in the growth of the social science disciplines. Of course, scholars also opine that the social sciences follow a cycle of differentiation and synthesis. Each period of differentiation is, in the course of time, followed by efforts to synthesise the ideas and substantive findings of diversified social science contributions into an integrated or general theoretical framework. We find that during the decades of the 1960s and 1970s in India, pressure did begin to build up towards a need for synthesis particularly in use of conceptual schemes and methods and also in some measure in the operationalisation of the choice of substantive themes for study. Yogendra Singh's *Modernisation of the Indian Tradition* (1973) represents an attempt to view sociological studies in India through a paradigm to demonstrate the logical link and integrative relevance of various isolated conceptual schemes and categories used by sociologists to analyse social change and modernisation in Indian society.

The differentiation in sociological researches now grew in several directions. One could now talk of sociologies in India rather than a single or synthetic sociology. For example, we begin to find research studies in the fields of sociology of rural and urban life, social stratification, industrial sociology, family sociology, sociology of religion, sociology of caste, scheduled caste-scheduled tribe, sociology of medecine, sociology of profession etc. Without being exhaustive, one could now visualise the theoretical and methodological diversities and tensions of differentiation and synthesis in the conceptual schemes and theoretical

orientations of the sociological studies. It became increasingly difficult to have an objective view of social change in India without taking into perspective the various dimensions of the findings of the specialised studies of social phenomena. Their evaluation from a schematic and comparative perspective became necessary both in conceptual terms as well as substantively.

Social Change and Differentiation in Sociology

The process of differentiation and professionalisation that we witnessed during the 1950-1960s owed its growth to the institutional expansion of sociology and the increasing contact and interaction of Indian sociologists with researchers from the west, particularly America. By the 1970s major changes took place both within the country and outside which began to impact upon the paradigms of sociology. The involvement of America in the Vietnam war had created a global disillusionment about that country which began to delegitimise its role and leadership. This process also reverberated in the world of social sciences and sociology. The focus on method and technique in sociological studies, identified singularly with the American influence in sociology came increasingly under criticism for its emphasis on the premise about social systems being essentially consensual and self-integrative or self-maintaining. Functional theory in sociology, a counterpart of such methods, began to be treated as inadequate in diagnosing or analysing the significant processes within the social system for it neglected the role of conflict and contradictions in the structure and process of social realities. Consequently, not only in Europe or the developing world, but also in America, many alternate theoretical paradigms, particularly those related to conflict theory, Marxist historical materialism or dialectical materialism, phenomenology, ethnomethodology and critical theories began to gain acceptance. These developments were not sui generis but a product of emerging global social situation. They exemplifly the close relationship that has always existed between theory and social conditions that influence its orientation and growth.

In India, the results of the planned efforts towards social and economic development during the decades of 1950-1970 were now visible in many directions. In rural India, the green revolution had begun to take root, food self-sufficiency was within reach; the welfare policy of reservation had energised the scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and weaker sections to give impetus to new social movements and a 'limited elite' had arisen amongst them to provide leadership; the expansion of industries, government institutions, educational institutions, expansion of the governing and developmental bureaucracy, technocracy and profes-

sional services, law and order agencies, para-military and military forces etc. contributed to the expansion of the middle classes in urban areas; the green revolution, even though it was confined to a limited section of the rural peasantry brought into existence a powerful rural middle class. These changes in society signified 'success' but these also triggered many new dimensions of conflict and contradiction in society indicating 'failure'. The incidence of inter-caste, inter-class violence in the villages increased; the marginalisation of the weaker sections, the dalits, women, landless labourers, minorities etc. was sharpened creating disillusionment and anxiety.

The impact of these changes in society upon Indian sociology during the 1970s onwards can be very clearly observed. Rural studies now increasingly began to use Marxist categories for sociological analysis; community development projects and extension services came under severe criticism for their status quoism on policies of land reform and support to rich peasantry to the exclusion of the weaker sections. The contributions of A.R. Desai and K. Gough primarily exemplify this orientation. More than sociologists, a large number of economists conducted studies of the agrarian social structure and its processes of change using the categories and methods of Marxism. They operationalised several indicators drawn from the rural economy and society to measure its socio-economic formations, for example: 'feudalism', semi-fudalism', 'pre-capitalism' etc. The debate among the Marxist economists, in which a few sociologists also joined issues, raged as to which type of the above social formation the agrarian social and economic structures (region-wise) could be attributed to belong. But a more significant development in Indian sociology during this period was the recognition of the relevance of the studies of social movements.

From the 1970s onwards, disenchantment from the functional explanation of social processes and structures had begun. It was noticed that societies underwent changes not merely through internal differentiation of roles and institutions as they underwent differentiation and growth, a postulate supported by the functional theory, but significant and sudden changes took place in societies through mass mobilisation and movement of the people or concerned sections of society. This phenomenon was also recognised by Indian sociologists as they witnessed such changes happenning in their own society. Moreover, the cumulative effect of the policies of planned development in India had by this time energised several sections and interest groups to mobilise protest movements to realise their demands which ranged from the economic and social to the political. The approach to the study of social change in India from the paradigm of social move-

ment, implied the application of the theory of 'collective behaviour' in which the significant variables were: the existing state of disenchantment among the concerned people on a set of issues, construction of new identities, the ideological rationalisation of the issues into specific goals, the emergence of a leadership, formation of an organisational base and its institutional networks and formulation of strategies for the articulation of demands through the movement in which not only protest, but also its withdrawal or reconciliation, played an important role.

Thus, a vigorous tradition of a sociology of social movement started in India. Since the studies of social movements were so far confined to only historians and political scientists, the contributions by sociologists introducing several sociological concepts and methods in the studies, particularly in contemporary times, enriched the nature of the movement studies. It also brought about an interdisciplinary orientation in sociology. M.S.A. Rao studied the S.N.D.P. reform movement in Kerala and published his findings in a systematic form. He also brought together in several volumes, a large number of contributions by many sociologists to the study of a variety of social movements in India. Peasant movements in various regions of the country were studied by A.R. Desai, T.K. Oommen, D.N. Dhanagare and Rajendra Singh. P.N. Mukherji made a systemic study of the Naxalbari movement in West Bengal which had a unique place in social movement as its strategy was based on class struggle and violence. He made conceptual contributions to the study of violent social movements. Similarly, T.K. Oommen's study of the Sarvodaya and Gramadana movement in Rajasthan makes use of the conceptual-theoretical paradigm of 'charisma' and its sociological dimensions to explain the processes within a movement. Dipankar Gupta has studied the Siva Sena movement in Maharashtra and the farmers' movement in western U.P. Studies of women's movement through the sociology of gender have gained momentum. Among several others, contributions in this field have been made by Neera Desai, Veena Majumdar, Gail Omvedt, Maitrayee Chaudhari and Lindsey Barnes. A large number of studies of dalits, backward classes, tribes and minorities have been completed. The contributions of Gail Omvedt and M.S. Gore can be noted as being rich both in terms of substantive analysis and theoretical contextualisation. The second and the third survey reports in sociology and social anthropology published by the ICSSR, outline in detail most of these studies and also give a full account of the advances made and of the diversificsation or differentiation achieved by Indian sociology.

Apart from the study of social movements, the study of structural and cultural aspects of society gained momentum. I. P. Desai's study of the family system in

Gujarat used a diachronic multi-generation perspective for the study of the family structure. This study has provided empirical evidence to support the theory of cyclical structural changes in the family system (joint-single joint family structures) in place of the prevailing theory of continuum (change from joint to single family system) based on western experience. A.M. Shah made a systematic study of the family system in India using the concept of the 'household' as the operational unit of the family. He also contributed to the tradition of historical sociology making use of gencology and local history.

Many studies on the sociology of social stratification in India were made which attempted to synthetically conceptualise the role of caste, class and power and other conceptual schemes to explain the structure and processes of status determination, ranking and differentiation in Indian society. A major contribution to this field came from Andre Beteille. He used the categories of caste, class and power to analyse the changing principles of social stratification in a village in south India. This study has significant analytical value for a general understanding of the changes in the system of social stratification. Notable contributions to this theme have been made by K.L. Sharma, Victor D'Souza, Dipankar Gupta and Yogendra Singh. The sociology of profession has emerged as a separate specialisation and many studies of the professions and professionalisation processes in India have been made. Lawyers, doctors, nurses, managers and civil servants and academics etc have formed the subject of such studies. Substantial contributions have been made by studies related to these new social structural phenomena; among the many sociologists who have contributed to such studies, we may refer to T.N. Madan's study of the medical profession, T.K. Oommen's study of nurses, N.K. Singhi's study of civil servants, J.S. Gandhi's study of lawyers and Yogendra Singh's study of university academics. Contributions have also been made towards the study of culture, leisure, communication and media etc. from the systematic sociological perspective. Yogendra Singh, T.K. Unnitan and Indra Deva attempted to evolve a theoretical approach to the study of culture and its changes in India from the perspective of the 'sociology of culture'. Communication system which was earlier studied by Y.B. Damle has now been studied more exhaustively. A systematic and critical study has been done by K. Sondhi. I.P. Modi has contributed to a sociological study of leisure and its changing patterns in a Rajasthan city.

As these new directions of study in sociology have gained strength, the studies in conventional areas such as those of religion, caste and rural-urban struc-

tures etc. have also continued. Of course, these studies now imbibe new methodological and conceptual sensitivity which was absent in the past.

The decades 1980-2000 have witnessed further differentiation in Indian sociology. These refer to the choice of substantive areas of study as well as the theoretical concerns. During these decades, the global developments in sociology have already thrown up and crystallised new theoretic perspectives and greatly enlarged the substantive concerns in sociology. This has coincided once again with the new forms and directions of the structural and cultural changes, particularly in the developed societies of the west, such as Europe and America. These changes have had a bearing on ideology, theory and issues for sociological explorations. The transition from the industrial to the post industrial phase of development in western societies, poised as they seem to be on the verge of growing into a full fledged 'information society', has exposed them to challenges and crises which manifest themselves at the levels of social structure, demography, culture, ideology, economy and polity. The process of globalisation which these societies have sponsored worldwide through their technological and economic achievements, is a synthetic expression of their successes as well as failures.

The decline in population and the aging of society in Europe has necessitated the reliance on more and more migrant workers (skilled and unskilled) from the less developed countries. This results in inter cultural conflicts and challenges of multi culturalism. The technological advancements in the production system make it possible to have economic growth without generating employment. This results in the end of tenure jobs, job security and institutions of trade unions and factory mode of production. The production process has moved from the pre-eminence of the commodity sector to that of services. The community and family structures have suffered a great erosion of roles. Computers, telephony and internet have abolished the community's social space which has now been filled up with the individual actor whose sense of freedom may have increased, but the resultant individualism breeds subjective alienation and emotional anxieties. The processes of decision making in the polity and economy have become too complex and faceless to be comprehended by common citizens. Hence, representative democracy, celebrated so far as being a major achievement is seen to be flawed requiring 're-invention'. The political party system is in disarray. Increasingly, the demand is made to move from representative democracy, which in practice is considered to be less accountable than expected, to a form of participatory democracy through net-working of the voluntary associations and

decentralisation at the grass roots. The industrial production system is also under challenge from environmentalist movements, and governments are under pressure from civil rights and human rights organisations. The weakening of the bonds of community and family and the perception that state is too faceless and unaccountable has strengthened these movements which support the causes of migrants, refugees, women, children, marginalised sections of population and the ever new varieties of the underclass.

These changes in the structure of societies of the developed world have not only led sociology to study new areas of substantive social concerns, such as the role of communication and media, ecology and environment, human rights, civil right, multiculturalism and cultural identities, the structure of leisure and life-styles and the future shape of the civil society etc., but theoretically, sociology has tended to become more reflexive, cognitive and interpretative. The empirical methods of observation and analysis have not been forsaken, but the treatment of social realities using tools of empiricism and objectivity have been made responsive to the demands of empathy and reflexivity in the construction of social realities. This has resulted in a large scale creative inter-mixing and synthesisation of theories hitherto considered to be contradistinct.

Indian sociology, following the decades of the 1990s, has been deeply influenced by these developments in western societies. Also, it has been influenced by many new processes of change within Indian society, particularly those which reflect upon the social structure and political processes, issues of sustainability in economic growth, problems of ecological and environmental protection in the process of industrialisation, displacement of population, particularly from the weaker sections due to urbanisation, setting up of the mega-industrial projects of irrigation dams, power units and atomic centres etc. The problems of corruption in public life, the protection of civil rights, reforms in the judicial system and public cause litigation etc. have emerged as new issues of social concern. Social pathologies of homicide, suicide, dowry death, and social depravity and exploitation related to women, senior citizens and weaker sections, tend to increase during the new processes of social change. The focus on these and several new social problems gains urgency as the country enters into the a phase of change which is characterised by an anomalous growth in which the number of the middle classes and those below the poverty line is equalised. This may trigger many unanticipated social and cultural conflicts. It strengthens the legitimacy of the new social movements for the empowerment of scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, backward classes, minorities, women and other deprived sections of the

society. The third survey of research in sociology and social anthropology is
indicative of the type of sociological studies which were conducted during the
past two decades. The survey reveals that during this period major areas of
research in sociology were: science technology and development, the problems
of scheduled castes and protective discrimination, studies of old age, women's
studies and women's development, sociology of youth in India, culture commu-
nication and development, political sociology and political anthropology, crime,
delinquency and correctional methods, social movements: old and new, sociol-
ogy of religion and rural development (see, The Third Survey of Research in
Sociology and Social Anthropology Vol. I and II: 2000). We may notice that
there has been a continuity in certain areas of research from the past, and at the
same time new areas of emerging sociological concerns have begun to be inves-
tigated. The reports also reveal that even though the areas of study in some
instance remain conventional, the analysis and theoretical treatment of the data
now invites fresh conceptual and methodological explorations.

An important feature of sociological research from the 1980s to 2000 is that
the institutional context in which the research is being carried out has changed.
Formerly, universities, institutes and colleges etc. comprised the institutions
from where most sociological research originated. Now, the country has seen a
stupendous expansion of 'non-governmental organisations' which not only con-
duct but also fund sociological research. Most of this research is in the applied
sociological area but covered themes which conventional sociologists are apt to
neglect. The studies of human rights, environment and ecology, empowerment
of women and children, displaced communities, social forestry etc., are a host of
new areas in which these voluntary organisations have been instrumental in
sponsoring or conducting research.

Towards A Sociology for India

An important area of sociological debate in India which has persisted relates to
the quest for a particularistic Indian sociology. As we have noted in the writings
of Radhakamal Mukherjee and D.P. Mukherji, the emphasis on the development
of a paradigm of sociology drawn entirely from Indian philosophical traditions
was visualised, but its focus was not on a particularistic Indian sociology. Its aim
was to sensitise sociology in general to the perils of gross applications of the
methods of positivism and scientism. But the new debate, initiated by Louis
Dumont suggested that Indian sociology could be confined to the study of the
ideology of Indian society. He identified 'hierarchy' or caste as the central ideo-

logical principle on which the social structure of Indian society was anchored. He distinguished this ideology from the western ideology of 'equality' as a measure of contradistinction between the sociology of India and western sociology. According to him, Indian sociology is to be founded upon Indology and anthropological observations. The journal *Contributions to Indian Sociology* which was jointly edited by L. Dumont and B. Pocock published the debate between him and Pocock on this premise in the numbers issued in 1957 and 1960. Pocock disagreed with Dumont's proposition as according to him sociology studies not merely structures of society constructed ideologically but also as empirical observable facts. Hence, Pocock felt one could not confine sociology to any particularistic confine. Its findings had inter-societal comparability.

This debate, however, has generated substantial sociological articles and books in which the implications of a sociology for India as a particularistic discipline have been examined. Starting from 1957 the debate has continued in the columns of *Contribution to the India Sociology* (new series edited by T.N. Madan et al) well upto the 1980s and continues to simmer. In these debates, the Indian sociologists recognise the need for indegenisation of concepts and tools of sociological investigation. The premise of L. Dumont, however, has been over-whelmingly rejected. Even if the centrality of the caste system in the social structure of India is accepted, the historical and empirical data on caste in India do not support the hypothesis of its being entirely an ideological system. Caste has many other features rooted in the Indian economy, power structure and instruments of control and exploitation. Indian sociologists tend to accept the need of indigenisation of concepts in sociology but at the same time also hold that these may have to be logically integrated with other comparable principles of ranking and social differentiation to offer general explanation. For example, caste could be an indigenous cultural principle of social ranking but its more universal meaning located it in the principle of status determination which may vary from society to society.

Over the years, particularly following the decades 1990-2000 the debate on the sociology for India has rather become less resonant, Indian sociology has gained a very substantial identity of its own. It is evident from the magnitude of sociological research conducted in India. Three consecutive surveys conducted of the research done in sociology and social anthropology during this period by the ICSSR bear testimony to this fact. In this research we witness a creative degree of intermix between the use of the indigeous categories with the application of universal sociological concepts and categories. As Indian sociologists

have expanded the scope of their interests, they have also thrown up methodological and theoretical insights which have been made use of by sociologists from other societies. Indian sociology is moving fast from the earlier position of self-consciousness to a mature self-confidence, readily interacting and establishing partnership with sociologist at the global level.

The Future Direction

It is hazardous to talk of the future. In the case of the research in Indian sociology and its future direction of growth, surmises can be reasonably attempted based on two parameters: first, on the basis of trends in sociological research conducted so far; and secondly, on the basis of the new challenges that processes of social change and transformation may throw up deserving sociological attention. Trends of research in sociology so far have indicated that research in sociology respond closely to examine the new emergent problems arising out of social changes. Research tend to be both diagnostic or policy oriented as well as analytical. The future changes in India will result both from the cumulative effects of the previous changes in society and from the new and the predictable as well as unanticipated changes on account of the impact of the globalisation and liberalisation of economy, and also on account of the revolution in the technology of information and mass media (Singh, Y: 2000). These changes will have deeper impact on the culture, style of life, occupational structure, processes of urbanisation and the nature of the family and community life. Indian sociological researches will have to focus upon these problems. The analytical and theoretical approaches will have to be creatively adapted to meet with the demands of research in the new areas. Already, the involvement of non-governmental organisations in conducting social research has highlighted the need for participatory research. A greater degree of innovativeness and reflexivity would be required in sociological research as new issues and problems of social change are encountered. But the direction of movement in this research is bound to remain cumulative rather than show unexpected leaps and turns.

References

1.   Chaturvedi, Jagdish Prasad (1985) *Pravasi Krantikari*, Publications Division, Government of India, New Delhi.

2.   Indian Council of Social Science Research (2000) *Third Survey of Research in Sociology and Social Anthropology*, Vols. I & II New Delhi: Manak Publications.

3. Mairet, Philip (1957) *Pioneer of Sociology: The Life and Letters of Patrick Geddes,* London: Lund Humphries.

4. Mukherjee, Radhakamal (1958) *A Philosophy of Social Sciences,* Presidential Address At the Third All India Sociological Conference.

5. Mukherji, Ramakrishna (1979) *Sociology of Indian Sociology,* Bombay: Allied Publications.

6. (1973) *Modernisation of Indian Tradition,* New Delhi: Thompson Press.

7. Singh,Yogendra (1979) "Constraints, Contradictions and Interdisciplinary Orientations: The Indian Context," *International Social Science Journal,* 31(1).

8. Singh,Yogendra (1983) *Image of Man: Ideology and Theory in Indian Sociology,* Delhi: Chanakya Publications.

9. Singh,Yogendra ((1986) *Indian Sociology: Social Conditioning and Emerging Concerns,* New Delhi: Vistar Publications.

10. Singh,Yogendra (2000) *Culture Change in India: Identity and Globalisation,* Delhi: Rawat Publications.

Women's Studies: Emergence of a Discipline

(With Special Reference to India)

5

Maithreyi Krishnaraj

Women's Studies as a separate and distinct study began as a mid twentieth century phenomenon in North America and Western Europe and spread to other parts mostly after the International Women's Year and Decade. Whether we can call it a discipline in its own right can be a matter of dispute, but one can confidently assert that its intellectual history lends support to the assertion that in some ways it can claim that status even if it has not arrived there, definitely moving towards it. In a way, the old rigid discipline boundaries have given away to more flexible ones and old disciplines are splitting into new specialisations. Interdisciplinarity is also now more acceptable.

Today we associate women's studies with the academic enterprise of teaching and research on women, but its roots go back to the eighteenth and nineteenth century European developments in philosophy and political activity. Individual writers and thinkers among men and women, in many parts of the world, might have devoted attention to women's plight but 'feminism' as a concerted movement to fight for the emancipation of the female sex as a whole, arrived only in the nineteenth century, whether in the west or here. When we trace the intellectual origins of women's studies to its ideological roots in the birth of 'feminism'—broadly interpreted as the doctrine of equal rights for women based on the theory of the equality of the sexes, we must also wonder at how this notion of equal rights developed in the first place. It was the conjunction of the perva-

sive influence of enlightenment philosophy coupled with liberalism as a political ideology that facilitated the birth of feminism in Europe. Enlightenment thinkers rejected the view that revelation from God was the source of all knowledge. Truth could be found by reasoned enquiry and not by any form of received wisdom. All human beings are blessed with reason and if all obstacles to the discovery of truth are eliminated, reason would triumph. The intellectual energy that this approach unleashed expressed itself in a wide range of theorising, one of which became the subject of the nature of women and their role in society.

Many leading philosophers of the eighteenth century took up the examination of women's condition for example, the 1794 tract by Theodor Gottlieb called 'On the Civil Improvement of Women' (Evans 1977). The argument that women are human beings and are entitled to the same rights as men became the main plank for feminist credo. Two other influential works were Mary Wollstonecraft's 'A Vindication of the Rights of Women' in 1792 and John Stuart Mill's 'Subjection of Women' in 1869. Mary Wollstonecraft argued that women were kept in unnatural subjection and the spread of reason and education to women would restore to them their innate rationatility. Mill's ideas had an enormous impact because it summed up the case for feminism by linking it firmly to the political theory of liberalism. Mill conceived Victorian England as a perfect example of liberalism with one exception, that is the absence of equal rights for women which impeded human progress. Women's mental and creative potential were equal to that of men and they should have the right to exercise them. Marriage and motherhood could not be their only vocation. In substance, this implied that what women lacked was only insufficient opportunity for participation in the affairs of men. Mill did not think that within the allotted sphere of marriage and motherhood women had any problems. In the nineteenth century this demand for a larger role within the existing social structure[1] informs much of the liberal wind that blew as far as India.

Another important branch of feminist thinking emerged from the Marxists. Ernest Babel's 'Women and Socialism' appeared in 1879. Marx and Engels shaped socialist perception of society and incidentally helped the socialists form some idea of women's position in society. Engel's 'Origin of the Family, Private

---

1. Geraldine Forbes refers to this as expanding the walls of the house. "Women in Modern India,' The New Cambridge History of India. Cambridge University Press. 1988.

Property and the State' (1884) did not have as much influence at its time of writing. It was much later that feminist scholars in mid twentieth century were to continually revisit Engel's work. Clara Zetkin, Emma Goldman, Alexandra Kollantai, Rosa Luxemburg were socialist revolutionaries who, in later decades, argued within the party that working women's struggle to emancipate themselves was part of the proletarian struggle. Zetkin was instrumental in promoting a vigorous proletarian women's movement in Germany which received the approval of the German Social Democrats as she was careful to dissociate herself from 'bourgeois feminists.' The revolutionary socialist women fought for autonomous space for women within the socialist parties and some, like Rosa Luxembourg and Alexandra Kollantai, also raised the issue of sexual division of labour within the proletarian home. These various ideas on women's emancipation and the history of women's movements would eventually form part of the essential *subject matter* of women's studies.

Throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century and much of the twentieth century this concern with women's condition continued but these early texts were political tracts setting out arguments for why women should get the vote and participate in public affairs or why women should be incorporated in 'social production' or wage labour. These tracts belonged to the 'history' of women's movements and as such would go under political history. Within India too the social reform movements of the nineteenth and early twentieth century felt the need for examining women's condition within their society and brought in reforms. These were action-oriented efforts. In today's understanding these efforts in India were limited and biased towards only the upper castes and a sizeable literature in women studies is devoted to analysing and critiquing these movements as well as recording the notable part played by early feminists here. The struggle against colonialism is part of the history of the Third World where in new questions begin to be asked and one's own national history takes a different contour. In India, the issue of women's emancipation became the touchstone of national liberation in a way unique to the colonised countries. This history in a way made it possible to initiate 'women's studies' more formally in the academe in India, far ahead of many other Third World countries or even a first world country like Japan. This used to surprise many visitors to India. Middle class women's entry into higher education in India was preceded by a struggle for women's education, a struggle that believed strongly in the goal of women's emancipation (whatever the limitation in the content of the goal or its assumptions). The easy passage of setting up women's studies in universities by the reg-

ulatory body of universities is a phenomenon quite unlike the challenges that for instance American women faced.[2]

To go back to the intellectual history of women's studies. The initial texts, as we just said, dealt with arguments for women's rights. It was much later that systematic theoretical explorations into causes of women's oppression from different perspectives both liberal and Marxist emerged. These attempts, we can see, belong properly, to what we may call social theories. It is with these theoretical and conceptual explorations, that we may say women's studies as a distinct area gets launched, though come time elapsed before the launching of academic courses under the rubric 'women's studies.' A major part of women studies scholarship owes its initial debt to 'male' theorists of social phenomena. To really write an authoritative account of the development of women's studies, interpreted expansively as any writing preoccupied with women's condition by way of either causes or solutions, from these early moorings is an unwieldy job of encyclopaedic dimensions which I cannot undertake in this essay. I would therefore, confine myself to developments since the 1960's in the Anglo-American settings, when a special terminological construction called 'women's studies' emerged within the academia.

The women's movement in the US in the 196's emerged along with the Civil Rights movement. In the UK, it was part of labour movements. Women who were active in both civil rights and left movements soon found to their dismay that despite their active involvement they were given little recognition or space within these struggles and felt acutely marginalised. Additionally, highly educated women felt confined with domestic responsibilities with no scope of exercising their talents. Betty Freiden's *Feminine Mystique* (Freiden 1963) was an enormously influential text that spoke directly to a lot of middle class white women in America who were agonising over their exclusion from intellectual and creative activity. Their sense of discrimination led them to discover how little of academic studies really dealt with women's contributions or their experiences. Much of what passed for human knowledge was men's knowledge written from men's point of view. It was then they set up special studies called 'women's studies' to remedy this lacuna. If men did not say much about women

---

2. When I say easy passage I do not mean that there was therfore a whole hearted support from every one. Being pushed from above most universities suffered its presence.

or said the wrong things, well women would undertake the task themselves. They would record and analyse women's experiences, to detect the biases in mainstream disciplines, account for why there was subordination of women. The answer to the fundamental question of why there was such near universal subordination of women would, it was felt, provide the politics necessary for eliminating it. It is therefore not without justification, that women studies was popularly called the 'academic-arm' of the women's movement.

We have come a long way from these early beginnings. Women's studies has proliferated across the globe, has acquired legitimacy, increased in depth and scope and has found a readership and a market in publishing. There has been a steady output of new journals and books. The label has also undergone mutations, from women's studies to feminist studies to gender studies. The Anglo American influences reached other countries too. The United Nations' declaration of an International Women's Year in 1975 and a Women's Decade 1975–85, and the setting up of National Committees to examine the status of women stimulated the growth of women's studies across the globe. Within India, women's studies arrived as a formal genre when the S.N.D.T. Women's University in 1974 set up the first women's studies unit which later became a full fledged centre. The University Grants Commission, under the Chairmanship of Dr. Madhuri Shah, took the decision to support women's studies centres in universities. Over the years, many state universities have women studies centres and scholars. Courses are taught in many universities at different levels. There are many organisations outside the university system that did research, undertook advocacy and participated in the women's movement. There were individual scholars within different disciplines who also 'did' women's studies. When we talk of women's studies, therefore, we often cover all these set-ups that do teaching, research, writing, training, action projects, advocacy and campaigning. Here, however, we take a narrower view of what its contributions to knowledge are drawn from writings during the last half of the twentieth century.

To cover all that women's studies includes would be too gargantuan a task. Having pointed out the intellectual and political origins of women's studies in feminism, I would now confine myself to tracing only the 'academic' contribution of women's studies that entitles it to the status of a discipline. Feminist practice and feminist theory have gone hand in hand and interacted a great deal and so, it is not as if women's studies grew only within academic establishments. A great deal of its inspiration came from the experience of fighting for women's rights and women's emancipation. It is also true, however, that 'feminist' theo-

rising and analysis have often taken directions independent of the movement, and has not necessarily been always tied to the immediate question of political action but has been a part of the general intellectual and critical inquiry into human society.[3]

What qualifies an area of study as a discipline? It has to have a specific set of conceptual intellectual tools, a distinct theoretical vocabulary and certain well defined analytical frameworks. It has to support distinctive methodologies. Its subject matter has to have a well defined scope. There are some ways in which one can look at the formation of the discipline. We can see how women's studies scholarship created new social theories at a macro level of systemic explanations; how it built on or added to existing frameworks; how it modified these frameworks. We can document contributions to specific disciplines either by way of critique offered by women's studies or by way of adding areas of inquiry into specific domains which were previously not considered part of the domain and hence excluded. Specialisation in subjects had created distinctive disciplinary boundaries and these boundaries are held sacrosanct until some one dares to break them or break into them. Women's studies developed unique conceptual and analytical formulations that have slipped so much into common vocabulary that no one today realises where they came from.[4] The academic history of women's studies has not by any means been a smooth evolution. It has passed through a stormy history in terms of shifts in theoretical, philosophical positions not only moving with the times but also facing critiques and challenges from within itself. The Third World has entered into this enterprise with its own

3. Being pushed from above most universities suuffered its presence. While feminists do hold that feminist scholarship is not for scholarship sake and has to have the liberatory goal, this must not be misunderstood as every action has to be backed by a relevant theory or that every theory or inquiry must have an application in practice. Beginners often misconstrue the link between theory and practice in this over simplistic way.

4. When some idea becomes part of common usage, we forget where it came from. I recall an amusing anecdote. It is common in India to mix a lot of English words. A maid who worked with us once proudly declared "What is so difficult about English? They have so many Indian words. We say in marathi matcheese and the in English they say 'matches.' In Chennai, so the story goes: a bridge of pre-independence vintage was named 'Hamilton Bridge' which the locals corrupted as 'Amilton' that progressively got transformed into "Ambattan" which then got retranslated into English as Barber's Bridge. Very likely some one could say women's studies has borrowed what now every one uses!

agenda, its own understandings and perspectives. Today we may not have one unified discipline called women's studies but clusters as in any other discipline, each of which have their privileged sites, positions and subject matter. It is not the content matter that defines what women's studies is but the questions asked and the way those questions are formulated. In that sense, all of human experience is its subject matter. Just as we say all experience has an economic aspect or a political aspect, all experience can have a 'gender' aspect.

Theories of Society and Social Change

Theories of society deal with how society is organised, detect patterns and linkages, explain particular social phenomena, suggest underlying principles, motivations and so on. Women's Studies involvement with theories of society arises out of its concern with finding out why women find themselves in subordinate positions. Major sociological thinkers like Marx, Durkheim and Weber grappled with ideas of social change and what the engine of progress could be in different situations. All of them base their departure in the development of capitalism – its distinctive features, its typical problems, their possible resolution. A key organising principle for all of them was (though their perspective on class conflict and the role of material versus ideological factors varied drastically) was the notion of division of labour as signifying social differentiation and as signifying stages of development of a society. To Marx, it was the division between capitalists (owners of means of production) and wage labourers who did not own means of production but sold their labour, that was the defining feature of capitalism. This class division led to conflicts which were not individual but systemic. The effects of this division was alienation of labour in two ways – technological where each did only a small portion of a product and, secondly, the fact that the worker had no control over the rewards of production. In Durkheim, division of labour becoming complex was merely specialisation. Weber, while not denying the existence of class, does not hold it to be the main structural axis for differentiated division of labour. His emphasis was on rationalism and consequently, the salience of achievement instead of ascription as the hallmark of capitalism and he rejected division of labour as an integral axis of class. What was integral to capitalism, according to him, was bureaucratic specialisation. His famous thesis on puritanism and its link to capitalistic ethics, privileged ideology over material factors. All these Founding Fathers were preoccupied by the need to explain social differentiation. The primary concern of feminists was: why was there social differentiation between men and women and they seized on this key con-

cept of division of labour. The concept of sexual division of labour was the first major step in formulating theories of women's oppression.

Secondly, from social theories they drew the notion of the 'social'. Male and female bodies were different but why should that lead to subordination? According to Durkheim, (Durkheim 1964) social facts are exterior to the individual. Every person is born into society which has already a definite origin and structure which conditions the individual personality. Any *one* individual is a single element within a totality of relations which constitute society. The relations are not the creation of a single individual but are constituted of multiple interactions between individuals. We cannot grasp the specific properties of social phenomena by studying the individual. Exteriority is not empirical by itself but is buttressed by the empirical fact of sanctions that exist to control individual behaviour. When a person becomes a parent, parenthood is a social phenomenon because a parent is obliged by convention and law in various ways to meet defined obligations. Social facts are methodological postulates whose properties cannot be learnt through direct observation but only through apprehending through some kind of functional analysis and historical understanding of how that changed over time. Functional analysis of social phenomena involves establishing a correspondence between the fact under consideration and the general needs of the social organism. Function here does not refer to psychological ends or individual motivations – causes which produce social phenomena are separable from the function they have in society. As one can see much of sociological explanations tend towards a functionalist explanation. Feminists had to confront a major problem. Men and women had different bodies. They had different roles and responsibilities and these were seen as either because 'nature' deemed them to be fit only for these or since that seems an inadequate explanation for a whole array of differences that are discriminations, they are explained in terms of their functional efficacy. Remember the nursery rhyme?[5]

> 'The King was in his counting house, counting out the money
>
> The Queen was in the parlour eating bread and honey'

Feminist theory has had a contradictory approach to functionalism; they have used it as well as contested it but it served as a point of departure. Weber

---

5. Very likely some one could say women's studies has borrowed what now every one uses!

(Weber 1968) on the other hand, preferred to apply what he calls 'interpretative' approach, that is understanding social action not in the sense of an individual subjective meaning to actions but where actions and their meanings are replicable and verifiable and exist across society. There has to a shared convention. An individual rebellion does not become capable of this shared feature. Hence, when some feminists argue that so and so woman rebelled or did something to challenge an established convention, it may speak of a suppressed sense of subjugation that might be shared but the action in itself may be ineffective as 'social action'. To determine causal adequacy, we should be able to determine that there is a probability which may not be numerically stated but is, in some sense, calculable that a given observation or event whether overt or subjective will be followed or accompanied by another event. Thus, in order to demonstrate explanatory significance, there must be an established empirical generalisation which relates the subjective meaning of the act to a specific range of determinable consequences. If any such generalisation however precisely verified lacks adequacy, at the level of meaning, it remains then a mere statistical correlation. To illustrate, say an action, like a particular form of marriage is practised by some persons; it becomes a social fact only when the custom has some meanings shared by everyone. Further, social action implies any sort of human conduct which is meaningfully oriented to the past, present or expected future. A social relation exists when there is reciprocity on the part of two or more individuals each of whom relates his/her actions to the other. It does not mean that meanings shared are identical.

From the above discussion on what is social phenomena, we can locate the basic bricks of theorising about society: notions regarding the social, social phenomenon and social relation. The subordination of women had to be explained through elaborating these three basic bricks. All three founding fathers of sociology (including Marx) were 'positivists' in that they all subscribed to the view that social phenomenon can be studied the way natural scientists study nature; they assumed a social fact or 'reality' independent of the observer. Secondly, all of them had a notion of progressive advance from one stage to another and were powerfully influenced by Darwinism and its concept of evolution. The more complex phenomena necessarily denoted an 'evolutionary' advance. Feminist scholarship picked up these bricks but faced immense difficulty in using them for their purpose. [As a later feminist was to say – to build a new house with the master's tools was self defeating] The basic questions that confronted feminists and for which they sought an explanation at the social structural level were:

- Why does women's subordination run through the whole social structure ?

- Why are women economically less powerful (even if not directly dependent on men)

- Why is sexual division of labour so pervasive and so much to women's disadvantage?

- Why is sexuality so asymmetrical in society?

- Why is the political arena resistant to women?

- Why are there power relations – male dominance – operating within the family and outside?

- Why and how do the state, family, education system, industrial relations, media etc ie, the whole of society reproduce these relations?

What was needed, they thought was an explanation of the *origin, persistence and reproduction* of a system that appeared to disadvantage and oppress women. Initially, they began by trying grand theories like the sociological founding fathers did – to discover *a* cause, the fundamental cause. For this, the concept of 'patriarchy' was lifted from anthropology and expanded to hold a meaning different from its original limited sense.

In nineteenth century anthropology, the notion of patriarchy belonged along with its inverse 'mother right' or matriarchy within competing schemes of universal stages in the evolution of human family and civilisation. From an original matriarchy, it was surmised human beings descended into patriarchy. Briffault (1969) and Bachofen (1967) propounded theses along these lines. By the twentieth century, this notion of an original matriarchy lost its salience and was abandoned by anthropologists. Radcliffe Brown defined matriarchy as a social formation when descent, inheritance, succession are all in the female line and marriage is matrilocal and authority over children is exercised by the mother's relatives. Radcliff Brown according to Uberoi, never addressed the question of sexual asymmetry and was indecisive as to the significance of the concept – did it merely represent a descriptive label or was it taxonomic where all societies can be located in a continuum of matriarchy to patriarchy with degrees of patriarchy? (Uberoi, 1995). Today one refers to kinship-descent categories as patriliny

and matriliny rather than patriarchy and matriarchy. In the 1960's, feminist theorists resurrected this concept but as Uberoi says, extricated it from descent theory. They redefined it as a system of male dominance. Neither history nor anthropology could give clear evidence of a matriarchy in the sense of female dominance but the obverse, that is male dominance seemed pervasive and universal. From the basic conviction that women-men relations related to the social domain and were not nature driven and therefore must have had a history, early theories began hypothesising about the origin of patriarchy, understood as asymmetrical power relations between men and women. To differentiate this relation from anatomical differences they came up with the notion of *gender*. This concept, as the most basic theoretical concept in women studies, was extremely useful in distinguishing the natural from the social. Sex was natural or biological, gender was social and therefore amenable to change. Patriarchy, gender, sexual division of labour were major contributions by feminist scholarship as theoretical categories that had a distinctive use in theorising in women studies. Today these seem common place and are routinely and reflexively, used as social variables in analysis of society.

From here, the feminist theory took a big leap where history, society, culture, psychology were all used to assemble a constitutive cause or causes of 'sexism'. These initial theories were grand theories cast in the universalist mode, applicable to the whole human world. The grand theory conceived of patriarchy as a universal phenomenon. In the process of elaborating these grand theories, divisions occurred among feminists, the materialists and others. In the second category further divisions occurred as between the liberals and radicals. These labels have since stuck to feminist theories though many transformations have taken place from these original formulations and the boundaries have become far more fluid. Within the materialists, marxist feminists differ from socialist feminists. The radical feminist on the other hand fell on biologism to explain patriarchy and regarded gender difference as primary and predating all other differentiation. The basic biological differences between the sexes provide the starting point and any radical transformation can only come from breaking away from heterosexual relations and what they termed sex-gender system [Rubin (1984), Firestone (1979), Millet (1977)]. The liberals spoke in terms of sex stereotypes reproduced by socialisation and the sexual division of labour; of the exclusion of women from education, many creative endeavours and unequal legal and political rights due to discrimination and prejudice – sexism was like racism. A lot of scholarship went into documenting these discriminations in western society. The bulk of women's studies scholarship belong to this theoretical base.

Studies began to be undertaken in literature, psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, philosophy and science, challenging the male bias in these disciplines. (We will come to this a little later). The materialists hitched themselves to marxist theories picking up some critical concepts and re interpreting, redefining them so as to explain 'subordination' and oppression of women. By materialism we mean a philosophy that subscribes to i) the proposition that the origins of all forms of existence including human activity can be explained in terms of physical being and ii) rejecting idealism which holds that only beliefs and ideas underlie reality. Marxist materialism was 'historical materialism' that is, it did not hold that human beings are mere passive reflex of self interest in the common sense notion of some one being 'materialist' but asserts human agency. Historical materialism offers an explanation of how social organisation changed in interaction with material determinants of human life; specifically 'modes of production.' (We leave aside here the controversy whether Marxism was deterministic and held all aspects of social life to be determined by the economic. This is held to be the result of vulgar Marxism and misinterpretation). Materialist feminist theories take a relook at, re-read and revisit Engels who was the first Marxist theoretician to systematically lay out the connection between production, which is processing things from nature to subserve human needs and reproduction which is about how human society reproduces itself.

Within Marxist theory, reproduction is used in three senses – the biological reproduction of the human being through birth, the sustaining of the infant to maturity and the social reproduction of social relations which is all that is involved in making a child enter into and function in society. Engels gave an evolutionary picture of women's status as related to the development of private property and monogamous family (Engels 1978 edition). Private property induced the control of female sexuality through monogamy to ensure that one's own progeny inherited property. Why and how did men come to control property? Feminists were dissatisfied with Marxist theory which said little about the specificity of sexual division of labour though the Marxist theoreticians' greatest contribution was to establish the social character of women's relation to men and therefore, its mutability. However, it emphasised only one aspect of social change, namely production. Women have a different relation to reproduction and production through the sexual division of labour. Their placement in the productive process is affected by their primary responsibility of reproduction-they have to rear children and other adults within the family. The distinctive contribution of feminists lay in postulating that there are relations of reproduction just as there are relations of production. If workers are tied to capitalists in

a particular relation of production where they are vulnerable because they do not own any means of production, the specificity of women's subordination lay in the relations of reproduction – the fact they do unpaid work in the home, they do not have control over their own labour, sexuality and reproductive capacity. This led some materialist-feminists to argue that just as labour produces a surplus for capital, women produce a surplus for men. Some tried to argue that domestic labour was 'functional' to capitalism through the instrumentality of men. The worker was paid only a wage to cover his subsistence; if women did not do unpaid labour at home this wage would have to be more. The solutions offered were varied: wages for housework; or collectivising housework and so women are drawn into paid-production. The position of women in the labour force was that of a 'reserve army' to be drawn in when needed and dispensed with, when not needed. Each woman belonged to the class of the man she married and therefore class separated women from each other and hence in this view, abolition of class society was a pre condition to women's liberation. Thus, while adhering to the main Marxist thesis of class being a primary division in society, they tried to show why women in the working class were subordinated. These were preliminary formulations and were full of over simplifications as it soon became obvious. The socialist feminists, while agreeing that capitalism is exploitative, place gender as important and something that will not go away by mere abolition of private property and class. Gender lay also in the realm of ideology and needed concerted action. Sexual division of labour persisted not because capital found it convenient but because men found it convenient. Hartman and others demonstrated through labour history the role of men in confining women to household labour (Hartman 1981).

Feminist anthropologists had in the mean time, both materialists and non-materialists, been working towards an anthropology of women. Their main conclusions were that women were the main producers of food as gatherers and hunters and not just 'domestics' at any time in history[6] (Reiter 1975). Other anthropologists argued that women were the first property of men and marriage meant exchange of women between women (Strauss-Misseaux). Feminist anthropologists focused instead on the sexual division of labour and the separation between the sphere of the private and the sphere of the public as the most

6. It is amazing that in the Discovery of India permanent exhibition in the Nehru Centre in Bombay, the stone age is depicted as man-the tool maker and producer and woman the tender of the hearth and children! It shows how much this mythology still prevails.

critical ingredient in social differentiation between the sexes. However, what constitutes the public and private differs from epoch to epoch. (Kelly, 1987). Where familial activities coincide with the public-social activities, the status of women tends to be high; where it is sharply differentiated it tends to be low. Early societies had mother-child groups and the domain of the social was pervasive. Women are active producers at all times in history but they lose control as they move up the scale of economic evolution and as private property develops, the communal becomes private. How do women get so identified with the domestic? When private-public division becomes sharp, property becomes distinguished by production for subsistence and production for exchange. Women function as property of men in maintenance-production of new members of the household which are relegated to the kin-family. Inequality of sex as well as class is traced to property relations and forms of work, and the forms of work differentiated by private versus public. According to this argument, control over property or lack of it is not as significant but, regardless of class and ownership of property, women have functioned as the property of men in the procreative and socialising aspect of society – in other words they are the means of reproduction. Similar conclusions are offered by Coontz and Henderson ed. (1986) where a forceful argument is given on how women's work became men's property.

Leacock (1981), in her cross-cultural analysis of several societies explodes the myth of a universal male dominance, but accepts that sexual division of labour is common to all societies. The public- private divide is resonated by others like Zimbalist and Lamphere (1974) and Sanday (1981). Examining many cultures, they find that it is not participation in production that tilts the balance in favour of women, but participation in public and community affairs. What it implies is that while women may have some sort of power over the domestic social processes, what appears to be critical is social power and authority that vest in 'public' sphere. This approach allowed for both diversity and ubiquity, compatible with the idea that the extent of women's oppression is not uniform across societies. However, as critics have pointed out (Fraser & Nicholson ed 1990), this is also a monocausal explanation. They assume that women's activities are basically similar in content and significance across cultures and falsely generalised on what was really a historically specific conjunction of the following properties: women's responsibility for early child rearing; women's tendency to spend more time in the home; women's lesser participation in community affairs; cultural ascription of triviality to domestic work and inferior-

ity to women. Each property may be true of many societies but the conjunction need not be identical in all societies.

More such attempts abound to identify the single cause and its history. Ferguson and Folbre (1981), Hartsock (1983), MacKinnon (1982) talk of women's role as implicated in a different mode of production called sex-affective production (labour of love) which is seen as functionally necessary to society. Others spoke of the 'domestic mode of production' as distinct from men's relation to 'production.' Whether Marxist feminist or Socialist feminist, their analysis privileged the centrality of production and labour and tried to incorporate Marxist categories or extend their meaning to other areas of human life such as reproductive work being production of life; sex as work where men get a surplus and so on. The conceptual tools consisted of working out analogous categories to the existing mainstream ones like: mode of production; surplus and property relation.

Psychoanalytical theories placed their central cause on the formation of the female-male psyche. Chodorow (1978) investigated how mothering is reproduced – a generation of women are reproduced with the psychic predilection to mother. She claims difference are created in gender identity through women's mothering across cultures. She makes three basic assumptions: psychoanalytic notion that every one has a deep sense of self constituted in early childhood through one's interaction with one's primary parent which remains constant; this deep self differs significantly between men and women across all cultures; this deep self colours all of life and everything one does. Juliet Mitchell also uses psychoanalytical theory but winds it around historical materialism (1975). Father right produces a certain kind of psyche—identification of mother with daughter and separation of boy from mother and his identification with father. All psychological analyses tend toward some kind of fixity of psychological categories. In the first two decades we see this attempt at alternate explanations but all project a single primary-cause

The model adopted is positivist. Just as physics, in its early days, tried to get down to the ultimate and fundamental constituent of matter, feminist theory tried to get down to the ultimate 'source' for gender assymetry and treated social phenomena as an external fact.

By the eighties, these 'grand theories' were given up. There were two major reasons for abandoning this preoccupation with first causes and origin questions

that could be applied to all of human race. The blacks in the US and UK posed a frontal assault on these theories for neglecting race altogether and universalising what was only the experience of white middle class American and English women in the Anglo Saxon world. From the Third World, newly liberated from colonialism and engaged in development, came another kind of attack – the first world presumption to theorise for everybody and ignoring the effects of imperialism. There was strong resistance to the picturisation of Third World women as unfortunate victims of backward cultures, victims who lacked consciousness of their oppression and who servilely accepted their fate. Thus, by the late eighties and nineties, some trends became visible: an acceptance of plurality and scepticism regarding a unified category called 'woman' standing for all kinds of women across class, race, caste, ethnicity, region etc. Secondly, concepts like gender, sexual division of labour and patriarchy began to be employed by everyone but with newer and more differentiated meanings in contexts that were very different. Thirdly, development economics brought in new understanding of societies that were not yet fully capitalistic and the pre-existing relations of men and women in these societies became new objects of study. Fourthly, the impact of development on women ushered in a whole range and areas of study, which together, became packaged into a rubric called 'gender-relations.' Further, postmodernism, with its critique of universal truth, linearity of change and a relativist stance put powerful spokes in the wheel of this early theorising to get at fundamental, humanity-wide causes.

Key Concepts: Elaborated and Refined to Serve Multiple Uses

Gender is a theoretical concept and had its origin in western feminist politics. It is used widely today in academic writing, in movement politics and in policy analysis. The extraordinary usefulness of this concept and its versatility for analysis has rendered it the most signal contribution of women studies, not only to women studies, but to all kinds of knowledge domains. Today every text has this subscript 'gender' to specify that whatever is being talked about also includes the question of relations between men and women. It helps to distinguish between what people considered 'natural' or beyond human action and what was primarily a social construction. It drove home the point, that inequality, oppression, subordination between groups – in this case men/women were the creation of society and therefore amenable to social action. Perhaps the ingenuity of this invention does not seem so striking but if we recall how, for centuries, the differential treatment of women in society was always justified on the basis that

'nature ordained it so', we can see how it altered our thinking about men and women.

From a very crude initial statement: sex is biology and gender is socio-cultural we have moved into a more sophisticated statement that gender is an organising principle of division and has many constituent elements such as traits, identity, roles, social relations, symbolic system and ideology. Gender, as a process, affects a whole range of social organisation. It affects all spheres of activity, it structures rewards and penalties, it structures entitlements, and organises distribution of all resources, positions power, authority and level of participation, gives social meaning to male and female and is also a valuation principle.

Gender, as an analytical category, captures a complex set of social processes. As a social process, it is relational. Gender relations is the way most social science analysis use the concept today. Gender relations are both complex as well as unstable processes, constituted by and through inter-related parts. Through gender relations, two types of persons are created: man and woman. One can only be one gender. In women's studies though one speaks of 'gender relations' one speaks mostly of women. Actually there should be three types of social histories – his, hers, and ours. Even today, with so much advance in women studies/gender studies, it is rare for scholars to search for the pervasive effects of gender relations on all aspects of culture. Gender relations entail two types of analyses: i) as a 'thought' category that helps us make sense of particular social worlds and histories as, for example, when we say class and gender ii) as social relations that enter into, and partially constitute all other social relations. We can understand the latter only by close examination of the meanings of male and female and the consequences of being assigned to one or the other gender within concrete social practices. Such meanings and practices vary across culture, age, class, caste, race, ethnicity and time. We cannot read a priori any single determinant in any particular culture.

A major part of feminist theory tries to de-naturalise gender but it has trouble conceptualising what is natural in so far as nature is also a part of human action. Dichotomies like body/mind and nature/culture are in themselves problematic. After all, human beings have many aspects of 'embodiedness' which are peculiar to us, our complex brains, the helplessness of the human infant for longer periods than other mammals. Yet, why is one type of anatomical difference assuming so much significance? Maybe because it has to do with specie survival and

reproduction. As of now, we are able to capture only one or the other aspect of a complex and contradictory set of social relations.

Gender is also an over-arching ideology. Any ideology works through institutions and social practices and tells a person who she or he is, what she or he can do, what claims she or he has on society and particular groups within it and who exercises power where, when and how. Gender is both a social process and a social product and is a dynamic phenomenon, historically constituted and linked to material forces, if not directly determined by them. The study of gender is to unmask this process – to see how it is constructed, re-constructed, how ideologies of gender change, what effect it has on people, what women have done to contest it or reformulate it. Gender is part of social structure and by focusing on how it is created and sustained, we expose the problematic involved, the contradictions within it.

There has been an efflorescence of gender analysis in all aspects: in literature, psychology, in history, in sociology and in economics, politics, philosophy and the creative arts. Did women contribute and, if so, in what way; were their contributions acknowledged; what theories show bias and resistance to incorporating women's needs, experiences; how do ignoring gender affects outcomes and so on. One goes back to historical times to see how gender was constructed, what influences were dominant in that process. We have gender training programmes to make groups aware of how bias operates. Gender awareness has spread world-wide, partly through international development agencies keen to promote gender justice and partly through international feminist movements and networks of scholars, and action groups, through extensive publishing and distributional channels that assist in the flow of ideas. It has percolated into the conscience of the late twentieth century and one enters the twenty first with an awareness that gender matters.

In this essay, I draw from my experience of women's studies in India to illustrate how we have used this concept in academic discourse, in movements and in policy debates.

a) Some have undertaken historical analysis of ancient texts like Manusmriti, the epics and various reform movements, colonialism etc to interpret how gender was 'constructed;' the impact of the ideas of those times on men and women, what their roles should be, what qualities were ascribed to each gender and what qualities were esteemed. For instance, the

misogynic utterances and prescriptions of virtue extolling chastity and loyalty to husbands were identified. Dissenting voices were located too. Examples of protest and assertion were extracted. Linkages were drawn with the prevailing economic organisation. Some examples of these approaches are found in the following: Bhattacharya (1991), Krishnan (1990), Sangari (1995), Ray (1992), Karve (1974).

b) Studies of regional variations in marriage forms, descent structure, cultural practices have yielded a better understanding of not only our own diversity, but demonstrated the linkage between kinship-mariage systems to women's status, giving some meat to the Engelian thesis. The tie-up between kinship, property and gender became clear. It is in this kind of exploration of societies in the South, that the limitedness of western feminist theorising became apparent. We now know, almost as a truism, that there is a big cultural divide between the Indo-Gangetic plain and the region south of the Vindhyas. Cross cousin marriages, more bilateral relations between bride givers and bride takers, economic participation of women and the influence of social reform movements have made for a different configuration of gender relation in the South. Matrilineal communities of North-East and South-West tell us something of alternate systems and their effect on women's status, autonomy and agency. Tiplut (1988), Dube (1993), Saradamoni (1992), Ganesh (1994).

c) Kinship studies now pay more attention to gender and detailed field work has unravelled their contours. We no longer think of gender as merely that of relations between only men and women but as mediated by a woman's or man's kinship position, (mother-in-law, father-in-law, sisters-in-law, brothers-in-law, uncle, unmarried daughter, son, married daughter and so on mediated also by age and the various rights and obligations attached to these statuses. (Dube) 1988, Palriwala and Risseeuw (1996), Ganesh (1994), and Uberoi (1994, 1995). These were notable departures from a unitary concept of gender.

d) As caste is a category that impinges on social life in significant ways, Indian theorising sought to integrate the interaction of caste and gender. Gender is now seen as a constitutive element of class and caste. Caste maintenance requires control of women's sexuality and purity. The experience of gender varies by class. Class, caste, ethnicity are not boxes but their formation is processed through gender. For example ethnic

identity usually requires women to act traditionally with associated values of gender relations in terms of dress codes, chastity, mobility and domesticity. Notions of correct behaviour get inscribed strongly for men and women. Analyses linking social practices of different castes for example in the treatment of widowhood, with female labour deployment in production and reproduction and their function for caste boundaries, are good uses of historical materialism. So too are how household configurations emerged in ancient times and modern times and their implications for caste. Chakravarty 1995, Sarkar, Sangari 1995, Desai 1998, Tharu 1994 are some well known examples.

e) Many studies explore, document women's protests, rebellions, modes of asserting their will within patriarchy in different periods of history – the Bhakti movement, peoples' struggles, reform movements. They stress that patriarchy was not an uncontested social formation either historically or in the present. Kosambi (1997), 2000, Bhagwat (1995), Stree Shakti Sanghatna (1989), Sen (1990), Chakravarty (1998) Nathan, Kelkar and Xiagang (1998) are instances of this approach. The literature on the contemporary women's movement is vast. It is not covered here because that is not the focus of this essay. We are seeking to trace the progressive theorisation in our context rather than write the history of women's movements. Contestation of prevalent gender constructions also took other forms. There was, here, an attempt to unearth alternate models in Indian culture such as other than the dominant pativrata model the Virangana or the Ascetic. (Hansen 2000, Ojha 2000).

f) Investigation into how, during periods of social change, gender is 'reconstructed' like during national movements, partition or social reform, more recent economic liberalisation, have been much in evidence. Sangari and Vaid ed, *Recasting Women* (1989) has become a classic and trend-setter for similar works. Some explore colonia Bengal, others deal with the south, and some studies portray North India focussing on reformulation of the household, the family, economic relations and the concomitant shifts in gender ideology that acccompanied these processes. Such reconstruction in the period of social reform and nationalism appeared to have set models for modern India. Bagchi (2000), Chatterjee (1989), Bhutalia (1998) and Lakshmi (1997).

g) Contribution of women to the many arts is another field of inquiry. Also how women are portrayed in different arts, in the media etc. These

writings and studies document and analyse 'representation.' What they demonstrate is really how gender construction is an on going process and is intimately connected to the economic processes unleashed for 'development.'

h) There has emerged a vast literature on women's work participation. By far, this is the most numerous of research efforts. Primarily, they depict the outcome of economic development of the last fifty years. The opening up of a how household, distributes resources, engineers discriminations in entitlements fill pages of academic work. The list would be too numerous to cite here. Jain and Banerjee (1985) is the first study in this genre. What these efforts provoked was a re-examination of our concept of 'family' in economics, politics and sociology to demonstrate its gender discriminatory character.

i) Most recently, an engagement with domestic violence against women, violent crimes against women (rape, dowry deaths and harassment, sexual harassment, prostitution of women and minor girls, trafficking) has led to questions of how sexuality is constructed by gender and how laws and their implementation are informed not just by biases and ideological blinkers, but rooted in a certain construction of the female body. John and Nair (1998), Thapan (1995), Das (1996) have in their analysis, brought in the importance of body-politics and our earlier overwhelming emphasis on economic determinants, has now given way to probing deeper structures of gender formation in psychological-physical manifestations. We are moving closer to, if not totally merging with the early radical feminists who held that sexual-politics is fundamental. The examination of sexuality is bringing forth a whole new array of questions and puzzles; our simplistic division of the 'natural' and 'social' crumbles in the face of this new understanding that such a dichotomy is not helpful; the two mesh in ways that are very complicated. Our overtly focus on 'feminity' has obscured the influence of the construction of masculinity as a counterposed identity where sexual-domination of the female seems to be an important ingredient. The spate of crimes against women that have a sexual texture are on the increase. The court processes give clues to this underlying misogyny.

j) Lastly, development studies have brought to the fore the unequal effects of development and the inherent gender bias in policy and in development

theory. The state influences how women are viewed in society in various ways-through legislation, in the way public institutions are run and through social and economic policies. (This literature is too vast to cite.) Indicators have been developed that reflect development of women like the UNDP's gender development index, gender empowerment index in addition to human development index. The destruction of environment in the race for 'development,' displacement of large masses of people of whom women are a significant number in the Third World has generated 'eco-feminism' which argues women have a special relation to nature and conservation. Along with environmentalists and socialists the most stringent critique of development as modeled today has come from feminists who oppose militarism, environmental destruction and consumerism.

Patriarchy has, over time, particularly in the Third World, acquired a different and more muted meaning as something that is not a closed system or the outcome of any single cause but is mediated by many factors; it varies in intensity in different settings. It accommodates to new situations by re-inscribing old forms in new ways or gets loosened by other forces and is thus a contradictory, often irrational, disfunctional social phenomenon. We speak of 'patriarchies' and no longer as 'the patriarchy.' Some wonder whether it has outlived its usefulness as a concept but it is still retained in its adjectival form – 'patriarchal.' As a social formation, we use it to refer to the ideological over tones in a social cultural setting and its practices that show sexism and male power.

Sexual division of labour has been found to be a most useful concept to examine the way an economy works and is today most employed by economists working on women's issues. It depicts not just a physical division, but carries with it a set of valuations that result in unequal access to social and household resources, unequal rewards for contributions.

New Intellectual Winds: Influence of Post-Modernism

Postmodernism[7] is a reaction to enlightenment beliefs of our understanding of the world and ourselves. It throws doubt on the following ideas and beliefs of enlightenment:

---

7. The main founding authors of post modernism are: Michel Foucalt, Jacques Derrida and Jacques Lacan.

that there exists a stable and coherent self – the speaking 'I' which is capable of, through reason, to have insight into its own processes as well as laws of nature,

- that reason based science can give us a reliable and universal foundation for knowledge; a knowledge that will represent something real and unchanging about our minds and the structure of the natural world. Science is the paradigm for all true knowledge,

- reason exists independent of the self's contingent existence – that is regardless of bodily, historical, social experience of a person,

- reason is the right arbitrator of truth and it can overcome conflicts between truth, knowledge and power,

- language represents the correspondence between words and things.

These challenges imply that there can be no universal truth; that the self is really a fragmented self. For feminism, this meant that the unified category 'woman' is suspect and we have to account for differences among women. Previous attempts to propound a theory of oppression is unviable as women in different groups have different social experiences and relate to one another various ways. The effect of postmodernism was to reject 'structure' as a given. All feminist theories hitherto took for granted the existence of a structure (patriarchy) which generates inequalities. If we reject this notion then, what is possible is to make sense of the 'discourse' in particular contexts. A discourse is a group of statements that belong to a single system of formations as when we say – legal discourse, scientific discourse and so on. According to the post modernist, gender relations are 'discursively' produced. If we wish to see for instance how there is gender bias in law, we 'read' the discourse of lawyers, judges, courts. Postmodernism and discourse analysis took root first in literature and has spread to other disciplines. Language, according to postmodernism, does not represent real things out there but constructs meanings.

In the last two decades, discourse analysis has caught on. There are many who now speak of 'colonial' discourse with regard to any matter – be it prostitution, women's work, religion or whatever. Colonial texts are unraveled to extract meaning and the 'post colonial subject' is found to be so inundated with orientalism of the colonial masters, a lot of discourse analysis by culture studies is attempted to extricate the subject from this fate! Whether it is art or theatre 'discourse' is the buzz word. We understand that not all women were submissive

to patriarchy. We, by 'reading' Draupadi's stance in the Mahabharata, or 'reading' Sita's response declare that the object of patriarchal subjection is a subject in herself who had some agency. To be a subject means one can interpret and act upon a situation. Subjectivity in postmodernism is not detected by signs of overt action but is a matter of text and meanings. Nationalist discourse is analysed to show how womanhood was constructed by casting the nation as 'mother.' Post modernism has been enthusiastically adopted by many scholars in India to emphasise 'difference'- caste or tribals – and if we speak on their behalf we are indulging in hegemonic discourse. A standard criticism against post modernism is that it is relativistic and paralyses collective action. Their reply is that solidarity cannot be taken for granted but must be worked out, negotiated between different groups. As Michele Barrett, a materialist-feminist theoretician states, "We do not need better theories to legitimate political practice. Debates about ideology, subjectivity show that we need a better conception of agency and identity than are available as either anti-humanist post-structural thought or humanist modern thought.' (Barrett 1980). Postmodernism gets stumped when it comes to formulating a strategy of collective action in the light of a theoretical understanding of the situation. If we perceive power as diffused throughout society to whom do we address our protest?

In the west, post-structuralism has dealt a severe blow to both liberal and Marxist thought and, as a result, feminism has lost its votaries there within social sciences and nestles more comfortably within literature and the humanities. In the Third World, though elite institutions have followed this intellectual trend, the bulk of women's studies is still rooted in social sciences and is strongly empirical and action-oriented. Problems of poverty, and violence cry for redress. They cannot wait for deconstructionist indulgences that appear to abdicate altogether the goal of systematic knowledge. One fall out of postmodernism which can be regarded as a positive gain is the movement away from 'grand theories' that postulate ultimate, single causes. There has been an increasing focus instead on local studies to grapple with the complex interplay of sex, race, class. Nonetheless, I argue that if we have only contextualised analyses without some kind of underlying connection between these localised phenomena, we would fail to make any sense of the social configuration and its logic, let alone mount any sustained protest. In this age of global capitalism we cannot, for instance, merely talk of what happens in Zimbabwe or Bangladesh for, even though the actual outcome may differ due to cultural and social specificity, the logic of capitalism has an underlying unity of purpose. Likewise, unless we also have a common vision of where humanity wishes to go, our goals

will be dilute, diffuse. Fortunately, international movements, with their concern for the destruction of our planet earth's finite resources with 'infinite' demands and the deep anguish at the inequalities that confine large masses of humanity to live less than human lives, are beginning to grasp this need for a common vision, a vision that would be liberatory.

The notion of a given, fixed, female identity is more tenuous now. This helps, in a way, to reformulate more acceptable components of gender identity. The greatest disadvantage of postmodernism is that social criticism has broken free of any philosophical mooring and has become ad hoc, pragmatic, contextual. This is unfortunate because we cannot dispense with the need for transvaluation of values. It is true that we may have to re-think our ideas about what is humanly excellent but cannot give up the notion outright.. After all, purely local preoccupations cannot produce those broader loyalties that are the mark of more mature civilisations. Neither can we do away with the notion of 'imagined communities' if we have to work out collaborations across divisive boundaries and recognise the links between them through their various histories. Histories of struggles of The Third World women against racism, colonialism, imperialism and monopoly capital, bind them in some common interests even as class and caste or ethnicity may divide them. As Mohanty et al (1991) states, unlike the post modernist negativity with respect to notions of agency and consciousness that splinters the subject and privileges multiplicity in the abstract, we can work with a different notion of agency which is born of history and geography and which prepares us for theorising the materiality and politics of everyday struggles. The coherence of politics and action can only emerge from a sociality but what we need to recognise, is that in today's context this sociality itself has to be re-thought out, and categories like self or collective have to be redefined from the imperatives of daily practice and survival. The category of woman is constructed in a variety of political contexts existing simultaneously and overlaid one on top of another in a messy way but nonetheless an imagined community of women is useful (Akerkar 1995). From an inquiry into causes of women's subordination, women's studies/feminist studies have progressively moved to articulating a more fundamental philosophical critique of gendered society be it on environmental issues, or developmental goals. It has challenged the bases on which all social differentiation rest. Women are indeed the last revolution.

Women's Studies and Academic Disciplines

Disciplines are domains of inquiry that share objects of study, problems for

investigation, values, terms, concepts, methods and assumptions, governed by a general set of rules and categories guiding the pursuit of knowledge. Many feminist scholars are trained in one or the other of academic disciplines and work within their disciplines. Within its own limits, each discipline, recognises true or false propositions. What feminist scholars have done is to push back the acknowledged territory of a discipline beyond its conventional borders. This has resulted in a process of destabilising the informal boundaries between disciplines. Anthropology, cultural anthropology, sociology, economics, politics, social pychology have been drawn upon in varying ways. The form this has taken is to open up new and substantive topics (for example, the issue of dowry in economic analysis) where they were hitherto considered outside the discipline. Real inter-disciplinarity implies not simply the use of more than one discipline to solve a problem or analyse an issue but also the integration of disciplines to create a *new epistemology*, to rebuild the prevailing structure of knowledge by creating new organising concepts, methodologies, skills and a reciprocal assimilation of disciplines. We have not arrived there yet. As pointed out earlier, certain core concepts like gender, patriarchy, sexual division of labour have been accommodated in many disciplines; sociological terms and descriptions, anthropological terms and cross cultural perspectives, economic analysis etc have found a berth within women studies in significant ways but not totally integrated into a 'new discipline' in the sense of a discipline as outlined above. Most of all, its destabilising effect on most disciplines lies in its critique of the androcentric theoretical foundations in all disciplines in so far as all of them were founded by men. Academic disciplines are found guilty of the following:

- Taking what applies to males as equally applicable to females.

- Make 'Man' stand for human disregarding 'woman.'

- Recording the experiences of men only.

- Regarding the experiences of men as more important.

- If including women, to do so from the point of view of men.

- Women not having had a chance to build theories.

In other words, omission, bias, distortion in the representation of social reality characterises existing disciplines.

In a single paper, one can neither deal with all disciplines nor examine each in detail. I propose, therefore, to point out the major departures that have given us a better understanding of society. We take up social sciences like anthropology, sociology, economics, politics and psychology and among the humanities, history and touch upon literature very briefly. Finally, we take note of some important methodological departures that spring from epistemological dissent.

Anthropology has had a significant influence on women studies because its cross-cultural studies yield material for verifying whether general propositions of universal women's oppression are true; if some societies are better at according status to women, to identify factors that contribute to 'better' status. Peggy Sanday, Eleanor Leacock, Shirley Ardner, Raina Reiter, Leela Dube are some well known contributors who have enriched our knowledge of gender in different cultures and have given us not merely a perspective but some conceptual categories. Various factors that have been identified are: systems of marriage (monogamy, polygamy, polyandry) and inheritance (male or female line); economic participation of women, distinction between private and public, symbolic articulation of the relative importance of male-female contribution to reproduction. Sanday(1981) seeks to answer why there is a power difference between men and women. Why is it that in some societies women seem to play a more prominent role than in others. She notes that some clothe sacred symbols of creative power in the guise of female while others do so as male. Where the forces of nature are sacralised, according to her, there is a reciprocal flow between the power of nature and the power of women. The control and manipulation of these forces are left to women. The mother goddess symbolism of early societies can be explained in this association of the sacred with feminine power. Environment, the type of human subsistence activities and sex difference provide the clue to shaping peoples' conception of creative power and their orientation to nature. Sexual division of labour is formed by peoples' adaptation to their environment in pursuing the necessities of life. This, in turn, leads to a cultural configuration giving rise to masculine or feminine creators, an inner or outer orientation. Where there is inner orientation (subsistence production) there is female control of goods, group decision making. In outer societies (extended production) female secular power is dependent on practical circumstances giving women access to scarce resources or giving them a role in ritual. Male and female power rules are cast when people forge their sense of 'peoplehood' which implies a shared sexual code of behaviour, not only in relation to each other but also in relation to valued scarce resources. Sanday argues that there is a link between religious thought and degree of female power.

Others have expounded the symbolic representation of reproduction as enforc-
ing relative male-female power. For example Dube (1986) shows how the notion
of the human male as the seed giver and woman as the soil, buttresses the male
as the 'active' fundamental principle and woman as mere receptacle and passive
element in Indian thought. Patriliny carries the idea further. Caste purity is strict
on female chastity but loose on male morality. Kinship studies of anthropology
by Palriwala, Ganesh, Risseuw, Uberoi (already referred to) in India have given
us valuable insights on how gender works within kinship by examining on the
ground social practices regarding sharing of woman's labour between natal
home and conjugal home, reciprocity in gift giving and women's status and
membership in the two settings – natal and conjugal. All these determine the
degree of woman's power and autonomy. Work on Kerala by Saradamoni dem-
onstrates the process by which matriliny disintegrated. Under the influence of
colonialism and the rise of new professions, gender relations underwent change.
She captures this by drawing on several sources and combining different meth-
ods. The anthropological categories are now integrated in any economic analysis
of the 'domestic' economy or household. Economic analysis is willing to incor-
porate the findings of anthropology and admit the play of 'ideology' and culture
in sexual division of labour or distribution of social product. Most western theo-
rists devote their analysis mostly to advanced capitalist societies and had little to
say of societies that were in transition and retained considerable 'pre capitalistic'
features. Feminist anthropology's contribution was to bring to light what were
salient in societies other than the West.

Sociology has undergone a transformation too in the areas of study and in
interpretation of existing social phenomena through challenges posed by women
studies. Some of its basic theoretical formulations, particularly in family studies,
stand discredited. The 'family' stood for the nuclear family of advanced capital-
ist societies. Father-Mother-Children is the prototype used even in India which
has many different forms of family. Sociologists in India were, of course, aware
of other forms but were obsessed with joint family/nuclear family types and
were concerned with how one identifies one or the other when families undergo
changes over a life cycle. (Desai1998). Secondly, to women studies we owe the
criticality of the distinction between household which refers to residence and
family which is a matter of membership which is culturally sanctioned with obli-
gations and rights, whether the members stayed together or not. This has consid-
erably advanced our analysis of gender relations. (Krishnaraj 1989). It is
through their commitment to the concept of the family that people are recruited
to the household and enter into material relations of production and consump-

tion; they marry, beget children, work to support dependents, accumulate, transmit and inherit cultural and material resources. Decisions of members of a household or family are not individual. They also affect the collectivity of the unit but the experiences of women are different because of their differential location within it. Women's location within the household extends to their placement in the wider society. Their subordination is reflected in inferior access to many social resources. Like wise, a woman's placement in the wider society shapes her fate within households/families - whether she lives in urban or rural settings, whichever caste, community she belongs. Within India there are now more studies of the interconnection between caste and gender. Tharu, Chakravarty (op cit) demonstrates how gender constructs caste and how caste constructs gender in a two way process. In the West, class and ethnicity are now domains of explorations for gender. Black women in the Anglo-American World have spelt out their version of gender experience within a racist context.

This perspective reversed the popular notion that the 'family' was a haven, was harmonious and whatever rights and obligations existed within it for members, were equal or equitable. Women studies drew accurate pictures of family life showing its contradictory faces-repressive, gender inequities and yet a support system. The support provided was premised on the condition of accepting the inequality. The troubling question of why women put up with so much oppression is partly answered by the realisation that not to do so invites such heavy penalties that women hesitate to rebel. Only a broader social movement can challenge the system. Domestic violence which was never acknowledged were made a public issue. Wife-beating sanctioned by custom was challenged. The myth of sex roles being 'complementary' and equal, was exploded and the hierarchical nature of sex roles and sexual division of labour was documented from many parts of the world. Sociological revelations of how gender socialisation takes place have led to attempts at educational reform and creation of alternate models.

Feminists have criticised Marxist sociology for not extending economic concepts to relations of production embedded in intimate, personal, affectionate relations. The Marxists saw the world of material relations of social production and domestic economy as unconnected where gender division of labour was only ideological. Feminist scholarship drew out the material relations deeply embedded in the sphere of the family. Women studies scholars of Marxist orientation showed how the labour market was not gender neutral; in fact, economists ignored women wage workers in their analysis of wage determination. Social

reproduction in Marxism takes account of only reproduction of the labour force but failed to theorise the reproduction of gender subordination. Linkages could be established with class and other hierarchies through such factors as control over property and women's labour, mechanisms of appropriation and transmission of the social surplus and the ongoing system of production. The mechanism of transmission includes systems of inheritance through kinship in addition to the distribution of the social product between land owners and tenants, capitalists and workers. Reproductive relations involve control over women's ability to bear children. Thus control over women's labour, child bearing and sexuality are interlocked in particular class, caste and other configurations of subordination.

As educated women began to seek employment outside the home, particularly in the professions, a genre of studies that talked of 'role' conflict emerged within sociology. Talcot Parsons propounded the theory that women's domestic role and men's earning role were complementary and functional—the man assumed the instrumental role and the woman the affective role. This functional separation was conducive to the structure of capitalism (Parsons 1954). Feminists exposed the limitations of the structural-functional theory. Initially, sociologists presented the problematic for employed women as the difficulty of reconciling a new function which is employment, with a given social role namely, domestic responsibilities and expectations that went with those responsibilities. However, these theories take the roles as given and cannot integrate macro changes. The presence of role conflict indicates a fact, it does not offer any explanation of why different sex roles produce subordination. (Krishnaraj 1986).

Economics in theory and practice have influenced policies and outcomes in a major way. For many decades, research on women's labour market participation got involved with questions like why it went up or down; documented discrimination in valuation of women's work by arbitrary criterion with no basis on any objective criteria like skill level or arduousness. There was no logical explanation for unequal wages for equal work . This resulted in legal reform of 'equal' pay for 'equal' work. However, many fundamental problems remained like the sexual segregation of labour so that there were women's jobs and men's jobs. In The Third World, the problems were compounded by the existence of large areas of the economy which had no wage labour. Many national level statistics left out women's economic activity because they used the definition applicable to advanced economies that 'economic activity' meant only those activities that created exchange value. What was produced for one's own consumption or needs

could not figure in this calculation. In economies that undertook productive activities in the non-monetised sector, this led to gross distortions especially for women who tended to be hidden under the ideological blinker of 'domestic' work. There thus emerged considerable literature on this aspect of under counting and under valuation of women's work. (Krishnaraj 1990 and Agarwal 1985).

Four main reasons were given for this deficiency: a) work is defined only that which obtains exchange value b) women's domestic work is perceived as having no value c) much of women's work tends to be within the household/family and is invisible d) apart from what is generally accepted as domestic work, women in rural economies do a lot of 'productive work' which covers collection of free goods, care of cattle and other livestock, repair and maintenance of dwellings, processing of harvested produce etc. which in other advanced economies are marketed. The highlighting of this anomaly spurred efforts to include these in GNP and in labour statistics. (Waring 1988, Goldschmidt 1987) The second big change came with the unpacking of the household to expose the unequal distribution of resources within it by gender, in terms of nutrition, health care, education, public participation and unequal property rights and access to productive means. Decisions regarding many areas are controlled by the household-collectivity which is gender-biased like in family planning, migration, schooling, marriage and so on. As already mentioned, the rigidity and obligatory nature of sexual division of labour had consequences for gender relations in almost all areas of social life and had far reaching policy implications for development planning.

There is the assumption of the individual economic agent in the household. Since the househdld is a collective, economics can conceive of it in one of the following ways: as glued together; or as a despotic head deciding for everyone; or as a happy consensus. (Sen 1983, 1990) whereas household dynamics point to a more complicated and contradictory process of both conflict and cooperation.

Prices, wages, costs are assumed to be gender neutral whereas they are, in reality, gender specific. Theory behaves as if the market was non discriminatory. In current environment debates, we see how different resources are used by men and women; how costs are different. When forests are destroyed, women bear the costs as their subsistence activities depend on them. When girls are sent to schools, mothers bear the cost of losing help at home. Examples can be multiplied by the irrationality of concepts like costs, efficiency that exclude many types of human costs, and loss of natural resources.

Women's studies and feminist sensibilities have made tremendous contribution in tracing the gender outcomes of development policies, in the gender short sightedness of development theory which has a unifocal obsession with economic growth. It is to their credit that UNDP woke up to measure development in terms of human development and gender equality and women's empowerment. The advances made in women's studies have found supporters among the male cognocenti like Amartya Sen where, in his recent work on Development as Freedom, he links women's agency as an important constituent of development. (Sen, 1999)

A more fundamental critique of neo-classical economics theory pertains to its assumption of rationality and the 'economic' man who is driven to maximise satisfaction. This excludes social influences and actions which may be altruistic. An international body has been formed for promoting feminist economics and a Feminist Economics journal has arrived on the scene. Critics of economics theory now find place in books (Krishnaraj and Joy 1993, Pujol, 1992).

Some attempts at reformulating theory through the use of institutional economics and new home economics have been made. This is discussed in the booklet *Feminist Approaches to Economic Theory* by this author (Krishnaraj 1995). Beker proposed a bargaining model whereby the family can be treated like a two-person enterprise and alternative options to do domestic work or paid employment are 'bargained' by maximising total utility. Feminists pointed out that this assumed 'choice' was available to women; it also portrayed a static picture. If women choose to stay at home, they not only forego present opportunities of paid labour but future ones through loss of skills and contacts. Sen (1990) improved this model by bringing the notion of a fall-back position. A choice by a woman is constrained by what she can get if she quits the household altogether; her bargaining position depends on what threat she can pose to the other bargainer. The threat point is heavily weighted against women by social cultural sanctions for 'single' woman as well as absence of support systems. The outcomes of bargaining are crucially dependent on rules posited about how negotiators actually interact and these rules are arbitrary.

Thanks to these efforts, we have a better understanding of the processes that distribute resources both material and ideological – within the family by age and gender. One can specify the incomes earned by different members; their entitlements to productive means for producing these incomes (example, education, capital, skill, technology etc); their contribution to the common pool; their

appropriation of a portion of the income earned for personal purposes; the share of resources of consumption from the common pool to each member. Women and girls come out in this process with less entitlements. A part of the problem of the household dynamics is the perception of women themselves of their lesser importance; their undervaluation of their own contribution. They are afraid to exercise the threat point as they identify their own welfare totally with the welfare of the family.

Thus, economics has come grudgingly to accept the role of culture and society in what was seen as the boundary lines of economics. Sen, in his many works, has been instrumental in promoting the legitimacy of this development through the enormous academic prestige he has. His bringing back morality and ethics in social theorising holds great promise for gender integration in economics.

In politics and political theory, women studies scholars have shown the shortcomings of conventional theories of citizenship. They have analysed the relation of state to gender construction. They have documented the relative participation of women in political struggles and in political activity apart from formal elected positions. They have lobbied for greater share of political representation to women. These efforts by women have borne fruit in some ways but are also resisted by male hegemonic pressures. Women Studies has drawn attention to social and institutional factors that impede participation of women and argue for a variety of forms of citizenship in national political life. Citizenship should primarily function as a term that reminds us that we are not merely private individuals but participants in a shared national life, members who have a collective as well as individual stake in the decency and humanness of our public arrangements. There is a reciprocal relationship between the citizen community and the individual citizen rights and these rights require a supportive political culture (Narayan 1997). While these are what feminists would like to see happening they have no clear cut theory of citizenship. Liberal theory has clear cut formulations though their assumptions are indeed questionable. There are five basic tenets in the liberal theory of citizenship:

a) it regards human beings as atomistic, rational agents whose existence and interests are ontologically prior to society,

b) society should ensure the freedom of all its members to realise their capabilities,

c) the ultimate worth of an individual is expressed in freedom where the
   individual can act unobstructed by others,

d) there is a clear separation between the private and public,

e) the individual is rational and competitive in maximising his gain.

Feminist criticism has pointed out that this formulation is riddled with contra-
dictions. On the one hand there is the notion of 'autonomy' which carries within
it an idea of subject-hood and agency; there is also the notion of private which
means freedom from control by the state (Davis 1997). The problem is the
assumption that all members within the private sphere have agency, when it is
free from state control. In India discussions on uniform civil code, reservations
etc show that the defence of the 'private' really amounts to men being free to
exercise their power within the family. Disillusionment with competitive capital-
ism and liberal double speak leads some to espouse 'communitarinism' as an
alternative ideal. Feminists contend that the ideal of the community privileges
unity over difference. The individual in liberalism is a self that is solid, self suf-
ficient unit, not defined by or in need of anything other than itself. In the notion
of the community, on the other hand, there is fusion of the self with other selves,
a sharing of subjectivities and a sympathetic understanding of each other. How-
ever, there is a lack of opaqueness. Young (1990), points out that there is here a
notion that face to face interaction eliminates 'alienation' produced by imper-
sonal intermediaries mediating one's experiences in modern society. If by alien-
ation we mean a situation in which persons do not have control either over their
actions or the conditions of their actions, due to the intervention of other agents,
then the community also 'mediates' though it may be face to face. The whole
politics of identity which extols 'the community' suppresses difference within it,
especially gender difference. (Krishnaraj 1998). Current debates in India on dis-
cussions about the women's representation bill and the experience of panchayati
raj have regularly appeared in journals and newspapers. Similarly, debates about
different interests of dalit women, lower caste women, and women belonging to
religious minorities, have raised questions about the kind of politics that will
ensure justice and voice to these groups. These debates have pressed the need for
fundamental re-thinking on several fronts, that of rights of individuals and
groups, of citizenship, of polity, of democracy and of notions of justice.

History is another area where feminist critique and scholarship have impacted
on historiography. History is the past record of peoples' experiences. What is

accepted as history is what is preserved in stone, drawings, writings or other artifacts and the rest is confined to pre-history for which one falls back on fossil evidence. Yet, such confident assertions are made about gender relations in those bygone ages which duplicate contemporary pictures like the cave-man being the hunter responsible for all food while the cave-woman merely cooked and reared children. (Even the Discovery of India exhibition in Nehru Centre, Mumbai, has an installation which propagates this view).

The critique of conventional history writing draws attention to the following faults:

a) it invisibilised women and behaved as though women did not exist,

b) ignored their contributions,

c) if mentioned; did so in a biased way,

d) if included, did so by selective presentation of elite women as it generally focused on elite classes,

e) inordinate emphasis on events and discrete occurrences like wars and invasions than socio-historical processes. How peoples' lives changed, how new traditions came to be established in many fields of endeavour, and how new groups emerged are submerged in this kind of history.

History writing changed by bringing a focus on women. It did so by filling in women's contributions; by tracing historical changes in the condition of women; by questioning periodisation; by reinterpretation; by questioning the selectivity of sources used; by adding issues and areas not included as proper material for history. Thus, feminist history writing covered women's collective struggles in the past; effects of major historical changes on women like the industrial revolution, social reform, wars, birth control, migration and changes in codes of behaviour. Women historians showed how women were economic and political agents as much as victims; they used new material sources like autobiographies of women, diaries, oral histories as testimonies or documentation of individual lives, and folklore as records of peoples' for views and metaphors of gender construction. They read between the lines those messages hidden in women's writings. In the USA, stories of frontier women's experiences, of black women under slavery became better recorded. In UK, working class women's lives

found space in history. Significant movements like birth control were studied more carefully. The burning of women declared as witches in medieval Europe was linked to male attempts at hegemony in medical practice. Midwives, who had handled childbirths, were displaced by male gynecologists. Women's organisations previously not a subject matter became an important area of study. Not only a more nuanced version of women's lives but also reading events from women's point of view yielded a better history. (Krishnaraj 1999)

In terms of histriography in India, Uma Chakravarty and Kumkum Roy have done pioneering work to correct the popular impression that the status of women in ancient India was high. They looked at the evidence used and concluded that only some stray facts were used which told us little about the majority of women who were *dasis* (Chakravarty and Roy, 1988). Others have analysed epics and other literature to establish the patriarchal overtones in all of them, the exclusion of women from public life and the use of women as 'commodities.' The moral disapproval of sacred prostitution by middle class intellectuals had failed to distinguish between sacralised version and the modern brothel. Feminist historical studies on *devadasis* and the debates for their abolition by different sections removed the 'moral' overtones and investigated it as a social phenomenon. Women in these occupations were highly accomplished in the fine arts and had property rights though they had to serve their patrons. Similarly, feminist studies analysed the value changes in many cultural activities which became vulgarised under a decadent feudalism e.g. the 'lawani' in Maharashtra. (Rege, 1995). The social history of ideas regarding gender during colonial times has engaged many scholars of history in recent times. The caste/class nexus and their connection to practices like the treatment of widows is illustrated by Chakravarty (1995).

A new preoccupation with cultural studies along post modernist lines dissociates culture from material conditions and veers dangerously close to cultural relativism. They claim that 'modernity' is a colonial construct that makes us see our culture through western eyes. We must see 'our culture' on our own terms. Nationalism, according to them, was the creation of colonial sensibility. These claims are problematic. It denies any criteria by which we can evaluate what is 'good'. Feminists are unhappy with this trend though some among them subscribe to it. The defence of culture, more or less means pulling the rug of gender from under your feet and justifying practices which in today's context are not defensible – like sati or dowry or confinement of women under purdah.

Coming to psychology, feminist scholarship developed more in the west. Beginning with the criticism of Freud's views on women they have moved to

creating new parameters for judging mental health. Work in India has begun only recently in looking at theories.

Penis envy and castration complex as describing psychic states of women and men, mistakes symbol for reality. Women may envy men not because they possess particular genitals but because men have power. Women, according to Freud, are masochistic. Stories of incest, which women narrated to Freud, he dismissed as fantasy. The psychological theories of Freud like the Oedipus complex, are exposed as theorisation based on a particular historical experience of western capitalism and nuclear family. As earlier mentioned, Juliet Mitchell (1975) and Nancy Chodorow (1978) postulated theories of women's subordination. Mothering by women was reproduced through daughters and boys were separated and forced to deny their bond with mothers because of 'father rights.' Within India, Sudhir Kakkar's post Freudian approach to the intimate son-mother bond as the problem that prevented men emerging as independent adults and as explaining mother-in-law and daughter-in-law. (Kakkar 1980).

Some recent studies on styles of parenting give a different view on the Oedipus complex. In joint families in India there are many women and men who 'mother' the child. This makes the child have a more diffuse, relational 'self'.

Preoccupation with gender differences in psychology has obscured the range of gender similarity. Sandra Bem's (1993) work challenged the traditional ordering of traits associated with 'masculinity' and 'femininity' as polar opposites. She suggested that these traits were really in a continuum and men and women had recourse to both depending on the context. Men as being aggressive, and women passive, were not fixed traits but had much to do with socialisation and what was valued for each gender. Mental health for each gender was a combination of both traits. This idea triggered a search for 'androgyny,' a state of being both masculine and feminine (Krishnaraj 1996). In different periods and in different civilisations these ideas have been current. For example ying-yang concept in China or purusha-prakriti in India.

Jean Baker Mill (1987) argued that the psychology of women was different not because their bodies/minds were different but because they experienced subordination and the subordinate adjusts behaviour to cope with the existence of the dominant partner.

More recently, Davar (1995) analysing data from mental health studies in India was struck by the remarkable differences by gender – in the nature of ill-

ness, in the age group that suffered them and in the response to afflictions. Married women had experienced most stressful situations. In our society and culture, marriage marks a major transition for most women and the burden of psychological adjustment lies heavy on them.

In literature there is a greater interest in women writers, analyses of their style, their themes and how women are portrayed in men's writing. The monumental *Women's Writing in India*, ed. by Susie Tharu and K. Lalita (1994) is an extraordinary accomplishment.

Methods and Methodologies

It is nearly four decades since women's studies emerged as a formal, specialised inquiry into women's condition and women's issues. Methods and methodologies evolved and are still evolving through experimentation. There are no set women studies methods. Often, techniques of data collection are confused with methodology. Methodology refers to something broader – the frameworks used. Methods are related to purpose and the nature of the problem and evolve out of a greater understanding of the problem area. Whether we use qualitative methods or quantitative methods without some background knowledge of the history, culture and social divisions that exist in a society one would not be able to make any sense of 'data' or even know what to collect. When there are important shifts in the problems studied, in the questions raised with regard to them, to the framework within which they are posed, in the interpretations given, we can talk of a paradigmatic shift. In this sense, one can claim there has been a paradigm shift in social sciences through women studies which make 'gender' a critical and central variable in our understanding of social reality. Until Prof Asok Mitra, the demographer, drew attention to the declining sex ratio in the Indian population and its serious implications, no one had ever thought of this fact as significant for study. Today we use the sex ratio as a measure of women's status. Similarly, only when women researchers noted the discrepancy between what their eyes saw and what their own experiences told them that they raised questions of bias in data systems. When the household became a unit for study and not just a unit of study, it was a big change. Earlier, one began by taking the household as the basic unit for gathering data on income, employment or land holding. Tremendous implications emerged from this shift to household as a unit for study. It challenged our notion of the family, challenged the economist's assumption of decision making and how markets functioned.

Why are we concerned with methods and methodologies? The purpose of our engagement in women studies is that we wish to capture social processes more accurately and we also want to know what strategies to adopt, what succeeds and what fails. A path breaking study that triggered a concern for women's health and nutritional deprivation was Srilata's scientific study, meticulously following scientific rigour, on the actual energy expenditure of men and women on various tasks and their nutritional intake (Batliwala). Women spent far more energy in daily tasks than men did and yet popular belief was that they needed less food than men. Actually, they needed more food not only because of their heavier work load but also because of the demands on their bodies by pregnancy and lactation.

To obtain knowledge we identify a problem, collect relevant data, analyse it, interpret it and forge links between data sets to draw out relationships between variables. These are exercises common to all domains. In general, there are distinct levels in acquiring knowledge. At the lowest level is the technique of data gathering. In social sciences they include observation, survey, case study or interviews. In natural sciences observation, experiments may be dominant forms. At the second level is the methodology which is an account of how the general structure of theory of a particular discipline finds its application. For instance, what we use as a framework to deal with social organisation, social process; or how we deal with mental life whether it is a psychoanalytical or psychiatric approach; economics uses the logic of supply and demand; literature employs notions of literary aesthetics. Methodology has to do with conceptual frameworks. At the third level is epistemology – how do we know what we know; are our senses reliable; what is the connection between our subjective experiences and outer reality; can we ever know reality as it is or is all that we can know mediated by our perceptions. These are basic philosophical questions. The three levels are related, each influencing the other. Women's studies has tried to intervene at all three levels. In technique of data gathering, it may resort more to qualitative methods (case histories, oral testimonies etc.) but most often a combination. No method is free of errors. At the methodological level, the framework has some building blocks like gender relations but may use a materialist, liberal or post modernist methodologies. At the philosophical level, it casts doubts on possibility of complete objectivity, takes a position that the subjective intervenes. There are three positions – empiricist, standpoint and post modernist. Empiricism assumes the existence of a world, independent of a human knower and relies on the primacy of senses. We assume what we see is reality as it exists. This is also known as positivism. Some may go beyond this, to state that 'standpoint' of women gives a double vision, that of the subordinated as

well as that of the 'oppressor' and hence a better concept of reality. Others hold that all subjective experiences are already 'gendered' and have no more claim to universal truth than men's views and therefore all knowledge is bound to be partial. Women live in an already gendered society and as gendered beings and the truth they tell is from their experience of gendered beings in a gendered society.

The post modernist denies that there can ever be truth and that what we take as reality is only representation. If we grant this, it follows there can be many representations - yours, mine and someone else's. If we accept that cognition is a human practice and there is no one way of knowing it, then we have to accept that there are several ways of apprehending reality and many cognitive possibilities - perception, intuition, conceptualisation, inference, representation, reflection, imagination, remembrance, conjecture, rationalisation, argumentation, justification, contemplation, ratiocination, speculation, meditation, validation and deliberation. Nonetheless, we have to ask for a minimalist standard of rationality that requires that belief be apportioned to evidence, and no assertion is immune from critical assessment; that we ask for some adequacy in the standards of evidence and apply some criteria of relevance. We learn to question traditions that have the stamp of authority.

These positions are not settled by debate and are still matters of controversy. As Barrett concludes while admitting the tentativeness of all theory: 'Political objectives are constituted on the basis of values and principles. They cannot be grounded in scientific social analysis but spring from aspiration rather than proof' (Barrett 1992). When women suffer from domestic violence, action to mitigate their suffering is not occasioned by 'scientific' analysis (while this may tell us about the extent of this) but by our notions of justice and sensitivity to human suffering. When we talk of new methods we are not inventing totally new ones but use refined tools. This refining involves exposing theoretical presuppositions while working within the tradition ourselves. If we presuppose that the household is homogeneous, we will not investigate differences within it. If we suppose that men are innately aggressive, or that they have stronger sexual drives, *our psychological understandings of behaviour and their justification* would take domestic violence, prostitution, rape as acceptable.[8]

---

8. In one judgement in the case of a minor girl whose father was the culprit the judge condoned the offence saying it was understandable because his wife left him. In other words he had a right to turn to any female around of whatever age, even his own daughter to appease his lust! Such judgements abound in our courts.

Neilson (1990) has summed up the departures in terms of approach in social sciences. Mainstream social sciences claim that they are:

a) exclusively rational in the conduct of research and analysis of data,

b) that they are oriented to carefully defined structures that are treated as impersonal,

c) that they are geared to control events and things,

d) that they care for validity of research findings,

e) that they have the capability to generate generalisable propositions,

f) that they seek replicability of events and procedures,

g) that they have the capability to produce a completed analysis of a research problem,

h) they address problems with pre-defined concepts.

As opposed to these, feminists would prefer the following:

1. to use a mix of rational, intuitive and serendipitous approaches,

2. to orient to process and not just product,

3. to understand phenomena in terms of their meaningfulness,

4. to use a mix of objective-subjective approaches,

5. to hold that one can give only specific explanations and not a grand unified theory,

6. to see unique events though they might occur frequently,

7. to generate concepts in vivo.

Their methodology pays attention to particular contexts rather than predefined operationalised hypotheses, uses more broad and inclusive descriptions than sharp, exclusive ones; instead of data selected for manageability and drawn from scholarly literature, to select socially significant ones. The ethics of research is an inherent part of methodology—namely not to 'control' environment but accepting a more open attitude of being subject to it and being shaped by it; sharing the research with the researched and admits that the process of research changes the researched. It does not claim validity but plausibility and does not

require replicability as the sole criterion and uses theory not so much to test hypotheses but to develop a better understanding through grounded concepts. The format of presentation may avoid academic, technical jargon and be accessible to wider users.

These are idealistic statements rarely reached in practice. Quite often, academic acceptability induces women's studies scholars to use academic jargon and academically acceptable methods. The original inspiration that knowledge is for transformation and that women's studies and women's movement must be closely aligned no longer holds true with women studies having found a place in the portals of academia.

So, feminist methodology is not 'new' but looks at established ways of looking with a different eye; asks new questions; detects relationships where none were suspected earlier; forges linkages among facts that appear disconnected; discovers new sources of data and therefore can design better research. What would establish credibility is not just these things but a commitment to the minimalist rationality and a concern for evidence. Apart from these conditions, feminist subscribe to the 'ethics' of non-exploitative research, that would empower the researcher as well as the researched. This is, of course, difficult to practice within conventional academic settings and within societies sharply divided by various divisions such as class, race, caste or ethnicity.

Conclusion

This brief outline of the intellectual history of women's studies needs much greater elaboration, filling in of details which subsequent histories can attempt. There have been many cross currents that have fertilised ideas and given direction to the inquiry on women's issues. The earlier preoccupation with gender as a unitary category, has long since given way to its plural construction and its contextualised manifestations and its implication with other stratification's like class and ethnicity. The internationalisation process has opened all countries to each other and feminism has now a chance of becoming truly global but paradoxically, in the nineties and in the closing years of the twentieth century, identity issues have become central to politics and the strong political message of feminism has got muted, corrupted by a camouflaged market, driven pseudo-feminism of a new woman whose components are beauty, models, cosmetics and commodities, making it difficult to forge solidarities. Our theorising too has to

move ahead as many of our utopian dreams have collapsed. Socialism and feminism need new theories to grapple with the present.

Within India, the preoccupation with the economic gave way to exploring 'reconstruction' of patriarchy during colonial times and the national movement. Radical movements like the non-brahmin movement in Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu had liberatory visions of gender equality and had made a substantial contribution to the analysis of women's subordination. Yet these radical critiques have failed to carry forward that thrust, to usher in truly egalitarian gender relations. Work needs to be done to find out why this happened. What was missing in the theory and practice of these radicals that accounts for this dimming of that liberatory vision? Politics of caste, reservations, women's employment, urbanisation, changing economic scene, population policy, militarism and the reach of the electronic media have brought in new contexts for patriarchy. Was it that while the Marxists put all their emphasis on the material conditions, those reform movements spent all their ire on the ideological and we thus missed the theoretical integration of the two to understand the contemporary scene? For example, the social reformers do not question the material base of sexual division of labour even as they advocate a large public role for women, egalitarian marriage, birth control etc. They tried to reform the family but retained its economic foundations. Recent work on the construction of female sexuality during the colonial period and thereafter and its connection to the material condition of women, once again brings out the caste and gender nexus. (Uberoi 1999). The rise of the new right and religious fundamentalism pose new questions regarding capitalism, religion and the state. We are living in the age of anxiety, of dissolving certainties, of the irrelevance of much fondly held beliefs. It is an opportune time to re-think, rather than to look backward to shore up a crumbling edifice of an erstwhile stable order. That stability was based on hierarchy and constraint to freedom. Let us remember that truth. Globalisation as an economic agenda has severe contradictions but a positive fallout is the assertion of peoples' groups all over the globe for rights and for freedoms and the possible building of solidarity across national boundaries. That still remains a 'possibility,' the realisation of which, poses the greatest challenge we have faced so far.

References

1.   Agarwal, Bina (1985): *Work Participation of Rural Women in the Third World, Some Data and Conceptual Biases*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 22, nos. 51 & 52, Dec.21–28.

2. Agnes, Flavia (199): *Law and Gender Inequality: The Politics of Women's Rights in India*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

3. Akerkar, Supriya (1995): *Theory and Practice of Women's Movement in India*, Economic and Political Weekly, vol 30, No 17, April 29.

4. All India Women's Conference (1946): *Indian Women's Charter of Rights and Duties*, Reproduced in Hansa Mehta ed. (1981): '*Indian Women.*' Bhutalia and Co. Delhi.

5. All India Women's Conference (1946): Memorandum Submitted to National, Central and Provincial Governments, Roshni, June.

6. Allen, Judith A and Sally L. Kitch (1998): '*Disciplines by Disciplines? The need for an Interdisciplinary Research Mission in Women's Studies.*' Feminist Studies, Vol 24, No 2, Summer.

7. Ardner, Shirley (1986): *The Representation of Women in Academic Models* in Visibility and Power ed. Leela Dube, Eleanor Leacock and Shirley Ardner. Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

8. Armstrong, Isabel ed.(1992): *Critical Essays in Theories and Texts*, New Feminist Discourses, Routledge, London/New York.

9. Bachofen, J.J. (1967): *Myth and Mother Right*, (trans. Ralph Manheim), Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

10. Bagchi, Jashodara (1993): *Socialising Girl Child in Colonial Bengal*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 28, No 41, 9 Oct.

11. Balasubrahmanyan, Vimal (1990): *In Search of Justice*, Women, Law, Landmark Judgements and Media, Shubda Pub, Pune.

12. Barrett, Michele (1980): *Women's Oppression Today*, Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis, London, New Left Books.

13. Barrett Michele and Anne Philips ed. (1992): *Destabilising Theory*, Contemporary Feminist Debates, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

14. Barrett, Michele and Mary Mc Intosh (1995): *The Anti-Social Family*, London, New York.

15. Batliwala, Srilata (1985): *Women in Poverty*, The Energy, Health and Nutrion Syndrome, In Tyranny of the Household, ed by Devaki Jain and Nirmala Banerjee, Shakti Books, (a Division of Vikas) New Delhi.

16. Bebel, August (1971): *Women under Socialism*, (originally published in 1904; trans.), Schocken Books, New York.

17. Becker, Gary (1981): *A Treatise on the Family*, Harvard Univ. Press.

18. Beechy, Veronica (1977): *Female Wage Labour in Capitalist Production*, Capital and Class, No 3.

19. Bem, Sandra L. (1993): *The Lense of Gender. Transforming the Debate on Sexual Ineqaulity*, Yale Univ. Press.

20. Bhagwat, Vidyut (1995): *Dalit Women. Issues and Perspectives*, Dalit Women in India ed. P.G. Jogdand, Gyan Pub., New Delhi.

21. Bhagwat, Vidyut (1995): *Marathi Litérature as a Source for Contemporary Feminism*, Economic and Political Weekly, April 29.

22. Bhattacharjee, Sukumari (1991): *Economic Rights of Ancient Indian Women*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 26, No 11 & 12, March 2-9.

23. Bhattacharya, Malini (1987): *Class Character of Sexuality*, Social Scientist, 15, 1, Jan.

24. Bhutalia, Urvashi (1998): *The Other Side of Silence*, Voices from the Partition of India, Penguin Books, London.

25. Briffault, Robert (1969) (reprint): *The Mothers*, Allen Unwin, London.

26. Chakravarty, Uma and Kumkum Roy (1988): *In Search of Our Past, A Review of the Limitations and Possibilities of the Histriography of Women in Early India*, Economic and Political Weekly, vol 23, No 18, April 30.

27. Chakravarty, Uma (1993): *Conceptualising Brahminical Patriarchy in Early India. Gender, Class, Caste and State*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 28, No 14, April, 3.

28. Chakravarty, Uma (1995): *Gender, Caste and Labour. Ideological and Material Structure of Widowhood*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 33, No 36, Sept. 9.

29. Chakravarty, Uma (1998): Rewriting History. *The Life and Times of Pandita Ramabai*, Kali for Women, New Delhi.

30. Chakravarty, Uma (1999): *Reinscribing the Past, Inserting Women into Indian History*, Beam, Vol 18. Jan.

31. Chandra, Sudhir (1992): *The Oppressive Present. Literature and Social Consciousness in Colonial India*, Oxford Univ. Press, Delhi.

32. Chandra Sudhir (1996): *Rukmabai. Debate over Women's Right to Her Person*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 31, No 44, Nov. 2.

33. Chodorow, Nancy (1978): *The Reproduction of Mothering*, Univ. of California, Berkeley.

34. Chowdhry, Prem (1994): *Marriage, Sexuality and the Female Ascetic*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 31, No 34, August 24-31.

35. Chowdhry, Prem (1995): *Contesting Claims, Counter Claims, Questions of Inheritance and Sexuality of Widows in A Colonial State*, Contributions to Indian Sociology, Vol 29, No 1 & 2, Jan-Dec.

36. Christiansen-Ruffman, Linda (1998): *The Global Feminist Enlightenment*, Women and Social Knowledge. International Sociological Association, Madrid, Spain.

37. Coontz, Stephanie ed. (1986): *Women's Work, Men's Property*, Verso, London.

38. Das, Veena (1987): *On female Body and Sexuality*, Contributions to Indian Sociology, Vol 21, No 1, Jan-June.

39. Das, Veena (1996): *Sexual Violence, Discursive Formation and the State*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 31, Nos 35-37, Sept.

40. Davar, Bhargava (1995): *Mental Illness among Indian Women*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 30, No 45, Nov. 11.

41. Davis Nira Yuval (1997): *Women, Citizenship and Difference*, Feminist Review, No 57, Autumn.

42. Desai, Neera (1998): *Engendering Family Studies and Sociolgy: A Perspective from India*, The Global Feminist Enlightenment ed. Linda Christiansen-Ruffman. Op cit.

43. Desai, Neera and Vibhuti Patel (1989): *Indian Women Change and Challenge*, Himalaya Pub. Mumbai.

44. Dev Nathan, Govind Kelkar and Yu Xiagang (1998): *Women as Witches and Keepers of Demons. Cross Cultural Analysis of Struggles to Change Gender Relations*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 33, No 44, Oct. 31.

45. Diwan, Ritu (1995): *Gender in Neo-classical Economics: A Conceptual Overview*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 33, No 17, April 29.

46. Dube, Leela (1986): Seed and Earth, *The Symbolism of Biological Reproduction and Sexual Relations of Production*, Visibility and Power. Essays on Women, Society and Development ed. Leela Dube, Eleanor Leacock and Shirley Ardner, Oxford Univ. Press, New Delhi.

47. Dube, Leela (1988): *Socialising Hindu Girls in Patrilineal India*, Socialisation, Education and Women. Orient Longman, New Delhi.

48. Dube, Leela (1993): *Who Gains from Matriarchy? Men, Women and Change in a Lakshadeep Island*, Sociological Bulletin, Vol 42, Nos 1 & 2, March–Sept.

49. Durkheim, Emile (1984): *The Division of Labour in Society*, (trans.) by W.D. Halls, Macmillan, UK.

50. Dwyer, Daisy and Judith Bruce (1988): *A Home Divided. Women and Income in the Third World*, Stanford Univ. Press, Stanford.

51. Eisenstein, Zilla (1979): *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*, Monthly Review Press, New York.

52. Elson, Diane (1993): *Gender Aware Analysis and Development Economics*, Journal of International Development, Vol 5, No 2, 1993.

53. Engels, Frederich (1978): (reprint) *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, (with introduction by Eleanor Leacock) International Pub., New York.

54. Ferguson, Anne and Nancy Folbre (1981): *The Unhappy Marriage of Patriarchy and Capitalism*, Women and Revolution ed. Lydia Sargent, South End Press, Boston.

55. Firestone, Shulamith (1979): *The Dialectic of Sex., The Case for Feminist Revolution*, Women's Press, London.

56. Fraser, Nancy (1989): *Unruly Practices, Power, Discourses and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

57. Freidan, Betty (1963): *The Feminine Mystique*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, London/New York.

58. Ganesh, Kamala (1994): *Crossing the Threshold of Numbers: The Hierarchy of Gender in the Family in India*, Indian Journal of Social Science. Vol 7, Nos 3-4, July-Dec.

59. Giddens, Anthony (1971): *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of Marx, Durkheim and Weber*, Cambridge Univ. Press, UK.

60. Gilligan, Carol (1982): *In a Different Voice. Psychological Theory and Women's Development*, Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass.

61. Gilman, Charlotte Perkins (1911): *The Man-Man World or Our Androcentric Culture*, Charlton Co. New York

62. Gilman, Charlotte Perkins (1898): *Women and Economics*, Charlton Co., New York

63. Goldschmidt, Lise Clermont (1987): *Economic Evaluation of Unpaid Household Work*, International Labour Organisation, Geneva.

64. Harding, Sandra and Merill B. Hintikka (1983): *Discovering Reality*, D. Reidel Pub. Co. Dordrecht, NL/Boston, USA..

65. Harding, Sandra (1986): *The Instability of Analytical Categories of Feminist Theory*, Signs, Summer.

66. Harding, Sandra ed. (1987): *Feminism and Methodology. Social Science Issues*, Oxford Univ. Press, Milton Keynes.

67. Hartman, Heidi (1981): *The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a more Progressive Union*, Women and Revolution ed. Lydia Sargent, South End Press, Boston.

68. Hartsock, Nancy (1983): *Money, Sex and Power. Towards a Feminist Historical Materialism*, Longman, Boston Univ. Press.

69. Jain, Devaki and Nirmala Banerjee ed (1985): *Tyranny of the Household*, Shakti Books (Vikas), New Delhi.

70. John, Mary and Janaki Nair ed. (1998): *A Question of Silence. Sexual Economies of Modern India*, Kali for Women, New Delhi.

71. Kakkar, Sudhir (1980): *The Inner World*, Oxford Univ. Press, New Delhi.

72. Kalpagam, U. (1986): *Gender in Economics. The Indian Experience*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 22, 43, Oct 25.

73. Kannabiran, Kalpana (1995): *Judiciary, Social Reform and Debate on Religious Prostitution in Colonial India*, Economic and Political Weekly, Oct. 28

74. Karve, Iravati (1974): *Yuganta*, Sangam Books, New Delhi.

75. Kelly, Joan (1987): *The Social Relation of the Sexes*, Feminism and Methodology ed. Sandra Harding, Oxford Univ. Press, Milton Keynes.

76. Kollantai, Alexandra (1977): *Selected Writings*, Allison & Busby, London.

77. Kosambi Meera (1988): *Women, Emancipation and Equality: Pandita Ramabai's Contribution to Women's Cause*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 23, No 44, Oct.29.

78. Kosambi, Meera (1997): *Anandibai Joshi: Retrieving a Fragmented Feminist Image*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 31, No 49, Dec.7.

79. Kramarae, Cheris and Dale Spender ed. (1992): *The Knowledge Explosion. Generations of Feminist Scholarship*, Athene Series, New York/London.

80. Krishnan, Prabha (1990): *The Idiom of Loss. Ideology of Motherhood in TV Serials*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 35, 42-3, Oct. 20-7.

81. Krishnaraj Maithreyi and Vibhuti Patel (1982): *Women's Liberation and the Political Economy of Housework. An Indian Perspective*, Women's Studies International,(New York), July.

82. Krishnaraj Maithreyi (1986): *Research on Women and Career. Issues of Methodology*, Economic and Political Weekly, vol. 21, no. 43, Oct.25.

83. Krishnaraj Maithreyi and Joy Deshmukh (1993): *Gender in Economic Theory and Practice*, Ajanta Pub. Delhi.

84. Krishnaraj, Maithreyi (1995): *Feminist Economics. Going Beyond Critique* (theme paper) in Feminist Approaches to Economic Theory, Indian Association of Women's Studies.

85. Krishnaraj, Maithreyi (1996): *Androgyny: An Alternative to Gender Polarity?* Economic and Political Weeekly, Vol 31, No. 16 & 17, April 20-27.

86. Krishnaraj, Maithreyi (1998): *Women in the Public Domain: Critical Issues for Women's Studies*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 33, No 8, Feb.21.

87. Krishnaraj, Maithreyi (1999): *Writing Women's History or Writing Women into History?* Paper, S.N.D.T. Dept of History Seminar.

88. Kumkum Roy (1992): *King's Household. Structure and Space in Sastric Tradition*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 27, Nos 43-44, Oct. 24-31.

89. Kurtz, Stanley N. (1992) *All the Mothers are one - Hindu India and the Cultural Shaping of Psychoanalysis*, New York: Colombia University Press.

90. Lakshmi, C. S. (1997): *Bodies Called Women. Some Thoughts on Gender, Ethnicity and Nation*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 32, No 46, Nov. 15-21.

91. Landry, Donna and Gerald MacLean (1993): *Materialist Feminism*, Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.

92. Leacock, Eleanor (1981): *Myths of Male Dominance*, Monthly Review Press, New York.

93. Leacock, Eleanor (1983): *Interpreting the Origins of Gender Inequality: Conceptual and Historical Problems*, Dialectical Anthropology.

94. Lerner, Gerda (1986): *Creation of Patriarchy*, Oxford Univ. Press, London/ New York.

95. MacKinnon Catherine (1982): *Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State: An Agenda for Theory*, In Feminist Theory. A Critique of Ideology ed. N.O. Kechane, Harvester, Brighton.

96. Marx, Karl and Frederich Engels (1935-42): *Collected Works*, Vols.1 & 2, Progressive Publishers, Moscow.

97. Meillassoux, Claude (1972): *From Reproduction to Production: A Marxist Approach to Economic Anthropology*, Economy and Society, No 1.

98. Mill, Jean Baker (1987): *The Psychology of Women*, Yale Univ. Press, New Haven.

99. Mill, John Stuart (1970): reprint. [original 1869] *The Subjection of Women*, Mit Press, Cambridge, Mass.

100. Millet, Kate (1977): *Sexual Politics*, Verso, London.

101. Mitchell, Juliet (1975): *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*, Penguin, Harmandsworth.

102. Mohanty Chandra Talpade, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres (1991): *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, Indian Univ. Press, Bloomington.

103. Mukund, Kanakalatha (1992) : *Turmeric Land. Women's Property Rights in Tamil Society since early Medieval Times*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 27, No 17, April 25.

104. Narayan, Uma (1997): *Towards a Feminst Vision of Citizenship. Rethinking the Implications of Dignity, Political Participation and Nationality in Reconstructing Political Theory*, Feminist Perspectives in Political Theory ed Mary Lyndon Stanley and Uma Narayan, Polity Press, Cambridge.

105. Nathan Dev, Govind Kelkar and Yu Xiagang (1998): *Women as Witches and Keepers of Demons. Cross Cultural Analysis of Struggles to Change Gender Relations*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 33, No 44, Oct 3-Nov.6.

106. Nicholson, Linda J. ed. (1990): *Feminism and Post Modernism*, Routledge, New York/London.

107. Neilson, Joyce McCarl ed. (1990): *Feminist Research Methods*, West View Press, Colorado.

108. Nongbri, Tilput (1988): *Gender and Khasi Family Structure*, Sociological Bulletin, Vol 37, No 1-2, March-Sept.

109. Palriwala, Rajni (1993): *Economics and Patriliny. Consumption and Authority within Households*, Social Scientist, Vol 21, No 9, Sept-Nov.

110. Palriwala, Rajni (1994): *Changing Kinship, Family and Gender Relations in South Asia. Processes, Trends, Issues*, VENA,(Women and Autonomy Series) Leiden Univ.

111. Pawar, M.S. (1992): *Criminal Justice Processing of Women in India*, Social Change, Vol 22, No 2, June.

112. Pujol, Michele A. (1992): *Feminism and Anti-Feminism in Early Economic Thought*, Edward Elgar, England.

113. Ram, Kalpana (1992): *Caste, Class and Patriarchy. Mukuwar Women*, Kali for Women (pub.), New Delhi.

114. Ramabai, Pandita (1981): (reprint) *The High Caste Hindu Woman*, Maharashtra State Board for Literature and Culture, Mantralaya, Mumbai.

115. Rao, Vidya (1990): *Thumri as Feminine Voice*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 25, No 17, April 28.

116.   Rege, Sharmila (1995): *The Hegemonic Appropriation of Sexuality: The Case of the Lavani Performers of Maharashtra*, Contributions to Sociology, Vol. 29, 1-2, Jan–Dec.

117.   Rege, Sharmila (1997): *Instituitional Alliance Between Sociology and Gender Studies. Story of Crocidile and Monkey*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 32, No 32, Aug. 9.

118.   Reiter, Rayna (1982): *Towards an Anthropology of Women*, Monthly Review Press, New York.

119.   Risseeuw, Carla and Kamala Ganesh ed. (1998): *Negotiation and Social Space*, Sage Pub., New Delhi.

120.   Rosaldo Marie Z. and Louise Lcmphere ed. (1974): *Women, Culture and Society*, Stanford Univ.Press, Stanford.

121.   Rubin, Gayle (1975): *Traffic in Women*, in Towards an Anthropology of Women ed. Rayna Reiter, op.cit.

122.   Sachs, Karen (1974): *Engels Revisited*, In Women, Culture and Society ed. Marie Rosaldo Z and Lousie Lamphere, op.cit.

123.   Sanday, Peggy Reeves (1981): *Female Power and Male Dominance. On the Origin of Sexual Ineqaulity*, Cambridge, Mass.

124.   Saradamoni, K. (1992): *From Matriliny to Patriliny*, Indian Journal of Social Science, Vol 5, No 1, Jan–March.

125.   Sangari, Kumkum (1993): *Consent, Agency and Rhetorics of Incitement*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 28, No 18, May 1.

126.   Sangari, Kumkum (1995): *Politics of Diversity, Religious Communities and Multiple Patriarchies*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 33, No 52, Dec. 30.

127.   Scott, Joan (1988): *Gender and the Politics of History*, Columbia Univ. Press, New York.

128.   Seiz, Janet (1991): *The Bargaining Approach and Feminist Methodology*, Review of Radical Political Economics, Vol 23, 1 & 2.

129.   Sen, Amartya (1983): *Economics of the Family*, Asian Development Review, Vol 1, No 2.

130.   Sen, Amartya K (1990): *Gender and Cooperative Conflicts*, Persistent Inequalities, Women and Development, Oxford Univ. Press. London, New York.

131.   Sen, Amartya (1995): *The Gender Inequality and Theories of Justice*, Women, Culture and Development. A Study of Human Capabilities. ed. Martha Nussbaum and Jonathan Glover, O.U.P./Clarendon Press, Oxford/New York.

132.   Sen, Illina (1990): *A Space Within the Struggle*, Kali for Women, New Delhi.

133.   Soper, Kate (1991): *Post-Modernism, Subjectivity and Question of Value*, New Left Review, March-April.

134.   Stabile, Carol (1995): *What is Post-Modernism?* Monthly Review, July-August.

135.   Sudhakar, Vindhya and U. Kalpana Rao (1988): *Women's Dimension in Psychological Research*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 23, 18, April 30.

136.   Spender, Dale ed.(1981): *Men's Studies Modified. The Impact of Feminism in the Academic Disciplines*, Pergamon Press, Oxford.

137.   Stree Shakti Sanghatna (1989): *We Were Making History*, Kali for Women, New Delhi.

138.   Thapan, Meenakshi (1995): *Gender, Body and Everyday Life*, Social Scientist, Vol 23, No 7–9, July–Sept.

139.   Thapan, Meenakshi (1995): *Images of the Body and Sexuality in Women's Narratives on Oppression*, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 30, No 43, Oct. 28.

140.   Tharu, Susie and K.Lalita (1994): *Women's Writing in India. 600 B.C. to the Present*, Vols I and II.' Oxford Univ. Press, (paper back), New Delhi.

141.   Tharu, Susie and Tejaswini Niranjana (1994): *Problems for a Contemporary Theory of Gender*, Social Scientist, Vol 22, Nos 3 & 4, March-April.

142.   Uberoi, Patricia (1995): *Problems with Patriarchy: Conceptual Issues in Anthropology and Feminism*, Sociological Bulletin, Vol 44, No 2, Sept.

143.   Uberoi, Patricia ed. (1996): *Social Reform, Sexuality and the State*, Sage, New Delhi.

144.   Vaid Sudesh and Kumkum Sangari (1991): *Institutions, Beliefs, Ideologies. Widow Immolation in Contemporary Rajasthan*, Economic and Political Weekly, April 27.

145.   Walby, Sylvia (1990): *Theorisng Patriarchy*, Blackwell, UK.

146.   Wally, Seacombe (1974): *The Housewife and Her Labour Under Capitalism*, New Left Review, No 83.

147.   Waring Marilyn (1988): *If Women Counted*, A New Feminist Economics, MacMillan, London.

148.   Weber, Max (1978): *Economy and Society*, An Outline of Interpretative Sociology ed. Gunther Roth and Claus Wittich. (trans.) Vols 1 & 2, Berkely Univ. California Press.

149.   Weinbaum, Batya (1978): *The Curious Courtship of Women's Liberation and Socialism*, South End Press, Boston, M.A.

150.   Wolf Gita (1991): *The Construction of Gender Identity. Women in Popular Tamil Magazines*, Economic and Political Weekly, Oct.26.

151.   Wollstonecraft, Mary (1983): [reprint; original 1792] *The Vindication of Women's Rights*, Penguin, UK.

152.   Young, Iris M (1990): *The Ideal Community and the Politics of Difference*, Feminism and Post Modernism ed. Linda Nicholson, op.cit.

Social Psychology in the Twentieth Century—a Review of Some Landmark Developments

6

M. Basavanna

What Social Psychology is About

We are born into and live in a social world – a world of people. The people around us determine our thoughts and actions to a large extent. Our success and failure in life depend on our relationship with others. In all our interactions with people we, try to understand them, decipher why they behave as they do. We try to value people; we like some and dislike some others. Often, we engage in influencing others; at the same time, some others influence us. We help people in distress; sometimes we do not. We do a host of things when we are in the company of others, things we would not dream of doing had we been alone. Social Psychology studies these and other fascinating aspects of peoples' social lives. It focuses on those aspects of human behaviour that unite us and separate us from one another. In short, it ventures to study how peoples' thoughts, feelings, and actions are affected by the actual or implied presence of others. It is a branch of psychology. Psychology studies behaviour; social psychology studies behaviour in social situations or simply social behaviour since the central task is understanding of how and why individuals think, feel and act as they do in situations involving others. Social psychology can be defined as the scientific field that seeks to investigate the nature and causes of individual behaviour in social situations.

, Social psychologists specially concentrate on five sets of factors that shape the individual behaviour in the social context (Baron and Byrne, 1994) they are:

1. The actions and characteristics of others the visible characteristics, what they say and do about the individual.

2. Cognitive processes: processes such as memory and reasoning that underlie our thoughts, ideas, beliefs, and judgments about others.

3. Ecological variables: direct and indirect influence of the physical environment; the effect of weather, noise pollution, population density, etc. Cultural context: Norms and values vary from culture to culture; behaviour considered decent in one may be seen as indecent in another.

4. Biological factors: According to sociobiology (a discipline which advocates that many aspects of social behaviour are the result of evolutionary processes in which patterns of behaviour that contribute to reproduction are strengthened and spread throughout a population), biological and genetic factors such as preserving one's own progeny (race preservation) and getting one's genes to the next generation, play an important role in social behaviour.

Thus, modern social psychologists are convinced that social thought and action are influenced by a wide variety of factors, including social, cognitive, environmental, cultural and genetic factors.

Origin and Development of Social Psychology

Social psychology is a very young discipline and its present has not yet become past to write its history. It can well be called a contemporary science but still, it is pertinent to ask the question: when did social psychology begin? It is a difficult question to answer, for we cannot choose a specific date on which a ribbon was cut to inaugurate social psychology. We can say that it could have started in 1908, the year in which William McDougall published his book, *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, or in 1924 when Floyd Allport published his *Social Psychology*.

McDougall's book proposed that social behaviour stems from a set of innate tendencies called *instincts*. This view was not acceptable to a majority of psychologists. But the book was an important event and it went into several editions. Still, the contents of the book are anything but social psychology from the contemporary point of view. But Allport's book comes very close to what we

today call social psychology. He argued that social behaviour stems from many different factors, including the presence of other persons and their specific actions. The book contains discussions of researches that have been conducted on topics such as recognition of facial expressions of emotions, conformity, the effect of audience on task performance, etc. These are the topics that are being investigated by social psychologists in recent times also. Further, Allport emphasised the value of experimentation in social psychological research. So it can safely be said that social psychology, in its present from, was emerging during the mid-twenties of twentieth century.

During the next two decades, social psychology witnessed the arrival of two of its pioneers, Muzafer Sherif and Kurt Lewin. Sherif published his research report on the formation of social norms in 1935. As every student of psychology today knows, he employed the famous autokinetic phenomena to study the effect of social pressure on the development of social norms. This is considered as a classic contribution toward understanding of the concept of conformity.

Kurt Lewin is a giant in psychology. He, along with his colleagues, carried out some seminal researches on leadership and related areas during the late thirties. Apart from his theoretical and research contributions, Lewin's influence on social psychology was profound through many of his brilliant students who remain leaders in the field. His students include Leon Festinger, Herold Kelley, Morton Deutsch, Stanley Schachter, and John Thibaut.

By about the mid-twentieth century, social psychology had established itself as an active growing endeavor. During the second half of the century, the growth of the discipline was phenomenal. During the fifties, the focus was on the influence of groups and group membership on individual behaviour. It was in 1951 that Solomon Asch published the results of his classical studies of the effect of group pressure on conformity behaviour. During the same period, one group of social psychologists became interested in the link between personality and social behaviour. They identified a number of personality traits that appear to be shared by members of a wide variety of extremist groups. One notable example of such studies was the research of Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson and Sanford on the famous authoritarian personality – a cluster of traits that predispose individuals toward extreme political ideology, such as one witnessed among the Nazies.

In 1957, Leon Festinger published his theory of cognitive dissonance. Cognitive dissonance occurs when a person holds two thoughts (congitions) that contradict each other and he or she is motivated to reduce the discomfort (dissonance) caused by these inconsistent thoughts. The theory led to many unexpected predictions and controversies and also to several insightful discoveries in the area of attitude change.

A significant event from the Indian point of view during this period was that the Indian Government invited Gardner Murphy to study the post-independence communal riots. Murphy's findings can be read in his book: In the Minds of Men.

During the 1960s, social psychology emerged as a fully developed scientific discipline. The number of social psychologists increased enormously. Ingenious experimental procedures were devised to study certain aspects of social behaviour. Darley and Latane's innovative methods of investigating prosocial behaviour, Arnold Buss's procedure of studying aggression only a few of the developments that took shape during this decade.

During the 70s, several new areas such as attribution (how we infer the causes of other's behaviour) gender differences, sex discrimination, interpersonal attraction, interpersonal relationships and friendship, love and sexuality, environmental psychology, health psychology and related areas came to occupy the center stage.

Two important trends shaped social psychology during the last twenty-five years. One is the cognitive perspective involving efforts to apply knowledge about processes such as memory, thinking, and information processing to the task of understanding social behaviour. The other is the increasing concern with the application of the principles and findings of social psychology to a wide range of practical problems. More and more investigators today are turning their attention to questions concerning personal health (what characteristics are associated with coronary heart diseases? how can we cope with stress?) legal processes (can we influence jury? can we trust eyewitness?), and organisational (work) settings (questions relating to work related attitudes, work motivation, and conflict).

As social psychology enters the twenty first-century, we can expect it to progress in three directions: First, there will be increased emphasis on cognitive

perspective and concern with applied aspects. Secondly, there will be renewed interest on the role of emotions on social behaviour and thirdly, social psychology will adopt a multicultural perspective, such that a full account of social diversity is taken into consideration.

Now that we have had a bird's-eye view of the origin and development of social psychology during the last century, we shall review, in a little more detail, some of the landmark contributions, which were mentioned above. We shall begin our journey with the central topic in contemporary social psychology, social cognition.

Social Cognition

To lead a normal life, the minimum requirement is the understanding of people around us - we must know why they do and say things they do. Often we must make various kinds' of judgements about them. To do so, we must somehow notice, interpret, remember and then use a wealth of social information available to us. This is a tough task. How we process these informations in our attempts to understand others falls within the domain of social cognition. It refers to the processes that underlie our understanding of the social world. Social psychologists have learned that individuals make use of certain cognitive frameworks, called 'schemas' in understanding others. Schemas are mental frameworks (sets of cognitions) about people and social expectations, representing our previous experience in many social situations, and with a wide range of people. These schemas give us a framework to categorise, store, remember, and interpret information relating to social stimuli. Regardless of their accuracy—very often inaccuracy—schemas influence what we notice and what we remember about others, and how we evaluate (judge) these people. They allow us to make predictions of what others are like on the basis of relatively little information. We tend to fit people into schemas when there is not enough evidence to go on.

Social cognition, we said, is a tough task that involves dealing with a lot of information. In many cases, people adopt strategies designed to reduce cognitive efforts and to decrease the possibility of information overload (having to deal with more information than they can handle). Such strategies are sometimes called heuristics (simple decision-making rules used to make inferences or to draw conclusions quickly and easily). Heuristics are mental short cuts used in social cognition. For example, when we see a man for the first time, we infer that he is a doctor, because he resembles "typical" doctors. Here we are using

what is called a representativeness heuristic. We sometimes use availability heuristic. According to this, whatever is easier to remember is judged to be more prevalent or important.

Our efforts to understand others are often subject to a wide range of biases and tendencies which together can, (and sometimes do) lead us into serious, error. While these lead us to error, we must note that, in some respect they are quite adaptive. They help us to focus on essential information, thus reducing the overall effort required for understanding the social world.

One such tendency is our paying attention to information that is contrary to our belief or expectation. A second tendency is to notice and emphasise negative information about others. This is often described as automatic vigilance or noticing the negative. The third one is called motivated skepticism, which states that we seek more information to reach conclusions that are inconsistent with our initial preference than we do to reach conclusions that are consistent with these preferences. One interesting finding in this context is the fact that thinking too much interferes with the accuracy of judgements and conclusions.

Impression Formation

The earliest work on social cognition was designed to examine impression formation, the process by which an individual organises information about another person to form an overall impression of that person. The role of the first impression is crucial in impression formation. First impressions are so strong that they are resistant to changes even in the presence of evidence to the contrary. That is why people take extra care to appear smart when facing an interview. Asch (1946) demonstrated the effect of this primacy factor. Two groups of subjects were given one of the following descriptions of a hypothetical individual and were asked to rate their overall impression of the individual.

1. Intelligent-industrious- impulsive-critical-stubborn-envious.

2. Envious–stubborn-critical-impulsive-industrious-intelligent.

The group that was given the first list, rated the person favorably while the group receiving the second list rated unfavorably. As you can see, the lists are identical in content; only the order in which the adjectives appear is reversed. Asch argues that the adjective read first changes the meaning of the ones read

later; when they learn that the person is intelligent and industrious (as in the first list) they interpret the later, negative adjectives favorably. The word critical implied that the person made good use of his intelligence. But when they learn that the person is envious (second list), even positive adjectives that appear later are interpreted unfavorably; here, intelligence is taken as calculative shrewdness.

Kelley (1950) made a more startling demonstration of the primacy effect. He used two groups. Both groups were told that they were about to hear a guest lecturer. The first group was told that the lecturer was "a rather warm person, industrious, critical, practical, and determined, " while the second group was told that he was "a rather cold person, industrious, critical, practical, and determined." The simple substitution of "cold" for "warm" was responsible for the drastic differences in the way the subjects in each group perceived the lecturer, even though he gave the same talk in the same style in each condition. Subjects who had been told he was "warm" rated him more positively than those who had been told he was "cold."

Further, impression formation does not occur in a cognitive vacuum. As we have seen earlier we have certain schemas that influence which information about people we notice and how we interpret them, and how we evaluate the person. Because of the schemas, we do not observe every single detail. If there are gaps in our knowledge of others, we tend to fill them in our own way or ignore the gaps, and fit the persons into personality schemas that represent particular "types" of people. In short, impression formation is a complex process in which we combine information about others with existing cognitive frameworks (schemas) to from unified overall impressions. The task seems effortless, but a lot is going on under the surface.

Impression Management

Impression management is the process in which people strive to present themselves to others in favorable light. All of us have a strong desire to make favorable impression on others and we engage in certain tactics to achieve this goal. The most commonly used technique is the alteration in appearance by proper grooming – keeping oneself clean and neat, especially, regarding clothes and hair. The second tactic is other enhancements, which includes attributing favorable qualities to the target person. Praising, expressing agreement, showing interest and liking, and outright flattery, have been shown to be effective in creating

good impression on others. A good tactic is to ask for advice and guidance from the target person. Many people find it flattering to be asked for such aids and this can lead them to form favorable impressions of the person seeking the assistance. A growing body of evidence suggests that if used with skill and care, the above tactics can be helpful to the persons who use them.

Attribution

One of the special areas of social cognition (or social perception) that has caught the attention of a number of social psychologists, during the last 25 years, is the process of attribution. Attribution refers to our efforts to understand the causes behind others' behaviour and on some occasions, the causes behind our behaviour too (Baron and Byrne 1994).

Attribution is a complex process and several theories have been developed to explain it. It is not possible to review them here. But to illustrate the type of theorizing that is going on, one of the influential theory, Kelley's theory of causal attributions is summarised below:

People's behaviour around us is puzzling. They say and do things we do not expect, have motives we do not understand, and appear to see the world through eyes very different from our own. But the mystery cannot be left unsolved, because others play an important role in our lives. Therefore, we try to understand them, to know their intentions, traits, and motives. In short, we make attempts to understand why people behave the way they do. It is necessary to know why your wife is angry with you, why your children misunderstand you, or why your best friend has let you down in a crisis. In all these and countless other situations, we would like to know why people acted as they have. This is the central attributional task we face all through our lives. Obviously, the causes of others' behaviour are many and varied. For the sake of convenience, they can be classified as internal causes (the person's traits, motives, and intentions) or external causes (environmental or situational factors). For example, when a boy does not get good grades in an examination, he may say that it was because he did not study well (internal cause), or he may say that it was because the examiner was strict (external cause).

Kellye's theory (Kelley and Michela, 1980) attempts to explain the conditions under which we attribute behaviours to either internal or external causes. Kelley

asserts that attribution of behaviour to either of the two sets of cause depends upon three major dimensions.

First is consensus – the extent to which others react to same stimulus in the same manner as the person we are considering. The higher the proportion of other people who react in the same way, the higher the consensus.

Second is consistency – the extent to which the person under consideration reacts to the stimulus in the same way on other occasions, that is, the extent to which behaviour is consistent over time.

Third is distinctiveness – the extent to which the target person reacts in the same manner to other different stimuli. If an individual reacts in the same way to a wide variety of stimuli, distinctiveness is said to be low.

Now, the theory suggests that we are most likely to attribute a person's behaviour to internal causes under conditions when consensus and distinctiveness are low, but consistency is high. We are most likely to attribute his behaviour to external causes when consensus, consistency, and distinctiveness are all high. Finally, we attribute behaviour to a combination of internal and external causes when consensus is low, but consistency and distinctiveness are high. An example will make the theory clear. Suppose two groups of people, representing two labour unions, are discussing an important issue. The leader of the first group makes an offer. On hearing of the offer, the leader of the other group becomes angry and says that the offer is insulting and walks out bringing the meeting to an end. Now, why did he act this way – because of internal causes or because of external causes? According to Kelley's theory, your decision (as an outside observer of this scene) would depend on information relating to the three dimensions mentioned above. Let us say the following conditions prevail:

1. No other member of the second group was angered when the offer was made (consensus is low).

2. You have observed the second group leader losing his temper during other meetings in response to similar kind of offer (consistency is high).

3. You have seen this person losing his temper in response to other, different stimuli too (distinctiveness is low).

In this case, the theory asserts that you would attribute the second group leader's behaviour to internal causes and say that he is a short-tempered person.

Now, in contrast, imagine the following conditions prevail:

1. Several members of the second group also lost their temper when they heard about the offer (consensus is high).

2. You have seen the second group leader becoming angry at other meetings when similar offers were made (consistency is high).

3. You have not seen him lose his temper in other contexts (distinctiveness is high).

Here, you would most likely attribute his behaviour to external cause – the offer really was insulting.

The theory is reasonable and it is applicable to a wide range of social situations. Several studies have confirmed its basic features. But there are some occasions in which we do not go through the difficult task of examining consensus, consistency and distinctiveness in attributing causes to behaviour. We jump to quick conclusions based on our past experience. That is, we resort to cognitive short cuts. For example, when a student gets a first rank in an examination, we conclude that it is because of his superior ability and hard work, two internal factors; when a man laughs, we assume that it is due to a joke, an external cause. But we do engage in the cognitive calculations, suggested by Kelley, when the behaviour is unexpected and when it is unpleasant. So, the theory is correct when we go through the cognitive calculations, but it may not hold good when we take short cuts.

There are two other principles that should be taken note of in attributing causes to others' behaviour. Suppose you see a mother angrily beating her child. You think that she is a short-tempered mother who is psychologically harming the child. But, suppose you come to know that she was angry with the child because he ran out in front of traffic on a busy street. Now, you would not think that she is a bad mother. You realise that there are two possible causes for her short temper. This example illustrates the first principle known as discounting principle which suggests that we reduce (discount) the importance of any potential cause to the extent that other causes also exist.

The second one, the augmenting principle, suggests that when a factor that facilitates a behaviour, and another that inhibits it are both present, and the behaviour occurs, we assign added weight to the facilitating factor. The follow-

ing example illustrates the principle. Suppose the mother is angrily shouting at her child and at this time an important guest is also present, you definitely conclude that she is an ill-tempered mother.

These two principles play an important role in attribution, especially when we cannot observe others' behaviour in several situations or over extended periods of time.

Forms of Bias in Attribution

Although attribution is a rational process, often it is subject to certain forms of bias that can lead to serious errors in ascertaining the causes of others' actions. One such bias is called the fundamental attribution error, which refers to our strong tendency to explain others' behaviour in terms to of internal factors rather than external factors. When someone spills coffee on your table, you think he is clumsy and you do not think that he did so because the coffee was hot. Research evidence suggests that although robust, the fundamental attribution error weakens over time.

Another bias, actor-observer effect, refers to the tendency to attribute our own behaviour to external causes and that of others to internal ones. When someone slips and falls, you think he is careless. When it happens to you, you blame the uneven or slippery road.

The third one, self-serving bias, refers to the tendency to attribute positive outcomes in one's own life to internal causes and negative outcomes to external factors. When you obtain good marks in an examination, you generally attribute it to your hard work. If the marks are low, you attribute it to the strict valuations or the toughness of questions. The self-serving bias is quite general in its occurrence and powerful in its effects. Often it can be the cause of much interpersonal friction. It often leads persons who work in a joint venture to perceive that they, not their partners, who have made the major contributions.

In passing, it is interesting to note that Indians use more situational (external) attributions than dispositional (internal) attributions because of prevailing social norms and values. Indians emphasise societal obligations more than others do. They tend to believe that society (or government) owes them their living (Miller, 1984).

Attitudes

Attitudes have long been a core content in social psychology. Since attitudes shape social cognition and social behaviour, a great deal of theorising and research has been done in the area attitudes. Attitudes are defined as learned predispositions to respond favorably or unfavorably towards objects, events or persons. We hold attitudes toward a wide range of objects such as, reservation policy, women's lib movement, nuclear policy, political parties, sex, marriage, divorce, religion and what not.

Psychologists talk about an ABC model of attitudes which suggests that an attitude has three components, namely Affect, Behaviour, and Cognition. Affect refers to our positive (like) or negative (dislike) emotions towards the attitude object. The behaviour component refers to our predisposition or intention to act in a particular manner relevant to our attitude. The cognitive component refers to beliefs and thoughts we hold about the object of our attitude. Every attitude has these three interrelated components although they vary in terms of which element predominates and the nature of their relationship.

None of us is born with well-defined attitudes towards any particular object; we acquire or learn attitudes. We learn them in just the same way we learn other behaviours. The general paradigms of learning such as classical conditioning, operant conditioning and modeling explain the acquisition of attitudes as well as they do other forms of behaviour.

One question that is still being debated is the attitude behaviour link. Long ago, Lapiere (1934) said that attitude and behaviour are not related. Wicker (1969) concluded that they are related but the link is weak. Recent researches have shown that there is a fairly strong relationship, but the relationship is more complex than what common sense would suggest. The relationship depends on attitude specificity, attitude strength, and attitude accessibility and on which component of attitude (ABC) is dominant.

Persuasion: Changing Attitudes

If you stop and think for a while, you will be shocked to know the number of people who are trying, in one way or other, to change your attitudes every day. You are being bombarded by countless efforts through newspapers, radio, television, political speeches, religious discourses, and appeal for charity to persuade

you to do or not do something. To what extent are such attempts at persuasion successful? And what factors determine whether they succeed or not? Social psychologists have tried to answer these questions. Janis and Kelley (1953) conducted the early research in this area at Yale University and often it is called Yale model. They asked the basic question; who says what to whom and with what effect? In answering the question, they proposed that persuasion involves three elements, namely, the source, a message and the recipients. The source refers to the communicators, message to the persuasive communications and the recipients are the target audience to whom the message is directed. The Yale group sought to identify the characteristics of the communicators, the communications, and the audiences that, together, would serve to maximise the impact of efforts at persuasion. Some of the notable findings of the Yale research are given below:

1. Experts (people who knew what they are talking and who had all the facts at their disposal) are more persuasive than nonexperts.

2. Attractive communicators are more effective in changing attitudes than non-attractive ones.

3. Messages that do not appear to be designed to change attitudes are often more effective than those that seem to manipulate people's views. People refuse to be influenced by others.

4. People are more susceptible to persuasion when they are distracted by some extraneous event than when they concentrate on what is being said.

5. People who are relatively low in self-esteem are easily persuaded than those who are high in self-esteem.

6. When the audience holds attitudes contrary to those of the persuader, it is better the communicator employs a two-sided approach (both sides of the argument are presented) rather than a one-sided approach.

7. People who speak rapidly are more persuasive than people who speak slowly.

8. Persuasion is enhanced by messages that arouse strong emotions (especially fear) in the audience.

While the Yale approach was a good beginning in studies of persuasion and provided a wealth of information about "when" and "how" of attitude change, it was less helpful with respect to "why" people change their attitudes in response to persuasive messages. This issue has been tackled by a modern approach called the cognitive model. This approach focuses on what some call a cognitive response analysis: efforts to understand (1) what people think about when they are exposed to persuasive appeals; and (2) how these thoughts and relevant cognitive processes determine whether and to what extent people experience attitude change.

One of the influential cognitive models proposed by Petty and Caciopps (1996) is called the elaboration likelihood model (ELM). According to this model, persuasion occurs in one of the two routes depending on the perceived importance of the message to the recipient. When the messages are important, or personally relevant to recipients, they are likely to devote careful attention to the message and the arguments it contains. In that case, persuasion occurs through what is known as the central route. Here cognitive activities such as evaluating the strength or rationality of the arguments and deciding whether its contents agree or disagree with current belief tend to occur. When the messages are processed via central route, attitude change will occur to the extent that the arguments are rationally convincing and the supporting evidence is strong.

When the messages deal with unimportant issues that are not personally relevant, persuasion occurs through the peripheral route. Here, individuals may respond largely to persuasion cues, such as, information relating to source's credibility, prestige or attractiveness of communicator or to the style and format of the message presented. The individual engages in little or no cognitive work in this case. If attitude change occurs, it is due to persuasion cues. Attitude change is more likely to occur through the peripheral route when audience members are distracted and cannot engage in a careful analysis of the speaker's message.

The ELB model is of considerable value because it helps explain, in modern cognitive terms, the impact of many variables found in earlier research to affect persuasion. For example, it helps explain why individuals who are distracted by events unrelated to the message are influenced by the message to a greater degree than those who are not. Such distractions may prevent individuals from engaging in careful analysis of the message – from entering the central route.

So, they are readily persuaded by weak arguments or may respond to persuasion cues such as source attractiveness.

Resistance to Persuasion

Given the frequency with which we are exposed to persuasive messages, if we were to change our attitudes in response to even a small fraction of them, we would simply become some sort of pushovers showing a strange pattern of shifts and reversals in our behaviour. Fortunately, this does not happen. In spite of the charm and expertise of the persr ider, our attitudes remain remarkably stable because of our capacity to resist persuasion. We are helped by three factors in our resistance to persuasion. These are reactance, forewarning, and selective avoidance.

Reactance is the negative reaction we experience when we realise that some-one is trying to limit our personal freedom by getting us to do what he wants us to do. In such situations, we often change our attitude in the opposite direction, an effect called "negative attitude change." Thus, the existence of reactance is one important reason why attempts at persuasion often fail.

The second factor that helps us resist persuasion is forewarning—advance knowledge that we are becoming the target of an attempt at persuasion. Fore-warning provides an opportunity to study the content of the persuasive message, to formulate counter-argument against it, and if possible, to refute the message. After all, "forewarning is forearming."

The third way of resisting persuasion is by selective avoidance - a tendency to direct our attention away from the information that challenges our attitudes. It is something like changing the TV channel when a commercial comes on the screen. The opposite effect occurs as well; when we encounter information that supports our views, we tend to give it increased attention. Together, these ten-dencies to ignore or avoid information that contradicts our attitudes and actively seeking information that supports them constitute the two sides of "selective exposure" - deliberate attempts to obtain information that supports our views. Through this mechanism we protect our current attitudes against persuasion and assure that they remain stable for long periods of time. So, remember that atti-tude change occurs sometimes, but not always.

Cognitive Dissonance

A landmark development that occurred in the context of attitude change was the propounding of the theory of cognitive dissonance by Leon Festinger in 1957. Cognitive dissonance refers to a feeling, usually unpleasant, that arises when individuals notice inconsistency between two or more of their attitudes, or between their attitude and their behaviour. For example, a smoker who knows that smoking leads to lung cancer holds two contradictory cognitions.

1. I smoke; and

2. Smoking leads to lung cancer.

Festinger's theory predicts that these two thoughts will lead to a state of dissonance. More importantly, it predicts that the individual will be motivated to reduce such dissonance in one of the following ways:

1. Modifying one or both cognitions;

2. Changing the perceived importance of one of the cognition;

3. Adding new cognition or information;

4. Denying the relationship between the two cognitions.

So, the smoker in our example might decide that he does not smoke that much (modifying the cognition); that the evidence linking smoking to lung cancer is weak (changing the importance of a cognition), that the amount of exercise he does compensates for the smoking (adding new cognitions); or that there is no evidence linking smoking and cancer (denial). Whatever the technique used, the result is the same: reduction in dissonance. But, what is the preferred technique? Obviously, one that involves least effort (the line of least resistance); changing whatever is easiest to change. Since it requires effort to change cognitions, acquire new information, or minimise the importance of outcomes that are really important, the easiest course is to change our attitudes.

There are several occasions in everyday life when we must say or do things that are inconsistent with our real attitudes. When your professor asks your opinion about one of his recently published papers, you might say that it is brilliant although you know that it is ordinary. In these and countless other situations,

your actions and your attitudes are inconsistent. Your actions in these situations involve what social psychologists call forced compliance. We are forced by circumstances to say or do things contrary to our real views. Cognitive dissonance theorists believe that forced compliance can be used to change attitudes and they have demonstrated how to do it in several experimental studies. One such technique is based on inducing feelings of hypocrisy among the recipients of persuasive appeals Briefly, the procedure involves (1) inducing subjects to encourage others to engage in various socially beneficial actions, and (2) reminding the subjects that sometimes they have failed to engage in such actions themselves. Under these conditions, subjects are reminded that they do not always practice what they preach. This generates dissonance, because being a hypocrite is inconsistent with their own, largely positive, self-image. As a result, they change both their attitudes and their behaviour so as to be less hypocritical – to actually practice what they preach.

When people engage in counter-attitudinal actions for strong reasons, they do not experience dissonance. For example, when you said that your professor's paper was brilliant, you had strong reasons for saying so (you do not want to incur his displeasure, it would be risky). But what if strong and convincing reasons for attitude-discrepant behaviour are lacking? Under these conditions dissonance will be stronger, because you said something you do not believe even though you had no strong reason for doing so. In this context, dissonance theory predicts that weaker the reasons for counterattitudinal behaviour, the stronger the dissonance generated and hence greater the pressure to change these views. Social psychologists have called this paradoxical phenomenon, "less-leads-to-more effect." This effect was confirmed in one of the famous experiment by Festinger and Carlsmith (1959). In this study, the investigators offered the subjects either a small reward (one dollar) or a large one (twenty dollar) for telling another person that some dull tasks that they had just performed were very interesting (one of the tasks consisted of placing spools on a tray, dumping them out, and repeating the process over and over again). After engaging in this attitude-discrepant behaviour (telling another subject the tasks were interesting when they knew full well that they were not), participants were asked to indicate their own liking for the tasks. As predicted by the "less-leads-to-more effect," the subjects who had received the small reward reported greater liking for the dull task than those who had received the large reward.

More recent studies on cognitive dissonance have raised doubts about its origin and operations, and have suggested the limits on the impact of forced com-

pliance. But none has come out with strong evidence, sufficient enough to refute the theory. By and large, social psychologists believe that dissonance derives from and centers on the effects of inconsistency, and that dissonance produces considerable pressure for change and one important change will be in people's attitude.

Social Influence

All through our lives, we come across many situations in which we say and do things we would not have said and done had it not been for the pressure from others. It means that our behaviour is influenced by others in one way or the others. It is also true that occasionally we try to influence the behaviour of others. These efforts on the part of one person to alter the behaviour or attitudes of one or more others are called social influence.

Social influence takes many different forms. Some are blatant and obvious, while others are subtle and disguised. We have already learnt about one form of social influence, namely, persuasion, under the section on attitude change. We will review below some additional forms of social influence, specifically three forms, namely, conformity, compliance, and obedience, on which a good deal of research has been going on. We shall start with conformity.

Conformity

Conformity refers to pressures to go along with others, to behave in the same way as others in the group or society. The pressure to behave like others do, stems from certain implicit rules prevailing in society called social norms. These rules indicate what we should and should not do in society, and are obeyed by most of us most of the time. The pressure toward conformity was dramatically illustrated by Soloman Asch (1951) in a series of experiments. Asch told the subjects that they are participating in a test of perceptual skill and shown them two cards, one with three lines of varying length and a second card containing a single line that matched with one of the lines in the first card.

The task was seemingly straightforward. Each subject had to announce aloud which of the lines in the first card was identical in length to the standard line in the second card. The answer was obvious, seemed easy to participants. But something odd began to happen. Each subject took the test along with some other persons (6 to 8). These persons were accomplices (confederates) of the

experimenter and this was not known to the real subjects. Moreover, these persons gave their answers before the participants responded. On certain occasions (12 out of 18), the accomplices offered answers that were clearly wrong. That is, the first six persons gave answers that contradicted what the real subject believed to be the correct one. On such trials, the participants faced the dilemma whether to follow his/her own perceptions or to follow the group and repeat the answer that everyone else was giving. Strangely enough, a large majority of participants in Asch's experiment opted for conformity. Indeed, 76 percent of those tested went along with the group's wrong answers at least once. But only 5 percent of the subjects in a control group, who responded to the same problems in the absence of any accomplices, made such errors.

While most people conformed at least once, it is important to note that they have resisted group pressure on many other occasions. Almost 24 percent never conformed and many others (37 percent) yielded only a few of the trials (1 to 3) on which the accomplices gave false answers. A small percent (11 percent) demonstrated total conformity. These results and those of other studies lead to the conclusion that many people find it easier to contradict publicly the evidence of their own senses than to disagree openly with the unanimous judgment of other persons even when they are total strangers.

In a later study, Asch repeated the experiment with one important charge. Instead of announcing their answers out loud, they were asked to write down their answers on a slip of paper. Then conformity dropped sharply showing that people often modify their behaviour openly (public compliance) but hang onto their opinion privately (private acceptance).

Conformity also dropped sharply when there was an ally (someone who did not accept the majority viewpoint, and on the other hand, shared the subject's opinion). This happened even when the ally was a stranger, not known to the subject. This suggests that social support helps a person to resist group pressure. In addition to social support, cohesiveness (degree of attraction to the group or persons exerting influence) and group size (the number of persons exerting pressure) were found to be important factors determining conformity.

When cohesiveness was high (when one is strongly attached to the group and badly wants to be accepted by the group), pressures toward conformity were generally much greater than when cohesiveness was low. This is one important

reason why most of us are much more willing to accept social influence from friends or persons we admire than from others.

Studies designed to investigate the effect of group size on conformity indicate that up to a point (about 3 or 4 members), rising group size does increase conformity. Beyond that level, however, further increments in group size produce less and less additional effect. One reason given to explain this indicates the fact, that as group size rises beyond three or four, the participants start to suspect collusion. They start thinking that members are not expressing their individual views but colluding to exert influence. When too many people agree, it may be a signal that it is time to be on guard.

Why do we conform? Conformity is a basic fact of social life. Most of us agree with others most of the time. Why? Social psychologists argue that people conform because of two powerful human needs: the desire to be liked or accepted by others and the desire to be right. The desire to be liked is universal. One way to make others like us is to appear as similar as possible to others. Parents, friends and relatives heap praises on us when we demonstrate similarity with them. This process is called normative social influence. It involves altering our behaviour to meet other's expectations, and it is common in our daily life.

The other compelling reason that makes us to conform is our desire to be right. We do not know what is the correct thing to do in several situations and therefore we tend to ask others' advice in this regard. We use their opinions and their actions as guides for our own. This source of social influence is called informational social influence. Taken together, these two, normative and informational social influence provide a strong basis for our conformity behaviour.

Why sometimes we refuse to conform? While social pressures are powerful forces that induce conformity, they are definitely not irresistible. On many occasions, people stick to their own judgements, even in the face of a disagreeing, unanimous majority. There are two reasons for this phenomenon. One is individuation, the desire to maintain individuality (the desire to protect one's own identity and to be distinguished from others in some respects). The second factor is the desire to maintain control over the events in our lives. We want to believe that we can determine what happens to us and yielding to social pressure runs counter to this desire. Research has shown that people with high desire for personal control are less yielding to social influence in the Asch type of experiment.

Compliance

Our effort to influence others through direct request is known as compliance. It is based on our belief that "to ask, sometimes, is to receive." Persons seeking compliance make their requests and take it that they will be granted. Compliance-seekers use many different procedures to achieve their goal. We shall review some of them in the following paragraphs.

One of the common techniques used in seeking compliance is called *ingratiation*. This refers to the efforts made by individuals to enhance their attractiveness to a target person so that this person will then be more yielding to the requests. Ingratiation makes use of impression-management techniques mentioned earlier under social cognition. Compliance-seekers may engage in target-directed tactics aimed at inducing positive feelings in the target person, hoping that these feelings will be transferred to the ingratiator thus increasing formers' liking for the latter. Such procedures include showing interest in the target person, agreeing with his views, exhibiting positive nonverbal signs (smiling, nodding), and outright flattery. Often these work, when not over-done. The compliance-seeker may sometimes use self-enhancement techniques such as putting up a good appearance, name-dropping, self-disclosure and self-depreciation.

Another technique used in obtaining compliance is to make a small request first and where this is complied with, come up with a bigger one. This is often called *foot-in-the-door technique*. (Ask for Rs. 10/-, when this is given, next time ask for Rs. 100/- or more). Research evidence shows this technique often works. The reason is that when people comply with a small request, they come to view themselves as helpful persons; then, when a bigger request is made, they give in order to maintain consistency in their self-image.

The third procedure use to gain compliance is referred to as *door-in-the face technique*. Here, compliance-seeker starts by asking a very large favor, one the target person is sure to refuse. Then, when the refusal occurs, a smaller request, the one he really wanted, is made. (Ask for Rs. 1000/-, when this is refused, ask for Rs. 100/-, the amount you really want). Generally, the second request is comply with. While both the-foot-in-the-door and door-in-the-face techniques are useful in gaining compliance, the existing evidence shows that the former is applicable in a wider range of situations than the latter.

The fourth tactic is known as *that-is-not-all technique*. This is the familiar tactic, often used by salespersons who first offer a commodity at an inflated price, and immediately after that, offers a discount, an incentive, or a bonus, to clinch the offer (if you purchase toothpaste, a toothbrush free).

Lastly, *complaining* is found to be an effective way of gaining compliance. We make statements such as "Why did you not clean the room today, it is your turn" or "You do not love me anymore," and induce in the target person a tendency to oblige us. Complaining to others does appear to be an effective method of gaining compliance in some situations. But chronic complaining may lose its effectiveness if it is repeated too frequently just as excessive flattery and related techniques lose their punch.

The conclusion we can draw from researches is that when applied with care, these strategies are effective and where social influence is concerned, *less really is often more*.

Obedience

The most direct technique that can be used to change another person's behaviour is simply to order him or her to do something. Although ordering is a less frequent technique than conformity and compliance tactics, by no means it is rare. Superiors order subordinates in business, police and military organisations. Obedience to authority is a common phenomenon; people in power possess some means of enforcing their directives. But the surprising fact is that even persons lacking in such power can sometimes induce high degree of submission in others. Stanley Milgram (1963, 1974) has reported the most dramatic and clearest evidence for the occurrence of such effects.

Milgram wanted to know whether people would obey orders from a relatively powerless stranger requiring them to inflict considerable amount of pain on another person – a totally innocent stranger. Milgram's interest in this phenomenon derived from the occurrence of tragic real-life events in which seemingly normal, law-abiding people obeyed such directives. For example, during the Second World War, German soldiers obeyed orders to torture and murder millions of unarmed civilians. Similar events have occurred in other parts of the world: the My Lai massacre in Vietnam, the massacre of Kurds in Iraq, the Tiananmen Square tragedy in China, etc.

In order to throw light on the nature of such occurrences, Milgram designed an ingenious, although controversial, laboratory experiment. In this experiment, the experimenter told the participants – all males – that they were participating in an investigation designed to study the effects of punishment on learning; their task was to administer electrical shocks to a learner (actually an accomplice of the experimenter) whenever he made an error in a simple learning task. The shocks were to be delivered by means of thirty switches on a huge shock box. The switches were marked clearly with the amount of shock they were supposed to give varying from 15 volts to 450 volts. In reality, of course, the learner (the accomplice) never received any shocks during the experiment. The only real shock ever used was a mild demonstration from one switch (No. 3) to convince the subject the experiments were real. The subjects were told to move on to the next higher switch each time the learner made an error.

During the experimental session, the learner (following a pre-arranged instruction) made many errors. Thus, the subjects were in a dilemma whether to continue punishing the "learner" with what seemed to be increasingly painful shocks or refuse to go on. Whenever they hesitated or refused to go on, the experimenter pressurised them to continue with a series of graded remarks. These began with "please go on," increased to "it is absolutely essential that you continue", and finally shifted to "you have no other choice, you must go on."

Since all the subjects were volunteers and were paid in advance, they could have refused to continue with the experiment. But they did not. They continued to shock the "learner." Surprisingly, 65 per cent of them showed total obedience to the experimenter's commands, proceeding through the entire series to the final 450 volts level. On the other hand, the control subjects who did not receive experimenter's commands generally administered only very mild shocks during the experimental sessions. Of course, many participants in the experimental group protested, but when ordered to continue, a majority succumbed to the experimenter's social influence and continued to obey. They continued to shock the "learner" inspite of the agony (pretended) exhibited by him, (the "learner" sometimes pounded on the wall as if protesting against the painful treatment he was receiving).

The experiment was repeated outside the laboratory setting; it was repeated in Jordan, West Germany and Australia; it was repeated with children as well as adults. Similar results were obtained. In one instance, a large proportion of subjects continued to obey even when the "learner" complained about the painful-

ness of the shocks and begged to be relieved. The most shocking of all, about 30 per cent continued to obey even when they were asked to grasp the victim's hand and force it down upon the "shock" plate. The results were fantastic and seemed to be alarmingly general in scope.

Further research revealed that certain personality traits were related to the tendency to obey. One trait is *authoritarian submission* - a tendency to adopt a submissive, uncritical attitude toward authority figures. Persons high on this trait showed a tendency to obey more in Milgram type situations than those who were low. The second trait was the *internal versus the external locus of control* proposed by Julian Rotter. It was found that externals (those who believe that their fate is determined by external forces) tended to be more obedient than internals (those who believe that their fate is largely in their own hands). Finally, and unexpectedly, people who were relatively more religious were found to be more obedient than those who here less religious.

One of the factors that contributes to high degree of obedience is transfer of responsibility. When the participants in the Milgram type study were told that it was the experimenter, not they, who was responsible for the victim's safety, the tendency to obey increased. So, the general defense many offer for obeying harsh or cruel commands is "I was only carrying out orders."

Secondly, people in authority wear some visible badges, or signs of power, such as stars, colors, and uniform. These are obvious reminders of who is in charge, and most people find it hard to resist such influences. The third factor is that the subject initially faces the commands in a graded manner, starting with mild ones and then moving towards those that are dangerous. For example, police or military people are first ordered to question, arrest, or threaten potential victims. Gradually, demands are increased to beat torture or even kill unarmed civilians. In a similar manner, subjects of obedience study in the beginning were asked to administer mild shock to the victim that was then gradually increased to harmful levels. This gradual manner of delivering punishment may itself be a contributing factor in the development of obedience tendency.

Given the fact that there is a tendency to obey, unfortunately leading to disastrous consequences, what can be done to resist this tendency? Social psychologists suggest strategies that may help in the reduction of this tendency. Firstly, when a person is made to realise that it is he, and not the commanding authority that is responsible for the harm produced to the victim, there will be a sharp

reduction in the tendency to obey. Secondly, when people are made to realise that beyond a certain level, unquestioning submission to destructive orders is inappropriate, there will be substantial decrease in the tendency to obey. Probably, this idea was behind Jaya Prakash Narayan's mind when he suggested to the police not to obey certain directives during Indira Gandhi's administration.

Thirdly, individuals who question the intentions and expertise of the authority figures find it easy to resist the tendency toward blind obedience. Finally, just knowing the power vested in the authority figures to command obedience may itself be sufficient. Research evidence suggests that exposing people to knowledge of results of psychological investigations, such as the one conducted by Milgram, enhances their ability to resist. The power of authority figures may be enormous, but definitely not irresistible. When large groups of committed people decide-not to obey, as it happened during Mahatma Gandhi's civil disobedience movement and recently in several other countries (East Germany, Soviet Union), victory may go to those on the side of freedom and decency, rather than to those whose possess guns, tanks and missiles.

Group Influence

One of the important facts of social life is that we belong to one or more groups. These groups influence our behaviour, and attitudes and values in several ways. Social psychologists have studied extensively group processes, impact of groups on task performance, group decision-making and group leadership during the last fifty years.

Groups are not just collections of individuals. A group consists of two or more interacting individuals who share common goals, have a stable relationship, somehow are interdependent, and perceive that they are part of the group. Individuals join groups for several reasons. First, groups help satisfy an individual's need for belongingness and receiving attention and affection. Second, groups help an individual to achieve certain goals that he cannot achieve alone. Group membership provides an individual knowledge and information that would not be otherwise available. Group membership gives an individual security and protection against common external enemies. Finally, groups help in the formation of a positive social identity, which becomes part of the individual's self-concept.

The group influences its members through certain structural aspects such as roles, status, norms, and cohesiveness. Roles refer to the set of behaviours that individuals occupying specific positions within a group are expected to perform. Status refers to social standing or rank an individual enjoys in the group. It also refers to the prestige associated with various roles. Norms are the rules, implicit or explicit - operating in a group that regulate the behaviour of members. The norms may be prescriptive (how to behave) or proscriptive (how not to behave). Cohesiveness refers to the totality of forces acting on members to cause them to remain part of a group. It includes mutual attraction, interdependence, shared goals, and so on. It may be interpersonal or task-based cohesiveness. It is necessary to keep these characteristics in mind when we consider the specific ways in which groups shape the behaviour and attitudes of individuals.

Groups and Task Performance

What are the costs and benefits of working with others? This question has engaged the attention of social psychologists for long. An important concept that emerged in this context is *social facilitation*. It refers to any effect on performance stemming from the presence of others. It includes both decrements as well as increments in task performance. Early studies in the area yielded confusing results. Sometimes, the presence of others improved performance, and at other times it interfered. Zajonc (1965) resolved this puzzling question in his theory called the *drive theory of social facilitation*. The central idea behind this theory is that the presence of others produces increments in the level of arousal (increased feelings of tension or excitement). How this increased arousal affects performance has to be answered taking two facts into account. First, increased arousal increases the occurrence of dominant responses - the responses an individual is most likely to make in a given situation. Second, such responses can be either correct or incorrect for any task currently being performed. Combining the two facts, Zajonc makes two predictions:

1. The presence of others will increase performance when an individual's dominant responses are the correct ones for the particular situation.

2. The presence of others will impair performance when a person's dominant responses are incorrect for the situation. The implication of these predictions is that the presence of others will improve the performance of strong, well-learned responses, but may interfere with the performance of new and as yet unmastered ones.

Although early research confirmed these predictions, they also raised another important question: Does social facilitation stem from mere physical presence of others, or other factors such as concern over others' possible evaluation? The latter factor has been named *evaluation apprehension* – the individual's feeling that his performance is being observed and evaluated by others. Research findings support that it is not the mere presence of others but the evaluation apprehension that gives rise to social facilitation. The results in this regard are not conclusive.

Another solution to this intriguing problem has been suggested by Baron, Saunders and Moore in their *distraction-conflict theory*. According to this theory, the presence of others (audience or co-actors) produces conflict between tendencies to (1) pay attention to others, and (2) pay attention to the task being performed. The conflict, thus generated, increases arousal which, in turn, induces social facilitation effects; that is, if the dominant responses are correct, performance is enhanced and if they are incorrect, performance is reduced. While the theory has added some more information, it fails to explain social facilitation fully.

Individual Versus Group Performance

Another issue that has drawn the attention of social psychologists is the advantages versus disadvantages of working in groups. Of course, working in groups does indeed offer certain advantages. It allows individuals to pool knowledge, skills, and equipment. It also allows for an efficient division of labor. But there are many disadvantages as well. When group cohesiveness is high, members tend to engage in non-productive interactions such as exchanging pleasantries. Pressure to adhere to existing norms may interfere with the emergence of novel and improved procedures of accomplishing a task. Further, as group size increases, it becomes difficult to coordinate members' activities. But the groups are found to work better in additive tasks, where the contributions of each member are combined into a single group product, and compensatory tasks where contributions of members are averaged to form a single group item.

In certain situations, group performance suffers because of a phenomenon known as *social loafing*. This refers to the tendency of some members of the group to pretend to be working but not really working. This is common in situations where groups are engaged in additive tasks where it is difficult to identify the contributions of each participant. Researches suggest that social loafing is

quite general in scope. It occurs in several cultures and in a wide range of work situations. Several techniques have been suggested to counter the tendency toward social loafing. For example, making individual effort identifiable, increasing members' commitment to successful task performance, providing members with opportunity to evaluate their own contributions, and strengthening group cohesiveness are recommended. It has also been found that when the task is important to members, they react to social loafing, not solely with anger and withdrawal, but also with an increase in their own effort, a phenomenon called social compensation.

Decision Making in Groups

Governments, military units, business and industrial organisations entrust key decisions to groups with the hope that groups, by pooling the expertise of their members, and by avoiding extreme courses of action, can make better decisions than individuals. Are these assumptions correct? Can groups make better decisions than individuals? We shall see here what social psychologists have to say in this regard.

Group Decision Making Process: When a group starts discussing an issue, the members present a wide range of views. After a good deal of discussion, they reach a decision. Now, is there a way of predicting this final outcome? Social psychologists assert that the final decisions reached by groups can often be predicted quite accurately by a set of simple rules known as *social decision schemes*. These rules relate the initial distribution of members' views to the group's final decisions. There are four such decision schemes:

1. Majority wins rule, in which the group opts for whatever position initially held by the majority of members; here, the discussion simply serves to confirm the popular view.

2. Truth-wins rule where the correct solution is ultimately favored.

3. Two-third majority rule.

4. First-shift rule where the group adopts a decision consistent with the direction of the first shift in opinion shown by any member. The research findings indicate that these rules are quite successful in predicting even the most complex group decision. Of course, different rules apply to

different situations. For example, 'majority-wins' rule predicts better the judgmental tasks while truth-wins rules are suitable for intellectual tasks.

The groups follow some procedures in addressing their agenda, managing the flow of interaction among members, and handling related issues. One procedure adopted is known as *straw poll*, where members indicate their present position through a non-binding vote. Here the members are free to change their views (non-binding) after hearing the views of others. The straw poll can lead to important shifts in the position held by members and so ultimately in the decision reached by the group.

The other procedural factor that can exert strong effect on group decision making is known as the deliberation style. This refers to the manner in which group members exchange information. They may follow verdict-driven deliberation or evidence driven deliberation. In the former, the members discuss their decision while in the latter they discuss the evidence before them.

The Nature of Group Decisions: Around 1960, an MIT student by the name of James Stoner, in his MA dissertation, reported that groups tend to reach riskier decisions than individuals. In his investigation, he asked college students to advise an imaginary person supposedly facing decisions between two alternatives: one highly attractive but relatively high in risk, and the other less attractive but safe. In the first part of his experiment, each subject made individual recommendations about the choice dilemmas. In the second part, they met in small groups, and discussed each problem in detail until a unanimous decision was reached. Stoner expected conservative decisions in the group situation. But surprisingly, the groups reached riskier decisions than individuals and the phenomenon was named *risky shift*. The magnitude of difference was small; still the implication of the results was large. It questioned the wisdom behind entrusting important decisions to committees, commissions, juries and such other groups.

Impressed by the possibilities, social psychologists conducted many additional studies on risky shift. The results were confusing. Some confirmed Stoner's findings, while others, indicated that groups were more conservative than individuals in decision making. Eventually, a clear answer emerged. What seemed to be a shift toward risk was found to be a shift toward *polarisation*. What actually happened was that group discussion led individual members to become more extreme, not simply more risky or more cautions. Group discussion simply enhanced or strengthened the individuals' initial view: if one's view was in

favour of an action initially, it become more favourable after discussion; if it was against, it became more so. Since such shifts occur in the direction of extremity, the effect was called *group polarisation.*

Then the question arose: Why does polarisation occur? Polarisation is explained in several ways, but two have received most support. These are known as social comparison and persuasive argument views. The first view suggests that before group discussion, most people think that their views are better and more extreme in the right direction than those of others. But during discussion, they realise that their views are not as extreme as they believed. Therefore, they shift to a more extreme position. The persuasive argument view suggests that members realise, during group discussion, that their initial views were correct and hence they come to hold them strongly and move towards an extreme position. Both the views were supported by research.

Pitfalls in Decision Making by Groups

Apart from group polarisation, there are two more processes that may interfere with the group's ability to make accurate decisions: one is what is often referred to as group think and the other is the inability of groups to accommodate information not shared by all members in discussion. Groupthink is a mode of thinking by group members in which concern with maintaining group consensus (Janis called it concurrence seeking) overrides the motivation to evaluate all potential courses of action as accurately as possible. According to Janis (1982), group think occurs when cohesiveness in the group is high, when it is facing a provocative situation (it is fighting against external enemy) and when there are structural and procedural faults in the group processes (such as lack of means for resolving internal conflicts). When groupthink develops, it leads to several catastrophic trends that do not permit realistic, accurate, effective decision-making. Members begin to think that their group is invulnerable – one that never goes wrong. They engage in collective rationalisation – ignoring information that is opposed to group's current views. They start thinking that their group is not only right, it is morally superior, and all others are confused or evil. Pressure on members to follow the group's line of thinking mounts up. Those who have lingering doubts engage in self-censorship or they will be silenced by other members. Finally, self-appointed mind guards shield the group from external sources of information that is contrary to the views held by the group. The end result is disastrous, a strong illusion that the group is correct and infallible and has no

dissent, or need for it. Obviously, the decisions made in such situations can lead to disastrous consequences.

Several steps have been suggested to counter the operation of groupthink. First, groups should promote open inquiry and skepticism among members. Second, subgroups may be formed to study different aspects of the issue and their views should be incorporated in the final decision. Third, after the decision is reached, a second-chance meeting may be held and members may be encouraged to express their lingering doubts freely.

Key decisions are entrusted to gr ups with the hope that members pool their resources – share ideas and knowledge unique to each individual – which will be helpful in reaching accurate decisions. But the question is, do groups really share knowledge and expertise brought to them by individual members? A series of sophisticated studies have shown that in fact such pooling of resources may be an exception rather than the rule. Information shared by many members is more likely to be discussed than information held only by a single member. The larger the group, the greater the advantage of shared over unshared information. Even efforts to increase pooling of resources by structuring group's discussions have been found to fail.

Leadership

Leadership is the single most important factor in determining the success of a group; it is the key ingredient in all group activities. Social psychologists look at leadership as a major source of social influence. This is seen even in their definition of leadership as "the process through which one member of a group (its leader) influences other group members toward the attainment of specific group goals (Yuke, 1989)."

The major question that social psychologists have been trying to answer is: who becomes a leader? The earliest attempt to answer this question was in terms of traits of leaders. This approach – trait approach – asserted that leaders differ from ordinary people in several respects; they possess certain key traits that set them apart from most human beings, and their traits remain stable over time. This view is often referred to as great person theory of leadership. It suggests that all great leaders share these traits regardless of when and where they live or the precise roles they fulfill. But, what are the key traits that distinguish leaders from non-leaders? Decades of research (prior to 1950) failed to yield a consist-

ent list of traits shared by all leaders. The results were so disappointing that most investigators gave up in despair and came to the conclusion that leaders do not differ from followers in clear and consistent ways.

But recently, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) have reopened the problem and claimed that at least in corporate settings, successful leaders do differ from other people in traits such as honesty, motivation to lead, self-confidence, cognitive ability (intelligence), expertise, creativity and flexibility. So, the investigators assert that leaders do not have to be great men, intellectual giants, or omniscient prophets to succeed, but they need to have the right stuff and this stuff is not equally present in all people.

Another important finding concerns gender differences in leadership. The popular stereotype that women do not make good leaders has been shown to be baseless. Research has indicated that while men and women leaders differ in a few respects, these differences are small and fewer in number; by and large, they do not differ in core characteristics that constitute leadership effectiveness.

Eagly and Johnson (1990) reviewed more than 150 studies of leadership in which comparisons between men and women were possible. Using a highly sophisticated technique called meta-analysis (a statistical procedure for evaluating the effects of one or more variable across many different studies), they compared men and women on important leadership-relevant variables such as employee orientation, work orientation and decision-making style, and came to the conclusion that gender differences in leadership are smaller in magnitude and less consistent than gender role stereotypes suggest.

Leadership Effectiveness

All leaders are not equally effective in fulfilling their role. Why? What factors contribute to leadership effectiveness? Several attempts have been made to answer these questions. Two views among them – Fiedler's *contingency model* and Vroom and Yetton's *normative model* – have been influential and are reviewed below:

According to Fiedler (1978), leadership effectiveness is determined by two factors: leader traits and situational variables. Fiedler infers leadership trait in terms of regard for the *least preferred* coworker (LPC) – a tendency in the leader to evaluate, favorably or unfavorably, a person with whom the leader has

found it most difficult to work. If he evaluates such a coworker favorably, the leader is said to be high LPC (people oriented) and if the evaluation is unfavorable he is believed to be low LPC (task-oriented). The situational favorability is inferred from three factors:

1. Task structure - the extent to which the task goals are clearly defined

2. Position power - the ability to enforce compliance by subordinates and

3. Degree of acceptance by the followers.

Each of this is rated on a five-point scale. The three factors are combined to obtain the situational favorability dimension, which may be high, low, or moderate.

Now, Fiedler suggests that low LPC leaders are effective when situational favorability is either high or low, and high LPC leaders are effective when situational favorability is within moderate range. These predictions have been supported in the case of laboratory studies. But in the real work situations, the results have not been very favorable.

Vroom and Yetton (1973) have focussed on a key task that all leaders engage in - decision-making. Making decisions and getting them implemented by followers are the defining characteristics of effective leadership. Leaders do not work in a social vacuum; they work with people. Even when leaders are very powerful, there is no guarantee that their decisions will be accepted or implemented by the followers. For decisions to be accepted, there is need for participation by the followers in the process of decision making itself. Then the question arises: How much participation by the followers should leaders permit? According to this model, it depends on several factors relating, primarily, to the importance of the decision's being high in quality and the importance of its being accepted by the followers. For example, when high quality of decision is crucial (the stakes are high), the leader has the expertise to make the decision alone, and the acceptance by the followers is not crucial (the decision can work even without their support), then, a relatively autocratic style of decision is best. On the other hand, when the high quality of decision is necessary, the leader can make it alone, but its acceptance by the followers is crucial (the decision cannot be implemented without their support), then a participative style would be preferable.

The theory suggests that by answering a series of such questions, leaders can arrive at the appropriate decision style - one that affords followers just the right amount of participation to maintain their morale while retaining the highest degree of efficiency possible. Generally, these guidelines and suggestions seem to work. Leaders who adopt their decision styles to existing conditions are generally more effective than those who are either uniformly autocratic or participative in style.

Recent researches have suggested certain modifications in Vroom and Yetton's model. First, most followers prefer a participative style by their leader even under conditions where the model recommends autocratic style. Second, leaders and followers differ in their reactions to various methods of reaching decisions. Leaders prefer the method suggested by the model, while followers prefer the participative style in all conditions. Third, it appears that certain personality traits of leaders play an important role in determining the effectiveness of various decision-making strategies. When adjustments are made in the model in the light of the above findings, the normative model may prove to be more helpful in understanding leadership effectiveness.

Recent studies have made attempts to explain the operation of an unusual but very important type of leadership described as *transformational* or *charismatic leadership*. Down through the ages, some leaders like Joan of Arc, Franklin Roosevelt, Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, and others similar to them have demonstrated extraordinary success in bringing about profound changes in the beliefs, perceptions, values, and behaviour of their followers. They were agents of change who have transformed the social, political, or/and economic reality of their people. How could they do it? What is the charisma underlying their leadership? Systematic research has begun to yield intriguing answers to these questions.

Although charismatic leaders possessed special virtues, what was important in their functioning was the special type of relationship they had with their followers. This relationship made ordinary people do extraordinary things in the face of adversity. The transformational leaders gain the capacity to exert profound influence over others by proposing a vision - they describe in vivid, emotional terms an image of what they could (and should) become. They describe a clear way of achieving or actualising the dream image. They show greater-than-average willingness to take risks and engage in unconventional actions to reach the goal. They have enormous amount of self-confidence and confidence in their fol-

lowers. They are concerned with the followers' needs and have excellent communication skills. They are masters of impression management. When these forms of behaviour are added to the captivating vision they propound, it is impossible to resist their impact. In short, the essence of transformational leadership appears to rest on the ability of these leaders to inspire others through their words, deeds and vision. As Conger (1991) puts it: "If you, as a leader, can make an appealing dream seem like tomorrow's reality, your subordinates will freely choose to follow you."

Prosocial Behaviour

Prosocial behaviour refers to helping others without expecting anything in return. It benefits others but has no benefits for the person engaged in such behaviour. On the other hand, it may involve risk and sacrifice on the part of the help giver. It is also called *altruistic behaviour* – an unselfish concern for the welfare of others. Prior to 1960, very little was known about prosocial behaviour. Today, it is a very important area in which enormous amount of research and theorising is taking place. How research started in this area has a bit of history. On March 13, 1964, at 3.20 A.M., Kitty Genovese, manager of a bar in New York, was returning home after her work. After parking her car, when she was about to enter her apartment, a stranger appeared with a knife and stabbed her. Ms. Genovese screamed for help. Lights came on in many apartment windows that overlooked the scene. The attacker retreated for a while and came back to resume his assault on the screaming victim. Almost 45 minutes after the initial attack (after three attacks by the stranger), the victim lay dead as a result of multiple stab injuries. Later, thirty-eight people reported that they had heard the victim's cries, but none came forward to help, or informed police. The next day, newspaper columnists, editorial writers, and television commentators condemned the event and suggested that bystanders were unresponsive because the society had become apathetic, selfish and indifferent toward human suffering. Americans were portrayed as people without feeling toward their fellow beings. Though such explanations were plausible, two social psychologists, John Darley and Bib Latane thought otherwise; they proposed a different explanation of why people failed to help. A new and fruitful area of research started in social psychology.

Kitty Genovese incident was explained by public in terms of *bystander apathy* – indifference on the part of witnesse to an emergency of failure to help a stranger in distress. But Latane and Darley (1968) thought that the inaction of

the bystanders resulted from the fact that many people were present at the scene and that no one person felt responsible for taking action; the cause of inaction was *diffusion of responsibility*. So, they hypothesised that as the number of bystanders increases, the diffusion of responsibility results in a decrease in prosocial behaviour. The hypothesis was supported in one of their experiment. The subjects in the experiments were told that they would be discussing a problem associated with college education. The subjects were told that each of them would be assigned to a separate room and could communicate only through an intercom system; they could hear each other, but the experimenter would not be listening.

Some subjects were told they were one of two discussants, others that they were part of a group of three, and still others that they were part of six. And in reality only one subject took part in discussion and the other participant or participants were simply tape recordings. In each session, the first person to speak was the tape-recorded individual who was to be the "victim." The "victim" announces, in an embarrassed voice, that he has taken ill, is suffering from a seizure, and needs help. Now, the question is what the subject under each instructional condition would do; who would leave the experimental room to look for the imaginary patient and how soon? It was very clear that as the number of apparent bystanders increased, the percentage of subjects attempting to help decreased. Further, among those who did respond, the increase in the number of bystanders led to increased delay in taking action. Among those who believed that they were the only witnesses to the emergency, 85 percent tried to help and did so within the first minute. Such responsiveness decreased and slowed down, as more bystanders were present. This phenomenon was called *bystander effect*.

Beyond demonstrating the operation of bystander effect, the experiment also cast doubt about the existence of all pervasive bystander apathy. This was found in the behaviour of those who did not attempt to offer help; they seemed emotionally upset, confused, and uncomfortable; definitely, they were not indifferent.

Following this initial experiment, Darley and Latane, and several others, carried out a series of studies which led to the formulation of a theoretical model to explain why bystanders sometimes help and sometimes do not help a victim. Latane and Darley (1970) conceptualised prosocial behaviour as the end point of a series of five decisions. At each point, one decision results in no help being

given, while the other decision leads to the next step towards a prosocial act. The choice points are given below:

1. The bystander should notice that an emergency exists. If he does not notice, no help is offered. If he notices he goes to the next step.

2. The bystander should interpret the emergency correctly. In many emergency situations, some ambiguity exists. Ambiguity, if not clarified, leads to indecision and help may not be forthcoming. When the individual is sure of what is happening, he takes the next step.

3. At the third point, the bystander asks himself whether it is his responsibility to help. If he does not feel so, help is not offered. If the person thinks it is his duty to help, he moves on to the fourth step.

4. Here the bystander thinks about the ways and means of helping the victim. If he does not have the know-how, he may not help. Suppose the victim is drowning and the bystander does not know swimming, he may not help. When he is able to help he goes to the final point.

5. Deciding to help: several factors influence this step. Will the victim accept the help? What are the risks involved in helping? What if he (bystander) is making a mistake (social blunder) in the name of helping? When he feels that every thing is okay, he offers help.

In short, helping behaviour is affected by aspects of the situation (the number of bystanders, the ambiguity in the situation), the skills of the bystander (whether he is a doctor, nurse, or swimmer) and the state of the bystander (time pressure, intoxication). Further, certain personality traits are found to be associated with prosocial behaviour.

Shotland (1985) has listed the following situations where bystander intervention is less likely to occur:

1. when the intervention might lead to personal harm (retaliation by the criminal, days in court testifying);

2. when helping takes time the bystander cannot afford;

3. the situation is ambiguous;

4. the individuals struggling or fighting are closely related, such as husband and wife;

5. when the victim is perceived as drunk rather than disabled;

6. when the victim and bystander do not belong to the same ethnic group;

7. when bystander has no previous history of victimisation, has witnessed fewer crimes and intervention efforts, and has had no training in first aid and rescue operations.

There are several other factors that may induce helping behaviour. For example, the presence of others who are helpful (role models), may make us follow their footsteps. We are more likely to contribute to a charity when we see the list of contributors. When we see a few coins on the towel in front of a beggar, we are more prone to put a coin. Helping behaviour shown in TV has been found to prompt school children to engage in such behaviour.

Explaining Prosocial behaviour

The basic question asked in all studies of prosocial behaviour is, why people help or do not help others in need? Several concepts such as selfishness, apathy, diffusion of responsibility, altruistic motives have been proposed as possible causes. These concepts have led to the development of some theories of prosocial behaviour. The first of these is *empathy-altruism* theory that suggests that, at least, some prosocial behaviour is motivated solely by the desire to help the recipient. Empathy includes compassion toward the victim and when empathy is aroused, help is offered. The second theory, *egoistic theory*, is based on the assumption that individuals, who experience negative emotions, are motivated to help a victim to relieve themselves of such feelings. The negative feelings may already exist in the individual or are aroused by the emergency. Either way, helping behaviour is motivated by the desire to make oneself feel better. The theory is often described as *negative state relief model*. The third theory is called the *empathic joy hypothesis*. It asserts that empathy leads to helping, but only if the helper can learn about the results of his helpfulness. Without that egoistic reward (the joy one experiences when observing that someone else's needs have been met), empathy does not lead to prosocial behaviour.

These theories are tentative views about prosocial behaviour. There is as yet no final agreement about the motivation that underlies this brighter side of human nature – non-selfish concern to help someone who is in distress. Future studies may well provide a satisfactory answer.

Concluding Words

Social psychology is a fascinating branch of psychology. The field currently is so diverse and so far ranging in scope that it was not possible to cover the entire subject in this essay. Only some of the major developments have been reviewed. Some exciting areas, where insightful studies have been made during the last century, have not been included here. For example, interpersonal attraction (how and why we are drawn toward some and not others), interpersonal relationships (study of close and intimate relationship as found in love and friendship), prejudice and discrimination (study of negative attitudes people develop toward members of some social groups and negative actions they engage toward these people), and aggression, the all-too-common form of social behaviour, have been omitted here. The more important omission is the applications of social psychology, social psychology in action.

The purpose of this paper is to enthuse the general readers about the discipline of social psychology, and create an interest in them toward this young science that is attempting to unravel the mystery of man in his relation to the social environment. If this is achieved, the purpose of the paper is more than served.

References

1. Allport, F.H. (1924). Social Psychology, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
2. Asch, S.E. (1946). *Forming Impressions of Personality*, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 41, 258–290.
3. Asch, S.E. (1951). *Effects of Group Pressure upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgement*. In H. Guetzkow (Ed). Groups, Leadership, and Men. Pittsburgh, PA: Canegie.
4. Baron, R.A. and Byrne, D. (1994). *Social Psychology*, (7th Ed.) Needham Heights; Mass: Allyn & Bacon.
5. Conger, J.A. (1991). *Inspiring Others: The language of Leadership*. Academy of Management Executives, 5(1), 31–45.
6. Eagly, A.H. and Johnson, B.T. (1990). *Gender and Leadership Style: A Meta-Analysis*. Psychological Bulletin, 100, 309–330.

7. Festinger, L (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive-Dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row Peterson.

8. Festinger, L & Carlsmith, J.M. (1959). *Cognitive Consequences of Forced Compliance*. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58, 203-210.

9. Fiedler, F.E. (1978). *Contingency Model and the Leadership Process*. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 11), New York: Academic Press.

10. Hovland, C.I., Janis, I.L. & Kelley, H.H. (1953). *Communication and Persuasion: Psychological Studies of One on One*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

11. Janis, I.L. (1982). *Victims of Groupthink* (2nd Ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

12. Kelley, H.H. (1950). *The Warm-Cold Variable in First Impression of Persons*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 431-439.

13. Kelley, H.H. & Michela, J.I. (1980). *Attribution Theory and Research*. Annual Review of Psychology, 31, 457-501.

14. Kirkpatrick, S.A. & Locke, E.A. (1991). *Leadership: Do Traits Matter?* Academy of Management Executives, 5(2), 48-60.

15. LaPiere, R.T. (1934). *Attitude and Actions*. Social Forces, 13, 230-237.

16. Latane, B & Darley J.M. (1968). *Group Inhibition of Bystander Intervention in Emergencies*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 215-221.

17. Latane, B & Darley, J.M. (1970). *The Unresponsive Bystander: Why Doesn't He Help?* New York: Appleton-Country-Crofts.

18. McDougall, W (1908). Introduction To Social Psychology. London: Methuen.

19. Milgram, S. (1963). *Behavioural Study of Obedience*. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67, 371-378.

20. Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to Authority*. New York: Harper.

21. Miller, J.G. (1984). *Culture and Development of Everyday Social Explanation*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 961-978.

22. Petty, R.E. & Caciopp, J.T. (1986). *The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion*. In L.Berkowitz (Ed., Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 19, pp. 123-205). New York: Academic Press.

23. Shotland, R.L. (1985). *When Bystanders Just Stand By*. Psychology Today, 50-55.

24. Vroom, V.H. & Yetton, P.W. (1973). *Leadership and Decision-Making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

25. Wicker, A.W. (1969). *Attitude Versus Actions: The Relationship of Verbal and Overt Behavioural Responses to Attitude Objects*. Journal of Social Issues, 25, 41-78.

26. Yukl, G. (1989). *Leadership in Organisations* (2nd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ; Prentice-Hall.

27. Zajonc, R.B. (1965). *Social Facilitation*. Science, 149, 269-274.

Landmarks in the Development of Political Science in the Twentieth Century

7

K. Raghavendra Rao

This presentation does not aim at providing a detailed historical narrative. What it does is to offer a highly focused and selective story of the way in which what may be provisionally designated as the discipline of Political Science developed during the last century. However, there is an important initial hurdle that needs to be overcome. This is the question whether something called Political Science really and legitimately exists as a universal phenomenon, since what is now known by that name was originally initiated and grew in the context of the history of a specific place, namely the West. Hence one must bear in mind the problematic nature of the discipline in our own Indian context. Colonial intervention in India inserted into our intellectual history a phenomenon originating elsewhere. This has implied a necessary process of assimilating and digesting the colonial gift both during the colonial period itself and in the post-colonial period.

But there is a more universal intellectual category that can approximately cover the pre-modern history of the West as well as our own pre-colonial history. This category is political discourse which can be meaningfully applied to all reflection in different parts of the world on the nature and functioning of politically organised communities prior to Western dominance. The ambiguity of the term, Political Science, even in the context of the modern West itself, may be highlighted by the fact that the discipline is known by a veriety of other terms such as Politics, Political Studies and Government. I am raising this issue right

at the start so that we should be under no illusion that the discipline as now constituted is unproblematically universal. Of course, this does not foreclose the issue of universalising it in a proper sense. Further, it should be noted that even in the West itself its universality is circumscribed by the fact that there are two different intellectual traditions – the continental which is structurally associated with legal and philosophical studies, and Anglo-American which has been mostly characterised by historical as well as legal-formal concerns. This distinction itself can be traced to the more fundamental distinction in their philosophical traditions between metaphysical idealism and pragmatic empiricism.

Before plunging into the main story, I want to mention an important aspect of this presentation, which is its limitation. It focuses on the foundational dimensions of the discipline – theory and methodology. This is not only because they are epistemologically crucial but also because it would be impossible to deal with all the complex interrelated and constituted components of the discipline. Each one of these components such as Comparative Political Institutions and International Relations has now grown into a specialisation in its own right.

As in the case of all social sciences, two crucial and recurring problems erupting periodically into epistemological crises in political science are the legitimacy of its claim to be called a science in the positivistic sense, and the frustrating problem of relating the subjective and objective dimensions of the concerned data. I have drawn attention to the positivistic problematic in order to make it easy for us to grapple with the discipline's historical crises.

A good starting point for our story would be 1908, in the very first decade of the century, when a landmark work appeared in English. This was the work entitled *Human Nature in Politics*, (Graham Wallas, 1924). Its author, Graham Wallas, was then professor of Political Science at London University. This classic of the discipline illustrates the basic epistemological impasse of the discipline at the turn of the century. In the preface to the 1920 third edition, cited in the 1924 edition of the volume, Wallas says,

"..... I tried in 1908 to make two points clear. My first point was the danger, for all human activities, but especially for the working of democracy, of the intellectualist assumption, that every human action is the result of an intellectual process, by which he desires and then calculates the means by which that end can be attained. My second point was the need of substituting for that assumption a conscious and systematic effort of thought..............., The

whole progress, I argued, of human civilisation beyond the earliest stages, has been made possible by the invention of methods of thought which enable us to interpret and forecast the working of nature more successfully than we could, if we followed the line of least resistance in the use of our minds..........."
(Ibid, vii)

In his first point, Wallas is puncturing the rationalist assumption that human beings always act rationally in terms of ends and means. Paradoxically, the second point maintains that we can grasp this human irrationality only through a systematic application of a rational methodology! But the more substantive point transcending both these negative points is the need for Political Science to seek its secure foundations in a systematic study of human nature. In other words, the theoretical point is that man may create culture but his culture must be within the parameters set by nature. Wallas illustrates this by pointing out that the First World War had discredited the conception of man as a creature moved by "enlightened self-interest" or rationality. According to him, this conception had blinded us to the darker and more irrational aspects of human nature. As examples of this irrationality, Wallas, given his conservative bias, mentions the Russian Revolution, British electoral democracy and the break-down of political institutions in Central Europe. But this position should not be taken to mean a pessimistic and negative evaluation of liberal democracy. His point is that democracy opens up opportunities for rational politics but it also makes it difficult to articulate a rational political behaviour. However, his main critique of existing Political Science is that it lacks a systematic conception of human nature. While the earlier theory of human nature based on the utilitarian doctrine had been discredited, no suitable alternative had been put in its place.

Let us now, shift the locus of our attention from England to the USA, since these two nations constitute a loosely integrated single system from the point of the discipline's development. Fortunately for us, there is a well researched and documented academic study of American Political Science by the English scholar, Bernard Crick (Bernard Crick 1956). Though Americal Political Science, along with other social sciences, became more theoretically oriented and abstract much later, in the first decades of the century, it, too, was empirically oriented as well as problem-solving. But one must draw some nice distinctions between the British and the American traditions within a common, broadly empiricist framework. The British tradition tended to tilt towards the historical and legal-formal approach to the study of politics, while the American tended to emphasise the pragmatic problem-solving function of the discipline. Also, the

American tradition moved towards an explicitly positivistic approach, paradoxically enough, attempting to re-fashion the discipline on the lines of natural-physical sciences. It is to the paradoxical unity of scientificity and pragmatism that Crick draws attention when he declares,

"...... Political Science as a discipline first arose in the United States to fulfil the practical task of maintaining a belief in the unity of American sentiments....." (Crick 1956:236).

Thus the American tradition could not escape the pragmatist and technological imperatives of the American ethos. This was, of course, more visible in the origins of its sociology in the so-called Chicago School. Its underlying assumption was to diagnose the ills of society and to suggest practical measures to cure it of the diagnosed ills. In short, between the two World Wars, the English tradition tended to emphasis empirical and historical methodologies with a focus on legal-formal and institutional analysis. The American tradition also tended to emphasis the scientific empirical methodology but leaving out history, with a focus on practical problems facing the relevant institutions.

Indian Political Science, originating as part of English colonial policy, tended expectedly to follow closely the English tradition of historical and legal-formal studies. This is, of course, more true of the academically constituted and practised discipline. There were other alternative discourses falling outside it such as the nationalist and the Marxist discourses. The Gandhian discourse never quite took off since the nationalist discourse sidelined the Gandhian discourse while nationalist politics assigned him a central role as its leader. Gandhiji himself saw this as far back as in 1908 in his masterpiece, *Hind Swaraj*, when he pointed out that while he wanted to establish Hind Swaraj in India, his Congress colleagues were interested only in parliamentary Raj. (Rudrangshu Mukherjee, 1993:3-66) Like the Gandhians, the Marxists have also managed to exist epistemologically, so to say, on the fringes of the dominant academic Political Science. Perhaps the situation has not changed much even to this day.

I shall now try to give a broad and suggestive account of the theoretical developments in the three ideological streams that seem to characterise political discourse in the last century in India and elsewhere. These streams can be broadly designated the liberal, the socialist and the indigenous. We shall first examine the situation in the West, and then focus on the Indian situation. The rise of industrial capitalist society in the West produced political theories both support-

ing it and opposing it. Of course, as in all historical developments, such neat labelling will not always do, since there are always cases of cross-pollination and floor-crossing! The idealistic tradition of Green and Bosanquet in England, emphasised, following Hegel, a morally constituted state, and thus argued that state intervention in the economic life of the society was legitimate on moral grounds, though their liberal ideological commitment created awkward situations for them. This argument was later to lead the liberals to set up the welfare state, based on a historical compromise between the working class and the capitalist class in the West, which broke down in the eighties of the last century to produce a neo-liberal climate after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the former communist regimes. This neo-liberal onslaught on the welfare state has now become global. But to go back in time, the idealist conception of the morally conceptualised sovereign state came under attack from a variety of sources in England, and this attack as a collective historical effort may be called the pluralist attack on the supremacy and sovereignty of the state. In his *The Grammar of Politics* Laski spearheaded this attack both on the ground that the state, in fact, did not enjoy such sovereignty and also on the ground that it was morally unacceptable. The other schools that attacked state sovereignty were the Guild Socialists and Anarchists. The Fabians represented the tradition of state intervention on mixed grounds, socialist as well as pragmatic-liberal. Socialists like Laski believed that the liberal state in its democratic dimension had the potential, at least in England, to produce socialist reforms. In liberal discourse itself, the state continued to occupy a commanding role whether as a dispenser of welfare for the majority or as the gatekeeper of the property-owning classes. As can be seen later, this position was mirrored in the socialist camp as well, though the theoretical formulations naturally differed considerably. While Western political theory in its liberal avatar had earlier defended colonialism on the ground that the colonised were backward (often characterised as children and hence in need of Western guardianship and tutelage) much later the same logic was transformed, via a concealed evolutionary framework, into the theory of political modernisation and political development.

The theory of modernisation and development which flowered in the 1960s, coinciding with the rise of the US as the supreme leader of the so-called free and non-communist world, attempted to justify theoretically a neo-colonial and neo-liberal transformation of the world into a global industrial capitalist system based on free market economies. The current globalisation discourse is a continuation of the apparently abandoned modernisation-development discourse. With all its sophistication and even theoretical subtlety, the modernisation-development dis-

course maintained that traditional, non-Western societies should move towards a modern society model, itself an abstracted and theoretically fabricated version of the existing industrial capitalist societies of the West, with the US being the paradigmatic exemplar of the so-called civic society. Some of the leading exponents of this theory are Almond, Powell, Shils, Apter, Eisenstadt, Pye and Huntington.

But this development was not outwardly visible in England, though it had infiltrated in subtle ways into political discourse there at various levels. For instance, Oakeshott's elegant and poetical attack on rationalism in politics was an indirect and implied defence of the established order, since rationalism led to the danger of reformism, not to speak of revolution. Going back a little further, pluralism in the us, as in the work of Bentley, attempted to reduce the role of the state in relation to what was called civil society, dominated by a plurality of non-governmental structures, thus leading ultimately to a lassaiz faire economy. English pluralism did not forge any links with a lassies faire economy. In England, the most debated issue in the fifties was the so-called death of political theory or political philosophy in the old sense. It was claimed in the name of logical positivism, a version of scientific world-view verging on scientism, that traditional political theory was dead since it lacked empirical foundations, being based on normative and metaphysical assumption. This idea itself was based on the epistemological position that true knowledge can only be the knowledge of what can be known empirically as verifiable fact. Whatever statement one made that did not conform to this empirical verifiability was not valid knowledge. Non-empirical and empirically unverifiable statements were regarded as nonsense. They had no meaningful sense. Thus all metaphysical, ethical, aesthetic and religious discourse was rejected as non-knowledge. (See Weldon, 1953). All the traditional greats like Plato and Aristotle, came to be discounted as theorists since the only genuine theory was empirical theory, based on verifiable facts. This theory surfaced in American Political Science in the guise of what has been called the behavioural revolution.

The behavioural approach, which seems now to be somewhat discredited along with the associated theories of modernisation and development, is a methodological variant of logical positivism. In essence, it asserts that theory-building in political science must be based on observed behaviour of the basic unit of political behaviour, the individual. It led to a quantitative emphasis on data collection through survey methods and statistical techniques. It rested not only on what is known as methodological individualism but also on the dogma that what

is not quantifiable is not scientific and hence, not genuine knowledge. This theory provided the methodology and the methods for the theorists of modernisation and political development. Behaviourism was also part of the theory complex which included the concept of the political system.

The system theory could have drawn on two systems theory traditions – the biological and the mechanical. David Easton (1953) the pioneer of the theory, drew heavily on the mechanical tradition. The overall subject of Political theory was not the traditional state or government but a far more complex thing called the political system. The political system was a dehistorised category with a universal scientific status. The system was ocated within an environment of other systems such as society, culture and economy. This was an adaptation of the Parsonian system in which the polity or Easton's system was only a sub-system of the social system. The system functioned as a machine which processed the demands emanating from the environment into policy outputs. The processing machinery was the conventional government with its classical functional organs of the executive, legislature and the judiciary. The demands were themselves produced through the processes of interest aggregation and interest articulation handled by specific structures such as political parties and interest – pressure groups located in the system. There was also a loophole mechanism by which the reactions from the environment to the output came back into the system as additional input. While Easton himself did not provide for system transformation, and his theory logically cannot accommodate revolutionary developments, it is possible to extend the theory by conceptualising a system breakdown and the emergence of a new by stem. In retrospect, the systems theory seems to have been nourished heavily on the structural – functional theory.

The student movements in the late sixties shook the very foundations of liberal theory if not liberal practice. This had a number of dimensions. At one level, the attack was on capitalism and imperialism, but its Marxism was not that of the earlier Marxists. It was fed by a number of new sources such as the feminist movement, the black revolution, the third world revolutions, and counter-culture revolution including the sex revolution and the ideology of the permissive society . While the capitalist crises of the earlier periods were contained through the welfare interventions of the state and the new deal and the Marshal plan, now the capitalist crisis, in the absence of a bipolar situation, has generated an aggressive agenda of globalisation through US-controlled international institutions like the World Bank and IMF and even the UNO. No doubt the crisis of capitalism has managed to become less visible, thanks to the collapse of commu-

nist regimes in Russia and Eastern Europe, it is still there, kindling hopes for a socialist revival. In terms of theory, dogmatic liberalism has been replaced by revisionist liberalism in such works as Rawls' neo-liberal *A Theory of Justice* and the radical anarchist work of Nozcik. The disecnchantment with the state in advanced capitalistic societies has generated a tradition of anti-statism represented by the communitarian theorists like Macintyre and Taylor, who question the moral legitimacy and the functional adequacy of the modern capitalist state. But their position cannot be linked to the free market theory. Their theories also reject universal categories, and thus they tend to emphasis history and local contextuality. In this, they have affiliation with the post-structural and post-modernity discourses. In the West, political science today represents an exciting but unsettled field, full of opportunities for theoretical innovation.

In Western Marxism there have been significant landmarks of development in theory and practice. Marxism has always been historically riddled with crucial debates right from the days of Marx himself. Leaving aside the nineteenth century story of Marxism, we find that, with the rise of communist regimes, beginning with the Soviet Union, a first loose schism took place in terms of Western Marxism and Soviet Marxism. But even earlier there was a debate between the evolutionary socialists and revolutionary socialists, the former calling themselves democratic socialists or social democrats. The debate centred round the socialist potentialities of capitalist democracy. The socialists held that the system was capable of reforming itself towards a socialist order. The revolutionary wing of socialists held that capitalist democracy is a sham democracy, a mere cloak for formal legitimisation of capitalism. The schism took a sharp political division in the Second International on the issue of supporting the first world war. Those who supported the capitalist states in the name of nationalist loyalties broke away from the International to form the socialist camp and the revolutionary wing called itself the communist movement.

After the emergence of Soviet Russia and other communist regimes, a clear division could be seen between the Western Marxists and the Soviet Marxists. While Soviet Marxism supported state socialism and the revolution from above, the Western Marxists have been more inclined to support classical Marxism in their anti-state position. The official communist parties in the West have followed the Soviet position while Marxists outside them have been critical of Soviet state nationalism. Gramscie, the Italian Marxist, has been one of the most innovative thinkers in Western Marxism. In particular, he has contributed the concept of hegemony and the idea that it has been maintained under capitalism

not merely by force but also through ideological and intellectual manipulation, through manufactured consent. He also developed the notion of the conciliar institutions, according to which workers should be organised less as a centralised party than on the lines of workers councils on the shop-floor.

The most important Western Marxist landmark is undoubtedly the Frankfurt school which paid great attention to the cultural and ideological dimensions of capitalism, issues relatively neglected in classical Marxism in its pre-occupation with the problem of analysing the capitalist structure, leaving the superstructure problems unexplored. It is not possible here to mention details but it can be stated that the Frankfurt Marxists lluminated the dark and complex corners of the cultural world such as literature, art, education, film and music. They often incurred the censure of orthodox Marxists as overturning the classical relationship of hierarchy between the structure and the superstructure. Today, the Frankfurt tradition is being carried on with considerable complexity and ambiguity by the German Marxist theorist, Habermas. His most famous theoretical contribution has been the communication theory which seems to give equal emphasis to economy and the structures of communication in society in the broadest sense. He would criticise capitalism for its failure to generate communication structures in which the members of a society possess and exercise what he calls communicative capability. In a sense, Habermas represents the general turn towards language as a central human structure, which seems to dominate recent turn western discourses. Hebermas has also been carrying on a battle against the anti-universalist trends in liberal and liberal radical positions of the communitarians. Apart from this, there has developed within Western Marxism, a school of thinkers who can be variously designated academic Marxists, Neo-Marxists and so on. One of the most well-known of these is Jon Elster. They argue for a thorough revision of Marxism amounting to its total repudiation. They argue for what they call market socialism and they want Marxists to abandon the classical Marxist categories of value, surplus value and structure-super-structure dichotomy.

Within Soviet Marxism, there has been a swing from worker dominance to the dominance of the party-state under Stalin. Also there has been a rejection of socialist internationalism in preference to socialism in one state. A crucial dissenter, Stalin's rival, Trotsky, focused on the idea of bureaucratic socialism. On the way to its collapse, Soviet system, under Gorbachev, generated the twin programmes of Perestrokia and Glasnost. These were euphemistic terms for accepting the failure of the Soviet Socialist experiment and the need for restoring

liberal capitalism. A significant innovation within world Marxism has been Mao's creative application of classical Marxism with specific reference to the Chinese conditions. Mao's most significant innovation is his concept of cultural revolution as a pre-condition for the preservation of other political and economic revolutions. While one may criticise its practice in China, there is no doubt that cultural revolution is a critical process in the establishment of a socialist system. Mao also emphasised human will as against material and objective situation. Thus, both liberalism and Marxism in a universal historical context have been riddled with crises and radical departures and ruptures.

When we turn to the situation in our own country, India, we find a broadly colonial replication of the Western story. The academic discipline of Political Science in the modern sense came to us certainly as a part of the colonial package. Around the 1920s, the subject was introduced in our University curriculum under colonial auspices. It followed heavily the British pattern till the departure of the British from India. This means that the subject was oriented towards historical and formal-institutional description. The disjunction between the classroom political study and the politics raging around it in the form of the nationalist struggle was due to the colonial ideological control of the educational system. Under the Gandhian influence, attempts were made to establish parallel nationalist institutions where presumably nationalist bias dominated. We shall take a quick look at the non-academic political discourse later and first focus on the academic version of it. While *de jure* accounts of political institutions prevailed, *de factor* versions of the same institutions were not encouraged as a threat to the ideological hegemony of the colonial power. But this liberal ideology colonially doled out was not the vibrant lkiberaism of the metropolis but a colonially constricted and doctored version of it. Yet the fact remains that even this truncated version was able to create an elite which challenged colonialism on the basis of its own liberal ideology with the watchwords of liberty and equality. After Independence this situation continued for quite some time. But soon the ideological hegemony in the discipline changed hands from the British to the new imperial or neo-colonial power of the US, which emerged as the dominant global power displacing the good old British Empire.

In 1960s, Rajni Kothari played an important role in inducting into Indian Political Science the new American sponsored theories and methodology of political modernisation, political development and behaviouralism. He was able to do it outside the University system through his Centre for the Study of Development Studies in New Delhi, an institution which was later alleged to have

received CIA funds. In 1967, he organised a huge workshop on Behaviouralism in Bangalore, inviting some of the most intellectually active and respectable political scientists and exposed them to a series of lectures and seminars conducted by some of the best practitioners of the new political science, which included such star performers as Edward Shils and Lucian Pye. While this new development in the US was part of the Cold War ideological fight against Communism and Marxism, its relevance to India was never clearly specified either by the visiting American savants or their local sponsors. The ideological and political implications of the so-called political science were camouflaged by the facade of an objective, value-free and politically neutral "universal" political science. These critical comments should not be taken to suggest that the visiting scholars were not intellectually fertile and technically competent. The point is not whether they were good scholars or not but the point is that they were obviously under political pressure to promote the ideological interests of the so-called "free world" under the US leadership. I was myself one of the participants and virtually most of the distinguished senior members of the discipline today participated in it. Rajni Kothari consolidated this process by himself publishing his *Politics in India*, which presented a comprehensive and well-argued account of the Indian political system, based on the behaviouristic methodology and the conceptual baggage of modernisation, political development and systems theory. The University system has yet to fully integrate this new wisdom with its official curricula, but in the meanwhile, the West itself has either rejected or radically modified these intellectual structures within the mainstream liberal tradition. Academic political science faces still a theoretically uncertain and unsettled situation, opting out for an eclectic framework, as indicated by Professor Thomas Pantham's recent survey of the situation. It has yet to demonstrate itself as relevant to Indian political life.[5]

While the purely academic situation is dominated by liberal and neo-liberal tradition, there has been certainly Marxist and Gandhian discourses which have registered their presence, though in a marginal way. But outside the academic system, vigorous political discourses have been operating throughout the last century. In these discourses, the major issues have been the problematic of Indian nationalism in the context of its colonial birth. Partha Chatterji has pioneered the critical examination of our nationalist discourse, highlighting its contradictions and complexities due to its colonial birth. Gandhiji's *Hind Swaraj* has inspired a Gandhian discourse in which the categories of the state, society, and the nation, have been re-interpreted in the light of a radically re-constructed Indian tradition. The Gandhian discourse does not reject the state *peer se* but

rejects the highly centralised modern state. In its programme of decentralised and communitarian politics, it conceptualises a political system in which the local rural communities enjoy maximum power as against the central state. This Gandhian state seems to be a solution to the problem of alienation in the modern state. Jayaprakash Narayan, in his Gandhian concept of total revolution, has advanced the theory of a partyless democracy and *Loka Neeti* as against *Raja Neeti*. His advocacy of direct and people-based democracy has certainly clear Gandhian echoes, but, ironically, his own political praxis was misappropriated by liberal politics during the Janata experiment to strengthen liberal democracy, and not usher in the expected Gandhian democracy. There is a historical parallel. Just as Gandhiji's own political praxis was appropriated by liberal nationalism, so also JP's Gandhian political praxis was misappropriated by liberal politics.

The left political discourse has been split into democratic socialist tradition anchored in its own version of Gandhism and enriched by the writings of socialists thinkers like Lohia, Narendra Dev and others and a communist tradition adhering to a revolutionary path as against the non-violent, parliamentary path. But today, mainstream communism has become virtually indistinguishable from democratic socialism as it has embraced the parliamentary path. Revolutionary Marxism has been banisherd to the exotic fringes of Naxalism and Marxism-Leninsm-Maoism. Even they seem to be contemplating a parliamentary turn!

Political discourse in India now faces challenges from an as yet imperfectly articulated political feminism and a better articulated Dalit and Backward classes movements. Dalit politics, in spite of its weaknesses as praxis, has been fortunate in a theoretically rich heritage in the seminal writings of Ambedkar. Ambedkar's critique of the liberal bourgeois concept of the Indian nation and his critique of Hinduism must be seen as potentially the most powerful strands in our modern political discourse. With Marxist radicalism apparently blunted, the Dalit radicalism seems to have the sharpest revolutionary edge today. Though it is being co-opted by mainstream bourgeois politics, it is certainly more difficult to handle for it than the Backward classes radicalism which has become fully integrated into liberalism. Dalit scholarship in Political Science has scarcely moved beyond the Ambedkar heritage though some interesting work has been done by Dalit political scientists like Gopal Guru.

Some of the other central issues facing Indian political science are the nature of nationalism in relation to the country's regional and ethnic diersities, the nature of

the Indian state, the role of micropolitics centred round institutions like the family and the caste the issue of corruption and the crisis in democratic politics. The subaltern attempts to focus on local micropolitical issues have opened up new territories for political exploration, though the subalterns, like all exponents of micropolitics, tend to depoliticise micropolitics by isolating it from macropolitics.

In conclusion, it can be claimed that political thinking in the last century demonstrated great intellectual vigour and political understanding in tackling the political challenges facing it. But it also had its ups and downs, frustrations and triumphs. Its history and fate have been different in different regions of the world. Yet these differences have surfaced within a loosely formulated universal framework. In the new century and the new millennium, there are new challenges – globalisation and information technology revolution. But, these new challenges are not really new because ultimately they have to tackle the perennial issues of human life, human freedom and human dignity. My last words will be from a recent Western work on political theory, John Dunn's *Rethinking Modern Political Theory*. Dunn draws our attention to the need for a more praxis oriented theoretical discourse on politics by invoking the concept of prudence. Now prudence is a virtue generated by an intellectual and moral interaction between what is historically possible in concrete terms and what is held to be trans historical by a given political community. He rightly argues that this involves a political discourse that forges links between agency and responsibility in political life, both at the individual and institutional levels. I could have quoted in conclusion Marx on praxis or Gandhiji on Dharma. Instead I shall quote Dunn as part of our political science predicament. Dunn writes, "........In political philosophy, as in ethics, the correct view in the first instance is from here and now: from where and when....."[8] If one looks closely at this piece of wisdom, it does not differ, in essence, from the Marxian dialectic of the abstract and the concrete, or the moral realism of Gandhiji. Both these require us to strike a balance between the practicable, the possible and the ideal. We, in India, have had a classical tradition of balancing the diverse demands of human life as in our theory of the four purusharthas which emphasis the ideal of harmonising the four goals of life – Dharma (Ethics), Artha (Material interst), Kama (Bodily desires) and Moksha (Transcendental). We have an opportunity to work out the political implications of this theory and contribute to the creation of a new landmark in a potentially global and universal discourse on politics.

(*Note:* This is a drastically recast version of the lecture delivered on 7th August 2000 at Gulbarga University under the auspices of the Piloo Homi Irani

Endowment. The revision has been basically made in response to the valuable comments of Prof. M.V. Nakarni.)

Notes

1. Though I have accepted the term, landmarks, suggested by the organisers, I still feel that the term, turning point, would have captured the historical dynamics of the developmental process better than the more spatial and static term, landmark. But this is not really an important issue.

2. The literature on modernisation is vast, now most of it outdated, but a good sample of it can be tasted in Welch(ed) (1967).

3. See Rao's essay, "Revolution, Political Development and Political System" in Rao, Raghavendra *K. Contradictions* (1974). It offers a critique of the theoretical concepts or modernisation, development, system and behaviouralism.

4. This is a conventional term used to distinguish non-Soviet versions of Marxism from the soviet version. However, it should not be elevated into a theoretical stance to attack the universalist claims of Marxism. Marxism contains a core that is universal and a mass of secondary, contigent elements which are contextually constrained by time and place.

5. Some years ago I published a polemical piece in the Delhi University Journal, Talking Politics, under the provocative title, "Political Theory of Indian Political Theory," and expectedly earned the wrath of many fellow political theorists. My point was that our political theory in academic context had yet to decolonise itself. I am not opposed to the "other" but I only want to ensure that the "other" does not gobble up the "self."

6. Once again my complaint is that these have not been sufficiently decolonised. For instance, there is a tendency to smother Gandhiji's distinctiveness by assimilaring him to Russia or communitarians or post-modernity.

7. Ambedkar is now receiving a well-deserved attention from political theorists like Valerian Rodrigues and myself in India and abroad. I have moved now, towards the position that Gandhiji and Ambedkar should be

regarded as the two seminal poles of all our political discourse. Gopal Guru who teaches at Poona University has yet to come up with a substantive volume, though his occasional presentations in seminars and conferences are full of promise.

8. Dunn (1985-1989): In this connection, I should like tomentioin the new historicism or historical relativism of the work of scholars like Quentin Skinner (1978) who have tried to contextualise political theory rigorously. This trend is yet another attack on the transhistorical and universalist claims of political theory.

References

1. Crick, Bernard (1956) *The American Science of Politics*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
2. Dunn, John (1985) *Rethinking Modern Political Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
3. Easton, David (1953) *The Political System*, Alfred Knopf, New York.
4. Mukherjee, Rudrangshu(ed) (1993) *The Penguin Gandhi Reader*, Penguin Books, London and Delhi.
5. Rao, K.Raghavendra (1974) *Contradictions*, Kavyadhara Publishers, Hubli.
6. Skinner, Quentin (1978) *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
7. Wallas, Graham (1924) *Human Nature in Politics*, Constable and Company, London.
8. Welch, Claude(ed) (1967) *Political Modernism—A Reader in Comparative Political Change*, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, California.
9. Weldon.T.E. (1953) *The Vocabulary of Politics*, Penguin Books, London.

Colonial Encounters: Aspects of Historiography on Modern India

8

B. Surendra Rao

History is a huge preoccupation in India to-day. We are intensely involved in writing our own history, rejecting the distortions or chasing away the calumnies that have entered it. We are also engrossed in refurbishing the testimonials we have received or writing out new ones. All these have gone into defining ourselves in the context of our freedom and nationhood. In fact, one of the sure signs of a people's desire to possess their present is their impulse to grab their past. However, we are witness to a curious paradox in India. History as an academic discipline has remained anaemic. It is looked upon as an option for those who are not too ambitious about their professional careers and do not intend to prance about in the brave new world of the twenty-first century. And yet, history is too much with us. It has always been an obsessive theme of nationalist rhetoric and political skulduggery. Historians, on their part, find themselves allotted a strangely ambivalent position. On the one hand they are dismissed as harmless cranks, rummaging the past endlessly for useless stories. On the other, they are called upon to adjudicate on some life-and-death issues of history which cynical politics conjures up from time to time to keep itself going. History, whether it is about past politics or not, has nearly confessed to being a part of present politics, – often of its exigencies, or at other times, of ideological concerns which were placed at the service of politics. It has always been so, notwithstanding the passionate professions of objectivity and neutrality it loves to make. Historiography is all about the historian's way of reconstructing the past. It is about the times of which he is a product, the ideological burden he carries, consciously or other-

wise, and the ways in which he is able to relate them to the craft of making sense of what the past leaves behind. History, as knowledge of the past, is what the historian does, and is inescapably ideological.

The historical tradition of modern India is a colonial inheritance. In the emphoric mood of Independence such admission is sometimes resented as too submissive. A pride of triumphant nationalism is ill-disposed to acknowledge that the colonial domination it had contested and overthrown would leave behind anything but a memory and legacy of blight. But negotiation with history needs more than our scalded and scalding emotions. Historiography is nothing if not a child of history, and it genetically carries with it the traits and experiences of the lived past. Colonialism is a fact of Indian history, and it cannot be wished away. One has to acknowledge that the tradition of historical writing we relate ourselves to is associated with what the British developed in India and our own acceptance of or reaction to, it. That does not mean that we should tell ourselves, as did our colonial rulers tell us, that the genius of India did not include a clear historical sense. Now it is generally acknowledged that India had its own ways of making sense of its past, though they were at variance with what was perceived in modern European scholarship as being authentically historical.[1] The Vedic literature and the *Itihasa-Purana* tradition have their own strains of historical sense, reflecting not so much a world as a world-view. The Prasasti literature which frequently sneaked into epigraphs and the flourishing industry of the court chroniclers, to which Islamic tradition contributed in no small measure have also ensured that the pre-British India was not altogether bereft of historical sense or works.[2] Interesting and useful as they are, they are not germane to the development of modern Indian historiography. The latter evolved out of a combination of European historical methods and the nuances of colonial ideology and its imitative of contestary responses in India. In fact, the categories of history on which colonial historiography is evaluated or censured are themselves European. In India, they did not have to contest for their supremacy, as they did politically or militarily at Plassey or Srirangapatna. There really was no flourishing historiographical tradition to be fought against and overthrown. In fact, such pre-British historiographical instincts as existed in India, had to be discovered before they were inferiorised, and the very process of inferiorisation was a part of colonisation. The real contest for history was launched only in the nationalist phase, and even there, within the parameters of the Western historiographical tradition. The weapons, ammunition and the rules of the fight were all borrowed from the West. They still largely are.[3]

Colonial historiography is better understood in its own dialogic mode where several profiles of the self-image of colonial rule are thrown up along with its concomitant 'others'. Its presiding theme was the Empire. The imperialists not only founded the Empire, but also marvelled at it, wrote extensive, running commentaries on their performance and reflected upon the future of their magnificent handiwork. They knew they were a part of history and some of them were sure history belonged to them. However, before the Company rule truly congealed itself in the country, the European writings on India were largely informed by curiosity for an exotic land and its people. The journals and travel accounts of William Hawkins, Thomas Roe, Edward Terry and Francois Bernier or the writings of the early missionaries expressed varied degrees of horror and wonderment at the favulous Orient. They had come here carrying with them a heavy cultural burden of Orientalised mythologies which had been tenanting the European consciousness for more than two thousand years, manufactured as they were as much by the writings of Herodotus and Marco Polo as by the fear of the dark unknowns. When they actually did stand face to face with the fabled Orient, it was difficult fro them not to reinforce their own pet notions about the subject. They could only posit the 'other' to compare and contrast. This attitude is also seen in the writings of Richard Owen, Cambridge, Luke Scrafton or Robert Orme who were witnessing the momentous events which launched the Company to the dizzy orbit of political power.[4] The facile but spectacular victories over the Indian 'powers' had to be explained which they did by contrasting the energetic, intrepid European with the degenerate and effeminate native. They were convinced, as was Montesquieu, that the Indian climate was enervating, which had rendered even the hardy Turks and Mughals languid and effete. In fact, they even feared that this Continent of Circe would exact similar revenge on the Europeans too. The construction of the Oriental 'other' is also seen in Holwell's much publicised account of the Black Hole Tragedy in which the decent European is done in by the wickedness and chicanery of the native ruler. This could have happened only in an 'Oriental Despotism' which got sculpted progressively as a stereotype. While its features were noticeable in the early European writings of the 17th century, its contours appear more sharply in Alexander Dow's *A History of Hindustan* (3 vols, 1768–1772) to which he appended his sombre reflections on the theme. Dow suggested that climate and religion had produced a kind of Indian genius which was so eminently prone to submit itself to despotism. It was as if India could not survive or flourish under anything other than a despotic rule. This thesis was destined to a long life, albeit with its own responses to the changing realities of colonial rule.

Once the Company began to feel that its involvement with India was more than just commercial, it had to explain the conquests and the empire they had led them to. It took the form of celebration and vindication, particularly of a moral kind. It was seen as an expression and proof of British superiority, both in military matters and in their national character, over the conquered natives, as in the writings of Sir John Malcolm[5] and Grant Duff.[6] It was also looked upon as a proof that the British were the chosen agents of change in the colonised world. It expressed itself either in the evangelical hopes of Christianisation as a precondition for heralding a new civilisation in the benighted colony or in the claims of radical social transformation to be achieved through the instrumentality of law and governance which Utilitarians like James Mill made with much promposity. In all this the bulldozing sentiment was the superiority of the conqueror, held in bold relief against an undoubted but a curable primitiveness of the conquered people. The evangelical writings of Charles Grant[7] or James Mill's celebrated History of British India (1817), dripping with its Utilitarian hopes and conceit, had both projected an image of India as a primitive country crying out for light and succour. The therapeutic value of the 'Good News' or of 'good laws' and governance could only be proclaimed in what was diagnosed as a sick society. Not an irredeemable society, but the one which could be saved if only it was tended and nursed by the benevolent Britain. This was, in fact, shown as the strongest justification of the British conquest of India. It was also seen as fulfilling the historical need of India, who had not only known the rule of the alien conquerors but seemed to do well only when ruled by them. Added to the fact that foreign rule was not distasteful to India, the Company could also stake its claim as the inheritor of the Mughal mantle. The 'Company Bahadur' took over from the Mughal after the latter had spent himself out. The eighteenth century in India is constructed in colonial historiography as a graphic illustration of the Mughal forfeiting his right to rule the country. The breakdown of order and the flourishing chaos were desperately crying out for a rescuer, and Pax Britannica was shown as merely answering that demand.

This imperialist stereotype had a long tenancy in historiography. It had its variants though, depending on who it had to engage in dialogue with. In the latter half of the nineteenth century when the colonial rule was targeted for reasoned nationalist reproaches, the British came up with the famous "fit of absent-mindedness" thesis. The picture of the reluctant conqueror fulfilling a solemn historic mission, conferring the benefits of good government where none existed, was drawn to counter the carping nationalists and their tireless obsession with the un-British rule in India. In fact, Seeley,[8] who spoke of the absent-

minded Company stumbling upon an empire in India even suggested that there was no real conquest of India, as it was not the state or its money or its army which built the empire. And since England was not a conqueror she should not rule India like one. A variant of this ingenious vindication is the all too well-known 'collaboration thesis' which claimed that the British acquisition of India was by consent and active collaboration of Indian peoples. This thesis generated its own inversions of competition, the bhadralok ambitions, scramble for power, etc. which attained different levels of sophistications in the writings Valentine Chirol,[9] Anil Seal,[10] John Broomfield,[11] David Washbrook,[12] Judith Brown[13] and others to explain the nationalist politics in India. The idea of 'conquest as no-conquest' has received further elaboration in some volumes of the *New Cambridge History of India*.[14] Colonialism, here does not appear as an imposition but as an emanation from the brewing politico-economic cauldron of the country. The legitimacy of the Company rule is shown to be as authentic as of others who competed for power or gain.

The creation of the Empire also seemed to need strong ideological props which colonial historiography unfailingly supplied. The climacteric of Sepoy Mutiny was one of the themes which colonial historiography truly turned into legend.[15] It was obsessively written about as a veritable trial by fire from which emerged the Empire, strong and resplendent. It was the supreme test of British character, represented by the Nicholsons and Havelocks, and an unimpeachable proof that Britain was destined to rule. Never was there a better occasion to formally announce the end of the Company rule and herald the magnificent, maternal, ecumenical rule of the Queen. The historiography of the Mutiny was largely a preoccupation with the production of an epic in which the British character was shown to triumph over the forces of recalcitrant and decadent Indian medievalism. It is a hard job taming the termagant Orient, but Britain was duty-bound to civilise her. Wielding an occasional stern cane was a necessity and part of that duty. British writings on the Mutiny, churned out with an indefatigable zeal for over half a century, were a paean to self-righteous imperialism, meant to illustrate the enormity of the task which the gallant British were assigned to in India.

The underlying assumption in the colonial writings is the tutorial function of the British rule in India. It, in turn, had to posit the primitiveness of the colony, which had to be both subjugated and transformed. But Orientalism had certified to Indian greatness in art, literature, philosophy, religion and other finer pursuits of life. Sir William Jones, Charles Wilkins, Colebrooke, H.H. Wilson and the redoubtable Max Muller had told Europe that Indians were not only no savages,

but ones whose accomplishments of mind and heart were truly outstanding. A product of the European Romantic tradition, sceptical of Euro-centric conceit about its progress, the Orientalists pitted their Indomania against the cynical Indophobia of the Evangelicals and Philosophical Radicals, whose influence had permeated the Haileybury College.[16] James Mill understably took cudgels against William Jones. But the Orientalists did hold their audience, whether by tracing the Mosaic tradition in the exotic Orient or by discovering their long-lost Aryan cousins. There were, however, some probing questions to be answered. If India was demonstrably so advanced, what could the British reasonably teach her? In fact, it should have been the other way round, as appropriately, Max Muller titled his famous little book n 1882, *India: What Can It Teach Us?* However, the Orientalists, for all their romantic enthusiasm for India, did not recommend the cessation of the British rule there. The Indian genius, they said, lay in their profound preoccupation with the world-after, which meant that for them it really mattered not who manned their mundane affairs. This lofty contempt for the world of illusion also meant that they had not taught themselves the rudimentary arts of governance. It was, indeed, a necessary constituent of the myth of the "Unchanging East" which was invented and harnessed to the imperial service.[17] In fact, it was easy to suggest that while the Indians could indulge in their profound but harmless speculations about the world-after and devise ways of reaching there, they could trust the British to look after the drab details of their governance. After all, that was what they had always done. Moreover they should feel more at home with the British. The Aryan thesis which the Orientalists like Jones and Max Muller had helped to create had assured the Indian Middle class that the British rule in India was a kind of reunion of parted cousins. Indians would do well to entrust themselves to the rule of their cousins who were practical and worldly-wise. In fact, the laid-back, brooding Indian could well strike a happy, profitable partnership with the intrepid European to achieve smooth governance.

The nationalists for all their apparent difference with the imperialist perceptions of India, drew generously on the latter. The Orientalists had supplied for the Indian nationalists the necessary academic arguments which they could passionately turn against the colonial rulers. The inferiority of the Indians which the haughty imperialists proclaimed at every available opportunity stood rejected. Yet the Empire held India in seductive embrace. Both the imperialist writers and nationalist historians dialogued with each other on the high platform of the Empire. The former affirmed its presence and value as historic necessity for India, and as a precondition of her peace, prosperity and honour. The national-

ists, without quite explicitly endorsing this grand proposition, yet looked for and
found 'empires' in ancient India which were more extensive and spectacular than
the ones which the British had established in India and been preening on.[18] If the
British claimed to be here to teach the Indians the arts of self-government within
the protective hug of the Empire, our Jayaswals, Mookherjees and Nilakanta
Sastris wrote passionately on the republican and self-governing tradition of
ancient India which could out-British the British.[19] If the colonial rulers claimed
that they had made available to the Indians the benefits of modern education
which they had evolved for themselves in their country, our historians responded
by discovering Oxford or London Universities in Nalanda and Takshashila.[20] If
the British could claim the creation of their colonial empire as the proof of their
power and creativity, so could the Indians, who established their noble cultural
colonies in Greater India in the East, to civilise rather then vandalise.[21] In all
these nationalist responses, however, the parameters are supplied by the Empire.
They offer a situation in which colonial realities are both ingested and repudi-
ated. They are of the stuff with which the 'intimate enemy' is made.

Historiography of modern India is perforce preoccupied with the phenomenon
of nationalism and its varied expressions. Compulsively it acquired political
character and had to relate itself to or confront the colonial rule. If the British
response to the early stirrings of modern Indian nationalism was to dismiss the
phenomenon as a 'Much Ado About Nothing' or as 'Indian Unrest' or as an
annual noise emanating from the pretentious Bengali Babus,[22] it soon came
round to accepting the reality of Indian nationalism. Nevertheless, it was seen as
a British gift to India: a product of the political and administrative unity which
the British rule produced, and the ways in which roads, railways, posts and tele-
graphs and modern means of communications cut down the distances as much as
the results of modern English education which was the purveyor of European
nationalist and liberal thoughts to eager elite groups in the Indian metropolitan
cities—"the benefits of the British rule." Besides, the British writings on the
Indian national movement also revolved around the premise that the British were
here to train the Indians in self-rule. By successive reforms they were extending
the share of the Indian participation in governance so that the latter could learn,
according to a carefully prepared time-table, the intricacies of responsible self-
rule.[23] But the Indians were in a hurry; like Oliver Twist they always asked for
more. Highlighting the Minto-Morley Reforms, Montague Chelmsford Act or
the Act of 1935 in the context of the Indian National movement served to illus-
trate not only the British projects of constitutional reforms but also express their
paternal exasperation at the juvenile impatience of the Indians. The nationalist

historiography of the post-Independence India was equally disposed to cling to this 'bargain model', but only as an inversion of what the Imperialists had offered.

Generally, however, the Indian writings on the Freedom Movement came from the freedom fighters themselves, particularly in the forms of autobiographies, memoirs and reminiscences. Academic scholarship preferred not to cultivate this area, either because the events were too close to allow proper historical perception or because, discretion being the better part of valour, they could, in the interest of professional safety, cultivate areas of a safer and more distant past. They could, however, indulge in, what Bipan Chandra calls, 'vicarious nationalism',[24] by discovering and celebrating freedom struggles in ancient and medieval India - in the mould of the 'Persian Letters technique' which Montesquieu used to by-pass the Bourbon censorship. Some of them like K.P. Jayaswal and R.K. Mookerji could, with a fine blend of passion and erudition, contest the British claim that they had brought to India the precious gift of participatory rule or modern education. It was only after Independence was achieved that its saga was well and truly told by academic historians. The multi-volume epics authored by R.C. Majumdar[25] and Tara Chand[26] put together vast data, but generally laboured within the familiar historiographical frameworks, representing the flourishing social and official prejudices. Notwithstanding his Olympian assertions of objectivity, R.C. Majumdar at times gives the impression of participating in the vitiated world of communal divide, while Tara Chand's officially sponsored volumes have about them a contrived eclecticism which was politically useful. Conventional writings on the Freedom Movement in the post-Independence India have generally projected the Indian National Congress as the hub around which the anti-colonial struggle revolved. Its leaders become so many knights-at-arms whose gallantry, courage and sacrifice put an end to the British rule. They are presented as the ones who forced the reluctant British to make constitutional concessions and finally hand over power. The British repression, dissimulation, divide-and-rule policies, sinister abetment of communalism and the consequent creation of Pakistan were the evils they fought against in the process. The Congress Party which has had a long innings as a ruling outfit in post-Independence India, was certainly keen on grabbing the most recent success story and a glittering chunk of Indian history for its political legitimation. This is not to say that the nationalist historiography of the National Movement did not grow beyond being an exercise in trumpeting hagiography. It was alive to the nature of the movement as an expression of the contradiction between the Indian people and colonialism, but failed or unwilling to grasp its many complexities

that emerged out of the presence and the differential role of different classes.[27] While the hegemonic role of the Congress was an indisputable fact of the Indian National Movement, projecting the latter as the biography of the Indian National Congress was not quite acceptable. Naturally, the issue entered into the realm of political contest.

A paradigm shift in the understanding of colonialism and nationalism in India is seen in the Marxist writings. Basing themselves firmly on Marx's diagnosis of the nationalism of the French Revolution as a bourgeois affair, the Marxists saw in the Indian context the stirrings of the new Indian bourgeoisie. M.N. Roy rejected the Orientalist predilection of Lenin to argue that India was no longer ensconced in the feudal cocoon, as the Soviet oracle thought, but had already stepped into the open world of capitalism.[28] To Roy nationalism was the expression of the political ideology and aspirations of the youthful Indian bourgeoisie. R. Palme Dutt's confessedly polemical work, *India To-Day*, which still remains an authoritative Marxist analysis of Indian nationalism, highlights the growth of the industrial bourgeoisie in the second half of the nineteenth century together with a new educated class of lawyers, administrators, teachers and so on. Palme Dutt described the Indian national movement as the history of the advancing consciousness and mass basis of the movement of national liberation, beginning from a narrow circle of the rising bourgeoisie and professional strata with the most limited aims, to develop into a fuller struggle for a more far-reaching social liberation.[29] The class analysis acquired greater elaboration in A.R. Desai's *Social Background of Indian Nationalism* (1948)[30] in which he argued that the new social classes had a national character about them because they were integral parts of a single national economy, which they could not be in the pre-British India. Prof. Desai, however, pointed out that national and class consciousness did not grow among the new classes simultaneously, which explains the occasional hiccups, frustrations and retrograde trends in the National Movement. Among the other exercises in the same direction, mention may be made of N.M. Goldberg's cautious distinction between the class bases of the Moderates and the Extremists, representing the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie respectively,[31] and also V.I. Pavlov's study of the national industrial bourgeoisie emerging in Bombay, and the forces which hooked them to the Swadeshi Movement.[32]

The class analysis, which is the badge of identity of the Marxist writings can at times become too adamant and pedantic, and has been questioned by both Marxists and non-Marxists. Amales Tripathi shows how Bengal Extremism had

enough patronage from some big landlords to give lie to the class analyses undertaken by E.N. Komarov and A.I. Levkovsky.[33] Sumit Sarkar too has no sympathy for the "simplistic version of the Marxian class approach used by R.P. Dutt or certain Soviet historians" or for the "glib talk about the 'urban' petty-bourgeois character of the 1905 upsurge."[34] He, instead, recommends more open methodological concepts like Trotsky's 'substitutism', with the intelligentsia acting repeatedly as a kind of proxy for as-yet passive social forces with which it had little organic connection or Antonio Gramsci's analysis of the formation and role of the 'traditional' as distinct from the 'organic' intellectuals; men of learning, not directly connected with the production process.[35] Sumit Sarkar has also been sceptical of Marxism in its "economic-reductionist straight-jacket",[36] as also its "rigid a 'priori' conception of class-interest" or "an unquestioned acceptance of formula of base and superstructure; faith in the primacy of the 'economic', balanced by the usual ritual concessions to interaction and relative autonomy; a consequent playing down of problems of culture and consciousness."[37]

Bipan Chandra, though rooted in the Marxist framework, has also been trying to rid himself of some of its 'cobwebs'.[38] He does not apply, mechanically, the class-model to explain early nationalist leadership[39] or the Indian capitalist class.[40] In his classic *Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India*, he has shown the early nationalist leaders as the intellectual representatives of the nation, though their outlook was basically capitalist.[41] He argued that colonialism should be recognised as a distinct phase of Indian history[42] and nationalism as an ideology born out of the growing awareness of the colonial contradictions, which transcended the narrow class divisions. To him Gramsci's concept of 'hegemony' is more helpful in explaining the nationalist politics than a mulish faith conventional class-analysis. The National Movement was seen both as a product of the process of the nation-in-the-making and as an active agent of the process.[43] He points out that even while movements such as the ones led by peasants, workers, tribals, etc. were all subsumed under the hegemony of the National Movement, communal politics remained outside it. The National Movement failed to combat it effectively. That Bipan Chandra's position should be looked upon with suspicion by the tub-thumping nationalists for having brought in an unwelcome Marxist heresy or by the passionate Marxists for having courted with the nationalist faith, is a measure of the intense and acrimonious political culture in which history-writing takes place.

Notwithstanding the self-doubts and debates, the Marxist analyses have been particularly rewarding. Occasionally, no doubt, they have been over-eager to

underline the narrow class character of the Congress-led movement and cock a snook at the swaggering ways in which the Congress party had appropriated the epic of Freedom Movement.[44] But more substantially, they have rehabilitated the valuable role of the peasant movements, working-class movements and other Left-movements which had long remained, at best, appendices to the main story. They have brought into the scope of Indian Freedom Movement the crucial debate on the secondary contradictions, which were not less critical than the primary contradiction with colonialism.

The red flag of Marxism has always been a red-rag to their snorting opponents, ideological or political. The compulsions to repudiate the Marxist frameworks and replace them with other models became particularly acute in the late 1950s when the academics too recruited themselves as soldiers of the Cold War. It is rightly pointed out that Professor Alfred Cobban's questioning of the explanation of the French Revolution given by Georges Lefebvre found its counterpart in the new Anglo-American University research works on Indian nationalism.[45] The new trend was to debunk the application of an alien model of class analysis and seek the clues to, and the dynamics of, Indian nationalism within the framework of traditional India. Basically it was a revival of the old imperialist model of Valentine Chirol by a set of new voodoo priests. They denied that any sharp or fundamental change had occurred in the structure of the Indian economy under the British rule. On the other hand, they argued that the British rule provided opportunities for upward social mobility which resulted in the politicisation of the existing social rivalries expressed in terms of region, language, religion and caste. The foci of these politicisations were to be seen in regions and provinces, where the traditional caste groups vied with each other to seize the new opportunities thrown up under the new colonial dispensation.

Writers like Anil Seal[46] and John Broomfield[47] have sought to explain the phenomenon to Indian nationalism in terms of the aspirations and politicisation of the caste elites within the presidencies – the Bhadralok in Bengal, the Chitpavan brahmans in Maharastra and the Tamil Brahmans in Madras. While Anil Seal identifies the Bhadralok in Bengal with three high-caste groups of Brahmans, Vaidyas and Kayasthas, Broomfield adds a sub-category of 'lower-class bhadralok' to allow greater elasticity to the term. Similarly Christine Dobbin's study of the Bombay city politics in terms of competition between the *shetia* class (Bania, Parsi, Khoja and Bohra community) and the Chitpavan Brahman intelligentsia of Pune[48] and Eugene Irschik's analysis of the South Indian politics between 1916 and 1929 and the emergence of the non-Brahman movement fol-

low the same model.[49] It also received further sophistication in the writings of Ravinder Kumar,[50] Dietmar Rothermund[51] and D.A. Low.[52] However, basically, this neo-traditionalist model revolves around the transformation of caste-elites under the British rule. If Anil Seal underlined western education as the open sesame to the new world of exciting possibilities, Broomfield emphasised the opportunities provided by the Legislative Council.

The *Bhadralok* model, despite its native flavour, does not help us a great deal. As Sumit Sarkar points out, the trouble about this term is that "it seems much too broad, ranging from the Maharaja of Mymensingh to the East Indian Railway Clerk; it consequently offers little or no real guide in any study of socio-economic compulsions behind political action."[53] And again, the tacit identification often made between *bhadralok* and certain Hindu upper castes (Brahmin, Vaidya, Kayastha) is also not quite tenable - how are we to categorise, for example, a Brahmin cook or a village priest?[54] Besides, the whole analysis debunks Indian nationalism as being no more than a rationalisation of narrow status interests, thereby sweeping under the carpet such substantial issues as colonial exploitation.

The campaign to 'de-emphasise' the over-arching unities in Indian nationalism achieved greater sophistication in the writings of a few historians who are described as belonging to the 'Cambridge School'. The 1970s nearly belonged to them, when they pranced and frolicked, and came up with successive, and often successful, monographs.[55] But in the 1950s one of the chief preceptors of this group, John Gallagher had written, along with Ronald Robinson, a highly influential article in *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser.6 (1953) on "The Imperialism of Free Trade", which examined the symbiotic relation between local groups and anti-colonial nationalist movements in the context of Africa. It had suggested that colonial expansion had been achieved through successive phases of collaboration and that the inversion of the same process could explain, in part, the phenomenon of decolonisation. This model was revived in the 1970s to be tested in the Indian context. The 'Cambridge historians' were also indebted, more than they cared to acknowledge, to Lewis Namier's study of mid-eighteenth century England, where he had discounted ideology as a mere rhetoric to cover up factional politics.[56]

Anil Seal, who in 1968 had contributed to the neo-traditional formulations, had by 1973 become an acknowledged adjutant of Gallagher. Declaring that "it now seems impossible to organise modern Indian history around the old notions

of imperialism and nationalism",[57] he argued that "Indian politics were an interconnected system of working at several levels; and the government had much to do with the linking of those levels",[58] and that "imperialism built a system which interlocked its rule in locality, province and nation; nationalism emerged as a matching structure of politics."[59] The Cambridge School has taken the analysis to localities, focusing on 'connections' straddling the social categories, an exercise similar to the one which Frykenberg conducted in his study of Guntur district. David Washbrook[60] has pointed out that in politics, at all levels, power is sought for its own sake, which is rooted in the logic of self-interest. The power alignments in the locality are rendered dynamic by the governmental action and constitutional initiatives, which would goad every interest to press hard for maximum advantage. At successive stages these factions would try to exploit as best as possible, the extended opportunities for power, patronage and status which the government conceded to secure the long-term interest of Britain in India. All agitations and movements, and all the high dramas associated with them were but 'antics' to cover-up a relentless pursuit of self-interest. That the impulse for the revitalisation of Indian politics came from the successive doses of constitutional reforms of the British is proved by Christopher Baker by an impressive demonstration of *Post hoc ergo propter hoc:* Montford Reforms was followed by the Non-cooperation Movement, the Simon Commission by the Civil Disobedience Movement and the Cripps Mission by the Quit India Movement.[61]

Explaining the various trends in national politics in terms of faction-politics is done with particular relish by the 'Cambridge School'. The emergence of the Extremist group in the Congress is explained in terms of factional quarrels between 'ins' and 'outs' for the control of the Congress. David Washbrook, for example, has analysed the Madras politics as a three-cornered conflict between the 'in-group', 'Mylapore Clique' (S. Subramania Aiyer, V. Bhashyam Iyengar, and V. Krishnaswami Iyer), its less successful 'Egmore' rivals (C. Sankaran Nair, Kasturi Ranga Iyengar), and the mofusil 'outs' like T. Prakasam and Krishna Rao in coastal Andhra and Chidambaram Pillai in Tuticorin, whose forged alliance with the 'Egmore Clique' became the basis of the Extremist politics in Madras after 1905.[62] Similarly Punjab politics is explained in terms of a conflict between Lala Harkrishan Lal and Lala Lajpat Rai after a schism in the Arya Samaj, and the Maharastra situation in terms to Tilak's quarrel with Gokhale and Agarkar over the control of the Deccan Education Society. 'Gandhi's Rise to Power' is explained by Judith Brown in terms of his clever linkages with local leadership in Champaran, Kheda or Ahmedabad.[63] While Gandhi used Raj Kumar Shukla, Rajendra Prasad, Vallabhai Patel, Indulal Yagnik and others

as his 'sub-contractors', the latter hitched their wagons to Gandhi to explore the possibilities of grabbing a nation-level play-ground for their political ambitions. It was, as if, in their desire for power Gandhi and his new-found adjutants needed each other.

It has been observed[64] that while on the one hand the 'Cambridge School' has effected a breakthrough in asking new questions on the origins of the pluralist politics in modern India, on the developing pattern of linkages among local, provincial, and national political organisations as driving force sustaining this pluralism, and also provided a variety of techniques for investigating these theories of linkage, like statistical and ecological analysis and political sociology, it also has shown a lack of rigour in testing the social science models that underlie its researches, besides a failure to exploit materials in Indian languages, as also to convey the drama of events by adopting a style which is coldly analytical and argumentative. Tapan Raychaudhuri[65] criticises this group for having reduced Indian nationalism to 'animal politics', by overdrawing its opportunism. What did it mean to the majority when the opportunities were so severely limited? he asks. He also points out that between 1920 and 1945 the Congress positively participated in electoral politics for less than 10 years, which should disprove that Congress was opportunistic. But more fundamentally the 'Cambridge School' revived the old imperialist denial of Indian nationalism. As S. Gopal has pointed out, "Namier was accused of taking the mind out of politics. This school has gone further and taken not only the mind but decency, character, integrity and selfless commitment out of the Indian national movement."[66] And this it has done by invoking glittering models and jargons from social sciences. However, by the end of the 70s the Cambridge School had emptied itself out, and Howard Spodek could assure us that "The Cambridge cluster has fissioned."[67] But it has left behind a legacy which the practitioners in the field can hardly overlook. The Cambridge historians would be remembered for the number of fond images they had mutilated or pulled down as much as for the spades and crowbars with which they did it.

In the 1980s the perception of Indian nationalism was subjected to some rude shaking by a group of historians described as belonging to the 'Subaltern School'. This brigade, led by Ranajit Guha, had sworn to upturn the elitist historiography which had, in various forms and incarnations, dominated the scene. In fact, as Ranajit Guha wrote, "The history of Indian nationalism is thus written up as a sort of spiritual biography of the Indian elite."[68] Nationalism is portrayed as "the sum of the activities and ideas by which the Indian elite responded to the

institutions, opportunities, resources, etc. generated by colonialism."[69] Now, he wrote, it is important to turn away from this pampered paradigm to look for the immense possibilities of the 'history from below'.

The demand for the 'de-elitisation' of history and the writing of the 'history of the historyless' has long been heard from such quarters as Puerto Rico, Dares Salaam and Mexico.[70] Jean Chesneaux, the French Sinologist, in an angry little book, had exposed the hollowness of the idea of neutrality of history and shown how 'occultation' of the past had secured for the rulers the control over the past and the people. He called for an insurrection against what could be regarded as the ancien regime of historiography, rejecting its dogmatic, unattainable ideal of objectivity, of which Ranke was the adored Messiah, and hoped that a 'reactionary cult of the past' would be replaced by a "revolutionary cult of the past" which would wrest for the proletariat the crucial control over history.[71] Frantz Fanon's evocative work had drawn attention of the world to *"The Wretched of the Earth."* The plebeian ideology and its various manifestations produced A.L. Morton's 'People', Rodney Hilton's 'Bondsmen', George Rude's 'Crowd', E.P. Thompson's 'Working Class', Eric Hobsbawm's 'Primitive Rebels' and Albert Soboul's 'Sansculottes'.

The 'Subaltern School' advocates the need to study the politics of the people independently of the elites, and stress the significance of, in the words of Antonio Gramsci, "every trace of independent initiative on the part of subaltern groups."[72] The subaltern expressions in history, according to Gramsci, generally tended to be spontaneous and amorphous; they lacked the autonomy of the hegemonic classes, and seemed perpetually racked by a contradiction between "passivity" and "turbulence", between a proclivity to succumb to the power of hegemonic groups and a compulsion to defy it. However, as David Arnold points out, Gramsci was aware that although the subaltern history appeared fragmented, episodic and spontaneous, a closer investigation of its record, structure and performance could produce a more cohesive, authentic and meaningful picture.[73] Ranajit Guha's introductory essay in *Subaltern Studies I* is more forthright in shrugging off the hegemonic theory of Gramsci, where he says that the politics of the people "was an autonomous domain, for it neither originated from elite politics nor did its significance depend on the latter."[74] Conventional historiography had treated the politics of people, whenever it cared to, either as a dull appendage or as one which could be manipulated by the elite leadership. It resembled the behaviour of a somnambulist or of robot whose remote-control had been surrendered to dominant leadership. It is like the story of Pied Piper of

Hamelin who has all the will and power, and the rats and children are compulsively drawn to his seductive tune. It is this Pied Piper Model which Ranajit Guha rejects to proclaim the autonomy of the Subaltern realm.[75] He has forcefully argued that "one-sided and blinkered historiography" which projected Indian nationalism as "a sort of spiritual biography of the Indian elite" had "failed to explain Indian nationalism for us." For neither the colonialist nor the bourgeois-nationalist paradigm would acknowledge, far less interpret, the contribution made by the people on their own. Besides, the elitist historiography has failed to understand the problem of mobilisation. At a naive, romantic level, it is the Toynbean "creative minority" and the ungrudging "mimesis" of the obedient majority. But the premium has largely been on the vertical mobilisation of the elite politics with its legalistic and constitutional orientation, while with the horizontal mobilisation of the subaltern politics which seemed to prefer the violent and the spontaneous or such idioms of insurgency, our historians have been far less patient.

Subaltern Studies was launched to highlight the failure of the Indian bourgeoisie to speak for the nation.[76] In fact, it questions the category of the 'nation' and poses the failure of the nation to come to its own as a fundamental problem of modern Indian history.[77] The ideology of nationalism, which revelled in Europe in the nineteenth century, was essentially defined in bourgeois terms. Its restless success story was also its biggest advertisement. It became a rampant ideology, journeying out of Europe in the bandwagon of colonialism. As the bourgeois regime triumphantly reproduced itself in the colonial world, it created a nationalism which built an eloquent love-hate relationship with colonialism. It imbibed the bourgeois ideology, institutions and culture, but repudiated the colonial regime.

Within this structure of relationship how authentically did the bourgeois nationalists of India represent the nation? The conventional nationalist historiography did not debate this question because it was largely preoccupied with the production of a nationalist hagiography, which had no place for such heresies as class analysis. The nationalist-Marxist historians did indeed venture to grapple with this question, and pointed out to the bourgeois character of the National Movement. The economic ideology of the early nationalist leadership, its political agenda and the whole blue-print of national struggle were shot through and through with the bourgeois vision of the world. Even when the Leftist ideas began to seep into the movement they were projected as concessions within the bourgeois hegemony. However, the nationalist Marxist historiography, while it

acknowledged the class limitation of the bourgeois leadership, looked upon it as the moral and intellectual representative of the nation. For, it could analyse the character and consequences of colonial workings in India, and articulate its critique. It could transcend itself to speak for the nation, which was in the making. However, the Subaltern Studies contests this claim. It argues that by projecting the 'nation' in their own image, but claiming to speak for all, the elites merely erased the subaltern domain from the story. Hence it exhorts the subaltern groups, rendered historyless by the dominant elites, to recover their voice and territory in history. In this constestary stance the Subaltern Studies shows the limitations of the Indian national movement. Surendranath Banerjee vision of India as a nation-in-the making was a compelling force in the Indian freedom struggle. One is quite justified in posing the question, how far was the nation truly made? When the leadership claimed to be 'national' one may ask, how truly? Scepticism regarding the full and uncontested permeation of national leadership may have its basis. But to dismiss the National Movement as wholly unreal is preposterous. It was the consciousness of a nation-in-the making that was crucial. It was particularly so for leadership, and that too when different segments of society had to be mobilised under its banner. Subaltern autonomy may be real; but there were occasions when it overruled itself. Not irredeemably, but under certain circumstances and impulses. Besides, the National Movement has to be seen as a composite response to the 'primary contradictions' with colonialism and the 'secondary contradictions' in the society which colonialism exacerbated indirectly. That, in fact, offered enough space for both the bourgeois articulations and the subaltern autonomy, although the latter was often blurred by the dazzle of the former's high-profile politics.

Essentially these debates took place within the framework of Marxist theory and practice. Sumit Sarkar has shown how *Subaltern Studies* emerged in a dissident – Left milieu of growing disenchantment with organised Left parties, bureaucratic state structures, embers of abortive Maoist armed struggle in the countryside and the spectacle of one of the two major Communist parties supporting an authoritarian regime that was close to Soviet Union.[78] Moreover, the *erosion of the Congress hegemony in politics was visible in the 1970's when it* could no longer confidently fall back upon the dividends of the Freedom Movement. It was only natural that this scepticism was telescoped to the past to question the Congress claim that it alone led the country from thraldom to freedom.[79] These confronting realities of politics had substantially gone into the *making of the constestary mood of Subaltern Studies when it was launched.*

Ranajit Guha's agenda-paper promised to retrieve the subaltern conscious-
ness, authentic in its insurrectionary mood, and pose it against the overdrawn
claims of elite politics. It was redeemed in some of the contributions made to the
earlier volumes by David Arnold,[80] Gyan Pandey,[81] Stephen Henningham,[82]
David Hardiman,[83] Tanika Sarkar[84] and others. Apart from these, there are his-
toriographical critiques and those which deal with uneasy contacts of the tradi-
tional groups of society with various forms of domination belonging to the
structures of modernity.[85] Some others saunter into deconstruction, feminism or
gender questions, which ensure that the original manifesto, launched in a polem-
ical mood, is not jealously adhered to. Its growing shift towards a wider engage-
ment with the Western academic, post-modernist rebellions has been seen by
Edward Said as "a crossing of boundaries, a smuggling of ideas across lines, a
stirring up of intellectual and, as always political complacence."[86] But it is also
looked upon as "The Decline of the Subaltern in Subaltern Studies."[87] Sumit
Sarkar, who had a passionate date with the Subaltern, is driven to make a little
quantitative analysis to prove the point: "A quick count indicates that all fourteen
essays in *Subaltern Studies* volumes I and II had been about underprivileged
groups in Indian society—peasants, tribals, and in one instance workers. The
corresponding figure for volumes VII and VIII is, at most, four out of
twelve."[88] The shift of binaries from elite/subaltern to colonial/indigenous com-
munity or Western/Third World cultural nationalist, which according to Sumit
Sarkar is the hallmark of the late Subaltern Studies, is significant not only
because it marks a retreat from its early flamboyant programme, but shows an
engagement with such themes that it had vowed to fight. The return of 'Colonial-
ism' as a constituting force, the Saidian Orientalism in homogenising the East-
West images, Foucaultian idioms of power permeation and the post-modernist
celebrations of fragments, have changed the moods of the Subaltern Studies.
Partha Chatterjee's 'Derivative Discourse'[89] thesis seemed to take away the
autonomy of the colonised subject of a fanatical defence in the programmatic
essay of Ranajit Guha. One perception of these changes is to interpret them as
infidelities to the avowed programme. Another is to see them as "expansion of
intellectual horizons", as the editors of volume IX have claimed.[90] Historiogra-
phy is nothing if not a dialogue, which when it is open, is apt to move away from
the original theme or preoccupation. An agenda of inelastic frame may produce
an eloquent monologue or repetitive exchanges. It would preclude an explorative
exercise in themes and methods. One may argue that late Subaltern Studies has
been seduced by current Western intellectual fads, which in turn, have pushed it
to sinful domestic infidelity. But ideological monogamy is a pious but unsustain-
able image. For ideology can enrich itself by its own discreet philanderings.

Whether Ranajit Guha's passionate project, which has shed its early aggression that seemed necessary for a historiographical land-grab, has really enriched itself by its explorative wanderings, is something which its critiques can debate on.

Engagement with colonialism, and summoning back the fond as well as disagreeable images of the Raj have remained a major concern of historiography of modern India. There are scholarly writings on the emergence of the colonial rule in the socio-economic churnings within India, suggesting thereby that it was not an imposition from outside.[91] They cover up or deodorise the stink of aggression and exploitation associated with the imposition of colonial rule. In the recent decades there have been several studies made on the colonial rule in India, drawing on the insights from Michel Foucault and Edward Said. Colonial rule expressed itself through a production of knowledge of the colony, and in doing so constituted the colony itself. The permeation of power through the production of knowledge and images of power and their acquiescence was a silent but irresistible project of colonisation. It could be anything like the writing of history, production of the gazetteers or district manuals, exercises in census and enumeration and classification of the subject peoples, the survey and mapping of the empire, the projects on modern education, science and medicine, or the images of grandeur and exclusiveness which the colonial monuments exuded.[92] They all unfold the various facets of legitimisation of colonial rule in which power operated not in its predatory or stampeding modes of conquest, but through institutionalised strategies of absorption or rejection. These writings have the merit of showing the subtleties of colonial domination and clues to its acquiescence by the colonised people. Do they indeed skirt the more important question of resistance against colonialism by turning the gaze away from the crucial issue of primary and secondary contradictions in colonialism? Their critiques think so. But then, without denying the factors which rendered the resistance inevitable, one can explore the forces which made colonialism such a seductive, overpowering evil. Even if we, in our unforgiving indignation of an exploited people, persist with the analogy of our colonial association as with a long tryst with a vampire, we can yet acknowledge its beckoning power. Vampire or a seductress, colonialism as an experience cannot be easily evicted from our mind. It keeps knocking at our doors with more questions and demands for more dialogue.

References

1.   Writings on the early Indian historical tradition have been copious. Some of the more important ones are, Pargiter, *The Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*,

(London, 1922); V.S. Pathak, *Ancient Historians of India*, (Bombay, 1966); A.K. Warder, *An Introduction to Indian Historiography*, (Bombay, 1971); Romila Thapar, *The Tradition of Historical Writing in Early India, Origin Myths and the Early Indian Historical Tradition*, and *Genealogy as a Source of Social History* in Ancient Indian Social History, (New Delhi, 1978); and *Society and Historical Consciousness; The Itihasa-Purana Tradition*, in Interpreting Early India, (New Delhi, 1992).

2. Muslim chroniclers of medieval India have left behind a massive body of writings, and the British historians did recognise them as 'historians', as did Henry Elliot and John Dowson, *History of India as told by Its Own Historians*, 8 vols., (London, 1867–1877). Modern writings on medieval Indian historiography include, Peter Hardy, *Historians of Medieval India*, (London, 1960); Harbans Mukhia, Historians and Historiography During the Reign of Akbar, (New Delhi, 1976); Mohibbul Hasan (ed) *Historians of Medieval India*, (Meerut, 1982); K.S. Lal, *History and Historians of Medieval India*, (New Delhi, 1986).

3. The maturing of the European tradition of historical writing in the 17th and 18th century also coincided with the colonial expansion of Europe. The British became the purveyors of the European historiographical tradition in India rather then its sole creators.

4. These early British participant-writers were the chroniclers of events, in the Carnatic or Bengal. They were all the creators the early heroes and villains in the making of the British power in India.

5. John Malcolm, *The Political History of India*, 2 vols. Reprint, Ed. K.N. Panikkar, (New Delhi, 1970).

6. Grant Duff, *History of the Mahrattas*, (1826), 3 vols. Reprint, (New Delhi, 1990).

7. Charles Grant, *Observations on the State of Society Among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain*, (London, 1797).

8. J.R. Seeley, *The Expansion of England*, (London, 1883).

9. Valentine Chirol, *Indian Unrest*, (London, 1910). Also his *India Old and New*, (London, 1921), *Fifty Years in a Changing World*, (London, 1927).

10. Anil Seal, *The Emergence of Indian Nationalism*, (London, 1968).

11. J.H. Broomfield, *Elite Conflict in Plural Society: Twentieth Century Bengal*, (London, 1968).

12. David Washbrook, *The Emergence of Provincial Politics: The Madras Presidency, 1870–1920*, (New Delhi, 1976).

13. Judith Brown, *Gandhi's Rise to Power: Indian Politics*, 1915–1922, (New Delhi, 1972).

14. Particularly C.A. Bayly, *Indian Society and the Making of the British Empire*, (1987) and also his earlier work, *Rulers, Townsmen and Bazaars*, (1983).

15.   British writings on the Mutiny are both copious and passionate. What is striking about them is that so many of them were produced even before its heat had gone (1859-60). Its stories and reports had always eager listeners in England. Every survivor of this historic crisis seemed to have a tale to tell, in which he could not but be a hero.

16.   Some of the more important works on British Orientalism are, David Kopf, *British Orientalism and the Bengal Renaissance: The Dynamics of Indian Modernisation*, 1773-1835, (Berkeley, 1969); P.J. Marshall, *The British Discovery of Hinduism in the Eighteenth Century*, (Cambridge, 1970); O.P. Kejariwal, *The Asiatic Society of Bengal and the Discovery of India's Past*, (Delhi, 1988); S.N. Mukherjee, Sir William Jones, *A Study in Eighteenth Century British Attitudes to India*, (Delhi, 1983); John Keay, *India Discovered*, (London, 1984); Thomas R. Trautmann, *Aryans and British India*, (New Delhi, 1997).

17.   The fond picture of the 'unchanging East' entered into the construction of 'Oriental Despotism' and the 'Asiatic mode of production' (AMP), the latter being sometimes described as "the bastard child of historical materialism." For a an exciting discussion on the theme see, Brendan O'Leary, *The Asiatic Mode of Production: Oriental Despotism, Historical Materialism and Indian History*, (London, 1989).

18.   R.K. Mookerji, specially in Asoka, (London, 1928) and HCIP, vol.2. *The Age of Imperial Unity*, (Bombay, 1951).

19.   Particularly K.P. Jayaswal's Hindu Polity, (1924); R.K. Mookerji's *Local Government in Ancient India*, (1920) and K.A. Nilakanta Sastri's *Studies in Cola History and Administration*, (1932) and Colas, (1934).

20.   R.K. Mookerji, *Education in Ancient India*, (Delhi, 1966).

21.   R.C. Majumdar, *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*, (Dacca, 1927).

22.   Valentine Chirol, *Indian Unrest*, (1910) and the pronouncements of Viceroys like Dufferin and Curzon or bureaucrats like John Strachey, J.D. Rees, Verney Lovett, etc. hovered between contempt and condescension for Indian 'nationalism'.

23.   A.B. Keith, *Constitutional History of India*, (London, 1936).

24.   Bipan Chandra, *Historians of Modern India and Communalism* in Romila Thapar, Harbans Mukhia and Bipan Chandra, Communalism and the Writing of Indian History, (New Delhi, 1969).

25.   R.C. Majumdar, *History of the Freedom Movement in India*, 3 vols., (Calcutta, 1962-3).

26.   Tara Chand, *History of the Freedom Movement in India*, 4 vols., (New Delhi, 1961-72).

27.   27. Bipan Chandra, *"Nationalist Historians" Interpretations of the Indian National Movement* in S. Bhattacharya and Romila Thapar (Ed), Situating Indian History, (New Delhi, 1986).

28. M.N. Roy, *India in Transition*, (1922).
29. R.P. Dutt, *India To-Day*, Reprint, (Delhi, 1983), p.288.
30. A.R. Desai, *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, (Bombay, 1981), pp.174-219.
31. N.M. Goldberg *Leader of the Democratic Wing in Maharashtra* in Reisner and Goldberg (ed), Tilak and the Struggle for Indian Freedom, (Bombay, 1966).
32. V.I. Pavlov, *Economic Changes in Maharashtra Towns in the Second Half of the 19th Century* in Reisner and Goldberg, op.cit..
33. Amales Tripathi, *The Extremist Challenge*, (Calcutta, 1947), pp.141-42.
34. Sumit Sarkar, *The Swadeshi Movement in Bengal*, 1903-1908, (New Delhi, 1977), p.508.
35. Ibid., p.513.
36. Sumit Sarkar, *Marxian Approaches to the History of Indian Nationalism*, (Calcutta, 1990), p.9.
37. Sumit Sarkar, *Social History: Predicaments and Possibilities*, (Presidential Address, Modern India Section, Indian History Congress, 45th Session, Annamalai, 1984), p.16.
38. Bipan Chandra, *The Long-Term Dynamics of the Indian National Congress*, (Presidential Address, Indian History Congress, Amritsar, 1985), p.15.
39. Bipan Chandra, *Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India*, (New Delhi, 1966).
40. Bipan Chandra, *Nationalism and Colonialism in Modern India*, (1979, 1981), pp.144-170.
41. Bipan Chandra, *Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India*, pp.752-753.
42. Bipan Chandra, *Colonialism and Modernisation*, (Presidential Address, Modern India Section, Indian History Congress, 1970).
43. Bipan Chandra, et.al, *India's Struggle for Independence*, (New Delhi, 1989), pp.22-23.
44. E.M.S. Namboodripad, *History of the Indian Freedom Struggle*, (1986).
45. Rajat Ray, *Three Interpretations of Indian Nationalism* in B.R. Nanda (ed), Essays in Modern Indian History, (New Delhi, 1986), p.17.
46. Anil Seal, *op.cit.*
47. J.H. Broomfield, *op.cit.*
48. Christine Dobbin, *Urban Leadership in Western India*, (1972).
49. Eugene Irschik, *Politics and Social Conflict in South India*, 1926-1929, (Bombay, 1969).
50. Ravinder Kumar, *The Bombay Textile Strike, 1919* in Essays in the Social History of Modern India, (New Delhi, 1986).
51. Dietmar Rothermund, *The Phases of Indian Nationalism and Other Essays*, (New Delhi, 1970).
52. D.A. Low (ed), *Soundings in Modern South Asian History*, (London, 1968).

53. Sumit Sarkar, *Swadeshi Movement in Bengal*, 1903-1908, p.509.

54. *Ibid.*, p.510.

55. Some of the important works are, John Gallagher, Gordon Johnson and Anil Seal, (ed), *Locality, Province and Nation: Essays on Indian Politics*, 1870-1940, (1976); Christopher Bayly, *Local Roots of Indian Politics: Allahabad*, 1880-1920, (1975); Gordon Johnson, *Provincial Politics and Indian Nationalism: Bombay and The Indian National Congress*, (1973); Francis Robinson, *Separatism Among Indian Muslims: The Politics of the United Province's Muslims, 1860-1923*, (1974); Judith Brown, M., *Gandhi's Rise to Power: Indian Politics*, 1915-1922, (1972); B. R. Tomlinson, *The Indian National Congress and The Raj*, 1929-1942, (1976); D.A. Washbrook, *The Emergence of Provincial Politics: The Madras Presidency, 1870-1920*, (1976).

56. Lewis B. Namier, *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*, 2 vols., (1929). As has been pointed out by Arthur Marwick, in this work Namier "studied the separate members of parliament and the motives for their being there, showing how small was the part played by the lofty political ideals which the Whig historians loved to bandy about", *The Nature of History*, (London, 1976), p.91.

57. Anil Seal, *Imperialism and Nationalism in India* in Gallagher, Johnson and Seal (ed), Locality, Province and Nation, (1973), p.2.

58. *Ibid.*, p.24.

59. *Ibid.*, p.27.

60. D.A. Washbrook, *op.cit.*

61. C.J. Baker, *Non-Cooperation in South India* in C.J. Baker and D.A. Washbrook, *South India: Political Institutions and Political Change, 1880-1940*, (1975).

62. D.A. Washbrook, *op.cit.*, pp.215-260.

63. Judith Brown, M., *Gandhi's Rise to Power: Indian Politics, 1915-1922*, (1972).

64. Howard Spodek *Pluralist Politics in British India: The Cambridge Cluster of Historians of Modern India*, American Historical Review, LXXXIV, 3, 1979, p.700.

65. Tapan Raychaudhuri, *Indian Nationalism as Animal Politics*, The Historical Journal, 223, (1979).

66. S. Gopal, in *The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, (July-Sept., 1977), p.405.

67. Howard Spodek, *op.cit.*, p.707.

68. Ranajit Guha, *Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India* in Ranajit Guha (ed), Subaltern Studies I, (1986), p.2.

69. *Ibid.*

70. S. Bhattacharya, Presidential Address, Modern India Section, Indian History Congress, Kurukshetra, 1982.

71.   Jean Chesneaux, *Pasts and Futures or What is History For?*, (1978).

72.   Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from Prison Notebook*, (London, 1971), p.55.

73.   David Arnold, *Gramsci and Peasant Subalternity in India*, in Journal of Peasant Studies, vol.II, No.4, (1984), pp.160-61.

74.   *Subaltern Studies I*, (1986), p.4.

75.   B. Surendra Rao, *Subaltern Perspectives* in T.R. Venugopalan (ed), History and Theory, (Trissur, 1997), pp.79-80.

76.   *Subaltern Studies I*, p.5.

77.   *Ibid*, p7. Also Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Invitation to Dialogue*, Subaltern Studies IV, (1990), p.373.

78.   Sumit Sarkar, *Writing Social History*, (New Delhi, 1998), p.83.

79.   B. Surendra Rao, *op.cit.*, p.81.

80.   David Arnold, *Rebellious Hillmen: The Gudem-Rampa Rising, 1839-1924*, Subaltern Studies I.

81.   Gyan Pandey, *Peasant Revolt and Indian Nationalism: The Peasant Movement in Awadh, 1919-1922*, Subaltern Studies I.

82.   Stephen Henningham, *Quit India in Bihar and Eastern United Provinces: The Dual Revolt*, Subaltern Studies II.

83.   David Hardiman, *Adivasi Assertion in South Gujarat: The Devi Movement of 1922-23*, Subaltern Studies III.

84.   Tanika Sarkar, *Jitu Santal's Movement in Malda, 1924-32*, Subaltern Studies IV.

85.   B. Surendra Rao, *op.cit.*, p.85.

86.   Edward Said, 'Foreward' to Select Subaltern Studies, Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, (New York, 1988), p.10.

87.   Sumit Sarkar, *Writing Social History*.

88.   *Ibid.*, p.82.

89.   Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought in the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse?*, (New Delhi, 1986).

90.   Shahid Amin and Dipesh Chakrabarty, 'Preface', Subaltern Studies IX, p.vii.

91.   The volumes of *The New Cambridge History of India* offer a varied fare. But some of them, like the one by Chris Bayly, make this point.

92.   We have a burgeoning literature on these themes. Some of them are, Thomas R. Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj, New Cambridge History of India III: 4*, (1995); Bernard S. Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge*, (New Delhi, 1996); Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism*, (New Delhi, 1983); Sara Suleri, *The Rhetoric of English India*, (Chicago, 1992); Carol Breckinridge and Peter van der Veer (Ed), *Orientalism and the Post-Colonial Predicament*, (Pennsylvania, 1993); Thomas R. Metcalf, *An Imperial Vision: Indian Architecture and Britain's Raj*, (California, 1989); Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*, (New York, 1989); Anil Kumar, *Medicine and the Raj*,

(New Delhi, 1998); Poonam Bala, *Imperialism and Medicine in Bengal*, (Delhi, 1991); Mark Harrison, *Public Health in British India: Anglo-Indian Preventive Medicine, 1859–1914*, (Cambridge, 1994); David Arnold, *Colonising the Body: State, Medicine and Epidemic Disease in Nineteenth Century India*, (Delhi, 1993); Satpal Sangwan, *Science, Technology and Colonisation, 1757-1857*, (Delhi, 1991); Deepak Kumar, *Science and the Raj, 1857-1905*, (Delhi, 1995); Deepak Kumar (ed) *Science and Empire: Essays in Indian Context*, (Delhi, 1991); Roy MacLeod and M. Lewis (ed), *Disease, Medicine and Empire*, (London, 1988); D.R. Headrick, *The Tools of Empire*, (New York, 1981); N. Gerald Barrier, *The Census in British India*, (Delhi, 1981); Mathew H. Edney, *Mapping an Empire: The Geographical Construction of British India, 1765-1843*, (Chicago, 1997).