

British Orientalism

- The late 18th century witnessed the completion of Europe's 'discovery' of the non-European world, and subsequently accumulation of knowledge on non-Europeans.
- This body of knowledge grew in proportion as colonization extended in these 'discovered' regions, especially in Africa and Asia.
- This knowledge was collected for the benefit of the colonizers, and resulted in specific kind of representation of Asian culture.
- **Orientalism emerged out of 18th century European quest for nature & origin of earliest 'civilisation' - India, Greek and the Egyptian, and to locate them within history of civilizations.**
- ***The beginning of what we term 'Indology' was through the Orientalism applied to Indic studies.***
- To gain access to Indian culture, ancient and medieval literature was seen as the source of information on India.
- In the 18th Century however, it was a more direct intervention in culture that led a group of Jesuit missionaries to understand the culture and the life of the Indians. The Jesuit fathers tried that out especially, since it was necessary for them to master the languages for preaching and translating Christian Psalms and Testaments.
- Governors General Wellesley and Warren Hastings believed that knowledge of Indian culture was the basis for sound Indian administration and therefore undertook initiative to understand the Indian traditions, beliefs, customs and conventions to establish a strong and uniform legislative and judicial system all over the country. This is how the culture of Indology began.

INDOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Indology is known as the science of Indian Society. **The Indological perspective claims to understand Indian Society through the concepts, theories and frameworks that are closely associated with Indian Civilization.** It made a claim that Indian Society is unique in structure, function and dynamics and cannot be associated with the European Society. **Indology relies on book view and culture and denounces rigorous empirical investigation.**

Indology is both an approach to study the Indian Society and also an independent discipline with Indian Society as subject matter. In both the form **Indology consists of studying language, beliefs, ideas, customs, taboos, codes, institutions, rituals, ceremonies and other related components of culture.**

It is antique in its origin owing its origin to **1784 by Sir William Jones of Calcutta.** It was in the year 1830 that Sir William Jones founded the **Asiatic Society of Bengal** where he introduced the two **departments of Sanskrit and Indology.** It is the beginning of Indology in India, which has been followed by several other scholars.

Scholars of Indology

Many founding fathers of Indian Anthropology are also influenced by Indology. The various scholars are like B.K. Sarkar, G.S. Ghurye, R.K. Mukherjee, K.M. Kapadia, Irawati Karve, P.H. Prabhu, Louis Dumont.

Indology and Orientalism

Within Indology there is the bifurcation of two studies. That is Indology or Indic studies and Oriental studies. Both of them have some commonalities and differences. **Indology is a sympathetic and**

positive picture of non-European society of the East including Indian Society and culture. Orientalism gives an unsympathetic and negative account of the Indian Society.

Orientalism emerged as **the ideological need of the British Empire**. Indologist like Jones, Louis Renou and Bougle in France and Wilson in British India are the reputed figure and the Orientalist include Muller, William Archard, Max Weber, Karl Marx. There is a general tendency among the Indologist either to exaggerate the virtue of Indian culture, Orientalist were trying to see negative aspect of Indian tradition and rationalize missionary activities and colonial legacy. Indologist over emphasized Indian spiritualist and under emphasized the materialistic culture but the Orientalist did the reverse as they undermined spirituality and over emphasized on materialistic culture.

Critiques of Indology:

- It **overemphasized the centrality of Brahmins and their dominant status in Indians society** even in the face of contrary evidence that showed few Brahmin dynasties and political and military power in the hands of other groups as well.
- Edward Said and Bernard S Cohn: **indology gives fixed, timeless, and spaceless view of Indian society with no regional variation** let alone historical changes over time. Authority of texts was given more importance over lived experiences/actual behaviour or customs. E.g., Ghurye saw India as product of Vedic period, ignored Islamic and British contribution. Similarly, Dumont saw India as Homo-hierarchichus (fixed view of Varna theory).
- **Nicholas Dirks: in his book 'Castes of Mind' Indological book views kills critical reasoning.** Caste, as we know today, is not an unchanged survival of ancient India, nor a system that reflects core civilizational values, not a basic expression of Indian tradition, rather it is a modern phenomenon, a product of clash between India and western colonial rule
- **M.N. Srinivas** criticized Indology by calling it a 'text view'. He proposed 'field view' to understand Indian society.
- **AR Desai:** studying India from the lens of culture provide us no space to understand the real India that lives within inequality, diversity, dialectic, and exploitation.
- **Yogendra Singh:** believed that though Indologists have taken the examples from the ancient texts but it is based on non-observable and non-empirical evidences.

G. S. GHURYE

Ghurye stands as the commander in the Indian Sociological frontiers. He has often been acclaimed as the 'father of Indian Sociology'. Ghurye was the first scholar, who had built up the entire first generation of Indian Sociologists/Anthropologists in Post- independence period, almost single handedly. **Ghurye is often accredited as "Theoretical Pluralist"** because he tried to study Indian Society and culture through multiple methods.

He relied on both the empirical and textual methods for studying Indian Society. Ghurye was initially influenced by the diffusionist approach of Anthropology and later on he switched to the study of Indian Social reality. Ghurye was influenced by WHR Rivers's Diffusionism during his stay at Cambridge, but it was pre-Cambridge education in Sanskrit and Orientalist thought which was equally influential. **From British Orientalism, he took Aryan invasion theory which Ghurye explained through Diffusionism.**

Ghurye's Indological Approach hovers around the study of Indian Culture and Social Structure drawing its sustenance from sanskritic literature base. He was more influenced by the writings of Indologists

of Bhandarkar Institute of Bombay rather than the British writings established by Sir William Jones or Max Muller. So, he is often said to be relying on indigenous Indology.

Ghurye's "**Caste and Race in India**" tried to make a reconstruction of a very orthodox traditional and age-old social institution of India i.e., Caste. In this landmark work he made a long journey from the traditional textual interpretation of caste from Sanskrit literature base to its modern social reality with changing function.

According to Ghurye Sociology of India is not static, it emanates from the ancient India, travels through medieval India and reaches Modern India. **Ghurye realized that if an institution cannot be studied in those three distinct phases, then we cannot make a claim that we have made a study in totality.** Phasal study of an institution makes a study fragmented and haphazard. **Ghurye viewed that an institution should be studied on the basis of three things that are transition, transplantation and transformation.**

Works & Writings:

The various writings of Ghurye include:

Caste and Race in India (1932)

Indian Sadhus (1953)

Bharatnatyam and its costume (1958)

Family and Kinship in Indo-European culture (1955)

Social tensions in India (1968)

Caste in India

Ghurye's understanding of caste is comparative, historical and Indological as well. Unlike his contemporaries he doesn't glorify or condemn caste, rather he considers caste as a product of Indian culture, changing with the passage of time. Hence, it is a subject of Anthropological interest. Ghurye studies caste mostly as a diffusionist and a historian than as an Indologist. In his book "Caste and Race in India", he agrees with Sir Herbert Risley that **caste is a product of race that comes to India along with Aryans.**

Ghurye considers it as unfortunate that caste system is mostly understood in terms of Brahminic domination. Caste has gone through the process of fusion and fission in different ways in Indian history. During Vedic period caste was a product of race. Aryans distinguished themselves from non-Aryans just in terms of color but subsequently different ethnic groups developed alliance/relationship with each other and Hindu culture and values moved from Aryan community to non-Aryan communities. Aryans never introduced themselves as Brahmins or as a superior race as against non-Brahmins. Aryan society itself practiced different kinds of occupations which were allocated to different individuals and families. On the basis of their occupation caste names were allocated to different groups. Therefore, Aryans society had architects, peasants, warriors, artisans and their society was highly disciplined, organized and progressive.

Ghurye tells that it may be a matter of fact that caste evolved in India with the advent of Aryans, as their racial character was different from Indians. But at the same time there were different racial categories present in India prior to coming of the Aryans. India was not the home land of one racial group. Aryans advent added one more race to the already existing ones.

Caste was not a hierarchical exploitative system. Aryans carried with them caste system which promoted discipline in their life giving them specialization over particular occupation. No caste was superior or inferior. Occupation change was possible. Hence Aryans became highly specialized and indigenous. People looked forward to Aryans for progress. Therefore, they started imbibing these elements into their life. Rulers were taught the virtues of Aryans by the Brahmins who glorified the Aryan culture. These mobile saints spread the embodiment of caste to non-Aryans.

Ghurye points out that caste was considered as central to organized form of division of labour in Aryan society. When Aryans and indigenous communities developed interpersonal relationship through communication and warfare, the disciplined nature of Aryan society was appreciated by indigenous rulers who injected the elements of caste into their social life. In addition to that, priests, monasteries and travellers glorified the virtues of Aryan caste system. Hence the element of caste radiated from northern India to other parts of the country.

ORIGIN OF CASTE:

1. The incoming Indo-Europeans around 2500 BC, later called Aryans or Vedic Aryans, were fair in color, settled in Gangetic and Jamuna plains, confronted local settler, dark in color, with rather snub noses, and called them dasas. Varna, in Sanskrit, refers to color.
2. The Aryan race maintained its physical purity and cultural integrity by keeping itself apart from local population (Dasas) through endogamy and ritual restrictions, thereby creating a closed group. This **endogamous arrangement and strict separation resulted into caste formation**. Pratiloma (Sudra Male consorting Aryan Female) was considered biggest sacrilege.
3. **Aryan society practiced different kinds of occupations which were allocated to different individuals and families. On the basis of their occupations, caste names were allocated to different groups.** Therefore, Aryans society had architects, peasants, warriors, artisans, and their society was highly disciplined, organized, and progressive. **Rig Veda** clearly writes Caste is not defined by someone's birth, rather defined by occupation. It means within a family; members could have different castes according to different occupations. So, in Vedic society, **caste was just a manifestation of DOL**.
4. **Caste was never a hierarchical exploitative system.** Aryans carried with them caste system which promoted discipline in their life giving them specialization over particular occupations. Caste system was seen as organised Division of labor. Individuals saw these occupations as their duty. Nothing else. **No caste was superior or inferior. Occupation change was possible.**
5. People looked forward to Aryans for progress. Rulers were taught the virtues of Aryans by the Brahmins who glorified Aryan culture. These mobile saints spread the embodiment of caste to non-Aryans. That is how Caste diffused from northern India to other parts of India.
6. **Caste is originated from race and occupation stabilised it. Caste became hereditary with reproduction of occupation in next generation.**
7. Ghurye concludes that **caste in India is a Brahminical child of Indo-Aryan culture, cradled in the land of Ganga and Jamuna and then transferred to other parts of country [through diffusion]**
8. **Diffusionist theory:** This Brahminic practice of endogamy and caste developed in Hindustan proper and spread throughout India as cultural traits rather than through large scale physical migration of Aryan Brahmins/Hindustan Brahmins.

Ghurye's traced the origins of the caste system to the Indo-Aryan civilization of the Gangetic plain, using historical, archaeological, and anthropometric sources and ***argued that Indian civilization was formed through the slow assimilation of non-Aryan groups to Hinduism, and that the caste system spread through the same process of cultural diffusion.***

The evolution of caste system from non-rigid to semi-rigid and to highly rigid structure is observable from its origin till now during different periods. Caste has gone through the process of fusion and fission in different ways in Indian history.

Features of Caste:

Ghurye explains caste in India on the basis of six distinctive characteristics:

- Segmental division of society;
- Hierarchy;
- Civil and religious disabilities and privileges;
- Lack of unrestricted choice of occupation;
- Restriction on food, drinks and social intercourse;
- Endogamy

Segmental division of the society:

Segment is the compartmentalization of the population into groups. It is basically horizontal in character. It generates social grouping but not labelling. The membership is ascribed in character, i.e. it is based on birth and flows from generation to generation. Based on the membership every member has fixed status, roles and tasks. According to the roles assigned they have to perform it. There are moral ethics, obligations and justification value behind these roles.

Hierarchy:

It is the second major characteristic of caste through which Hindu social organization and Indian Society penetrates. After the segmental divisions of the society, they are put in a pyramidal structure then it is called as hierarchy.

Certain cultural principles like purity and pollution, prioritization of certain group, preferences of the society, determine the positioning of the social segments in the hierarchy t in layer. The layering of the segments is basically vertical in nature. This caste hierarchy is responsible for spelling out the access and prevention of caste and it becomes the primary consideration for role allocation, responsibility sharing and the imposition of restrictive rules. Hierarchy determines caste norms.

According to Ghurye hierarchy becomes the major consideration for deciding all these aforesaid variables. It basically **implies the Division of Labour. The entire gamut of activities in the society is divided into four types like religious, governance, maintenance and menial.** Among all these activities the religious activities are given the highest position in society. Therefore, Brahmin are given this responsibility. The second major activity is governance, which implies for managing the state craft and defending the populace from external aggression. So, it is accorded to Kshatriyas. The managerial activities are fixed on Vaishyas, who have to generate sustenance for the society. And the menial activities though an integral part of the society, are given the least priority and accorded to the shudras.

Thus, it is the hierarchy that determines the roles. The higher the position in the hierarchy the greater is the role and higher is the responsibility. **Hierarchy also determines the individual's access to life chances (education, health, nutrition) and life resources (wealth, power, property).** The higher the position in caste hierarchy the easier becomes the access and vice-versa.

Civil and religious disabilities:

Civil and religious disabilities expressed the rigidity of the caste system. To Ghurye the general reflection of Hindu social life was observed and felt through such disabilities. Civil and religious disabilities basically came from the concept of purity and pollution. Disabilities were for impure and polluted caste and privileges were for pure/higher castes.

Lack of unrestricted choice of occupation:

The occupations have been fixed by heredity. Generally, they have not been allowed to change their traditional occupations. Members of a caste maintain their supremacy and secrecy in their jobs and do not allow the other caste group to join in. The upper caste people like Brahmins are free to opt for study of religious books, while this cannot be done by other classes. The lower ranking activities like sweeping bathrooms, washing clothes, scavenging etc have been kept in untouchable category.

Restriction on food, drinks, and social intercourse:

Some rules have been imposed upon all caste people. Restriction on feeding and social intercourse are still prevalent in Indian society. There are two types of food i.e., Kachha (cooked) food and Pakka (raw) food upon which certain restrictions are imposed with regard to sharing, for example:

- Caste groups from whom twice born caste people can accept Kachha food;
- Caste group from whom twice born caste people can accept Pakka food;
- Caste groups from whom twice born caste people can accept water but no food;
- Caste groups from whom twice born caste people do not accept water or food and maintain distance.

Endogamy:

Indian caste system is also polarized due to endogamy being determined primarily by Caste. People can marry within caste only. To disobey the caste rule is not only treated as a crime but is also condemned as a sin. The caste panchayat not only denounces inter-caste marriages but also imposes severe punishment upon those who break these rules.

Current situation of caste (modern period):

Bernard S Cohn believed that Indian census, rather than being a passive instrument of data gathering, created by its very method and logic, a new sense of category-identity in India putting different weights and values on existing conceptions of group identity.

Ghurye was not unaware of this problem. He saw census itself having effect on caste system. He was aware of the objectifying power of the census. **Ghurye was perhaps the first scholar to condemn caste census for leading to the emergence of caste associations, a "livening up of the caste-spirit"** (1932, 158), and hence to competition and conflict. This insight was later picked up by Louis Dumont ([1970] 1998) in his discussion of the "substantialization" of caste identities under modernity.

Government's obsession with labels and pigeon-hole method of classifying/categorising had led to crystallization of the caste system which was anyhow very fluid under indigenous rule. Initially, caste

was occupational functional group. But it was only with colonial rule that idea of caste as exploitative and creating inequalities became more stringent.

Risley had conducted extensive studies on the tribes and castes of the Bengal presidency and is known for the formal application of the caste system to the entire Hindu population of British India in the 1901 Census. This is how Caste was used first time to understand division of population of India.

Among many British critics of caste-counting, Ghurye singled out L. Middleton, a Punjab census officer in 1921, who noted that many were refusing to give their caste which showed that Indians were abandoning caste altogether. The idea of occupational castes is purely manufactured and preserved by British census.

British insistence on classification reflected a desire for data on which to base early forms of affirmative action (such as quota representation of lower castes in administrative bodies), thereby curing the problem that British themselves were creating. Ghurye noted that one obvious result of caste census was proliferation of caste associations aiming to change their levels in the hierarchy: aboriginals seeking classification as Hindus, Sikhs worried about undercounting, Kolis claiming to be Koli Rajputs etc. he referred to the anti-Brahmin ferment which made a far-reaching impact on the Backward Class Movement in India

He personally believed Caste would wither away unless there were continuous reinvigoration via the census, Brahmanic writing, or government intervention (quotas).

He had actually rejected the occasional British policy of affirmative action, arguing that the classic liberal policies of open schools and free competition would break down the walls of hierarchy faster than would quotas and targets.

Tribes in India

Ghurye considers that multiple ethnic groups were present in India prior to the entry of Aryans. Hindu culture was not imposed on tribal communities; rather an interaction Aryan culture that was mystical, magical and spiritual got entangled with Tantric culture, magical culture and materialistic culture of different ethnic groups gave way to evolution of Hinduism. Therefore, considering Hindu culture as Aryan culture is nonsensical. The tribal deities like Ganesh, Kali, and Shiva were getting equal space in Hinduism with Aryan deities like Indira, Vishnu, Brahma. Animism, totemism, naturalism for establishing synthesis between multiple culture present in Indian society. As a result, the tribes of India consider the Hindu society and its cultural tradition a new home for them. Therefore, voluntarily they assimilate themselves within the folds of Hindu society. Many tribal leaders like Tana Bhagat, Vishnu Bhagwat, Kabir Panthi and others successfully carried Hindu cultural attributes to tribal life. As a result, the tribes of the heartland of the country sharing Hindu values have Hinduised themselves. Ghurye writes "**Tribalism always contribute towards the construction of Hindu temple that is yet to be completed**", meaning Hindu culture is evolving through a series of dialectics addressing to the demand of people in time and space. Therefore, tribes of India are **backward Hindus**. Backward' because of knowledge of Hinduism like Sanskar, distinction between Buddhi, Mana, Ahankar are yet to reach them even though they have already gone for Hindu life, ritual and way of life.

Ghurye was critical to Elvin's approach of 'isolationism', indicating that forced isolation of the tribes from the larger society will accelerate suspicion leading to secessionist movement. He further indicated that separatist movement in North East India is a product of the cultural distinction between

tribes located there and the larger Hindu society. In conclusion one can advocate that Ghurye understands of tribes and their problems largely manifest his nationalist appeal as he considers cultural unity between tribes and caste can only promote integration in Indian society.

Verrier Elwin (British Administration)	GS Ghurye (Nationalist approach)	Remarks
<p>ISOLATION/PROTECTIONIST POLICY: British administration and anthropologists believed Indian tribes to be culturally distinct from caste Hindus and that their tribal way of life should be preserved through state-enforced isolation from Hindu society</p>	<p>INTEGRATION: Ghurye became the best-known exponent of the nationalist view & instead of regarding tribes as distinct cultural group, Ghurye pointed to the cultural similarities between tribal groups and their Hindu neighbours, and he contested the tribe/caste distinction itself by designating tribes as Imperfectly integrated classes of Hindu society or Backward Hindus rather than aborigines.</p> <p>Nationalists were concerned about unity of India and the need for modernising Indian society. They believed that protectionist policy of Britishers would keep the tribals in a backward state as 'museums' of primitive culture.</p> <p>Why Tribes are called Backward Hindus?</p> <p>Tribes are backward hindus because of their imperfect integration into Hindu society. Backward because the epistemology of Hinduism like Sanskar, distinction between Buddhi, Mana, Ahankar are yet to reach them even though they have already gone for Hindu life, ritual and way of life. Tribes have retained much more of their tribal creeds and organization</p>	<p>In order to show that Tribes are not distinct cultural groups, he cited detailed evidence which explain how tribals had been involved in constant interactions with Hinduism over a long period. He gave the example of how Vanar Sena helped Ram and Nishad helped Ram in crossing river, which shows that they were always part of Indian society.</p> <p>Result of fusion: Tribal deities like Ganesh, Kali, and Shiva, tribal religions like animism, totemism, and naturalism assimilated into Hinduism with Aryan deities like Indira, Vishnu, and Brahma. Basically, tribals assimilated themselves within the folds of hindu society.</p> <p>Oraons, Khonds, Gonds, Korkus, Baigas, Bils, kols, halbas, Rautias have adopted Hinduism as their religion. Ghurye referred to the process of Hinduization which was occurring in south-central India.</p> <p>With Hinduization, they can come out of their tribal crafts and adopt a specialised type of occupation which is in demand in society. Ghurye believed Hinduism has improved economic situation of the tribal people.</p> <p>Ashokan rock edits mentioned his policies towards the tribal people.</p> <p>DN majumdar: In bastar, Tribes participate in Hindu Dussehra festival in spirit of cooperation.</p> <p>But all tribes have not been equally integrated with Hindu society (Differential degree of Integration). Divided tribes into 3:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perfectly integrated-Hinduised tribes, • partially Hinduised tribes and • Hill section: who offer resistance to the process. <p>S.Fuchs writes on central Indian tribes 'out of 25 million tribal recorded in 1941, 6 have been dropped in 1951. Of 19 million left, only 1.5 million officially recorded as confessing a tribal religion... all the others must have embraced Hindu Religion.</p>
Protectionism through creation of Excluded and Partially Excluded areas.	<p>Ghurye believed that protectionist policy or promotion of cultural pluralism would lead to social disintegration of independent India through secessionist movements in NE.</p> <p>Protectionist policy/administrative separation of tribal areas was motivated by imperial economic interests in forests and minerals rather than any real concern for the welfare of the people.</p>	
Assimilation of tribals with Hindu culture would leave them vulnerable to exploitation, cultural degradation, and extinction.	<p>ill-effects (exploitation and degradation) were not specific to tribal cultures, but were common to all the backward and downtrodden sections of Indian society, Ghurye explained that Tribals faced the same problems as caste Hindu cultivators—indebtedness, land alienation, bonded labour—and that their solution lay in 'strengthening tribal ties with other backward classes through Integration', rather than isolation.</p> <p>Even AR Desai agreed with it and said, vast bulk of lower strata of tribal society-Hindu, Muslim, Christian and Buddhist- are exploited and suffer from same disabilities as the non-tribals. The process of change which tribals are undergoing, has led to assimilation strains and stress, is the result of larger force like colonial capitalist system and not due to their contact with Hindus.</p>	
Hindus are responsible for exploitation and cultural degradation of Tribals.	<p>Ghurye believed that tribals cultural degradation and exploitation was due to the economic and legal changes brought in by colonial rule. Therefore, tribes are at risk due to Britishers, and not due to the hindus.</p>	

Political Sociology (Social integration/national integration, conflict)

He was mainly concerned with 'fissiparous tendencies' in the country and the need for national integration. In his later life he wrote on diverse political issues such as the rebellions in the northeast,

Hindu–Muslim conflicts, and other divisive trends in the new nation-state, always from a cultural nationalist and social integrationist perspective.

National Integration is based on social integration, which is based on shared values and emotional identification of individuals with ideal totality represented by nation-state.

Ghurye had no faith in official ideology of secularism promoted by Nehru, or in the idea that a composite/plural nation could be politically created. The failure of secularist theory of integration was demonstrated in continuous communal riots, demands for separate states, and other divisive tendencies. He was opposed to the ‘appeasement’ of minorities in the name of secularism.

He was trying to imply that it the religion (Hinduism) which is the basis of national unity, which was broken by the Islamic invasion. Muslims had always kept themselves apart from Hindus. and they pose major challenge to India’s integration. Islam failed to be absorbed into Hindu culture, Hindu-muslim relations are fraught with tensions.

Although he was venomous about muslims, any group attempting to assert a separate identity became the target of Ghurye’s rhetoric: adivasis, dalits, and proponents of other caste-based movements were equally condemned for threatening the unity of India.

Following are the threats to national integration:

- Policies of ruling party that offer special privileges to religious minorities, numerically strong Hindu Backward, and Scheduled castes for the hidden purpose of winning votes.
- In Book **Wither India**, he criticised the policy of reservation for SCs and STs. Similarly, in Caste and Race, he attacked Risley’s work as census commissioner for promoting consolidation of caste identities and emergence of caste associations. He believed that government policies were producing divisive caste politics, and he opposed social movements of backward classes because they perpetuated caste distinctions and impeded assimilation of diverse groups into mainstream Hindu society and the creation of nation-community, Caste associations, reservation of posts and seats by caste, and even caste-based movements for equality were criticised by Ghurye on the same grounds: they were against national integration. He believed that the burgeoning of caste associations had increased caste consciousness and strengthened community aspect of caste, creating a vicious circle. The feeling of caste-solidarity is now so strong that it is truly described as caste-patriotism.
- **Separatism and Particularism:** Partition of country is the culmination of long history of separatism and particularism. Hindu-Muslim conflicts have become running theme post-independence.
- **Dravidian party’s style of politics:** breeding strong anti-Hindi sentiments, indifference to northern Sanskrit and its literature dumping it as Brahmanical.
- **Linguistic tensions:** anti-hindi sentiments, Assamese-Bengali conflict and Urdu protagonism
- **Anti-Brahmin movements/Backward class movements:** Attacks on hierarchy started with rise of non-Brahmin movements in southern province. These mobilizations generated a new kind of collective sentiments and the feelings of caste solidarity (Caste association). MN Srinivas developed this point further and called it horizontal (intra-caste) solidarity. MN Srinivas writes, ‘Focusing specifically on the possible consequences of modern technology and representational politics, far from disappearing with the process of modernization, caste was experiencing a ‘horizontal consolidation’. Printing, regular postal service, vernacular newspaper and books, telegraph, railway, bus enabled the representatives of caste living in different areas to meet and discuss their common problems. The educated leaders started caste journals and held caste conferences (living up to the

ideas of liberty and equality). Caste hotels, hospitals, libraries, cooperative societies became a common feature of urban social life.

- Ghurye idealises the past by pointing out that competition is a modern phenomenon, and thus the conflict of oppositions has replaced the old harmony of demand and acceptance. Caste solidarity has taken the place of village-community.

Ghurye believed that national Integration should be achieved by the absorption of diverse religious and backward groups into mainstream Hindu society. Similarly, remedy for untouchability is the assimilation of untouchables into Hindus society.

