

**EMERGING THEMES IN INDIAN
SOCIOLOGY: AN ANALYSIS OF T.K.
OOMMEN'S WORKS**

*Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of the Degree of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

MAMTA BAIRWA



**CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL SYSTEMS
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI - 110067
INDIA
2012**

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the dissertation entitled “**EMERGING THEMES IN INDIA SOCIOLOGY: AN ANALYSIS OF T.K. OOMMEN’S WORKS**” submitted by **MAMTA BAIRWA** to the Centre for the Study of Social Systems, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of **Master of Philosophy**. This is an original work and has not been submitted, in part or full, for any other degree or diploma of any University.

MAMTA BAIRWA

We recommend that the dissertation be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

PROF. SURINDER S. JODHKA

(Chairperson)

DR. VIVEK KUMAR

(Supervisor)

DEDICATED TO
MY FAMILY
AND
TEACHER

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work is the outcome of substantial help and encouragement provided by many individual. First of all, I express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Vivek Kumar, who has helped me in every possible manner. His loving, caring nature and encouragement only made me possible to complete this work. He showed immense patience and great understanding, while going through this manuscript. His immense patience bears with all my shortcomings and enthusiastically correct me whenever I went wrong has been of great help. I am thankful to all my teachers in CSSS for their guidance and intellectual support to complete this piece of work.

I express my gratitude to the staff of CSSS for their guidance, encouragement and moral support in the process of writing this manuscript. I am thankful to the staff of JNU library for their invaluable help in supplying relevant material for research.

I cannot repay the debt of my seniors Naresh, Vinod, Jitendra, Dharmveer, Neeraj, Ashok, Suresh, Manjinder, Anil, Sheena, Susri, Manisha, Sharda Prasad and Bharat Kumar who have made sacrifice of his studies and helped me in every stage and they stood with me in the time of crisis and provided all kind of help and cooperation through my work.

The contribution of my parents and family members in higher education is enormous. They without complaining provided me all kind of help in pursuing higher education. I cannot repay the debt of all my elder and younger members of my family. I am very thankful to my brothers and sisters, Rajnish, Rajendra, Avinash, Trilok, Lokendra, Praveen, Neeraj, Arvind, Sunita, Anita, Manju, Arti and Pooja.

I am also thankful to my friends, Rimlee, Dhiren, Tanushree, Anjali, Smriti, Sudipta, Swapnil Singh, Milind, Saheen, Nadiya, Ishwariye, Priyanka, Soumya, Ashwini, and Swapnil Moon.

I am also thankful to my juniors, Vinita, Shubhankshi, Alok, Manoj, Babbi, and Prachi who stood with me in the time of crisis and provided all kind of help and corporation throughout my work.

Finally, I take sole responsibility for the all shortcomings and errors of this study.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgement	
Chapter I	1-27
Introduction	2
Emergence of sociology	3
Emergence of sociology in the Indian context	4
Dhurjati Prasad Mukherji (1894-1961)	7
Akshay Ramanlal Desai (1915-1994)	8
Mysore Narasimhachar Srinivas (1916-1999)	8
Approaches in Indian sociology	10
Expansion and emergent concern of sociology in post-Independence India	15
Sociology in India and the global scenario	17
Challenges faced by sociologists	17
Statement of the problem	19
Objectives of the study	20
Terms Used in the Study	20
Meaning of social movement	20
Meaning of sociology of profession	21
Meaning of political sociology	21
Methodology	21
Sources of data	22
Chapterization	22
Conclusion	26
References	27
Chapter II:	
Locating Individual in Profession and Discipline of Sociology	28 -
40	
Introduction	29
What is profession?	29
Sociology as a profession in India	30
Living for and of sociology	30
Bibliographical sketch	31
Contribution to organization	31
Putting Indian Sociology on the World Map	32
T.K. Oommen and awards	33
Oommen and his works	33
Oommen saw as in professional form	35
Conclusion	39
References	40

Chapter III:	
A Plea for Contextualization and Indian Sociology	41-
51	
Introduction	42
The Traditionalist	43
The Nationalist	43
The Nativity	43
The Cosmopolitans	43
The Radicals	44
Problems of contextualization of sociology: series of tensions	44
Indology verses sociology	44
Necessity of western system of knowledge: avoiding academic nationalism	46
Working with Social Problems before and after Independence	46
Avoiding Danger of Academic Communalism	47
Avoiding Academic Feudalism	47
Three Motivations for Entry in the Profession	48
Unit of Analysis: Micro vs Macro and Alein Contexts	48
Conclusion	49
References	51
Chapter IV:	
Sociology of Social Movements: from old social movement to the new social movements	52-
72	
Introduction	53
Approaches for the study of social movement	54
Functionalist	55
Subaltern	57
Indian's contribution to social movements	59
Social movement as instrument of social change	62
Social movement and development	63
State and social movement	64
Oommen's analysis of student politics (movements)	66
New social movements	67
Conclusion	68
References	70
Chapter V: Sociology of Profession	73-
91	
Introduction	74
Debate on the meaning of profession and occupation	75
Approaches of the sociology of profession	76
Evolutionary approach	76
Structural functional approach	77
Marxist approach	78

Inter-actionist approach	79
Professional orientation	80
Attributes of Profession	81
Conclusion	90
References	91
Chapter VI: Sociology: A Plea for Perspective From Below	92-
107	
Introduction	93
Evolution of Indian society and need of the perspective from below	95
Perspective from below and Emic -Etic approaches	97
Perspective from below and subaltern approach	98
Perspective from below and feminist approach	99
Upper caste hegemony and Indian sociology	100
Theoretical foundation of the perspective from below approach	101
Conclusion	104
References	106
Chapter VII: Conclusion	108-
115	
Bibliography	116-
126	

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

This study is a humble attempt to record the contribution made by one of the senior most sociologist T.K. Oommen, in the subject of Sociology. We will try to map up his contribution to Sociology through his writings spread for more than five decades. Let us begin by observing the emergence of Sociology in the western and Indian context. It will focus on the meaning of Sociology and its development in both contexts. The Subject matter of Sociology moves around the three themes: Sociology is the study of society, Second Sociology is that it's the study of institutions and third theme is the study of the social relations

According to first theme, Sociology need not to be study of any one part, it may be the study of the whole that is why Sociology is a special discipline which takes society as its unit of analysis. Its purpose then would be to discover how the institutions which make up a society are related to one another in different social systems. Second theme of Sociology is that it's the study of institutions. There are many institutions in our society like: family, religion, kinship, marriage, economic institutions and educational institutions. These institutions are core of concern for sociology. Emile Durkheim said that "Sociology can be defined as the science of institutions, but this form of sociological analysis has not been intensively developed" (Inkles 1964: 15). Sociology also has been concerned with the units of the social life and also the relationship between these units. These units include social institutions like: marriage, association, kinship, religion, family, education and political institutions. These institutions provide a structural framework for the society which is necessary for sociologists to study. The third theme is as the study of the social relations Sociology which are found in our society between people. Societies are complex systems of institutions, so institutions may be conceived as complex systems of still simpler social relationships. The family for example is made of many sets of relationships those between man and woman, parent and child, brother and sister, grandfather and grandchild. Each of these may be studied as a particular type of

relation. Sociologists also studied the social processes. These are the dynamics aspect of social relations: socialization, social control, co-operation, conflict, social deviation and social changes (Inkles 1964: 15).

We will try to analyze T.K. Oommen's role first as an individual in the profession and then in the discipline. We are aware that sociology emerged in the world almost two centuries back and Indian sociology emerged some a century ago. If we locate T.K. Oommen in Indian sociology it is approximately half a century, in sociology in Pune in India. Therefore one can safely argue that he has been engaged in sociology for quite some timing and hence it is permit to analyze his contribution to the subject. More so when he disciplines of sociology is itself undergoing change. Before we do that let us take a stock of western and Indian Sociology.

Emergence of Sociology

Sociology emerged in Europe out of philosophy, metaphysics and the different revolutions like Scientific Revolution, Industrial Revolution and Enlightenment, Romanticism, French Revolution. In the similar way Indian Sociology has emerged in India through the different directions which had influence of colonialism and anthropological theories of contemporary time. Social thought is as old as society itself, yet the origin of Sociology is traced back to 19th century Western Europe. Sometimes Sociology is called the child of the 'age of revolution'. The revolutionary changes in the preceding three centuries had decisively changed the way people lived thereby paving the way for the emergence of Sociology as we have today. Sociology took birth in such a climate of social upheaval. The roots of the ideas developed by the early sociologists lie in the then social conditions that prevailed in Europe.

Social thought is as old as society itself, yet the origin of Sociology is traced back to 19th century Western Europe. Sometimes Sociology is called the child of the 'age of revolution'. The revolutionary changes in the preceding three centuries had decisively changed the way people lived thereby paving the way for the emergence of Sociology as we have today. Sociology took birth in such a climate of social upheaval. The roots of the ideas developed by the early sociologists lie in the then social conditions that prevailed in Europe. This period of history is often described as 'the

great transformation', which led to the emergence of Sociology. Around the late eighteenth century an intellectual period known as 'the Enlightenment' challenged many of the established orders of society from an analytical and scientific perspective. The Enlightenment period coincided with the increase in knowledge in other scientific fields such as life sciences. Darwin's studies into evolution were controversial as they challenged old established ideas of the church. From a sociological perspective, the basis of 'survival of the fittest' brought about 'social Darwinism', a fiercely conservative ideology that believed that society will gradually improve on the basis that the 'fittest' (i.e. the most intelligent and productive members of society) will be the most successful and therefore 'survive'. Since this is one of the cornerstones of capitalist thought (the dominant political and economic presence in the western world today) it has contributed to the emergence of sociology, with thinkers such as Herbert Spencer and Karl Marx holding completely contrasting sociological ideas regarding capitalism.

Emergence of Sociology in Indian Context

Sociology tends to be taken for granted in India, like most established things. But this was not always so. In the early days it was not clear at all what an Indian sociology would like and indeed, whether India really something likes Sociology. In the first quarter of the 20th century, those who become interested in the discipline had to decide for themselves what role it could play in India. There are some founding fathers of Indian Sociology and they helped to shape the discipline and adapt it to our historical and social context.

The specificity of the Indian context raised many questions. First of all if Western Sociology emerged as an attempt to make sense of modernity, what would its role be in a country like India? India too, was experiencing the changes brought about by modernity but with important differences, it was a colony. The first experience of modernity in India was closely intertwined with the experience of colonial subjugation. Secondly if Social Anthropology in the west arose out of the curiosity felt by European society about primitive cultures, what role could it have in India, which was ancient and advanced civilization, but which also, had primitive societies within it? Finally

what useful role could Sociology have in a sovereign, independent India, a nation about to begin its adventure with planned development and democracy?

The pioneers of Indian Sociology not only had to find their own answers to questions like these, but they also had to formulate new questions for themselves. It was not only through the experience of doing Sociology in an Indian context that the questions took shape they were not available readymade. As is often the case, in the beginning Indians become Sociologists and Anthropologists mostly by an accident. For example one of the earliest and best known pioneer of the Social Anthropologist in India, L.K. Ananthakrishna Iyer (1861-1937), began his career as a clerk, then became interested in ethnographic study. He was first self-taught anthropologist to receive national and international recognition as a scholar and an academician. He was invited for a lecture at the University of Madras and was appointed as reader at the University of Calcutta, where he helped set up the first post-graduate anthropology department in India.

After him, lawyer Sarat Chandra Roy (1871-1942) was another accidental anthropologist and pioneer of the discipline in India. He did his graduation and post-graduation in the English and afterwards became lawyer by profession. Roy was deeply interested in the tribal society as his profession needed to understand and interpret tribal customs and laws in the court. He travelled extensively among the tribal communities and did intensive fieldwork among them.

This study will focus briefly on the contribution of the four pioneers of Indian sociologists, who were the immediate later generation of Iyer and Sarat Ray. They have witnessed the colonial era but continued their career as sociologists in the post independent India. They in the course of time, helped to shape the first formal institutions that established Indian sociology. G.S. Ghurye and D.P. Mukherji were born in the 1890s while A.R. Desai and M.N. Srinivas were about fifteen years younger, having been born in the second decade of the 20th century. Although they were all deeply influenced by western traditions of sociology, they were also able to offer some initial answers to the questions that the pioneers could only begin to ask: what shape should a specifically Indian sociology take?

G.S. Ghurye can be considered the founder of institutionalised Sociology in India. He headed India's very first post-graduate teaching department of Sociology at Bombay University for thirty-five years. He guided a large number of research scholars, many of whom went on to occupy prominent positions in the discipline. He also founded the Indian Sociological Society as well as its journal *Sociological Bulletin*. His academic writings were not only prolific, but very wide-ranging in the subjects they covered. At a time when financial and institutional support for University research was very limited, Ghurye managed to nurture Sociology as an increasingly Indian discipline. Ghurye's Bombay University department was the first to successfully implement two of the features which were later enthusiastically endorsed by his successors in the discipline. These were the active combining of teaching and research within the same institution, and the merger of Social Anthropology and Sociology into a composite discipline.

Best known, perhaps, for his writings on caste and race, Ghurye also wrote on a broad range of other themes including tribes; kinship, family and marriage; culture, civilisation and the historic role of cities; religion; and the Sociology of conflict and integration. Among the intellectual and contextual concerns which influenced Ghurye, the most prominent are perhaps Diffusionism, Orientalist scholarship on Hindu religion and thought, nationalism, and the cultural aspects of Hindu identity. One of the major themes that Ghurye worked on was that of 'tribal' or 'aboriginal' cultures.

In the 1930s and 1940s there was much debate on the place of tribal societies within India and how the state should respond to them. Many British administrator-anthropologists were especially interested in the tribes of India and believed them to be primitive peoples with a distinctive culture far from mainstream Hinduism. They also believed that the innocent and simple tribal's would suffer exploitation and cultural degradation through contact with Hindu culture and society. For this reason, they felt that the state had a duty to protect the tribes and to help them sustain their way of life and culture, which were facing constant pressure to assimilate with mainstream Hindu culture. However, nationalist Indians were equally passionate about their belief in the unity of India and the need for modernising Indian society and culture. They believed that attempts to preserve tribal culture were misguided and resulted in maintaining tribes in a backward state as 'museums' of primitive culture. As with many features of

Hinduism itself which they felt to be backward and in need of reform, they felt that tribes, too, needed to develop. Ghurye became the best-known exponent of the nationalist view and insisted on characterising the tribes of India as ‘Backward Hindus’ rather than distinct cultural groups. He cited detailed evidence from a wide variety of tribal cultures to show that they had been involved in constant interactions with Hinduism over a long period.

Dhurjati Prasad Mukherji (1894-1961)

D.P. Mukherji was born on 5 October 1894 in a middle class Bengali Brahmin family with a long tradition of involvement in higher education. Between the 1920s and the 1950s, sociology in India was equated with the two major departments at Bombay and Lucknow. Both began as combined departments of sociology and economics. While the Bombay department in this period was led by G.S. Ghurye, the Lucknow department had three major figures, the famous ‘trinity’ of Radhakamal Mukerjee (the founder), D.P. Mukerji, and D.N. Majumdar. Although all three were well known and widely respected, D.P. Mukerji was perhaps the most popular. In fact, D.P. Mukerjee — or D.P. as he was generally known — was among the most influential scholars of his generation not only in Sociology but in intellectual and public life beyond the academy. D.P. came to Sociology via History and Economics, and retained an active interest in a wide variety of subjects ranging across literature, music, film, western and Indian Philosophy, Marxism, Political Economy, and Development Planning.

He was strongly influenced by Marxism, though he had more faith in it as a method of social analysis than as a political programme for action. D.P. wrote many books in English and Bengali. His *‘Introduction to Indian Music’* is a pioneering work, considered a classic in its genre. D.P. Mukherji argued that Indian culture and society are not individualistic in the western sense. The average Indian individual’s pattern of desires is more or less rigidly fixed by his socio-cultural group pattern and he hardly deviates from it. Thus, the Indian social system is basically oriented towards group, sect, or caste-action, not ‘voluntaristic’ individual action. Although ‘voluntarism’ was beginning to influence the urban middle classes, its appearance ought to be itself an interesting subject of study for the Indian Sociologist.

Akshay Ramanlal Desai (1915-1994)

A.R. Desai is one of the rare Indian Sociologists who was directly involved in politics as a formal member of political parties. Desai was a life-long Marxist and became involved in Marxist politics during his undergraduate days at Baroda, though he later resigned his membership of the Communist Party of India. For most of his career he was associated with various kinds of nonmainstream Marxist political groups. Desai's father was a middle level civil servant in the Baroda state, but was also a well-known novelist, with sympathy for both socialism and Indian nationalism of the Gandhian variety. Having lost his mother early in life, Desai was brought up by his father and lived a migratory life because of the frequent transfers of his father to different posts in the Baroda state.

After his undergraduate studies in Baroda, Desai eventually joined the Bombay Department of Sociology to study under Ghurye. He wrote his doctoral dissertation on the social aspects of Indian nationalism and was awarded the degree in 1946. His thesis was published in 1948 as '*The Social Background of Indian Nationalism*', which is probably his best known work. In this book, Desai offered a Marxist analysis of Indian nationalism, which gave prominence to economic processes and divisions, while taking account of the specific conditions of British colonialists.

Mysore Narasimhachar Srinivas (1916-1999)

Srinivas was a student of Ghurye at Bombay University. Srinivas was probably the best known Indian sociologist of the Post-Independence era. M.N. Srinivas earned two Doctoral degrees, one from Bombay University and one from Oxford. Srinivas was a student of Ghurye's at Bombay. Srinivas' intellectual orientation was transformed by the years he spent at the Department of Social Anthropology in Oxford. British Social Anthropology was at that time the dominant force in Western Anthropology, and Srinivas also shared in the excitement of being at the 'centre' of the discipline.

Srinivas' Doctoral dissertation was published as *Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India*. This book established Srinivas' international reputation with its detailed ethnographic application of the structural-functional perspective dominant in British social anthropology. Srinivas was appointed to a newly created lectureship in Indian sociology at Oxford, but resigned in 1951 to return to India as the *head* of a newly created Department of Sociology at the Maharaja Sayaji Rao University at Baroda. In 1959, he moved to Delhi to set up another Department at the Delhi School of Economics, which soon became known as one of the leading centres of Sociology in India.

Indian Sociology traces its origin through the works of British civil servants, missionaries, and western scholars during 18th century and 19th century. British administrators wanted to understand the customs, manners, institutions of the people of India to ensure smooth running of their administration. Christian missionaries were interested in learning local language, culture to carry out their activities. First census was conducted in 1871.

The process of the contextualization of Sociology in India involves the following dimensions. First, recognition of the fact that tradition contains both assets and liabilities was viewed in terms of the present needs and aspirations. Second, we should not be shy of adopting appropriate values and institutions from other societies and cultures and should judiciously graft them on to our own society. Third, in doing this we should take into account the central tendency in our society, which seems to be one of those gradual adaptation and reconciliation. At the same time, we should recognize that such a societal ethos is capable of bringing about social transformation at slow space. Fourth, the social engineering involved here-the selective retention of our tradition, informed borrowing of other cultures and the judicious mutation of the two will have to be a process peculiar to India. (G.S. Ghurye: Indian Sociology).

As on today, Indian Sociology or say Sociology in India is passing through a critical phase. It is still dominated by the changing paradigms of Western Sociology and enamoured by their methodologies. It has not yet succeeded in making its contributions to social theory and conceptual development. Reasons for such a state of affairs are too far wider and deeper and to understand its reasons it is necessary to go

into those circumstances and to analyse the socio-historical and political conditions in which Sociology in India emerged as a formal discipline.

The Indian sociologists of the 1950s and 1960s were deeply influenced by currents of change in their own society and the emerging pedagogy of Western Sociology, particularly in the United Kingdom and America. During the 1960s there are two frames for the Sociology: one is the policy anchorage of Sociology and quest for relevance and the second is the search for a paradigm of a Sociology for India', which led both to explorations of the possibility of indenisation as well as to a methodological treatment of the data bases of Indian Sociology in terms of uniqueness of the Indian civilization.

Approaches in Indian Sociology

In India there are many orientations to the emergence of Sociology. The first is the philosophical theoretical orientation, associated with Lucknow School of Sociology. It is seen in the contributions of the Radhakamal Mukherjee, D.P. Mukherjee and A.K. Saran. Most of their contributions belong to the 1952-60 periods, however in the subsequent years only A.K. Saran remains prominent. It does not seem to have made a major impact on the theoretical nature of Indian Sociology. Radhakamal Mukherjee finds it possible to talk of universal series of concepts and general categories which do not integrate Sociology internally but also include other disciplines both in the natural and the Social Sciences.

D. P. Mukherjee led emphasis on the history and tradition. Among Marxist the notion of dialectic was used only by D.P. Mukherjee. A. K. saran on the other hand takes a more logically rigorous and consistent stand of the Sociology. Mukherjee made a systematic statement about the philosophical foundation of Sociology and other Social Sciences in his book entitled "Philosophy of Social Sciences" (1960). He postulates for each order of reality from physical to meta-physical; a unified triadic principle of dialectical interaction which links one level of reality with other, and which renders one level of concepts and categories significant and meaningful to other levels. He uses the dialectics but differs from the Marxists. He writes: "the philosophy

of dialectical materialism today promotes the universal notion of an inevitable pattern of social development through struggles and conflicts of global revolution and war and subsumes all human progress within the dialectic of the economic movements.

Modern evolutionary naturalism, Spenserians, Marxian or Bergsonian, reduces man's mind and values to passive entities manipulated mechanically by a vast process that he cannot intelligently direct or control. Evolution as revealed to modern thought has many levels or 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: 1960: 118).

D. P. Mukherjee had talked about the historical-dialectical mode of sociological analysis rather than empirical- positivistic. He rejects the atomism as a relevant notion for sociological analysis on which empiricism is anchored. He specially refutes the values of empirical methods such as surveys and quantitative-mathematical models as they essentially violate the phenomenology of Indian social reality which is devoid of the notion of individual, and has as its unit- category as the collective or the sangha. D. P. Mukherjee does not rule out the possibility of comparison between historically distinct societal forms or systems or the relevance of objectivity in Social Sciences, but he strongly pleads for awareness in formulation and uses sociological categories which are derived from the native tradition. He introduces a notion of levels in the concept formation in sociology from the contextual to the comparative, from the particular to the universal and from the historical to the general, which has not been systematically dealt with by Mukherjee, but is implicit in his Sociologically formulations.

A.K. Saran, who was Mukherjee's student, and later his colleague, however was inspired by his writings, takes on a logically more extreme standpoint on the theoretical formulation of Sociology and its meta-theory. In his writings(Saran, 1956), he proceeds to examine the meta-theory and underlying premises of sociology as a fundamental western cultural and cognitive reposes to meet the historical challenges of its own disintegrating worldview, following the industrial revolution and eclipse of its traditional society.

Secondly, the important orientation is culturological orientation. M.N. Srinivas's famous book entitled "Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India" (1952) makes a mention of it. This work led him to formulate the concept of Brahminization to represent the process of the imitation of life-ways and ritual practices of Brahmins by the lower caste Hindus. This concept was used as an explanatory device to interpret changes observed in the ritual practices and life-ways of the lower castes through careful field study. He also used the two other terms Sanskritization and Westernization. Sanskritization characterized a change within the framework of the Indian tradition, while Westernization was a change resulting from the contact with the British socio-economic and cultural innovations. We find a systematic study of these two terms in the M.N. Srinivas's "Social change in the modern India" (1966), where he says Sanskritization is the process by which a low caste or tribe or the other group takes over the custom, ritual, beliefs, ideology and style of life of high and in particular, a twice born caste. While the westernization is the one in which one caste follows the western culture.

The third, structural theoretical orientation: the Culturalogical orientation of Indian sociology whose theoretic tendencies has been related to the studies of the village communities, caste structure, its institutional correlates and family, kinship, and religious ideology of the people in villages. Most of the studies are conducted through the field work which is part of anthropology and the observational techniques. But the social structure which was studied at the village level was more descriptive and socio-graphic rather than a theoretical explanatory point of view. Thus the culturalogical orientation differs from the structural orientation. In the structural studies, one important trend is the focus on comparative categories relationship, such as caste and class relationship in India and its implication on the nature of the society. The structural theoretical orientation of sociology during the seventies is also reflected in the spurt of urban surveys which were completed from 1957- to 1969 (D' Souza, 1974: 117). These urban surveys were sponsored by the research programme committee of the planning commission. But after some time it also studied the agrarian structure. The interest in this structure is derived from the study of basic changes in the rural social structure initiated through land reforms after independence. It covered the study of new class formulations, social mobility and contradictions arising from these processes, with inter-regional and comparative perspectives.

The fourth orientation is the dialectical historical orientation, which is related primarily to Marxist methods and propositions for the analysis of social reality. We have used the dialectical not Marxism in Indian sociology because Marxist approaches comprise several adaptive models; many innovations have been made on classical Marxist formulations for the study of the Indian society. For example D.P. Mukherjee used the dialectical method in the Indian sociology. He used the categories of structure, class conflict and the model of socialist society in his analysis of historical social processes in India. Both historical framework and dialectic orientation are essential, according to him, in sociological thinking. Ramakrishna Mukherjee made systematic historical as well as empirical studies using the dialectical model but D.P. Mukherjee did not use empirical studies using this framework. Among the Indian sociologists one who has advocated and applied dialectical historical model in his sociological studies is A.R. Desai. He has studied the issues of nationalism, analysis of rural social structure, the nature of economic and social policies of change in India and the structure of the society and the state.

To quote Yogendra Singh “The contribution of the British administrators-cum-sociologists was quite substantial. Related to studies of the various aspects of Indian social structure, customs and traditions, the selection of themes and sociological paradigms was not without ideological biases. The conceptual problems of caste, tribe and village community, reflected in their observations served consciously or unconsciously exaggerated elements of segmentary cleavages in Indian society to the exclusion of the principles of organic linkage and societal unity. This bias was rooted in various ideological positions that Western sociologists and scholars held while analysing Indian social reality. The “Missionaries” derived their paradigm from their own version of the normative principles of Christianity and judged most Indian social and cultural institutions negatively. Their solution to India’s problem was, therefore, Christianization. The view of social reality that it offered was mechanistic, segmentary and instrumental in nature. It constituted a typical “colonial paradigm” for social analysis and offered a deeply fractured picture of Indian society and as such of Indian reality. (Singh 1986: ix, x)

During the pre- independence period there were many prominent sociologists like B.N. Seal, G.S. Ghurye, B.K. Sarkar, Radhakamal Mukherjee, D.P. Mukherji and K.P. Chattopadhyay. Their intellectual interests, methods of data collection, and their interpretations of the Indian social system and social institutions were strongly influenced by the style and content of the ethnographic works produced by scholar-administrators of the colonial period. Studies on caste, family, marriage and kinship, social stratification, tribal communities, rural and urban society figured prominently in this period. However, it is amazing that one of the early stalwarts of sociology G.S.Ghurye ventured to study such a forbidden theme as ‘sex-habits of middle class people in Bombay’ (1938), which many Sociologists would shy off even today, besides a large number of other areas. It would be no exaggeration to mention that Ghurye introduced the down-to-earth empiricism in Indian Sociology. His diversified interests which are reflected in the great variety of works of his research students produced on themes ranging from family, kinship structures, marriage, religious sects, ethnic groups – castes and aboriginals, their customs and institutions, to social differentiation and stratification, caste and class, education and society, the Indian nationalist movement, social structure and social change in specific villages or regions of India, and also urbanization, industrialization and related social problems in India. It would be appropriate to characterize Ghurye as a practitioner of ‘Theoretical pluralism’ (Dhanagre 1993: 38-39).

Whereas Seal and Sarkar were products of the Bengali renaissance and were inspired by the Indian National Movement, and had pioneered studies on ethnicity, religion and culture (Mukherjee, 1977, 31-41), Chattopadhyay was a Cambridge trained social anthropologist. He conducted large scale social surveys which revealed the conditions of the peasantry and the working class as well as of the tribes of Bengal and elsewhere. Chattopadhyay’s initiatives in portraying these issues were further pursued by Ramakrishna Mukherjee’s initial works on the economic structure and dynamics of rural Bengal.

The only other major centre which contributed significantly to the growth of Sociology in the country during the pre-Independence period was Lucknow. One of the pioneer of Sociology in Lucknow particularly Radhakamal Mukherjee also focused on the issues of rural economy and land problems (1926,1927), deteriorating agrarian

relations and conditions of the peasantry in Oudh (1929), population problems (1938), and problems of the Indian working class (1945), being initially trained in economics. The other doyen of the Lucknow school, D.P. Mukherjee, on the other hand preferred to study 'music and fine arts as peculiar creations of the Indian culture' and 'Indian tradition in relation to modernity'. Mukherjee, however, was a professed Marxist or 'Marxologist' as he preferred to call himself.

Expansion and Emergent Concerns of Sociology in Post-Independence India

The real phase of expansion of Sociology and Social Anthropology began in 1952. Several factors account for this expansion and growth. The policy makers of independent India pursued objectives of economic regeneration and social development, and they recognized the role of the Social Sciences in attaining the objectives of national reconstruction and development (Dhanagare, 1993:45). They defined the new task of Sociology as Social Engineering and Social Policy Science. It meant increased participation by Social Scientists, particularly Economists and Sociologists, in research and social and economic development (Y. Singh 1986, *pp.* 8-9). At the same time heavy funding from Ford Foundation to save India from sliding into the revolutionary communist path of development led many Sociologists in India to undertake researches in the field of community development as well as in the process of strengthening the policy relevant researches. P.N. Mukherjee has rightly pointed out that "Sociology in India, particularly after independence, in a large measure developed in an environment of tension between the Social Anthropological heritage of Britain, Sociology as canonized in the US and the Marxist intellectual tradition" (2000:75).

A major reason that contributed to the growth of Sociology in the post-independence period can also be attributed to the Constitution of India which declared the practice of untouchability in any form an offence, and with the introduction of reservation for Scheduled Castes and Tribes (SCs and STs) in the legislatures and jobs in the government and the public sector, a new field was opened up for study to Sociologists, though very few were aware of this fact (Srinivas, 1994:12). It is also an

acknowledged fact that when societies change from agricultural to industrial they give rise to internal inequalities and this is precisely what has happened in India also.

In the long run such a situation led to interest group oriented Sociology such as Black Sociology, Gender Sociology, Dalit Sociology, Tribal Sociology, Hindu or Islamic Sociology etc. Indian sociologists have taken all these Sociologies too in their stride. Despite successes in selected areas of social and economic life, such as the expansion of the middle class social base, growth in professional and services sectors, the Green Revolution and widening of the base of the commercial and industrial entrepreneurship etc., basic problems have remained unresolved. Nearly half of the total population is still illiterate, the rate of population growth continues to defy planned estimates, though some positive trends are emerging. Poverty level is intolerably high at about 40% of the total population being below poverty level, and the number of urban poor is increasing at a very rapid rate due to migration from villages. Multiplication of urban slums illustrates this process. The larger problem of the people is the urban poverty and its ghettoization.

The Indian cinema also focused on the many problems and through these they are trying to draw mind of the people. For example, The Oscar winning film 'The Slumdog Millionaire' amply illustrates the miserable condition of the urban slum dwellers. The discontent in the urban life is enlarged leading to continued conflicts between urban middle classes and the slum dwelling poor. The liberalization and opening of the economy have now added a new class of the 'super-rich' to the urban social situation. This creates among urban middle classes as well as the urban poor very complex forms of cultural, psychological and social tensions. Its significance is yet to be fully explored (Y. Singh 2000: 244).

Indian sociologists are yet to devote their serious attention to these issues if they have to pursue the goal of equality and to justify their relevance to the society at large. The culmination of social forces operating in our society since independence, have led us to face many unanticipated challenges. This has affected both our society as well as the profession of sociology. As such there is need to reflect deeply on these problems and to organize ourselves to meet with these challenges since challenge is inherent in the process of change. It affects both individuals and societies. We have to

examine as to how far the forces of change that are global, also bring about liberating consequences to society (Y. Singh, 2000: 239). A serious assessment of this situation is yet to be made.

Sociology in India and the Global Scenario

One major challenge that we encounter is a result of sudden alteration in the balance of power among nations due to the end of cold war. The disintegration of the USSR and changes in the policies of administration of economies in many former socialist societies, have created the myth of invincibility of capitalism as an ideology. There is economic pressure on the state to increasingly withdraw from its commitments to support many vital areas of social, economic and cultural welfare of its citizens. A plea is made to pass on such responsibilities to the free market forces, irrespective of the degree of the people's vulnerabilities. Human rights are applauded, but it does not include the citizen's right to work or measure of economic security. All over Europe and North America the state is under increasing pressure to withdraw from welfare commitments to its people.

Our own society can hardly escape such pressures (Singh 2000: 240). A pertinent question that arises is: What happens to the removal of inequality or say bringing about equality in society? Enigmatically, the march of global society and culture carries amongst its legions the forces that reinforce smaller identities, for example, ethnicity, sub-nationalism and cultural and religious fundamentalism. Despite all its benevolent consequences, the expansion of the global domain does not resolve the problems of social and cultural alienation, conflicts due to ethnicity, and minorities, etc. It is compounded by emergence of new social problems of disintegration of family, decline in community values and alienation of the individual (Y. Singh, 2000: 242).

Challenges Faced by Sociologists

Indian sociologists are facing many challenges and gradually becoming more conscious of the persistent inequalities operating both at the inter-national as well as intra-national levels and are trying hard to understand the 'Why', 'How' and 'Whom'

of the phenomenon of inequality in the context of its reasons, the processes and the victims. At the operational level, many young sociologists are working to understand the dynamics of the reservation policy, both in the context of its positive and negative consequences, as also within the issues of social inequality in the broader context of social injustice. However, a major handicap has been that many of these studies are either descriptive or at best analytical, but in most cases these are bereft of a sound theoretical foundation, even though efforts are being made to examine issues in the broader context of marketization and globalization.

The problems of language, publication and funding continue to persist. Sociologists are either working in regional languages and suffer from paucity of vernacular journals or even if they are writing their reports in English there is very little chance of getting them published, particularly in scarce English language journals, let alone foreign ones. As a result what is being done hardly ever comes to the knowledge of the international community and good works may never see the light of day. To salvage this situation, the Indian Sociological Society has taken concrete steps to encourage regional associations by organizing special symposia on regional issues and in this way stimulate sociologies from below.

Among the many challenges that Sociology is facing in India, while some pertain to the quality of students, since brightest or even the brighter of them are not coming to sociology under the current market forces -- others pertain to the paucity of faculties and funding because of neglect and failure on the part of state governments.

Indian Sociological Society (ISS) is making every possible effort to strengthen the reach and scope of Sociology in India. By organizing its annual conferences in every nook and corner of the country it is trying to give international exposure to a large number of participants coming from small towns. The ISS now regularly organizes a North – South dialogue between the eminent Indian and international sociology scholars on the occasion of its conferences.

Noteworthy among them are futures research, language and society, Sociology of sports, Sociology of work, Sociology of youth, Sociology of arts, biography and society, Sociology of disasters and Sociology of childhood. Similarly, the ISS is yet to grapple with the Sociology of local-global relations, and also the body in the Social

Sciences and time-use research. On the other hand, ISS seems to have led the study of such areas as backward and marginalized groups, and tribal communities which mainly face the problems of poverty, inequality and injustice. It is precisely for these reasons that a large number of Indian sociologists present their researches focused on these themes in the respective RCs.

The fast growing NGO sector is also contributing significantly to the growth and development of Applied and Action Sociology in India. This sector is also trying hard to grapple with and bringing to light the problems of the backward and the marginalized groups in the country. While Academic Sociology in India is losing ground in terms of providing jobs, the NGO sector has emerged in a big way to help the young Sociology entrants since they are considered well equipped and trained in field research and research methodologies.

There are other challenges of marketization and globalization and the growing clout of business management, the future of sociology in a large country like India, presently witnessing one of the fastest growing economies in the world, is not likely to lose its sheen and importance since there exists a large scope of research to grapple with the problems of poverty, illiteracy, health, hunger, and marginalization of a large section of its population, in a big and appropriate manner. Indian sociology seems to be equipped better to face the challenges of the outside world than the insurmountable internal challenges.

Statement of the Problem

In the present study, the concern is to understand and analyze the contribution of T.K. Oommen to the Indian Sociology. Although the concept of Sociology is not new term or concept, it is defined by many thinkers in their own perspective. Basically through this study I would like to focus on contribution of T.K. Oommen to Indian Sociology, which is not properly defined. If we observe his works carefully, we would find that different facets of Sociology practiced by him like Sociology of Profession, Sociology of Social Movements, Sociology: a plea for perspective from below and Sociology: a plea for contextualization to Indian Sociology.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study is to find out the different facets of sociology as practiced by T.K. Oommen.

To explain the causes for the development of Sociology in Indian contexts.

To explore the contribution of T.K. Oommen to the Indian Sociology.

To understand the plea for contextualization of Sociology by T.K.Oommen with special reference to perspective Indian Sociology.

To understand the relevance of T.K. Oommen's contribution to general and Indian Sociology in particular.

To understand different facets of Sociology as practiced by T.K. Oommen viz. Sociology of movements, Sociology of Profession and Political Sociology.

Terms Used in the Study

Social movements, profession, political sociology are few terms which is used in the present study, let us see their explanation:

Meaning of Social Movement

A social movement includes not only movements which he called as collective actions but also ideas systems. But the term social movements refer only to collective actions. But here problem is that collective actions are of several types: panic responses, hostile outbursts and organized social actions. When an elementary collective action (the crowd behaviour, mass action), acquires organization and a body of customs and traditions, established leadership, an enduring division of labour, social organization and new scheme of life, it becomes a social movement. (Oommen, 'Social Movement in India' pp.7). "Movements are usually defined and perceived as large scale or mass efforts. Traditions are the vehicles of goal fulfillment of movements". He says that social movements are conditioned by the three factors: its core institutional order, the primary goal pursued by society and the principal enemy as perceived by the deprived.

Meaning of the Sociology of the Profession

An inscriptive profession can be thus defined as a work practitioner, whose task commitment is performed in a monopolistic organization which determines his status, evaluates his ability according to organizational requirements, delineates through a process of selection or designation the precise area within which he will out his activities. T.K. Oommen says that the profession as a class category articulating specific interests presents a different perspective concerning the reality of profession.

The Meaning of Political Sociology

The meaning of Political Sociology based on the four notions, first political sociology is the science of the state. This was supported by the Jellink (German sociologist), and Marcel Prelot (French Historian). The second notion of political Sociology is that it refers to the process of interaction between society and politics. Bendix and Lipset observe that “Political science starts with the state and examines how it affects society while political Sociology starts with society and examines how it effect the state”. The third notion of political Sociology, as advocated by Maurice Duverger is modern. It holds that political Sociology deals with power. It is the study of the government. It is the science of authority of command. It is concerned with all human societies including the national society. The last notion about Political Sociology is that it is integration of Sociology and Political Science. Political sociology thus could be styled as the interdisciplinary progeny of the more established parent discipline Sociology and Political Science.

Methodology

The present study tries to analyze on the basis of secondary literature available in the field of social research. The study has also made a huge debate on what is the contribution of T.K. Oommen to the Indian sociology and how it is different from other Indian sociologists. The paper has consulted all the major theoretical works as well as paradigm. There are so many books printed in *London, Newark, United States and New Delhi*. On the basis of the literature a huge debate has been made on the emergence of

the sociology in India and how it has been emerged in the social science context. The present study has been designed in a systematic way to arrive at a particular conclusion of the present study.

The present work emphasizes on the contribution of T.K. Oommen to the Indian sociology. Methods used in the research work are both qualitative and descriptive in nature. Qualitative, because the emergence of sociology, in the western or the Indian contexts has a peculiar reflection but we cannot ignore the contribution of the eminent sociologist and social anthropologist like T.K. Oommen to the Indian sociology. On the other hand it is descriptive because in this he tried to find out the causes of the emergence of sociology in both contexts and T.K. Oommen describes sociology in many forms like Political Sociology, Sociology of Professional, Sociology of Religion and the Economic Sociology.

Sources of Data

The present study is primarily based on the secondary data. Theoretical literature has been collected from various Books, Journals, Newspaper articles and Magazines.

Chapterization

The present research work consists of seven chapters.

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

The first chapter focuses on the meaning of Sociology and the history of the development of Sociology in the Western and Indian Contexts. This chapter is going to discuss how the British Sociology had great impact on the emergence of Indian Sociology. It is said that British administrators tried to apply Sociology in many institutions in India and they emphasized that there are many branches of the social sciences which studies only one aspect of the society so we should try to develop a branch which studies the whole parts of the society. According to them Sociology is

one of them, which studies the whole society while other branches like political science studies the activities of the government, economics studies the production, consumption or economic activities of the society. Similarly history study past events related to the society. Thus we can say that Sociology is the best for the study of the every part of the society in wholistic way.

CHAPTER II LOCATING INDIVIDUAL IN PROFESSION AND DISCIPLINE

This chapter tries to locate T.K. Oommen as an individual academician in the Sociology as a discipline and profession and we will trace the journey of T.K. oommen to make sense of Sociology as a profession in India. At this point I wanted to look that how an individual tries to locate himself/ herself in the profession. Every individual has their basic needs and for the fulfillment of these needs he/she have to rely on some source of livelihood and for this he/she has to do some work. Thus they search a profession and through this they get income and thus they become a part of that profession. But the choice of the profession differ from individual to individual, it means that every person want a job according to their choice.

CHAPTER III SOCIOLOGY IN INDIA: A PLEA FOR CONTEXTUALIZATION

The chapter discusses on the Sociology: a plea for contextualization in Indian Sociology. T.K. Oommen encapsulates about the Indian Sociology and said that we can divide Sociology through three points of view for example Sociology in, of and for India. Sociology in India deals with the academic output of the sociologists, the state of the art in the country, discussion on Sociology of India concerns itself with approaches to the study of Indian society, as a space-time chunk. In the case of sociology for India, efforts try to be one of those postulating a set of concepts and theories suitable to study Indian social reality. There are many persisting tensions in Sociology, from the beginning of the period. I will focus on the three of them. One of these tensions emanates from its ambiguous identity of Social Anthropology. But this tension is peculiar to post-colonial world societies of Asia and Africa. The second tension under

the reference is based on Sociology's claim for scientificity along with material and life sciences. The third tension in Sociology is to be located in the appropriateness regarding the unit of analysis- society, nation-state and civilization.

CHAPTER IV SOCIOLOGY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT: FROM SOCIAL MOVEMENTS TO NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

This chapter discusses on the contribution of T.K. Oommen to the Sociology of Social Movements and how he has journey from the Old Social Movements to the New Social Movements. On this point Oommen says that social movements are seen as congruent with social conflict, they are neglected by the structural functional approach, the dominant paradigm of the discipline which emphasis harmony and equilibrium. Oommen conceptualizes social movements as those purposive collective mobilizations, informed of an ideology to promote change or stability, using any means violent and non-violent and functioning within at least an elementary organizational framework. He discusses typology of social movement, their reason for emergence, their transformation into institutions and methodological issues.

According to him Social Movements in society are conditioned by three factors; its core institutional order, the principal enemy as perceived by the deprived and the primary goal pursued by the society- nature and types of social movements keep changing as these features change. Conventional wisdom in Sociology views social movement as a united effort on the part of the deprived social categories to bring about social change. In this perspective movements are defined as oppositional forces against the status quo. The discussion on the scale of movements can be organized under three heads: a number of participants, the time span of movements and the social composition of movement participant. He has discussed different types of movements like tribal movement, women movement, caste related movement, regional movement and religious movements. He says that movements may be viewed as institutionalized collective actions, guided by an ideology and supported by an organization structure.

CHAPTER V SOCIOLOGY OF PROFESSION

The Chapter V focuses on the contribution of T.K. Oommen to the Sociology of Profession. Oommen has defined profession as ‘An inscriptive professional can be thus defined as a work practitioner, whose task commitment is performed in a monopolistic organization which determines his status, evaluates his ability according to organizational requirements, and delineates through a process of selection or designation the precise area within which he will carry out his activities’. T.K. Oommen says that the profession as a class category articulating specific interests presents a different perspective concerning the reality of profession. He divided the Professional Sociology into three aspects; the first being professional organization and these institutions are based on the two types of work first, full-fledged profession and second is the semi profession. The second aspect, service organization and the third is the non-professional. There are three volumes which are related to the Professional Sociology and Occupational Sociology. One is written by Kirkpatrick, other by Oommen and the third by Suma chitins. The subject matter of these three volumes could be included in the area of the Sociology and occupations and professions. Two of these books deal with doctors and nurses in hospital settings and the third deals with the university teaching profession.

CHAPTER VI SOCIOLOGY: A PLEA FOR PERSPECTIVE FROM BELOW

Chapter VI looks at the point that Sociology as a perspective from the below or analysis the perspective from below in the discipline of Sociology as mooted by T.K. Oommen. We are aware that Sociology As a discipline in India is almost a century old. Ambedkar argues that the subaltern communities that have been discriminated against for centuries identify themselves as Dalits. According to him, “Dalithood is a kind of life condition that characterizes the exploitation, suppression and marginalization of Dalits people by the social, economic, cultural and political domination of the upper castes. T.K.Oommen also tries to understand Indian society from the perspective form below which is called as the subaltern perspective. He says that all societies are stratified on the basis of the age, sex, gender, class, caste, and occupation.

CHAPTER VII Conclusion

The last chapter is the conclusion of the whole dissertation. It is concluded that there is history for the development of Sociology. Through this study I will try to make the sense of contribution of T.K. Oommen in the discipline of sociology. Since the ancient time, there are many problems in the society and for the study of these problems and we need a Social Science which studies society and its problems in its totality, called as Sociology. Although there are others who contributed to the Sociology but one cannot ignore Oommenian contribution. T.K. Oommen is an eminent Indian sociologist; he is the one of them whose book firstly published in the polity press. Oommen has an important contribution to the sociology in the different facets, for example Sociology of Social Movements, Political Sociology, Sociology of Profession, Sociology of Education, Sociology of Religion and the Sociology of Medicine. At the ending point he says that Sociology is the child of modernity and the hybrid of Western Sociology. Thus we can see that he has a significance role to the emergence of Indian Sociology.

References

Ahmad and Gupta. 1967. *Opinion and Survey of Scientists And Technologists*. New Delhi: Council of Scientific and Industrial Research.

Ahmad, Imtiaz. 1972. For Sociology Of India: Contribution To Indian Sociology. 6:172-78.

Bierstedt, Robert. 1963. *The Social Order*. New York: Mac-Graw Hill.

Baily, F.G. 1959. For A Sociology of India, Contribution to Indian Sociology. No. 3.

_____ 1958. *Caste and the Economic Frontier*, Bombay, Oxford University Press.

Beger, Peter. 1966. *Invitation to Sociology*. Penguin Books.

Beteille, Andre. 1974. *Sociology and Ethno-Sociology*. International Social Science Journal, 24 (4):703-4pp.

_____. 1977. *Inequality among Men*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Dhanagare, D.N. 1993. *Themes and Perspectives in Indian Sociology*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Inkles, Alex. 1993. *What Is Sociology: An Introduction to the Discipline and Profession*. PHI Learning Private Limited.

Mukherjee, Radhakamal. 1960. *The Philosophy of Social Sciences*. New Delhi: Rawat publication.

Oommen, T.K. 2010. *Social Movements: Issues of Identity*. New Delhi, New York: Oxford University.

_____. 2008. *Reconciliation in Post-Godhra Gujarat: The Role of Civil Society*, New Delhi: Pearson Longman Imprint of Person Edition, 2008.

_____. 2007. *Knowledge and Society: Situating Sociology and Social Anthropology*. Oxford University Press.

CHAPTER II

LOCATING INDIVIDUAL IN PROFESSION AND DISCIPLINE

CHAPTER II

LOCATING INDIVIDUAL IN PROFESSION AND DISCIPLINE

Introduction

This tries to locate T.K. Oommen as an individual academician in the Sociology as a discipline and Profession; we will trace the journey to make sense of Sociology as a Profession in India. Alex Inkeles has argued that Sociology is not only an intellectual discipline, it is also a profession. Further, he opines that, “when we consider any branch of learning as an intellectual discipline, we have in mind the perceptions on which the men in the field rest their work, the ideas and currents of thought which unite or separate them, the characteristic style of reasoning or argument, which they use, the types of data considered, the way in which they are collected, and the manner in which they are treated” (Inkeles 1964: 106).

What is profession?

Ageing taking clue from Inkeles (1964) we can explain that, “when we speak of a profession, we refer mainly to such theme as the use or application of a body of knowledge for example whenever to teach or to heal; to the context in which the discipline is used whether in public or privately, with large group or face to face with one individual; to the way in which those concerned with a given realm make their living; how much freedom and autonomy they measure; however and how poorly organized they are and the like. The nature and practice of a discipline determine the kind of intellectual enterprise and profession it may become” (Ibid).

It is also a fact that approximately three thirds of those holding the Ph.D in Sociology teach in university for in college or even professional colleges. In India those professional colleges well are IIT or IIM. And it is no confidences that T.K. Oommen, who landed in the sociology discipline and profession by accident, by his own admission in different talks, seminars and conferences, taught Sociology for approximately thirty years.

Sociology as a Profession in India

Oommen has a different take for Sociology as Profession in India. According to him, “While Sociology in India deals with the professional activities of Sociologist, the state of the art in the country, discussion on Sociology of India concerns itself with approaches to the study of India society as a space-time chunk. In the case of Sociology for India, the effort seen to be one of the postulate a set of concepts and theories suitable to study Indian social reality”.

However it is evident from the long and illustrious career of Oommen that he has been involved in both, Sociology as a discipline and Sociology as a Profession. His different roles as a teacher, as a researcher and then as an organizational builder (at national and international) amply prove the point. As far as production of knowledge is concerned his publications further authenticate the facts that he has contributed to most of the spheres of Sociology. A three day seminar to felicitate Oommen on his retirement in 2002, October recorded his intellectual contribution in five broad themes of Sociology- Sociological Themes, Political Sociology, Sociology of Profession, Sociology of Movement's and Sociology of Transformation, as told by one of the teachers from center for the study of social system. Another teacher told about the personal trait of Prof. Oommen. Specifically two qualities, one his punctuality in the class and formal appointments. Secondly, he never tries to create a “Guru-child” (teacher- triple) school. Although he has acted as mentor to most of the students passing out the Sociology Department of Sociology at Jawaharlal Nehru University but he never tried to calculate legacy of his known.

Living For and Of Sociology

There is an army of sociologists in India who act as teachers and produce books after books but never like to take the burden of professional organizations of Sociology. However if we observe Oommen's contribution to Indian Sociological Society, we only national professional organization, it is phenomenal. Apart from contributing 17 articles in the official Journal of the Society, Sociological Bulletin, highest number of articles by a single Indian Sociologist, he has been Treasurer, Secretary and President of

Sociological Society (Shah 2011: 416, Jayaram 2011: 437). Along with that he had organized world Sociological Conference in India. He contributes to the organization of Indian Sociological Association by showing as the EC member then as the president not only first Indian but first Asian or first non white to do so. Oommen has been the editor of Sociological Bulletin. In this manner we can easily argue that T.K.Oommen has been living not only of sociology but also for Sociology. No sociologist in India has done so much for Indian Sociology as T.K.Oommen has done. Let us have a detailed sketch of his academic journey as a Sociologist.

Bibliographical Sketch

T.K. Oommen was born in 1937. His full name is Tharailath Koshy Oommen. He did his graduation in economics from the Kerala University, Trivandrum India in 1957. After that he went to Poona to complete his masters in Sociology in Pune University in 1960. He did his Ph.D. from the same university in 1965 under the supervision of the Y. B. Damle. The topic of his Ph.D. thesis was 'Charisma, Stability and Change: An analysis of Bhoodan-Gramdan Movements in India' in 1964-70. He gave his first lecture and became lecturer in Social Sciences, Delhi school of Social Work in Delhi University. After that he joined Jawaharlal Nehru University as the Associate Professor of Sociology in 1971-76 and also became the Professor of this University in the Centre for the Social Systems, School of Social Sciences. In 2003-2006 he undertook three public tasks: he was the chairman of the Advisory Committee, Gujarat harmony project, to explore the possibility of reconciliation between Hindus and Muslims after the 2002, 'communal' carnage in Gujarat. He was also the member of the Prime-Minister's High Level Committee, to Study the Social, Economic and Educational Status of The Muslims Community of India; He held a Ford Foundation Chair on Non-Traditional Security. In 2007 he became The Professor of Emeritus, in JNU, New Delhi.

Contribution to Organization

Professor Oommen is not only a renowned Sociologist but also social Anthropologist. As an eminent Sociologist he has a peculiar picture in the world map

of Indian Sociology and also gives a popular contribution to the organizations. He is member of Indian Sociological Society. He also participated in India Sociological Association (ISA). In 1986, he became the security general of 11th World Congress of Sociology and also the EC member and in 1990-94, he served as the president of this institution. He participated in Indian Sociological Society as a treasurer in 1975-78 and in 1989-91 remained as secretary of Indian sociological society. He acted as the editor of the sociological bulletin. During the period of 1998-99 he was the president of the Indian Sociological Society. He was also the member of the Board of Directors, International Institute of Sociology, in Rome in 2001-2005. He was a Council member of International Association for the scientific study of the Religion in 1989-91 and in 1993-95 and Vice Chairman, Church and Society World Council of Churches, Geneva in 1984-89 and the member of the Indian National Commission for UNESCO in 1993-97.

Putting Indian Sociology on the World Map

T.K. Oommen has put Indian Sociology on the World Map: Secretary General of the XI World Congress of Sociology, the quadrennial Congress of the International Sociological Association (1990-1994), in New Delhi in 1986 and he is the only scholar from Asia and Africa to be elected as the president of International Sociological Association, a fifty-year old body sponsored by UNESCO. T.K. Oommen is an eminent Sociologist and Social Anthropologist. He retired in October 2002 from the Centre of the Study of Social System, Jawaharlal Nehru University, and New Delhi, where he worked for over 30 years. During his distinguished career, he served as the president of the Indian Sociological Society (1998-99); President, International Sociological Association (1990-94); and Secretary General of the 11th World Congress of Sociology (1986).

He has been a visiting professor at the Department of Sociology, California; Visiting Fellow at the Mansion Des Sciences de L'Homme, Paris; Visiting Professor at the Wissenschaftszentrum, Berlin; Visiting Fellow at the Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, Canberra and Senior Fellow of the Institute of Advanced Studies, Budapest and the Senior Fellow, Institute of Advanced Studies,

Uppsala, Sweden, Department of Sociology University of California, Berkeley (USA); Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, Canberra; Institute of Advanced Studies, Budapest, Hungary and the Scandinavian Institute of Advanced Studies, Uppsala, Sweden.

T.K. Oommen and Awards

Professor T.K. Oommen is the recipient of all the three Indian awards available to sociologists: the V.K.R.V. Rao prize in Sociology (1981), the G.S. Ghurye prize in Sociology and Social Anthropology (1985), and the Swami Pranavananda award in Sociology (1977). He also awarded with the Padam Bhusan in 2008. Apart from awards let us have names of the books and monographs.

Oommen and His Works

Books and Monographs- Professor Oommen has written about thirty books, of which seven are published by Sage, four by Oxford, two each by Macmillan, Pearson/Longman and popular, one each by polity, Orient Longman, Thompson and Vikas among others.

Research Paper- Professor Oommen has written nearly 200 of which 100 are in books edited by scholar of repute and the remaining in professional journals including Commonwealth Journal of Political Studies, Comparative Studies in Society and History, Sociologia Ruralis, Asian Survey, Social Forces, International Sociology, Sociological Bulletin, Contribution to Indian Sociology, Indian Journal of Social Science, Economic and Political Weekly etc.

Books Reviewed- There are 65 book reviewed in Journals such as India Quarterly, Indian Journal of Social Work, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Political Science Review, Indian Journal of Public Administration, Indian Book Chronicle, The Book Review, Religion and Society, Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, International Studies, Indian Journal of Social Sciences, Indian Social Science Review, Radical

Humanist, Sociological Bulletin, Contribution to Indian Sociology and Newspaper such as The Times of India, Hindustan Times and Indian Express.

Popular Articles- Over one Hundred in Journals/Magazines such as AICC, Economic Review, Kurukshetra, Indian Co-Operative Review, Seminar, Quest, Indo-Asian Culture, Yojana, Social Welfare, New Frontiers in Education, The Indian and Foreign Review, Indian Journal of Youth Affairs, Gandhi Marg, ISA Bulletin, Media Development, Manorama Year Book, The Radical Humanist, Dialogue, Agenda and Edited Books.

News Paper Articles- Over fifty mainly in the Times of India, Hindustan Times and Indian Express and The Hindu.

Edited Volumes- He has written and edited seventeen books so far including ‘Protest and Change’; ‘Alien Concepts and South Asian Reality’; ‘Citizenship, Nationality and Ethnicity’; ‘The Christian Clergy in India’; and ‘Pluralism, Equality and Identity’. His Twenty one books were published by different presses like: Polity Press; Oxford University Press, Macmillan Press and Sage Publishers. He has been writing in newspapers such as The Times of India, The Hindustan Times, Indian Express and The Hindu on social, cultural and political issues thereby playing the role of an opinion leader.

He is associated with thirteen journals as editor or as a member of Editorial Advisory Board, eight of them foreign and five Indian. An incurable pluralist, Prof. Oommen had published extensively on the intricate relationship between nation-state, minorities and multiculturalism. He firmly believes that there is much for Europe and India to learn from each other. As President, Forum for India and European Union, Prof. Oommen was continuously engaged in dialogue on themes of common concern for both. He was appointed as Ford Foundation Chairman of ‘Non-traditional Security’ at the Delhi Policy Group in 2003-4. A book entitled: Understanding Security: A New Perspective is published by the Macmillan Press in 2006.

As Chairman of the Programme Advisory Committee of Gujarat Harmony Project (2002-4) Prof. Oommen went beyond relief and rehabilitation and advocated

the imperative need for reconciliation so that peaceful co-existence of groups and communities is possible in multi-cultural societies. A monograph entitled: Civil Society Intervention in Post-Godra Gujarat: Reconciliation from below is under Preparation. Translating into practice the ideas of M.K. Gandhi and E.F. Schumacher, Prof. Oommen in his capacity as Chairman, Schumacher Centre Delhi is involved in rural development, employment generation and livelihood projects. He was the Member of the Prime Minister's High Level Committee for preparation of Report on Social, Economic and Educational Status of the Muslim Community of India since March 2005.

Oommen Saw as in Professional Form

Oommen was interviewed by Welz and Kumar (2001), and they saw him as in professional form and say that, in the first part of his career was very much oriented to Indian situations; this often entailed critique of Western Sociology, with which he showed his familiarity, for making generalizations that ignored the Indian data, or theorized it in terms of backwardness, but he also wanted to go beyond existing Indian practice. The book based on his doctoral thesis (1972) was the first by an Indian sociologist to deal with a social movement, and his *Doctors and Nurses* was the first book-length study of a modern occupation, in which he had collected data from the M.A. students of Delhi School of Social Work.

He saw three broad orientations as having dominated the Indian sociology: 'institutionist', aiming to perpetuate the past and cleanse it from alien accretions; 'nationalist', seeing the role of Sociology as to promote an Indian version of modernity and nation-building; 'cosmopolitan', seeing Sociology as a monotheism science, and India as essentially the same as other societies despite a few cultural specificities. He has not been happy to subscribe fully to any of these, but he calls his own position 'pluralist', advocating theoretical eclecticism with attention to historical diversities, and reconciliation of national and basic humanist values, the 'alien' and the 'indigenous'. (Welz and Kumar, 2000). Not all of those points would seem equally relevant to other national sociologies, but they will have their own equivalents; he has

also played an active part in the discussion of internationalization and how to achieve it (1990, 1991).

It is of interest to note that Oommen's identity as a Kerala Christian, which puts him outside the Hindu majority, has given him a valuable and relatively unusual social perspective. He points out that in India, far from Christianity having been imported by colonialism (though of course that also played a role, much later), it existed in Kerala by the third century AD, before Hinduism, which came in with the Aryan conquest. This means that its adherents can neither be treated as less indigenously Indian than Hindus, nor as a western religion intrinsically connected with colonialism. The issues of identity raised by looking at the complexities of modern Indian society from this angle have surely helped in the development of work such as his 'Insiders and outsiders in India' (1986), and *Citizenship, Nationality and Ethnicity: Reconciling Competing Identities* (1997).

As these notes suggest, Oommen has, and had before his active role in the ISA, an impressive range of publications, on a range of significant social issues and theoretical topics. The distribution of their appearance exemplifies a pattern which illustrates the structuring of the sociological literature more broadly. They have all been in English, though their empirical focus has usually been on Indian data; most of his books have been published in India, but often by the Indian branches of prestigious western publishers such as Sage, Macmillan and Oxford University Press. His articles have been very widely spread, divided between Indian journals such as the *Sociological Bulletin* or *Economic and Political Weekly* and international or specialist ones. Oommen reports that ISA was not salient to him earlier in his career, despite his prominence in India and the fact that he had a number of invitations to foreign countries.

He had no involvement with it until he found himself organizing the 1986 World Congress on behalf of the Indian association; he was then surprised to find himself nominated for the EC without even his consent being asked. He became a member of several RCs, but his membership of the Working Group on Famine and Society has probably lasted longer. In his presidential address, he had discussed geographical as well as social boundaries of many kinds, and their interrelationships.

He sees them as an essential part of identities, although their co-terminology is not desirable because it promotes religious fundamentalism or secular totalitarianism, threatening pluralism. It can be seen how his earlier work already raised themes related to those of his presidential address, and one may assume that his interest in these issues influenced the choice of a Congress theme which invited discussion of them (Welz and Kumar 2001).

In a recent interview on the eve of XXXVII Diamond Jubilee celebration conference in 2011 at Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, Oommen answered his questions. Oommen, himself tells us about his association with Indian Sociological Society and the society's journey from regional to national to global stage in the XXXVII ALL INDIA SOCIOLOGICAL CONFERENCE, December 10-13, 2011. He said "I enrolled as a life member of Indian Sociological Society (ISS) only in 1973 that are 22 years after it was established". If one examines the history of ISS it becomes clear that it had a dual parentage. The direct lineage of ISS can be traced to the society established in 1951 with its roots firmly anchored in the department of sociology in Bombay (now Mumbai) under the patronage of G.S. Ghurye who remained its president for 15 years (1951-66).

Other functionaries of ISS during this period were mainly the former student of Ghurye some of whom became his colleagues in the Department of Sociology at Bombay. Sociological bulletin is the official organ of ISS which was edited by Ghurye with assistance from his departmental colleagues. Also the annual symposium of ISS was held at Bombay and the papers published in sociological bulletin were mainly those read at these symposia. The life membership of ISS was predominantly drawn from western India, particularly Maharashtra.

The Journal of Institutional Economics is devoted to the study of the nature, role and evolution of institutions in the economy, including firms, states, markets, money, households and other vital institutions and organizations. It welcomes contributions by all schools of thought that can contribute to our understanding of the features, development and functions of real world economic institutions and organizations. The Journal of Institutional Economics is an interdisciplinary journal that is of interest to all academics working in the social sciences, particularly in

economics and also to all academics working in the social sciences, particularly in economics and business studies.

Contributions from politics, geography, anthropology, sociology and philosophy are also welcomed. The Journal of Institutional Economics aims to provide all authors with an expert verdict on their articles within fifty days of submission. The term 'orientation' here refers to professional cognitions and perceptions that are modes of perceiving the wider socio-political reality and the professional relationship with such reality.

Oommen says that Sociology is a Child of Western Modernity but Modernity is not the monopoly of the west and it should not be mistaken for eternity. Further, modernity is not a spatial but temporal phenomenon. At any rate the notion of the multiple modernities is now widely endorsed. Social sciences, particularly, sociology faces the crisis because of its reluctance to adapt to the changing contexts. The collapse of the socialist world and the down grading of the state from its commanding position as well as the centrality bestowed on market in capitalists countries calls for a new role for sociology. The world over the perception is that the current crises have two edges; the crisis emanating from market fundamentalism in capitalist countries and the crisis thrown up by authoritarianism perpetrated by non-democratic political regimes. This perception renders the autonomy of society, apart from economy and polity, a conceptual nullity. The urgent need of our times is to invest society with its centrality.

Oommen says that, contemporary societies should stand on these three pillars democratic states, competitive market and the civil society, by which he refers to the organized part of the society. To bestow undue importance on the first two and relegating the third to the background has been the bane of our times. Blaming corporate culture and political dictatorship are not the way out but empowering civil society, as a countervailing power to them is the way forward. And in this context professional associations such as ISS and ISA which constitute a dimension of civil society can and should play their expected role.

There is a question being raised. Knowledge is for whom? It needs to be answered responsibly. While analysis of social reality ought to be task of sociologists,

sociological knowledge generated by them should be used for human welfare. Professional sociologists should therefore apply sociological knowledge for improving the quality of life. In turn the sociological task should also include the analysis of the latent functions of political authoritarianism and the hegemony of market for the integrity of society. In the similar point, Prof. Oommen tries to locate the definition of Sociology from the three points of view: one, sociology in India: a plea for contextualization, second: Sociology for one world: towards an authentic Sociology and third, internationalization of Sociology: a south Asian perspective.

Conclusion

To conclude Oommens dedicated and committed scholarship and work culture reminds us what C.Wright Mills has written, “on intellectual craftsmanship’. He argues, “scholarship is a choice of how to live as well as a choice of career;...the intellectual workman forms his own self as he works towards the perfection on his craft; to realize his own potentialities and any opportunities that come his way, he constructs a characters which has its core the qualities of then good workmen” (Mills 1959: 216). That aptly reflects the personal traits of T.K.Oommen. However his life and intellectual journey is always guided by his concerns society and humanity as a whole. That he never turns back to gravest of problem faced by mankind, whether his Tsunami or it is Gujarat carnage he is found standing besides the needy. His sociological imagination is always guided by making a difference in the quality of human life.

In the concluding lines we can say that Indian Sociology is thus a hybrid, a product of the creative confrontations and dialectical interactions between an intense desire to retain Indian tradition, a passionate quest for evolving and maintaining a distinct national identity and an abiding interest to acquire a prominent place in the world community of academic sociologists. Thus we can see that professor Oommen has started his life at the beginning point of Sociology and now he reached the highest point of the Sociology. His journey in the emergence of Sociology has a particular space in Indian Sociology.

References

Jayaram, N. and Tina Chaudhary. 2011. The Biography and Meta Analysis of A Journal, *Sociological Bulletin*, Volume 60, No. 3, November

Mills, C, Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. Penguin Book, Australia.

Mukherji, Partha Nath. 2006. "Rethinking Sociology in an Era of Transformatory Changes" *Sociological Bulletin* 55, no. 2 (2006).

Mukerji, Dhurjati Prasad. 1943. *Modern Indian Culture: A Sociological Study*. Allahabad: India Publisher.

Millerson, Geoffery. 1964. *The Qualifying Associations: A Study in Professionalization*. Rutledge and Kegan Paul Ltd London press.

Mills C. W. & Hans Gerth. 1946. *Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford.

Mukherjee, Ramkrishna. 1989. *Indian sociology or sociology of India?* Pp. 135-50 (Ed.) Nikolai Genov, *National Traditions in Sociology*, Sage.

Mukherjee, Radhakamal. 1960. *The Philosophy of Social Sciences*. New Delhi.

_____. 1945. *Indian Working Class*. Bombay: Hind Kitab.

_____. 1945. *Introduction to Indian Music*. Poona: Kutub.

_____. 2000. *Diversities: Essays in Economics, Sociology and Social Problems*. New Delhi: Manak.

Oommen, T.K. 1995. *Alien Concepts and South Asian reality: Responses and Reformulations*. New Delhi/ Thousand Oaks/ London: Sage Publications.

_____. 1986. *Indian Sociology: Reflections and Introspections*. Bombay: popularize Prakasan.

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

_____. 2000. *Culture Change in India: Identity and Globalization*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Shah, A.M. 2011. "The Indian Sociological Society", From a Learned Society to A Professional Association, *Sociological Bulletin*, Volume 60. No.3. November.

CHAPTER-III

SOCIOLOGY IN INDIA: A PLEA FOR CONTEXTUALIZATION

CHAPTER-III

SOCIOLOGY IN INDIA: A PLEA FOR CONTEXTUALIZATION

Introduction

In this chapter we will examine the contribution made by T.K. Oommen in his writing for making sociology contextual so that it gives attention to historicity of Indian social reality. We will analyze that even after completing hundreds year why there is this tension within the subject- the tension of differences between sociology and social anthropology, tension between differential emphases accorded to the study of past and the present.

According to Oommen, “Indian sociology has existed in India for hardly a century, although sociological thinking and empirical research did exist since the nineteenth century (Oommen 2007). For Oommen the field of Sociology in India is the ‘locus of struggle’ between different external influences, specific conditions and different local centers of Sociology. We can argue that Indian Sociology has grown under the different influences. The British, European and American influences and dominants as have been recognized by the sociologists (Bottomore 1962). Singh (2004) on the other hand argues that “like most other social sciences in India, has grown through an encounter with the western philosophical and social scientific tradition (p. 135).

However Oommen goes beyond this domination and influences on Indian sociology. He tries to analyze the existing tension within Indian society on the concern of sociology. That is its unit whether Indian sociology should remain Indian specific or it should get trans-national (Oommen 1986:284). In fact he has tried to identify five such trends in Indian society accordingly. These are: traditionalist, nationalist, nativity, cosmopolitans and radicals.

The Traditionalist

Some people, who look at India as a unique society, culture or civilization, there by emphasizing the need to focus on the specificity of Indian society pursuant, they advocated the need to study Indian society as a whole and this entails delving deep into India's hoary past through ideology and ancient history, they considered as the traditionalist (ibid).

The Nationalist

This group of people does not consider that Indian society as a unique but they recognize that as in other cases it has a specificity of its own and argues that this specificity can be understood only through an analysis of Indian history and tradition. This orientation calls for the need to emancipate ourselves from the constricting influence of outsider (academic colonialism is the current catch-phrase) and to reject the international reference model to render ourselves nationally relevant (ibid).

The Nativity

These people argue for the use of native concepts and categories, on the basis of those they try to reconstruct social reality as people perceive it. This perspective implies that there are as many version of social reality on the basis of their socio-cultural variations and hence what is emphasized is local history and tradition (ibid).

The Cosmopolitans

Cosmopolitans consider that, Indian society essentially as the same anywhere else and hence believe that concept, theories, techniques and methods are universally applicable in spite of the variations in the contexts of their origin. Emphasizing the need to focus on the general and the present, they tend to be a historical (ibid).

The Radicals

Radicals accept that the position that transformation of society's everywhere falls into a grand evolutionary schema to be accelerated through conscious human intervention. The advocacy of intervention inevitably calls for an understanding of the past experiences and the need to take clear value position, a prerequisite to pursue desired goals. Those who pursue this strand of thinking also call for a selective rejection of the outside influences, those of the capitalist first world (ibid). Oommen concludes from the above discussion that from the ongoing debate in India Sociology print at two things. One it points that there is multiplicity of orientation within practitioners of Sociology. Secondly it also shows that the subject Sociology is passing through a period of identity crisis.

Problems of contextualization of Sociology: Series of Tensions

Further, Oommen highlights the problems of contextualization of Sociology in India by arguing that it can be 'viewed as series of tensions' (Oommen 2007:23). He argues that D.P. Mukherjee emphasis on the study of past is one such tension. But he was proposed by the statement made by Dumont. Oommen quotes his statement which is really problematic. Dumont argued, "... a sociological of India lies at the point of confluence of sociology and Indology" (Dumont quoted in Oommen 2007: 23). However Oommen highlights that if sociology will be the study of Hindu texts then that will produce Hindu Sociology and not Indian sociology (Oommen 2007: 23).

Indology verses Sociology

In the same vein Oommen elaborates that if Indology will be Indian sociology which in turn will be reduced to study of Hindu religious texts, in turn it will turn out to be Hindu values; will be reduced to Indian values. This will not be accountable to Dalits, Adivasis, Muslim, Christian, Dravidians etc. (Oommen 2007: 24).

A recurring theme of debate in Indian Sociology has been the unit of analysis. This postulated in terms of micro versus macro studies, a misconstrued juxtaposition

(Oommen, 1972:62-67). True, India is a nation-state or if you prefer a civilization. But it is not one society or culture; we have a multiplicity of cultures and societies co-existing under political arrangement.

The units of analysis along with the substantive concerns of a study determine the appropriateness of techniques of data collection to be employed. The inadequate appreciation of this consideration results in arguments for or against a particular technique of data collection. The debate on units of analysis entails another issue, the kind of concept to be employed. Generally speaking, those who undertake micro-studies tend to argue for native concepts and categories. On the other hand, those who grapple with macro-analyses prefer concepts which are abstract in nature, usually concepts originally developed, based on western empirical experience. Thus if one is studying a culturally homogenous unit, native concepts can be profitably employed. But if the study envelops a variety of culturally heterogeneous units, the use of native categories is likely to be more confusing than enlightening.

The arrival of freedom heralded our rejection of western political dominance but at the same time we accepted western political institutions, economic values and social goals. Our constitution endorsed these values and institution- socialism secularism and democracy. The compelling need of independent India was to repeat the exercise we undertook during the colonial rule, but in the reverse order: selective de-socialization of ancient Hindu institution and values as well as re socialization of the constitutional values so as to bring about a judicious and creative reconciliation between the two.

We did not have Indian thought the opposition and dualism between subject and object, matter and spirit, state and church, emperor and pope, etc. understandable, the process of change comes gradually through adaptation and accretion of structures and values and not through sudden displacement. T.K. Oommen conceptualize Sociology from three point of view; sociology in India: a plea for contextualization, Sociology: for one world and Sociology internalization: A South Asian perspective.

Necessity of Western System of Knowledge: Avoiding Academic Nationalism

Oommen argues that it is fact that there is western domination because of colonialism and hence we should give up the western knowledge system is a wrong approach, we need western knowledge. He opines that, “there is something compelling in western system of knowledge and its applications. Its acceptance seems to be necessary for India’s very survival in the modern world”. Second thing about this colonialism is that we are not only receivers and creatures of history (in this context colonialism) “we are as much creatures of history” as well. That is why we are not able to leave it, reject it even through the colonial forces have gone back long ago (Oommen 2007: 20). Remaining with the aversion to colonial knowledge and preference to indigenous system of knowledge, Oommen is of the opinion that, there is nothing like uncontaminated, pure and pristine form of culture rather in this era when the borders of countries are porous and they are exposed regularly to outside world. Therefore adaptation, acculturation and assimilation is an ongoing process. Hence we cannot reject the undesirable and assimilate desirable events (Oommen 2007: 29).

In this context, of external intrusion Indian sociologists should develop a critical capacity to disarm what is good and relevance for us rather than rejecting the colonial knowledge in toto. In this regard Oommen (2007), argues that, “I must make it clear that the rejection of an international model in the case of knowledge implies academic ‘Nationalism’ and even academic communalism both are not without their share of danger” (ibid).

Working with Social Problems before and after Independence

The focus of Sociology, the goal and perception has changed after independence. The obstacles of nation building have changed. Second what has been hitherto according to Oommen (2007:30) perceived as national interest are now known as ‘communal’, ‘class’ linguistic’ or caste issues. These differing conceptions and consequent contextualization of National interests are reflected in the pursuit of Sociology. Therefore, opines Oommen, what is reflected in Sociology in independent India is not

an erosion of national concern but a re-conceptualization of national interest, which is redefinition of sociologists constitute (Oommen 2007:30).

Avoiding Danger of Academic Communalism

Another element in the contextualization of Sociology is avoiding the practice of academic communalism in the discipline. Oommen defines academic communalism as the practice in which social researcher select specific constituencies based on primordial identities and they tend to study those only. And try to emerge as their spokespersons. Hence Oommen is at pain because he thinks that, “the tendency today is that the women are studied by women, the Dalits by Dalits, the Muslims by Muslims, the Punjabis by Punjabis etc.” Then disadvantage in doing these studies is that, “... the study of marginalized categories- Dalits, Adivasis, unemployed, minorities and the poor will get neglected” (Oommen 2007:31). Further, in this process of insiders then that means, “if each social category ‘produces’ its own sociologist will lead to academic communalism” (ibid). But then who will study children or mentally challenge.

Avoiding Academic Feudalism

For contextualization of Indian Sociology, Oommen moves from denouncing academic colonialism, to academic communalism to denouncing academic feudalism. According to Oommen, “... academic feudalism and scholastic parochialism that reign in Indian sociology... is not much the profession but the patron client and network ties. This is evident in the recruitment of academics, distribution of ‘rewards’, be it membership in committees or referring to the works of fellow sociologists” (Oommen 2007: 32). He illustrates this point with few examples. For instance take the case of footnotes there and reforms in a book or article it reveals who is quoting whom or who is referring whom. In this way a network is formed (ibid).

Therefore, Oommen concludes that, “academic nationalism is not the answer to academic colonialism” (Oommen 2007:32). It is so because academic nationalism in turn produce academic communalism and academic feudalism. If that is the case, then

what is the way out of this route? For Oommen answer is simple, “The way out is to develop an authentic concern for man and society, a concern informed of humanism and not simply concern for fellow citizens, co-religiousnists, co-nationals or academic networks (Oommen 2007: 32).

Three Motivations for Entry in the Profession

Oommen’s plea for contextualization for Indian Sociology which plays down the academic nationalism to counter academic colonialism appeals for concern for men in society. But this will need some extraordinary motivation to enter in profession of sociology. He lists three broad motivations for such commitment to professional sociology. These are:

- a. Instrumental
- b. Professional
- c. Existential (Oommen 2007:33).

To the vast majority the entry in the profession is instrumental. It is a career and not a calling. There is nothing wrong as such in this instrumentality but they need to develop a proper orientation through occupational socialization. Therefore, instead of choosing their profession mechanically, they should do it more consciously for fulfilling their commitment towards “man and society”. For instance a sociology teacher should not only act as communicator but also as a producer of knowledge. Secondly, the sociologists who project themselves dedicated to the cause of developing the discipline of sociology- the teachers and researchers of university demands and research institutes should be committed more to issues and problems which confront as here and now and should not keep an remaining to foreign destinations. Their concern should be of issues our immediate Social milieu (Oommen 2007: 34). The third possible motivation for Indian sociologists is existential. Accordingly Oommen argues that, “... pursuing sociology as a profession is rooted in One’s biography, one’s existential conditions, and life experience...most sociologists in India do not enter the profession to fulfill a ‘mission’ – to revive the past glory of India ... to launch revolution ...[moreover] it seems to me that the majority of sociologists in Indi are without a goal which transcends the immediate mundane needs and aspirations; they are steeped in pragmatism...(that is why)... the Sociologists of ... India do not respond to the critical issues of their time and environment” (Oommen 2007: 34-35).

Unit of Analysis: Micro vs Macro and Alein Contexts

Oommen identifies yet another area where some attention is to be paid if Indian sociology has to contextualize. This is unit of analysis. Whether it should be micro or macro study which gives objective ruling in India. Oommen is of the view the dichotomy does not always exist, and given the internal differentiability in India – based on Caste, Class, religion etc. One way not the hold of reaching. Hence he moots there levels of analysis that is the grass root at the three levels one, is village, at culturally homogenous regions and at third, at the country level. The second issue involved in the unit of analysis is the kind of concept to be employed for the study of Indian reality. Oommen, is of the opinion that the western origin concept, which cannot be avoided, should not be sued when we postulate conceptual dichotomies such as – Caste versus Class, Joint family versus Nuclear family, Rural versus Urban and Tradition versus Modern (Oommen 2007: 38).

Conclusions

In conclusion what is further suggested by Oommen is that if Sociology in India has to be relevant and have rigour then it has to anchor in the Indian value system. According to Oommen (2007: 39) “Independent India has two sets of competing value packages: one, traditional values of hierarchy, holism, and pluralism, and two constitutional values of socialism, secularism and democracy... if sociology is to be relevant for India as a discipline, it should endorse and its practioners should internalize the value package in the Indian constitution, the differing interpretations of these values notwithstanding” (Oommen 2007: 40). However, it is true that Oommen moves from Indian sociology to A South Asian Perspective to sociology for one world.

Oommen also talked about the cultural globalization and says that the culture is multi layered phenomena. Sociologists have distinguished culture into two forms: the material and non-material culture. They said that material culture moves fast than the non-material culture that’s why there is emergence of the condition of the cultural lag. This means that the non-material culture is to go behind the comparison of the material

culture. We find some items of material culture which would spread much more quickly, for example Macdonald and Kentucky chicken or even Italian pizza are more popular as compared with several other food items. He also talked about the specialty of the culture in particularly as nation and region. And this in turn would give birth to numerous permutations and combinations.

Therefore the important thing which came to my mind is not to speak about the world culture in singular but to look at the plurality of world cultures and to understand how it has come about, which historical process is involved.

References

Inkles, Alex. 1993. *What is Sociology: An Introduction to the Discipline and Profession*. (PHI) Learning Private Limited.

Madan T.N. 1991. *Religion in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Mukherjee, Ramakrishna. 1977. "Trends in Indian Sociology" *Current Sociology*, 25(3), pp. 1-193.

Mukherjee, Ramkrishna. 1989. *Indian sociology or sociology of India?* Pp. 135-50 in ed. Nikolai Genov, *National Traditions in Sociology*, Sage.

Mukherji, Partha Nath. 2006. "Rethinking Sociology in an Era of Transformatory Changes" *Sociological Bulletin* 55, no. 2.

Oommen, T.K. 2007. *Knowledge and Society: Situating Sociology and Social Anthropology*. Oxford University Press.

_____. 2005. *Crisis and Contention in Indian Society*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: New Delhi: Sage Publication.

_____. 2004. *Development Discourses: Issues and Concern*. Regency New Delhi: Publication.

_____. 1995. *Alien Concepts and South Asian reality: Responses and Reformulations*. Sage Publications, New Delhi/ Thousand Oaks/ London.

_____. 1990. *State and Society in India: Studies in Nation Building*. Sage Publication, New Delhi/ Newbury park London.

_____. 1997. "Individual and Society in India: Reconciling Equality and Identity", *IASSI Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 1, July-Sep 1997, pp. 70-76.

_____. 1997. "From Plural Society to Pluralism: Towards a just and Human Social Order in India", *Social Action*, Vol. 47, No. 3, July-Sep. 1997, pp. 259-271.

CHAPTER IV

SOCIOLOGY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT: FROM SOCIAL MOVEMENTS TO NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

CHAPTER IV

SOCIOLOGY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT: FROM SOCIAL MOVEMENTS TO NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Introduction

In this chapter we will try to understand the contributions made by T.K. Oommen in the specific field study of 'Social Movements'. It is a rare co-incidence that a sociologist began his career with research in the area of 'Social Movements', when it was a fashion to study villages or village studies were at their zenith. He had to make extraordinary effort to convince the established sociologists that "Social Movements" can also be a field of research in the discipline of sociology. Although Oommen first book length work on social movements was published in the year 1972, yet while writing another full length volume "Protest and Change: Studies in Social Movements" in 1990 he wrote,

"Understandably, movement studies are recent in India in general and in Indian Sociology and Social Anthropology in particular. The present volume should therefore be viewed against this background; it attempts to address itself to a relatively new and unchartered area" (Oommen 1990:11). The studies of 'Social movements' were rarely undertaken by Sociologists before 1970s. One important exception is A.R. Desai, who conducted a masterly study of the Indian national movement from a sociological perspective. His *Social Background of Indian Nationalism* (1954) became a classic both among Sociologists and Historians. Afterwards, Stephen Fuchs (1965) study on messianic Tribal Movements during the 1960s. T.K. Oommen's study of Gramdan-Bhoodan or the village-in-gift- land-in- gift movement in Rajasthan, based on the Gandhian Sarvodaya philosophy led by Vinoba Bhave in the first year of the 1970s, are other examples. A. R. Desai's study made a systematic contribution to the study of the social movements from the perspective of Marxist sociology. But the Stephen Fuchs and Oommen introduced the values and ideologies as pre-eminent elements in the triggering process of social movements.

After that M.S.A. Rao convened a workshop in 1976 at the Department of Sociology, Delhi University, at which several papers were presented on social movements (Rao: 1979: vol. 1 and 2). A series of seminars were also organized 1974-75 at the Centre of the Study of Social System, at Jawaharlal Nehru University to work out the theoretical and methodological perspectives required in the study of social movements which later on resulted in a series of empirical studies of agrarian, tribal, revolutionary and religious movements. Some areas of the study of social movements have made contribution to the theory of social structure and social change, and the methodology for studying social movements and its implications for the perception of social reality.

In this context Rao (1979) wrote that: *“for long, sociologists and social anthropologists have been pre-occupied with the concept of social structure at various levels of the abstraction-from empirical relations to the relationship of relationships. There is often an excessive concern either for what goes on in the mind of the people or what their actual behavior is. Social movements deal with a class of social phenomena which are connected with the two in the realm of process. If we consider a social movement to be an organized effort on the part of a section of the population, involving collective mobilization based on an ideology; to bring about changes in the social system, then we have to see the social process as consisting of inter related activities, interactions and events as related on the one hand and as connected with social and cultural changes on the other. The character of social movement as an instrument of social change is quite different from an imitative or emulative process of mobility and change. While the latter center’s around acquiescence, the former is focused on the protest of one kind or the other. Following from this, the latter emphasized the functional unity of the social system, whereas the former places emphasis on the contradiction and conflict (M.S.A. Rao: 1979: vi-x).*

Approaches for the Study of Social Movements

There are many approaches for the study of social movements and they looked sociology of social movement their own perspective, for example Functionalist, Structuralist, Marxist, Interactionist and Subaltern.

Functionalist Approach

Social movement not only questions the functional presuppositions of social system, but also the constituent processes of movements link them organically with the historical forces in the particular society. The conceptual issues deal with the movements' definition, typification and implications for the social order. Rao identifies the conceptual issues as internal dynamics, reutilization and social consequences. Collective mobilization, ideology and orientation to change were its important processes.

The explanation of social movements according to Rao, lies in the theory of the relative deprivation and reference group behavior. He questions the viability of the strain theory or revitalization theory as explanations of social movements. Their organization comprises aspects of recruitments, commitment and leadership. As for social change a social movement may either bring about reforms, transformation or revolution. These three outcomes also characterize types of social movements: reformative, transformative and revolutionary. Oommen agrees with Rao about the component process of social movements but questions his classification on account of its lack of exclusiveness. According to him, 'it is the dialectic between the historicity (past experiences), social structure (present experiences) and the urge for a better future (human creativity) which provides the focal point for analysis of social movements (Oommen 1977:17). Historicity lies in the process of development and its contradiction. A typology of social movements could be evolved by making a methodological distinction between the problem related to the scale of the movements and the issues related to the units and levels of observations. Oommen reviews social movements as institutionalized collective action that is guided by ideology and supported by an organizational structure. Hence the essential tension in movements is between mobilization and institutionalization.

Oommen evolves a critique of structural functional approach to study movements. According to Oommen, "...the structural functional approach for which role is the basic unit of analysis, views change in terms of three adaptations. According

to this sequential model change, a movement may appear in any one of stages depending upon certain system conditions.... In this tradition, then movements are viewed as necessary accompaniments of the tensions released by structural differentiation and movement manipulation as a tension management mechanism by specialized role incumbents. Since differentiation renders prevalent rules and norms absolute it is necessary to develop new mechanism of integration, which follows a three-phase model... Thus, the movements are viewed essentially as adaptive mechanism in a period of rapid social change” (Oommen 1990: 29-30).

According to Oommen, “the basic flaws of this approach... are there: it does not specify the source of deprivation: it considers human beings as mere creatures of societal determinism, sapping them of their creative vitality, and its unit of analysis is not appropriate for analyzing movements” (ibid). Therefore Oommen puts up a correction in the structural theory of movement by arguing, “It needs to be emphasized here that while structural similarity may be necessary condition it may not be a sufficient one for the development of similar consciousness.... Therefore, we need to recognize...the inevitability of conflicts, in their mobilization, and the desirably of institutionalization of collective efforts to provide them (individuals) with purpose, while analyzing social movements” (ibid).

Further Oommen’s analysis of social movements helps us to understand the ethos and the style of social movements in the society. He is of the opinion this is dependent on the system characteristics of a society. In other words we can understand the nature of social movements by knowing its basic characteristics, for instance Oommen argues, “a primitive’ or pre-political society may mainly express its values in a religious vocabulary, its mobilization efforts may be based on communal or primordial attachments. But with the emergence of nation-state’ this vocabulary may be redefined to suit new conditions; it may be transformed into ‘secular’. Similarly, mobilization efforts may be increasingly anchored around civil collectivities. However, the movements will neither have the potentialities to root out the existing system completely nor will they succumb to the traditional structure entirely. Essentially then, social movements provide the stage for confluence between the old and new values and structure” (Oommen 1990:31).

In this context then nature of a collectivity according to Oommen (1990: 256) gives us the hierarchy of movements within that category. In other sense we can get an answer that why a collectivity launches a type of movement first or another type of movement later. Answering this, Oommen analysis the hierarchy of movements in the Dalit community. According to him,

It is logical to expect that a collectivity subjected to multiple deprivation will protest first against those disabilities which it perceives to be the most inhuman and unbearable. An once protest is perceived as a viable mechanism to deal with deprivations, the importance of political prerequisite to any sustained struggle is economic resources who participate in protests. Therefore, it is no accident that Dalit protest in India first crystallized against socio-cultural oppression, particularly Untouchability. This was followed by mobilization for political enfranchisement. Finally, protest against economic exploitation gradually emerged (Oommen 1990: 256).

The comparative study of Naxalbari by Prathanath Mukherjee left revolutionary movement and the Sarvodaya a Gandhian movement in Bihar, postulate that it is collective mobilization as such but the objectives envisaged in social change which should define a social movement. A social movement is essentially a collective mobilization seeking change of structure either through institutional or non-institutional nations. All other mobilization which seek changes in social structure, are quasi-movements. He schematizes various types of social movements based on the nature of the change that they pursue and the degree of the institutional appropriateness of the means employed (P.N. Mukherjee: 1977).

Subaltern Approach

Apart from structural functional approach to study social movements there is also subaltern approach. However it has not very popular among social scientist. This approach makes an extensive uses of structuralism and semiology, often from a dialectical-historical perspective in the analysis of social movements. It is claimed that an important theoretical contribution to go beyond the system state categories such as feudalism, colonialism, capitalism etc. They tend to conceive the process of change as

a transition from one system-state to another, mainly through the rise of a new class, a politicized elite or a national bourgeoisie that is also a carrier of a new mode of production. Social movements play an important role in escalating not only the process of change, but also in giving direction to social transformation. As social movements are seen as congruent with social conflict, they are neglected by the structural functional approach, the dominant paradigm of the discipline which emphasizes harmony and equilibrium.

The study of movement led very late in the centuries in Social Sciences and behind of this there are many reasons. One reason for this is that revolutionary and intellectuals had recognized the role of the masses in social transformation only by mid-nineteenth century. There are many approaches to study the social movements; first and foremost is historical, in which historians pursued the life style approach and traced the career of movements; they posed the question: how did movements get institutionalized as conventional structure? Historical case studies focused on the characteristics of participants and their motivations. But little effort was made to extrapolate from case studies and formulate hypotheses and theories. As Charles Tilly notes, historical analysis of movements are concerned with motives and beliefs of crucial participants who are takes to be an undifferentiated mass which can be mobilized into collective action. But a sociological approach abandons the indiscriminate use of articulated beliefs as explanations of collective actions, and call attention to the necessity of analyzing the development of an ideology, its function for the group which adheres to it and more generally the condition under which a group will fight in the name of a set of beliefs.

There is another approach, the psychological approach, views movement as expression of individual participants' needs and discontents, its basic assumption is that the aspiration and frustration of individuals provide motives for the participants in movements. This approach focuses on the neurotic and psychotic personality traits which prompt participation in movements. While social psychology contribute to understand the behaviour of individual and small groups within movements, its scope to understand the phenomena of social movements is limited.

A sociological analysis of social movements presupposes a theory of society because collective action is one of the possible responses to crisis, which occurs in society. There are different types of society and the structure of deprivation in them vary a variety of movements emerge, crystallize and fade away in them (Oommen 2004: 212-216)

Indian's Contributions to Social Movements

There are some Indian authors who paid attention to the theoretical and conceptual issues in the study of social movements. For example Mukherjee classified movements based on the quality of change accumulation, alternative and transformation they pursue. While accumulative changes are intra-systematic, the latter two are systematic changes; alternative changes are geared to create new structure and transformative change aims at replacing the existing structure.

Mukherjee distinguishes between three types of movements based on the nature of change: collective mobilization geared to alteration or transformation of the structures of a system is a social movement; collective mobilization aimed at wide ranging changes in the major institutional system is a revolutionary movement and collective mobilization aimed at change within the system is a quasi-movement.

Rao distinguishes between three levels of structural changes and on that basis of three types of social movements- reformist, transformative and revolutionary. Reform movements bring about partial changes in the value system, transformative movements aim at effecting middle level structural changes and the objective of revolutionary movements is to bring about radical changes in the totality of social and cultural system. These movements also vary in terms of the intensity of conflicts; conflict is least in reform movements, it acquires a sharper focus in transformative movements and in the case of revolutionary movements conflict is based on class struggle. There are several difficulties in the classification of movements as suggested by Rao. One, reform and revolutionary movements are distinguished based on the basis of quantum of change, partial or total. Second, reform and transformative movements are distinguished in terms of where the change occur, in the case of the

former, change ours in the value system and in the case of the latter it takes place at the middle level of the structure.

Oommen conceptualizes social movements as those purposive collective mobilizations, informed by an ideology to promote change or stability, using any violent as well as any non-violent means and functioning within at least an elementary organizational framework. He discusses typology of social movement, their reason for emergence, their transformation into institutions and methodological issues. According to Oommen, the social movements in society are conditioned by three factors; its core institutional order, the principal enemy as perceived by the deprived and the primary goal pursued by the society- nature and types of social movements keep changing as these features change. Conventional wisdom in sociology views social movement as a united effort on the part of the deprived social categories to bring about social change.

In this perspective movements are defined as oppositional forces against the status quo. The discussion on the scale of movements can be organized under three heads: a number of participants, the time span of movements and the social composition of movement participant. He discussed the different types of movements like tribal movement, women movement, caste related movement, regional movement and religious movements. He said that movements may be viewed as an institutionalized collective action, guided by an ideology and supported by an organization structure. Without mobilization no movement can sustain itself but if these mobilizations are uniformed by an ideology and an organizational basis they cannot be distinguished from elementary forms of collective behavior, like panic response.

Oommen (1990) talked about the three approaches to the study of the social movements in India. Firstly, historical approach focuses on the characteristics of participants and their motivations. On this Charles Tilly says that the historical analysis of the movements is concerned with motives and beliefs of crucial participants who are taken to be an undifferentiated mass which can be mobilized into collective action. Second approach is that of psychological, where movements as expressions of individual participants needs and discontents its basic assumption is that the aspirations and frustrations of individual provide motives for participation in movements. It also

focuses on the neurotic and psychotic personality traits which prompts participation in movements. But social psychology can contribute to understand the behavior of individual and small groups within movements, its scope to understand the phenomena of social movements is limited. The main cause for joining the movements will be in the condition of society rather than in the conditions of leaders. The third approach, sociological analysis of social movements presupposes a theory of society because collective actions are one of the possible responses to crisis, which occur in society. A social movement includes not only movements which he called as collective actions but also ideas systems. But the term social movements refer only to collective actions.

The problem with this kind of movement is that collective actions are of several types: panic responses, hostile outbursts and organized social actions. When an elementary collective action (the crowd behaviour, mass action), acquires organization and a body of customs and traditions, established leadership, an enduring division of labour, social organization and new scheme of life, it becomes a social movements. (Oommen 2010: 7). There are two important considerations about the study of the social movements: to discuss the characteristics of social movements and to identify the major components of the social movements. "Movements are usually defined and perceived as large scale or mass efforts. Traditions are the vehicles of goal fulfillment of movements". There are many methodological problems in the study of the social movements: problems related to the scale of the movements and the issues related to the units and levels of observations. Three factors are impinging on the scale of the movements: the number of the participants, the time span of movements and the social composition of movement participation. He says that social movements are conditioned by the three factors: its core institutional order, the primary goal pursued by society and the principal enemy as perceived by the deprived.

The sociology of social movements cannot be separated from a representation of society as a system of social forces competing for control of cultural field. Sociology of action ceases to believe that conduct must be responses to a situation and claims rather that the situation is merely the changing and unstable result of relations between the actors who, through their social conflicts and their cultural orientations, produced society. Professor Oommen tries to locate social movements with some other concept and through this he tries to relate those concepts with social movements and how these

are effected with each other, for example social movements and social change, social movements and development, and state and social movements.

Social Movement as Instrument of Social Change

According to Oommen, conventional wisdom in sociology views that social movement is a united effort on the part of the deprived social categories to bring about social change. In this perspective, movements are defined as oppositional forces against the status quo. This perspective probably had greater validity at a time when the state operated as a mere police state, confining its attention to the protection of the citizen from external aggression and providing them with adequate internal security to facilitate the pursuit of their chosen economic activities. But with the emergence of the nation of welfare and socialist states, what had hitherto been defined as private worries have become public issues (Mills, 1959).

In this process, the state has to mobilize vast masses into collective action; the state bureaucracy who was hitherto taken to be an agent of the status quo gradually turned into, at least by definition, an instrument of change and development. Oommen (2004) is talking about the broad historical perspective, in which we may identify four major phases in the transformation of political authority structures and the concomitant variations in the nature of social movements.

The first phase is the ‘pre-political’ or ‘stateless’ phase during which the type of movements we are familiar with since the sixteenth century but did not know the reasons so they exist in the society. Most movement of this phase was akin to ‘elementary’ collective behavior or, if one prefers, spontaneous mobilization in limited geographical locales.

In the second phase, as the scale of human communities increased, large aggregation and collectivizes came to be organized under a limited number of central authority systems –the era of empires, colonies and nation-states. Gradually, the notion of nation-state assumed wide currency and an increasing number of territorially bound primordial collectivities-religious, linguistic, regional group-came to claim the status of

nation-state. The typical movements of this type that is the second phase were anti-imperialist and anti-colonial mobilization (Oommen 2004:180-182).

During the third phase, with the spread of science and technology following the industrial revolution and the development of modern capitalism the antagonism between classes grew and the movements of particular classes or occupational categories came into vogue-the working class movement and peasant revolution.

The fourth phase is marked by the consolidation of capitalism and the decline of socialism, on the one hand, and the emergence a limited number 'post-industrial' societies, on the other. This development gave birth to the notion of a global society and the distinction based on the type of economy and the level of economic development. This phase is also witnessing a proliferation of international movements for human rights, dignity of women, disarmament, environmental protection, ecological balance, etc, usually designated as a new social movement (Oommen 2004:180-182).

Social Movement and Development

In order to understand the role of social movements in development it is necessary to discuss the notion of social development and distinguish it from the concept of social change. The social development is that type of social change taking place through the active participation and conscious volition of the people, geared mainly to the welfare of the disadvantaged, dispossessed and disinherited. Social change can takes place without social development. Mobilization for social development entails involving group in collective action. Group formation is based on a variety of factors. However for the purpose, I propose to categories them into biological collectivities such as workers, peasants, students, professionals and primordial collectivities such as regional, linguistic, religious, caste group (Oommen, 2004: 215).

State and Social Movement

Oommen says that in terms of the world situation today, we can visualize at least three possible relationships between the state and social movements. First, the authoritarian states run by military juntas, religious fundamentalist and racist group, which invariably oppressor attempt to oppress , all social movements which challenge state authority. Second, the few one –party systems which continue to oppress effective challengers of state authority but sponsor such movements which work to their advantage so as to sustain and nourish state power. Third, the multi-party system allows a large number of social movements, which poses an explicit threat to the very existence of the state. That is, no state by its very nature permits the operation of movement which undermines its authority, notwithstanding the fact that the elasticity of permissive mess and the limits of tolerance admittedly vary according to the sources of its authority.

The above referred setting gave way to the emergence of the following type of social movements, Social movements sponsored or supported by the government if a section of the ‘national’ population is perceived as a stumbling block in institutionalizing change in terms of state ideology, Social movements against the government by an overwhelming majority of the population either because it deviates the professed state ideology or because the government perpetuates itself in power through state violence and Social movements are against the government, as well as against a section of collectively which supports it, to stem the aberrant tendencies which crept into the mode of functioning of the state.

It should be clear from our analysis so far that state response to social movements does not fall into a unilinear pattern; it is dictated by the nature of mobilization attempted by a movement. We can discern at least four empirical possibilities:

First, the ideology and the means of a movement correspond to those of the state. That is, both the state and the movement pursue the same goals, and the means employed by the movement are defined as legitimate by the state. In such a situation state-sponsored

movements come to stay and all probability the state response is one of facilitation. Second, the ideology of a movement differs from that of the state but the means differs from that of the state but its means correspond to those perceived as legitimate by the state. The typical state response is that of toleration. Third, the ideology of a movement corresponds to that of the state but the means differs, that is, the movement and the state compete to attain the same goal but through different routes. The state attempts at discreditation of the movement.

Fourth, both the ideology and means of a movement differ from those of the state. The state would spare no effort at repression of such movements. Oommen (2004) stated here that social movement is the weapon of the weak against the strong whether viewed globally or within the confines of state-societies. Movements, therefore, are a mechanism of transfer of power from the legitimate power holders, whether the source of legitimacy is divine or secular, to the hitherto powerless and marginalized movement are enterprises which endeavor to move those in the periphery to the centre, or which attempts to create new centers of power so that the alienated and marginalized are brought into the orbit of participation which is one of the indices of quality of life. The vulnerable groups in these state-societies were not simply the poor and the physically or mentally handicapped but also the radically distinct (as in the case of the native Americans and the black in the us), culturally different (as in the case of different nationalities in the former USSR) or the socially stigmatized (as in the case of the SCs and STs in India). If the vulnerable groups, and the traditional target of social policy are in homogeneous societies, is an aggregate of individuals drawn from the same people, in heterogeneous societies the vulnerable groups is an aggregation of organic collectivizes.

Even as we take cognizance of this phenomenon we should not be impervious to the importance of consciousness in the emergence of deprived groups. There are many perceptions about the social movement, for example:

First, there are multiple sources of deprivation and the saliency of the source varies from one category to another. A new source of deprivation may surface because of a new perception by a category. Second, new consciousness is also a function of changing self-definition and perception. Thus, the erstwhile stigmatized groups-unwed

mothers, sex workers, homosexual-who voluntarily retreat from main stream society and may have remained invisible earlier, demand special consideration from the state and other agencies of social welfare.

Third, the contemporary democratic ethos and the collective mobilization which it implies can create subjectively deprived groups such as the rural elites, the new bourgeoisie emerging from the traditional aristocracy but currently experiencing a downward mobility (Oommen 2004: 210-215).

Oommen's Analysis of Student Politics (Movements)

In a unique contribution to the Sociology of Movements Oommen analysis, Student Movement, specially students of University. The essays were published in 1984, say almost three decades ago. However, the analysis of the nature of such movements still remains effective. It is worth mentioning some of its features. Oommen explains us that the nature of students politics in the following words,

“Given the varied social, economic and cultural backgrounds of students in any of all of them attesting the same ideology. That is to say, the support base of student politics is heterogeneous and this will be reflected in the process of the recommitment of student leaders. This in turn makes any unified political action difficult. Student politics be necessary, therefore, tends to be conditional.... Another peculiarity of student politics emanates from the fact that the expectations the students entertain vis-à-vis the leader are diffuse in character. Unlike the members of other organizations, such as trade unions or recreational clubs, student expectations with respect to their leaders are ill-defined and nebulous. This renders the smooth functioning of student politics difficult (Oommen 1984: 228).

Remaining with student movement, albeit under the nomenclature of student politics' Oommen lists another problem related to it. He argues,

“Another very important feature of student politics is transitory character of its personal. Generally speaking, the student leaders are elected for a period of one year and the electorate that is the students, themselves spends only two to three years in the

same institution. This means that neither the electorate nor the leaders have any long-time perspective or interest regarding the problem and issue of their particular institution. This compels student leaders to seek external advice from campus-watchers...mostly professional leader” (Oommen 1984:229).

In the same vein Oommen has not restricted himself to old social movements only. But has gone to analyze and understand ‘new social movements in the country.

New Social Movements

T.K. Oommen is perhaps the one of the few Indian sociologists who has engaged himself with the Social Movements both ‘Old’ and ‘New’. He also links the ‘New Social Movement’ with the ‘tradition-modernity dichotomy. According to him ‘New Social Movements’ (NSMs) of west are widely perceived to be post-class and post-modal: they crystallized because of two reasons. First, the inability of Marxian analysis is to account for the emergence and existence of non-class identities. Second, the incapability of the modernization project is to cope with the discontents of modernity i.e., the failure of liberal theory. Therefore, the genesis of NSMs will have to be situated in the sources of modernity and in the persistence of non-class identities. To the extent there are different sources of modernity, it is legitimate to think of multiple modernities” (Oommen 2004:231). In this context he argues that the sources of western modernity were structural differentiation (Durkheim) , rationalization (Weber) and the history making project exclusively based on class identity eventuated in alienation of individual (Marx). And the sources of modernity in south Asia was colonialism and the discontents created by the colonialists planned economic development and social justice (Oommen 2004:241).

It is under this modernity number of new social movements emerged in India like agrarian movements (Old and New), women’s movements (Old and New), Dalit movements (Old and New) etc. let us take the example of agrarian movement to prove the point how is the New Social Movements in India are different. To quote Oommen, “modernization of agriculture leads two dimensions getting feudal elements through the green revolution. Examples of discontents of Indian modernity are displaced of

labour by technology resulting in uprooting millions of peasants;... The understandable responses to these discontents are youth and student protests, anti-dam mobilization, Environmental and Ecological Movements, articulations against the violence of Green Revolution and the likes. There are the New Social Movements of contemporary India” (Oommen 2004:245). Further, Oommen has given in calculation of values of equality and social justice into an extremely hierarchical society like India, as another source of Indian modernity. These sources have give rise to Adivasis, Dalit, OBCs, and Women Movements. Hence he argues that the substances of the NMS of India are qualitatively different from those of the west (Oommen 2004:245).

Conclusion

To conclude, the contribution of Oommen in the field of ‘Sociology of Movements’ is unique and unparallel in the discipline in India, Asia and in many of the western countries. As one of the pioneers of the study of social movements he has given virtually a new area of research in the discipline. Otherwise before him most of the sociologists argued that movements can be studied only by historians. But nobody had tangled that historians study only terminated movements. It is only sociologists and social anthropologists are capable of studying ongoing movements.

Oommen is also responsible for changing the mindset of researchers regarding the study of social movements and its relationship with development. He has written that in conventional social science. Social movements used to be viewed as mechanism of coping with stress and strain and why were rarely seen as sources of change and development. Even when role of ideology was recognized, social movements were not perceived as vehicles of creative ideas. Secondly when movements’ studies surfaced, the initial tendency was to look upon movements as indicative of social pathology. Against all these Oommen has tried to establish that movements are vehicles of innovative and creative ideas, the participants can be called as martyrs and can produce a society based on a qualitatively different collective consciousness.

However Oommen still laments Sociology has not been able to play a creative role in providing a role in the sphere of social movements and its relationship with

social policy. This has been so because of limited emphasized base from which conceptualization of the social reality takes place. Hence in a way Oommen is inviting researchers to explore this area, special when contemporary India in flense.

References

- Almong A. Gabriel. 1973. *Crises, Choice and Change: Historical Studies of Political Development*. Boston.
- Benedict, Anderson. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Beso, London.
- Moore, Barrington Jr. 1958. *Political Power and Social Theory*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Hisenstadi, S. N. (Ed.) 1971. *Political Sociology* York Basic Book.
- Jangam R. T. 1990. *Textbook of Political Sociology*. Oxford and IBH Publishing Company, New Delhi.
- Kornhauser, W. 1971. *The Political and Mass Society*. Penguin.
- Kothari, R. 1979. *Politics in India*. Orient Longmans Ltd.
- Oommen, T.K., 2010. *Social Movements: Issues of Identity*. New Delhi, New York: Oxford University.
- _____ 2008. *Reconciliation in Post-Godhra Gujarat: The Role of Civil Society*. New Delhi: Pearson Longman Imprint of Person Edition, 2008.
- _____ 2004. *Nation, Civil Society and Social Movements, Essays in Political Sociology*. Sage Publication.
- _____ 2003. *Nation, Civil Society and Social Movements: Essays in Political Sociology*. Sage Publication, New Delhi.
- _____ 2002. *Pluralism, Equality and Identity: Comparative Studies*. Oxford University Press.
- _____ 1997. *Citizenship, Nationality and Ethnicity, Reconciling Competing Identities*. Polity Press.
- _____ 1997. *Citizenship and National Identity: From Colonialism to Globalism*. Sage Publication, New Delhi, Thousand Oaks, and London.
- _____ 1990. *State and Society in India: Studies in Nation Building*. New Delhi. India. Newbury Park. Sage Publication.
- _____ 1990. *State and Society in India: Studies in Nation Building*. Sage Publication, New Delhi/ Newbury Park London.
- _____ 1990. *Protest and Change: Studies in Social Movements*. Sage Publication, and New Delhi / Newbury Park.
- _____ 1985. *From Mobilization to Institutionalization: The Dynamics of*

Agrarian Movements in 20th Century Kerala. Bombay Press.

_____, 1984. *Social Structure and Politics, Studies in Independent India*.

Delhi, Hindustan Publication.

Problem, In Parsons, Talcott & Clark, Kenneth B. (Eds.) 'The Negro American',
Boston: The Riverside Press Cambridge.

P. Blau, 1956. *Bureaucracy in Modern Society*. Random House, New York.

Rajani, Kothari 1973 (Ed.) *Caste in Indian Politics*. Orient Longmans Ltd.

Taylor, Charles. 1992. *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition* Princeton. NJ:
Princeton University Press.

Turner, Brian S. 2006. 'Classical Sociology and Cosmopolitanism: A Critical
Defence of the Social', the British Journal of Sociology 57 (1) 133–151.

Articles

Oommen, T.K., 2010, "Indian Labour Movement: Colonial Era to the Global Age",
Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 44, No. 52, 26 Dec 2009- 1 Jan 2010, Pp. 81- 89.

_____ 2009, "Development Policy and the Nature of Society: Understanding
The Kerala Model", Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 44, No.13, 28MARCH-
3APR. 2009, Pp. 25-31.

_____ 2007, "State Policy and the Socially Deprived In India: Situating
Muslims and Christians of Schedule Castes Origin", Indian Journal Of Federal
Studies, No. 1, 2007, Pp. 19-30.

_____ 2006, "Coping With Development Pathologies: Resistance to
Displacement", Sociological Bulletin, Vol. 55, No. 2, May-Aug.2006, Pp. 267-280.

_____ 2005, "Complexity of Identity: A Critique of the Human Development
Report 2004", Radical Humanist, Vol. 69, No. 3, June 2005, Pp. 32-35.

_____ 2002, "State versus Nation in South Asia: Linking Language and
Governance", South Asian Survey, Vol. 9, No. 2, July-Dec. 2002, Pp. 275-286.

_____ 2001, "State versus Nation: Linking Culture and Governance in South
Asia", South Asian Survey, Vol. 8, No. 2, July-Dec. 2001, Pp. 213-238.

_____ 2001, "Civil Society: Religion, Caste and Language in India",
Sociological Bulletin Vol. 50, No. 2, Sep. 2001, Pp. 219-235.

_____ 2000, "Vision of Nation Building in India", Indian Journal of Federal Studies, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2000, Pp. 82-90.

_____ 1999, "Conceptualizing Nation and Nationality in South Asia", Sociological Bulletin, Vol. 48, No. 2, March-Sept, 1999, Pp. 1-18.

_____ 1998, "Citizenship, Nationality and Ethnicity", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 103, No. 5, March. 1998, Pp. 1414-1417.

_____ 1997, "Climate Change and 'The Quest for Sustainable Development'", Mainstream, Vol. Annual, 20 Dec. 1997, Pp.89-94.

_____ 1997, "Individual and Society in India: Reconciling Equality and Identity", IASSI Quarterly, Vol. 16, No. 1, July-Sep 1997, Pp. 70-76.

CHAPTER V

SOCIOLOGY OF PROFESSION

CHAPTER V

SOCIOLOGY OF PROFESSION

Introduction

In this chapter we will try to understand the contribution made by T.K. Oommen to the Sociology of Profession. On this point, Oommen defines profession that ‘An inscriptive professional can be thus defined as a work practitioner, whose task commitment or performed in a monopolistic organization which determines his status, evaluates his ability according to organizational requirements, and delineates through a process of selection or designation the precise area within which he will carry out his activities. Oommen says that the profession as a class category articulating specific interests presents a different perspective concerning the reality of profession’.

(Oommen 1978: 2).

In early stages of the world there were many types of professions but only three were noticed by the people, and these are divinity, medicine and law. With the rise of technology and occupational specialization in the 19th century, bodies of the professional began to claim professional status: pharmacy, veterinary medicine, nursing, teaching, librarianship, optometry and social work, and all these became milestones of the professions during 1900. But amongst them, only some professions rose in status and power through various stages and some declined. Although only few of the professions enjoyed high status and public prestige, not all professions earned high salaries. Within specific professions, there were significant inequalities of compensation, for example trial lawyer specializing in tort litigation on a contingent fee basis used to earn several times more what a prosecutor or public defender used to get. “A profession rises when any trade or occupation transforms itself through: the development of formal qualifications based upon education, apprenticeship and examinations, the emergence of regulatory bodies with powers to admit and discipline members and some degree of monopoly rights” (Elliot Philip 1972: 4-6).

Debate on the Concept of Occupation and Profession

There is misunderstanding with the meaning of the concept of occupation and profession. Some people consider both of these are the two sides of the one coin but on the other hand some accepted that these are two different terms. On this Oommen argues that profession has a variety of meaning. "Professions are those occupations which involve the use of knowledge and techniques by a practitioner directly upon or on behalf of a client in order to maintain, or induce in the client a culturally determined and socially approved state of well being". Sociological definitions lay stress on the social aspect of the individual aspect. Marshall holds that "the essence of professionalism is the individual qualities of the professional", which makes for individual judgment and assumption of individual responsibility not concerned with self-interest but also with the welfare of the client".

On the other hand definition, there were disputes between the experts of the every field. The main reason is that in vernacular, profession is infrequently a synonym for occupation, meaning thereby any socially patterned means of earning livelihood. There is a little consensus over which occupations should be considered professional. While we speak of surgeons, lawyers and chemists as professionals, we also speak of professional criminals, gamblers and prostitutes. If there could emerge an agreement that only socially approved occupations are professions, then socially approved occupations means that practitioners possess a sense of responsibility. This implies not only pride in their craft, but also a moral obligation to perform their occupational tasks at maximum efficiency. The term professional in fact differentiate not one but several dimensions such as amount and kind of training, commitment and working conditions. Secondly the group of occupations called profession has been assigned contradictory missions and cultural outlooks. Basically, professionals have been diversely labeled, new class, lackeys of capital, leader of service society and misleaders of dismal bureaucratic future to cite a few. While some professions can be traced to the hoary past, other occupational titles subsumed under profession appeared.

The concept of 'profession' is defined by different ways in literature. For example, Oxford Dictionary (Philip 1972: 7) defines "a profession as a vocation in

which professed knowledge of some department of learning or science is used in its application to affairs of others or in the practice of an art founded on it". While the dictionary definition lays emphasis on intellectual dimension of profession, it ignores many others, such as ethical and authority aspects. In sociological terms "professionalism is one that views a profession as an organized group which is constantly interacting with society that forms its matrix, which performs its social functions through a network of formal and informal relationships and which creates its own sub-culture requiring adjustment to it as a prerequisite for career success" (Philip 1972: 7).

Approaches to the Study of Sociology of Profession

The study of the professions of sociology has emerged as a significant field of study and research within the general frame of sociology. There are several approaches for the study of the sociology of profession.

Evolutionary Approach

The evolutionary growth of the profession is irrevocably linked with all nature around it. Morgan was the first, who talked about the sociology of profession and distinguished three stages of cultural advance: savagery, barbarism and civilization and linked the transition with major technological innovations like pottery-making, domestication of animals and the technology of melting iron.

Structural Functional Approach

The approach found its best exposition in Durkheim's division of labour and its function in maintaining 'social order' and 'cohesion.' To avoid anomic form of the division of labour, Durkheim emphasized on the increasing roles of occupational professional groups and syndicates. They are to his mind a mid-point between the state and the family. He was drawing his inspiration from the communal and corporate ideology of medieval guilds. According to Durkheim professions do not represent only the unrestricted economic interested but they are rooted in the moral codes and ethic.

On the other hand, Talcott Parsons found the similarity between the professions and business. For him both are rational, functionally specific and universalistic, rationality and objectivity.

In view of the functionalists, professionalism means observance of codes and ethic, service, community-orientation, and effectual-neutrality. Parsons saw the growth of professions, the emergence of a new social force, which he was inclined to regard as a universal trait of all modern societies, including the socialist ones. His observation tends to convey the misleading impression that professions constitute a great social formation, comparable to the bourgeoisie or the managerial class held together by common interests. He defines that 'a profession is a cluster of occupational roles, that is, roles in which the incumbents perform certain functions valued in the society in general and by these activities they typically 'earn a living' at a 'full time job'. Among the occupational roles types, the professional is distinguished largely by the independent trusteeship held and exercised by the incumbent of a class of such roles of an important part of the cultural tradition, usually by a formally organized educational socialization so that only those with the proper training are considered qualified to practice the profession.

There is a one example of the Sociology of the Profession, in which the professions were thought to be distinct from the occupation. It has been maintained by pioneers like Durkheim, Carr Saunders and others that as against occupations and common vocations which were guided by considerations of maximal profit, professions were inspired by a sense of high morality, which was formed from the centrality of their ethos or from their collective conscience. The collectively orientation was thought to be one of their raison determination. In the same logical continuity it was hypothesized that professional associations represented the collective conscience of professions and laid down rules and norms for guiding the professional conduct. But the fact that the existential conditions of professional practice often obviated the professionals from conformity to these norms, it was assumed that these norms exercised a compulsive and automatic influence upon the professionals since these were ingrained in them through the process of extended socialization.

Structuralist approach looks upon profession as highly abstracted and theoretical functional units fulfilling a particular need of society in accordance with the prevailing social values and goals. But in contrast to the internationalists view, the structuralists emphasized on the social structure as the determinant of the degree of professionalization and not the mystique associated with it. Parsons, the greatest exponent of the structuralist model spells out certain important attributes of profession and attempts to associate them with the normative pattern of social structure. According to him, it is the one such attribute, the importance of which in modern professions generally but particularly in those important ones concerned with the development and application of science serves to emphasize its role in the society at large.

Marxist Approach

According to the Marxists approach, professions are a part of stratification and class structure. In their view, knowledge and professions skills are a commodity having their market value as they can be exchanged for money. It is a fact that professions are based on knowledge and specialized training but the commercial and profit-oriented aspects of professions are concealed in the structural-functional approach of the professions. According to this approach professionalism may be characterized by the extension of exchange relations and use value. Thus the professions are the part of the labor market.

According to the Marxist approach, the society, there are four major aspects of the Sociology of the professions which have been focused in recent studies. These may be classified as: Concept (definitions, attributes of the professions and occupations), Process (professionalization, education and training, recruitment, licensing, credentials, professional organizations and associations), Structure (membership, community, spirit-de corps); Professional practices (professionalism, ideal codes, ethic, and ideals).

Inter-actionist Approach

The group of people of this thought looks at a profession as a set of role relationships between the professional and the client. The professional as an expert provides skill in service to a client who in turn gives trust and payment of fee to the former. A profession, according to Hughes, “is a social role defined by the nature of relationship between the professional and his client”. Hughes perceives autonomy and authority of the professional to be maintained by the fact that on the one hand the client is ignorant or incompetent to understand what has been mastered by the professional and has no option but to trust him. The professional, on the other hand, keeps his knowledge secret and mystifies his practice. The profession if viewed from the interactionist’s point of view appears to be free from any objective control mechanism. Profession being a part of the social structure must be objectively under control of a defined social mechanism. In the absence of social control, autonomy and authority will give much scope for deception and exploitation of the client by the professional. Interactionists however perceive occupational culture arising from role performance and the role relationships.

If we look at the Indian context, we can trace the Sociology of profession with the starting of the ancient period. Indian society was organized around guilds, corporations, occupations and professions. Unfortunately, this fact of Indian society was almost discarded by scholars till the middle of this century. There are two possible academic explanations for it:

- Under the impact of Indology, there was emphasis on the study of the traditional Hindu ideology (dharma, karma, punarjanma or re birth, purusharthas), organizational structure (Varna, caste, gotra, family, village) and institutions (marriage, religion, polity). In their zeal to explore the textual and ideal notations of Hindu society, Indologists ignored the study of work, occupation, professions and their organizational structure.
- The colonial rule for administration purpose required detailed reports on caste, tribes and communities; therefore officially sponsored

monographs were prepared on them. This policy proved to be congenial for anthropological works, dealing with tribes and communities.

Professions are typically regulated by status, with the responsibilities of enforcement delegated to respective professional bodies, whose function is to define, promote, oversee, support and regulate the affairs of its members. These bodies are responsible for the licensure of professionals and may additionally set examinations of competence and enforce adherence to an ethical code of practice. However they all require that the individual hold at least a first professional degree before licensure. There may be several such bodies for one professional in single country. Individuals are required by law to be qualified by a local professional body before they are permitted to practice in that profession. Due to this in such cases, qualification by the professional bodies is efficiently still considered a prerequisite to practices as most employers and clients stipulate that the individual hold such qualification before hiring their services.

Professional Orientations

A number of studies are available on both medical profession and legal profession; there is paucity of information on the nature and character of professional cognitions, even though there is ample evidence on some other aspects of professions such as their social background, conditions of practice, professional goals and organizational demands etc. I will be discussing about the following study:

I will start with Madan's study which copiously reports on doctor's self-image and their cognitive orientations towards society. His study was conducted at all India institutes of medical sciences, Delhi during 1975-77 as a part of UNESCO sponsored study of doctors in India, Malaysia and Sri-Lanka. His total sample constituted of 100 doctors out of which only 97 answered. The findings were reported in an anthropological style that is through a narrative description of the profession and its conditions, rather than presenting through indiscrete tables.

Most of the respondents of Madan's sample were teaching and also in most cases researching at the institute, the image of doctors who dealt with the patients was central to their self-image. Nearly all of them were connected with their professional associations and enjoyed the intellectual content of their work. Curing gave them enormous self-gratification. Many thought that they did not get their due from society and were often ill-treated by public especially politicians. A majority viewed themselves inferior to civil servants. A substantial number of them were oriented outside the institute prepared to leave it whether for going abroad or for a better career within the country, whenever opportunity arose.

Attributes of the Profession

Oommen has talked about the many attributes of profession in his book "Doctors and Nurses: A Study in Occupational Role Structure" (1978). Profession tends to be autonomous, which means they have high degree of control of their own affairs. Professionals are autonomous in so far as they can make independent judgment about their work. This means the freedom to exercise the professional judgment. In other context the professional autonomy is often described as a claim of professionals that has to serve primarily their own interests, this professional autonomy can only be maintained if members of the profession subject their activities and decisions to a critical evaluation by the other members of the profession. The concept of autonomy can, therefore, seen to embrace not only judgment but also self-interest and a continuous process of critical evaluation of ethics and procedures from within the profession itself (Oommen 1978: 5).

Professions enjoy a high social status regard and esteem conferred upon them by society. This high esteem arises primarily from the higher social function of their work, which is regarded as vital to society as a whole and thus of having a special and valuable nature. All professionals involve technical, specialized and highly skilled work often referred to as professional expertise. Training for this work involves obtaining degrees and professional qualifications without which entry to the profession is barred. Training also requires upgrading of skills through continuing education.

All professions have power and this power is used to control its own members, and also its area of expertise and interests. A profession tends to dominate police and protect its area of expertise and the conduct of its members and exercise a dominating influence over its entire field which means that professions can act monopolist, refuting competition from ancillary trades and occupations as well as subordinating and controlling lesser but related trades. A profession is characterized by the power and high prestige it has in society as a whole. It is the power, prestige and values that society confers upon a profession that more clearly defines it (Philip 1972: 12).

There is considerable agreement about defining the characteristic features of a profession. They have a 'professional association, cognitive base, institutionalized training, licensing, work autonomy, colleague control and code of ethics,' to which Larson then also adds, 'high standards of professional and intellectual excellence,' (Larson: 221) that 'professions are occupations with special power and prestige,' (Larson: x) and that they comprise 'an exclusive elite group,' (Larson: 20) in all societies. Members of a profession have also been defined as 'workers whose qualities of detachment, autonomy, and group allegiance are more extensive than those found among other groups...their attributes include a high degree of systematic knowledge; strong community orientation and loyalty; self-regulation; and a system of rewards defined and administered by the community of workers.'

Oommen is talked about the three perspectives to define the attributes of the profession. These are: objective-evaluative, symbolic-realistic and class-interest oriented. The objective-evaluative perspective is essentially attribution in that the writers attempt to specify a set of attributes so as to construct an ideal-typical notional of professions. The main problem to the work with this perspective on professions is that along with a set of objective attributes-knowledge base, professional authority, code of ethics, high income, power, prestige etc. it also lists a set of subjective perceptions services ideal, professional identity etc, which have a moral evaluative tone.

The symbolic-realistic perspective is essentially a variant of the objective-evaluative but on the some point it is different. For example those who follow the

objective evaluative approach would consider the attributes they list as real, in that a full-fledged profession should have these attributes according to their reckoning. In contrast, the symbolic-realistic perspective insists that the attributes one may list regarding the phenomena, say profession, should be viewed as a symbol, an ideal and one should explore the reality so as to unfold the gap between the ideal and the actual and to understand the reasons for this gap. The strongest representative of this perspective is found in Becker.

On the third perspective we find that a profession as a class-category articulating specific interests presents a different perspective concerning the reality of professions.

A profession has been further defined as, "a special type of occupation possessing corporate solidarity prolonged specialized training in a body of abstract knowledge, and a collectively or service orientation a vocational sub-culture which comprises implicit codes of behaviour, generates an among members of the same profession, and ensures them certain occupational advantages also bureaucratic structures and monopolistic privileges to perform certain types of work professional literature, legislation, etc" (Oommen 1978: 5-7).

We can divide Professions into two parts on basis of rank as either Primary or Secondary. Primary professions include, for example: Judges, Doctors, Surgeons, top Police Officers, top Military Officers, Professors, higher ranking Lawyers and Bishops etc. while on the other hand the Secondary professions include, for example: Dentists, Architects, Civil Engineers, Surveyors, Accountants, Lawyers and all other specialized technical occupations Scientists, Educators, Nurses, etc. While all professions enjoy high social status, primary professions have the highest status, regard and esteem conferred upon them by society at large. This high esteem arises primarily because of the wider, deeper and higher social function of their work as compared with other lower ranking professions. Their work is regarded as more vital to society as a whole and thus of having a special and very valuable nature.

By contrast, the secondary professions, while also enjoying high standing in society, yet the value of their work is seen as less vital to society and thus they enjoy a

correspondingly lower status. All professions involve technical, specialized and highly skilled work. Training for this work involves obtaining degrees and professional qualifications in order to gain entry into the profession, and without which entry to the profession is barred.

All professions more or less represent a distinctive social group as an elite social class, which is disconnected, distanced and isolated to some extent from the host society which it serves. There is thus an intrinsically ambivalent and conflict-ridden relationship between members of a profession and the public they serve, often described as paternalistic. This sense of dislocation from the rest of society breeds paternalism and professional arrogance as well as a cold indifference, professional distance, with which they are liable to treat their clientele.

Being paternalistic is an aspect of the sense of elevation, demarcation and underpinning arrogance of members of all professions as a self-acknowledged elite social group, and it runs in the feeling that they have of higher status and of being demarcated from the host society as special and elite, privileged persons with a specialized technical knowledge and expertise that places them above most of the rest of society. All professions have an exert power. This power, for example, is used to control its own members, and also its area of expertise and interests. A profession tends to dominate police and protect its area of expertise and the conduct of its members, and asserts a dominating influence over its entire field. This domination over its fields means that 'a profession frequently acts monopolistically, seeing off' competition from ancillary trades and occupations, as well as subordinating and controlling lesser but related trades'(Oommen :1978: 12-15).

This generates friction and 'border disputes' with any ancillary trade that threatens or is perceived or suspected of threatening encroachment upon the interests, affairs and/or field of activity of the established more powerful profession. As is apparent, a profession is not really identified by its specialized technical nature or by its control over its own knowledge base, as is commonly supposed, rather it is better defined by the power and high prestige it has in society as a whole...dustmen, waste collectors, for example, have their own knowledge base of sorts, and autonomy over their own affairs, and while regarded as a true specialism, or trade, they are not

regarded highly by society as an elite high prestige group...thus, it is the power and prestige or value that society confers upon a profession that more clearly defines its inclusion in this category. There are many Lawyers, Clerics, Military, Police and Medical personnel enjoy this high social status and are regarded as true professions.

Many 'secondary professions' also have high status, autonomy, power over their own distinctive knowledge bases, closed entry and high value to society—such as architects, dentists, civil engineers, military officers, land surveyors, etc—but crucially, they do not share the same high professional and social status of doctors, lawyers and clerics and this seems puzzling. It, therefore, seems that these primary or true professions have a wider remit, a deeper value in society that breeds their higher status and confers upon them an even higher value within society. They apparently deal with more compelling and more crucial aspects of social life than the secondary professions or the lesser trades. What seems clear, therefore, is that the classical definition of a profession regarding occupational closure, its clear epistemological autonomy and high status, while valid and useful, is also a somewhat fuzzy and deficient definition that requires some fine-tuning to give it greater kudos and reality.

Sociological studies of professions have traditionally focused on definitional list making in an attempt to differentiate professions from non-professions. Despite recent criticisms of that approach, it has persisted. After first discussing inconsistencies and difficulties associated with the traditional approach, this paper explores an alternative perspective for analyzing professions. It is argued that the ability to obtain and maintain professional status is closely related to concrete occupational strategies and to wider social forces and arrangements of power. Such a perspective leads to a consideration of the social meaning of occupational tasks, the resources behind the emergence and continuation of professionalism, and the social consequences of professionalism.

He divided the professional sociology into three aspects; one professional organization and these institutions are based on the two types of work first, full-fledged profession and second is the semi profession. The second aspect, service organization and the third is the non-professional. There are three volumes which are related to the professional sociology and occupational sociology. One is written by Kirkpatrick, other

by Oommen and the third by Suma Chitnis. The subject matter of these three volumes could be included in the area of the sociology and occupations and professions. Two of these books deal with doctors and nurses in hospital settings and the third deals with the university teaching profession. Although these books were published recently, the data on which they are based were collected some time ago. Moreover the analysis depends on theories and concepts not current for at least a decade. Jounna collected her data from the brown mission hospital in Ludhiana from Dec, 1965 to June 1996. She was influenced by studies like Coser's "Life in the Ward" and Talcot Parsons book "Social System", which discussed the sick role. She points out some of the shortcomings of the theories expounded by Parsons, Coser and others.

Oommen collected data from ten different hospitals in Delhi from 1966-1970 by five groups of M.A. social work students who collected information from 1022 respondents, 447 of whom were doctors and 545 nurses, to follow the question about the prevalent theories in the middle of the 1960s. The classics then were on role status and the conflict and such concepts as semi-profession. Six characteristics that define professionalism were preoccupying scholars. Thus when Oommen analyzed his copious data, the answers neatly categorized to show how nurses and doctors faced their role conflicts, status deprivation, occupational commitments, and the like. Beside an unfortunate over-reliance on many of the dated concepts and theories there is yet another major shortcoming. The data were collected in batches but analyzed so that any change over time is marked. Moreover there is no account of the historical and cultural background within which these hospitals operated. There is almost no attempt to the micro structural issues to the micro attitudinal views. Suma Chitnis and Philip G. Altbach have edited a series of the papers on the problems faced by college and university professors in India. Altbach especially gives a thoughtful and critical view of the reasons the teachers as guru is now being downgraded. Since independence, the number of college students and teachers has multiplied. At the same time, the political infighting in the academic setting as well as in the country itself has created an untenable situation for the academic forces.

The vast majority of the entry of sociologists into the profession is a matter of bread and butter; it is a career and not a calling. This is not something to be deprecated or denigrated; in all probability they may develop an appropriate orientation through

occupational socialization. Two sources have gradually enlarged the career opportunities of Indian sociologists: first, Introduction of sociology as an undergraduate teaching subject and second recruitment by the state, as collection and analysis of data for policy formulation by the planner and administrator became a prerequisite in the socialist state. In the case of the most college teachers, they look upon themselves mainly as communicators of available knowledge to the students and not as producers of knowledge.

Division of Professionals

There is always a debate to take the division of the professions for example and authors are divided it into different types according to their own perspectives. Oommen has divided professionals into two types: one, independent professionals and second dependent or professional employee. The independent professionals were one who owned the material resources with which he worked. But the professional employee who is working in an organizational set up in a 'socialist' or 'welfare' state or even in a private corporation does not own his means of production and is necessary enveloped in a bureaucratic hierarchy. This disengagement between the professional and the tools of his work may lead to his alienation from his occupational activities. In a country like India wherein independent professional co-exist with professional who are public servants', two basic types of professionals are likely to emerge.

The independent professional working with his own tools even as he is enmeshed in his professional activity may often be a capitalist entrepreneur running a shop or firm with profit orientation, unless he is imbued with the Calvinist concept of calling or its functional equivalent which invests his activity with nobility and services orientation. On the other hand, the professional employee caught in the wide web of bureaucracy is likely to get alienated from his occupational activity lest he develops a sense of collectivity orientation which would sustain him as a true professional in the impersonal organizational context (Oommen 1978: 5-8).

Professions are characterized by an autonomous community of shared interests and the crucial attribute of organizations is a structure which insulates it from its

surrounding institutional environment. Harries- Jenkins defines that 'a restrictive professional can thus be defined as a work practitioner, whose task commitment is performed in a monopolistic organization which determines his status, evaluates his ability according to organizational requirements, and delineates through a process of selection and designation, the precise area within which he will carry out his activities' (Oommen 1978: 2).

On the other hand, Schumpeter viewed professionals as incumbents of certain newly created roles, carrying out new and expanding social functions. He saw the professionals taking the place of erstwhile self-made entrepreneurs, who had replaced the nobleman-landlord and the knight as the occupational ideal of western societies.

Etzioni distinguishes three organizational types in which professions usually work: 1). Professional organization

According to Etzioni Professional organizations are divided into two sub types these are: Full-fledged professional organizations which knowledge is produced, applied, preserved or communicate, which employ a high proportion of professionals on their, in which professionals have superior authority in influencing the goal activities of the organization.

Semi-professional organizations in which professionals are with shorter training and less autonomy are employed.

2). Service organizations in which the professionals are provided with infrastructural facilities but are not employed by the organization or subordinated to its administrators.

3). Non-professional organizations in which the professionals are assigned to social divisions or positions" (Oommen 1978: 9-10).

Oommen has defined this typology through the example of doctors and nurses and said that for instance, a large hospital employs both doctors (full-fledged

professionals) and nurses (semi-professionals). Thus a hospital is at once a full-fledged and a semi-professionals organization.

Scott also identifies three organizational contexts in which professionals are employed. In the autonomous professional organization, the work of professionals is not subject to any external or administrative control, it is exercised by senior professional colleagues. The major source of authority lies with professionals themselves and typically they evolve an organizational structure best suited to their functioning. In contrast, in the heteronomous professional organizational the professional employees are subjected to an external authority which leads to the possibility of lessening the professional authority. The third organizational setting is the professional department which functions as a part of a larger organization.

Scott also focuses on the comparative analysis of doctors (full-fledged professionals), house surgeons (semi-autonomous professionals), and nurses (semi-professionals), employed in public hospitals will be particularly useful in pursuing our argument. The basis of professional authority is knowledge, and the nature and extent of knowledge the professional commands may considerably influence his role-structure in the organizational system. Doctors undergo longer training, they generate and apply knowledge, their activities are not supervised by purely administrative superiors, their expertise is usually not questioned and their advice invariably accepted by clients. All these factors may facilitate the maintenance, if not the enhancement, of professionalism among the doctors even if they work in hospitals. In contrast the nurses have shorter periods of training, they do not usually generate knowledge, even when they apply knowledge the decision as to what thereby is to be administered is made by the doctors, and they are supervised by administrative superiors or by full-fledged professionals (doctors) and invariably by both. In fact, nurses invariably work in organization whereas doctors work both in organizations and as independent practitioners (Oommen 1978:10-11).

Thus the professionals are simply the last link in the continuously evolving system of an occupational prestige chain. Through these perspectives we will draw conclusion that profession is not an easy task and each of the perspective seems to have focused on one or another dimension. These are: a set of objective attribute, a set of

subjective perceptions by the professionals, or the social researchers or the lay public, and a set of factors which influence the actual functioning including individual motivations, group interests, the system of stratification, etc.

Conclusion

In concluding lines we can say that professional is a type of higher grade, non manual occupation with subjectively and objectively recognized occupational status, possessing a well defined area of study or concern or providing a definite service after advanced training and education. The finely graded nature of professions also generates fierce internal competition at all levels, acute rank awareness and a struggle between individuals to gain advancement within the promotional structure of the profession. This also generates a culture of whispers, rumors and people being either in or out of favour and being continually judged as to their competence and merit. This in turn generates strong social tensions within the profession and helps to sustain a climate of suspicion, and petty jealousies.

At the end, Oommen strongly said that in the light of our discussion we can safely conclude that defining “profession of sociology is not easy task and each of the perspectives seems to have focused on one or another dimension. These are: one, a set of objective attributes, second, a set of subjective perceptions by the professionals, or the social researchers or lay public, and the third, a set of factors which influence the actual functioning including individual motivations, group interests, the system of stratification etc. As noted at the outset, our primary interest is to investigate the consequences that theoretically independent professions may face concomitant to the shift in their work-millieu to organizations, particularly government organization. Admittedly, all the attributes of a profession may not be equally affected because of the changed context of functioning. One has to identify those attributes which are more amenable to change and adaptation due to organization impact” (Oommen 1978: 7-8).

References:

- Chitins, Suma and Philip G. Altlab. 1979. *The Indian Academic Profession*. Macmillan. New Delhi.
- Durkhiem, Emile. *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals*. New Delhi. Rawat Publication.
- Elliott, Philip. 1972. *The Sociology of Professions*. Macmillan Press.
- Jacob, M. Joseph. 1988. *Doctors and Rules: Sociology of Professional Values*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Kirkpatrick, Joanna. 1980. *The Sociology of an Indian Hospital Ward*. Columbia, South Asia Books.
- Millerson, Geoffery. 1964. *The Qualifying Associations: A Study in Professionalization*. Rutledge And Kegan Paul Ltd London Press.
- Oommen, T.K. 2000. *The Christian Clergy in India: Social Structure and Social Roles*. New Delhi, India: Thousand Oaks. California, Sage Publication.
- _____ 2006. "Coping With Development Pathologies: Resistance to Displacement", *Sociological Bulletin*, Vol. 55, No. 2, May-Aug.2006, Pp. 267-280.
- _____ 2000 "Professionals without Professionalism" *Seminar* No. 495, Nov 2000, pp. 24-28.
- _____, 1978. *Doctors and Nurses: A Study in Occupational Role Structures*. Macmillan New Delhi
- Vopa, La and Anthony. *Grace, Talent and Merit: Poor Students, Clerical Careers and Professional Ideology in 19th Century*.

CHAPTER VI

SOCIOLOGY: A PLEA FOR PERSPECTIVE FROM BELOW

CHAPTER VI

SOCIOLOGY: A PLEA FOR PERSPECTIVE FROM BELOW

Introduction

In this chapter we would analyze the importance of ‘perspective from below’ in the discipline of sociology as mooted by T.K. Oommen (2007). We are aware that sociology as a discipline in India is almost a century’s old. There are allegations that most of analyses which exists in Indian sociology is from perspective of the so-called upper castes (Kumar, 2005, Kumar 2010). In the process the lowest strata that are Dalits or castes truly known as Scheduled Castes have been blacked out. Oommen has rightly argued ...that “Ghurye’s analysis of Scheduled Castes is characterized by cognitive black out... (Because) his considerable reliance on ancient Hindu texts and not having done any fieldworks among the untouchables to unfold their life”.

In this context according to Prof Nandu Ram (1995), Ambedkar was perhaps the first person to articulate the understanding of Indian society from “perspective from below”. Giving his own rationale for the “view from below” Oommen opines that, it is an old and persisting issue in social science, particularly in sociology and social anthropology. But concomitant to the emergence of the traditionally oppressed and stigmatized collectivities as partially emancipated and empowered ones, their conventional silence is being replaced by audible new voices. In turn, the need for their representation in the process of knowledge production is grudgingly being recognized” (Oommen 2007: 97).

Who constitutes the “perspective from below”? Oommen is of the opinion that “the bottom layer in hierarchical societies is constituted by the cumulatively deprived section of the society. Unlike women, youth, proletariat... who are deprived in one of the contexts, the cumulatively deprived are subjected to multiple deprivations. They are found only in hierarchical societies. The ex-untouchables of India afford an ideal type of examples of this category” (Oommen 2007: 98).

According to Oommen, Indian society is moving around the three specialties i.e., heterogeneity, externality and hierarchy. Most societies in the world are culturally heterogeneous as the Indian society, but no society is as heterogeneous as the Indian society which has several religions and numerous languages, not to speak of racial groups. Thus the culturally heterogeneous society in India makes its society more complex. Although in many contemporary societies, tension between nationals and aliens does exist, the latter are mainly immigrants. But in India those who are defined and perceived as aliens are natives who profess non-Indic religions, particularly Islam and Christianity. This is specific to the Indian social situation. But the uniqueness for Indian society is its institutionalized inequality manifest in the abominable practice of Untouchability and caste based occupations sanctified by religion. These specificities of the Indian society exist in addition to a social stratification based on factors such as class, gender, and age which is found universally. The recognition of the four in one nature of Indian society stratification, heterogeneity, hierarchy and externality will go away in handling several contentions and tackling several crises.

According to Oommen the unit of analysis of the Indian society refers that Indian society has a bewildering variety. For example one can legitimately speak many societies on the basis on languages like Indian, Tamil, Mizo, Naga, Bengali, etc society. Thus the term society connotes different entities in different contexts at different levels. In contrast the term nation is vexing because of the persisting tendency to assume co terminality between state/polity and society/culture leading to interminable debates.

Oommen has talked about the six major sources exist in conflict in Indian society; these are patriarchy, inequality, sectorality, peripherality, externality and hierarchy. The first three are found in all societies including these which are democratic and culturally homogeneous. The fourth and fifth sources of conflict are prevailed in most culturally heterogeneous societies. The sixth source, hierarchy is unique to India. (Oommen 2005: 18-20).

Oommen exemplified through the case study of Kashmir and says that there are three articulations regarding the contentious Kashmir problem. First, the primordial's view which holds that Jammu and Kashmir should either be a part of Indian or of

Pakistan, the position pursued by some political parties in both the countries. Second, the nationalist view which asserts that Kashmir should have ‘*azadi*’ has its own sovereign state. Third, the federalist perspective which holds that, Kashmir should continue to be a part of federal India but without sacrificing its cultural identity and political autonomy. Oommen focus on the five entry point to describe the Indian society: perspective from below. (i) rural-urban interaction, (ii) tribe-caste religion nexus; (iii) linguistic reorganization and the identity of subaltern nations; (iv) state-civil society interface and (v) dynamics of change in the family and among youth and women.

Evolution of Indian Society and Need of the Perspective From Below

Oommen tries to locate perspective form below in Indian context that is why he takes a historical and evolutionary perspective of Indian society’s development. According to him “Indian society has evolved through a long and complex historical process. The seven major events which contributed to the formation of this process are the Aryan advent; the emergence of Indian protestant religions-Jainism, Buddhism, and Sikhism, the entry of non-Indic religions into the subcontinent as immigrants religions; the Muslim conquests; western colonialism; anti colonial freedom struggle; and the partition of the Indian subcontinent in 1947 on the eve of the British exit” (Oommen, 2007). Oommen says that Indian society stratified on the basis of age, gender, caste, rural-urban differences and class.

But unlike many others, Indian society is marked by considerable cultural heterogeneity too, particularly, due to a large number of communities speaking different languages, counting more than 1500 including 460 tribal dialects. India’s religious plurality is complicated by the uneasy co-existence of religious of Indic and non-Indic origin, which is a rare phenomena in most contemporary societies. However what is unique to India is the all pervasive caste hierarchy legitimized through the Hindu doctrine of karma and reincarnation. It is my contention that apprehending social reality of a hierarchical society poses certain methodological issues specific to that society.

According to Oommen every society is passing through the four major trends of social transformation, first and foremost is a transitional trend from cumulative to dispersed dominance. If status, wealth and power were earlier concentrated in the hands of the twice born caste Hindus- Brahmin, Kshatriya and Vaishya accounting for a mere 15 to 20% of the population, now there is an incipient trend towards dispersal of political power to the other backwards classes like OBC, SC and STs together constituting the vast majority of Indian population. This is the resultant of universal adult franchise introduced in India with the arrival of independence and the reservation of seats in legislatures proportionate to their population. The changes in power and wealth are not matched by changes in status that is weakening the importance of the ritual dimension. Intertwining, intermarriage and social interaction between the twice born and SCs are still rare particularly in rural areas due to the practice of Untouchability. This resultant in status incongruence that is their upward social mobility in wealth and power is not matched by mobility in the ritual context. In the case of the OBCs status incongruence results from their low representations in the high echelons of bureaucracy and professions even as they became politically powerful.

The second major trend in social transformation manifests itself in the gradual movement from hierarchy to equality resulting in the decline of traditional collectivism and emergence of individualism. With the emergence of the individualism, the salience of traditional collectivism which manifests itself through the joint family, *Jati*, villages are being gradually relegated to the background. While there is no neat and tidy displacement of collectivism by individualism, the birth of the Indian individual is clearly evident.

The third important trend in social transformation in India is the simultaneous demands for individual equality and the assertion of collective identity. The Indian constitution unambiguously assured equality and concomitantly social justice to all the individuals irrespective of their gender, caste, creed, or class. Initially most of the traditionally disadvantaged groups believed that the implementation of the constitutional promise would automatically follow and the maintenance of their group identity was irrelevant. But the persistence of the stigma associated with their identity prompted them to abandon it and plumb for assimilation, as the process of 'Sanskritization' implied. But the gradually it dawned on them that their efforts to

Sanskritize were not accepted by the higher castes and individual equality per se would not emancipate them. Consequently they became aware of their need to reinvent their dignity in their collective identity, expressions such as Dalits, and Adivasis clearly point to this trend. While the constitution does not clearly recognize identities based on religion, caste, language, and tribe, it does not completely overlook these identities either, if these are disadvantageous to the collectivities concerned.

The fourth transition is that of movement from the plural society to the pluralism. Plural society as initially conceptualized by J.S. Furnivall (1948) alludes to an arrangement in which different social and cultural segments uneasily co-exist and there is transfusion of blood or transmission of culture. This arrangement prevailed within the Hindu society, through the operation of the Jajmani System for centuries, laterally; the twice born castes interacted with the OBCs and SCs both in the political and economic contexts but had very limited interaction in socio-cultural contexts and no interaction in the ritual contexts. This description also fits in the mode of interaction which prevails between Hindus, particularly the upper castes and those who profess the non-Indic religions, particularly in the rural areas.

But in the case of culturally heterogeneous societies if the constitutes segments are unequal either because they are numerically small or economically weak or culturally backward or all of these, the tendency is to ignore them in the representation of reality. There are numerous instances when those ignored or marginalized communities demand to be represented in the process of knowledge production. A familiar example in India is the neglect of the numerous, numerically small and less developed linguistic communities. Their emerging identity assertions are also indicative of their clamor for representation in the context of knowledge production. In the plural societies the un-represented bottom categories are invariably viewed as outsiders to the society, as in the case of followers of non-Indic religions categories in India. Voices of protests from them have gradually led to the provisioning of space to their experiences in the context of knowledge production. For example the distinctiveness of religious minorities is increasingly recognized in studies of sociology and social anthropology in India.

Perspective From Below and Emic Etic Approaches

Oommen opines that perspective from below should not be confused with Emic and Etic approaches. The specific of the anthropological method is the distinction between 'Etic' and 'Emic' approaches, both of which employed the technique of participant observation which is often mystified. But the demystification of participation observation was bound to happen when anthropologists started investigation their own societies. The point of interest for the present is that in hierarchical societies the anthropologists and sociologists drawn from upper castes were invariably reluctant to interact with the bottom rung of the society, gives the norms and values associated with the practice of Untouchability. We should do an effort to participate in the life world of the untouchables, by a Savarna social researcher; it would be disapproved not only by their own Jati peers but also by the untouchables themselves, given the grip of the doctrine of karma and reincarnation on them. Even the distinction between Etic and Emic approaches remained problematic. The Etic approach identified and studied social reality independent of the natives' cultural judgments. The Emic view in contrast is an insider's view.

The different cultural segments in heterogeneous societies may have differing insider's view. Further the lack of co-terminology between political boundaries and cultural boundaries creates problems. This is exemplified in the difference between an Indian Bengali anthropologist studying the Bengali society spread across Indian and Bangladesh, and his investigating Tamil society, divided between India and Sri-Lanka. While in west Bengal he is both a political and cultural insider, in Bangladesh he is a cultural insider but a political outsider. In Tamil Nadu he is a political insider but a cultural outsider and in Sri-Lanka he is both a political and a cultural outsider. (Oommen 2007: 99-100)

Perspective From Below and Subalternist Perspective

The perspective from below should not be confused for the much heralded Subalternist perspective. Subalternist focused their attention on the elite politics and have emphasized the insurrectionary activities and potential of the subaltern classes,

poor peasants, and landless labourers which are essentially economic categories, who according to them possessed self-conscious and coherent conceptions of resistance that were directed against rich peasants, urban traders/merchants or the colonial revenue administration. The setting for subaltern history was provided by colonial India and the freedom struggle. The nationalist historians were macro holists who ignored the voices from below, Subalternist historians are micro-individuals who missed the view from above (Oommen, 1985, 20). But both confined their attention to different dimensions of and actors involved in the freedom struggle. The perspective from below goes much beyond this. It focuses on the implications of the nature of social structure and the location of the researcher in the process of knowledge production. Hierarchy as a feature of Indian society existed much before colonialism arrived and the freedom struggle started.

Perspective From Below and Feminist Perspective

Third, the view from below is different from the proletarian, feminist or generational perspective. Class in the sense of social gradations exists in all societies and there are no immutable boundaries between classes. The feminists seem to take the view that only women can understand and analyses issues concerning women. The corollary of this is that only men can understand their problems. Even as one concedes the existence of differences between men and women, those who belong to the same class within a society and share the same culture have things in common irrespective of gender differences. But I have noted that all these differences are based on the class, age, groups and gender exist in all societies in including the homogeneous societies.

Fourth, the plural, the segments even when they are equal remain cultural strangers. That is even as they interact in the economic and political contexts which results in interdependence, culturally they are instead. To the extant socio-cultural insulation persist hostility could develop between them.

Upper Caste Hegemony and Indian Sociology

There is upper caste hegemony in Indian sociology for example D.P. Mukherjee addressed in one of his lecture in Indian sociological conference in 1955 and there are several reasons why we look sociology as perspective from below. And in this he says that it was not enough that an Indian sociologist be a sociologist but should be an Indian first and how does a sociologist acquire Indianization, by situating himself in Indian lore, both high and low. But unless sociological training in Indian is grounded on Sanskrit or any such language in which the traditions have been embodied as symbols, social research in India will be a pale imitation of what others are doing. Although Mukherjee wanted sociologists to be familiar with Indian lores both high and low, he thinks that our traditions are embodied in Sanskrit. There are several problems with this advocacy.

First only the twice-born Hindus were allowed any access to Sanskrit, the texts in which traditions knowledge was embodied. By instating the texts that Sanskrit is the route through which Indian sociologists can cultivate originally. Second by the native declaration become a constitutional possibility to the vast majority of Indians, Sanskrit ceased to be live language. That is to say if one is not traditionally privileged to learn Sanskrit one can scarcely have the opportunity to learn it. Third, the reference one to such other language may be an allusion to Pali and Tamil, but it should d include Persian too. If indeed all the four language Sanskrit, Pali, Tamil and Persian are under reference, one cannot talk of tradition in the singular; indeed there is a multiplicity of traditions in India.

Fourth, even if one such an accommodative view, still all the traditions under references are great traditions' and the traditions of the vast majority of the peoples of India are little traditions confined to folk regions. No sociologist's can afford neglect this rich variety of tradition and remain authentic. Fifth with these it is difficult to comprehend why training in Sociology grounded on Sanskrit and or other such language ca inform Sociology of originality. By Mukherjee perception, an overwhelming majority of Indian sociologists are pale imitators. On the other hand, that handful of Sanskrit knowing sociologists hardly demonstrated any originality they

invariably indulged in exegetical analysis. In turn, this world blurs the distinction between Indology and Sociology.

In this presidential lecture Mukherjee also argued that all our Shastras are sociological in the entitled theme “Indian sociology and tradition”. But the some Shastras are sociological and some other Shastras are theological. The concern of Sociology with Shastras is normative. True, Sociology cannot ignore the normative and it should take into account the ought, but it’s primarily concern is with reality as it exist and operates in society. To anchored Indian sociology to Hindu Shastras is to undermine Sociology’s secular and humane foundations. Finally it led to the debate between Ambedkar and Gandhi.

Indeed the book view of Sociology in India was is excessively in favour of projecting the view from above. To cutler this field view would have been greatly helpful if executed with care. But that was not to be. Almost all fields’ studies in sociology and social anthropology until recently were undertaken from the perspective of twice-born middle class Hindus. For example there is hardly any study of village, a much celebrated theme in Indian Sociology. But it be noted here that the bottom layer of Indian society itself is no more uniform and homogeneous. The upward mobility urban educated Dalit elite are qualitatively different from the cumulatively dominated ritual, illiterate, economically stagnate Dalits.

Oommen also says that ex-untouchables are deprived in the three-social, economic and political realms. And the construction of consciousness of the Dalits is shaped by these three types of deprivations. Oommen has rightly pointed out; Dalits consciousness is a complex and compound consciousness which encapsulates deprivations stemming from inhuman conditions of material existence, powerlessness and ideological hegemony (Oommen 1990: 256).

Theoretical Foundation of the ‘Perspective From Below Approach

As stated by Oommen “ Sociology of knowledge, is the theoretical foundation of this approach designated as the perspective from below. According to this approach

according to Oommen experience and knowledge are inextricably interlinked in social science, and then the location of the knowledge producer, the researcher, in social structure is crucial from the perspective of production of knowledge. That is the perspective from below is necessitated due to the politics of location. The process of production of knowledge and the advantages and disadvantages emanating out of one's location in social structure are inevitably linked.

Further Oommen emphasis that, "one can dismiss this formulation as exclusively ideological indeed political and hence harmful to the generation of objective knowledge" (Oommen, 2007, 105). But he reports that the quality of knowledge produced till now gives as an animation. For instance he argues that, "there has been a cognitive blackout in Indian social sciences, at least until recently, as far as knowledge regarding the life world experiences of Dalitbahujan.... The dominant tenure in Indian Sociologyhas been to suggest that the Dalitbahujan are abandoning their way of life in favour of the lifestyle of caste Hindus. This is what Sanskritization is all about. In this perspective, not only are the norms and values of caste Hindus privileged, but the Brahmins are also christened as norm setters and value givers for the society as a whole" (Oommen 2007:105). Therefore Oommen suggests, "To correct this imbalance we need the perspective from below" (ibid).

Oommen giving rationale of the perspective from below patiently explains, "if the white anthropologists indulges in the 'invention of primitive society...the twice-born sociologists of India projected an idealized picture of Hindu society mainly based on classical texts'. Even the field view has not interrogated the deficit successfully. That is the reason we need a counter view even if it is an idealized version of Dalitbahujans" (ibid).

Therefore Oommen presents this perspective, which he say, that he has drawn for analysis of Dalitbahujan intellectuals. In all Oommen discusses ten bases for a new perspective. These are: First, the Dalitbahujan do not subscribe to the notion of all India or pan Indian Hinduism, not even regional Hinduism, ideas widely accepted in Indian sociology (Srinivas, 1952). In fact the Dalitbahujan identity is essentially a localized caste identity and a series of mini-traditions not even a little traditions. Their

religion does not admit patriarchal Hindu gods and the absence of professional priesthood is a pronounced feature.

Second, the Dalit bahujan women enjoy considerable economic independence and sexual equality. Absence of sharp sexual division of labour is a prominent feature of their society. These traditional values of Dalit bahujan are actually much acclaimed values of modernity and even post-modernity. But they tend to lose these values as and when they get Sanskritized. Third, in the Dalitbahujan society gender relations are largely open and egalitarian; parent-child interactions, including father-child interactions, are intimate; widow are respected and not stigmatized; widow remarriages are practised. The incorporation of patriarchal values into their society is changing these norms and values.

Fourth, while there is an over evaluation of occupational of caste Hindu, there is a studied lack of respect for the occupations of Dalit bahujan such as agriculture, arts, and crafts. In turn, knowledge associated with production of wealth is undervalued. Fifth, the language used by Dalit bahujan in their everyday life is different from that used by caste Hindus. Their language is not only non-sanskritic but not even standard vernacular languages such as Hindi, Tamil or Bengali. Not only is their language not recognized by the state, is stigmatized by the caste Hindu society both in which undermines Dalit bahujan identity.

Sixth, the ideas generated by the organic intellectuals of Dalit bahujan are hardly recognized let alone communicated to the new generations. Even when Dalibahujan intellectual are reluctantly, the politic of knowledge transmission invariably renders their contribution insignificant. Seventh, generally speaking the exclusive political voice of Dalit bahujan remains muted and submerged due to the absence of political parties which champion their cause.

Eight, given the numerical importance of Dalit bahujan, universal adult franchise did make them politically salient. But this is not adequately matched by their upward economic mobility in spite of improve their economic condition. The change in the ritual context is the least and it continues to bestow on them low social prestige.

Ninth, although rebels challenged the Hindu caste system periodically in the last 25 centuries and tried to establish separate religions or sects they did not succeed; they were silenced by, incorporation into the Hindu system and usually assigned a low status.

Finally it is necessary to recognize from below that knowledge has two uses: oppression and perpetuation of hegemony and institutionalization of equality and justice. The view from above sometimes directly and almost always indirectly died and abetted oppression and hegemonization. The view from below can and should provide the much needed antidote to this by facilitating the institutionalization of equality and social justice. This is the rationale and justification for the perspective from below.

Conclusion

To conclude T.K. Oommen through this contribution to Indian Sociology has questioned the very basis of sociological knowledge of Indian Sociology. He has successfully depicted the domination of the twice-born castes in Indian Sociology, who dominate at different levels of the disciplines- as practitioners, as organizational builders and as producers of knowledge. On the other hand through Sociology of knowledge perspective he has been successful to show how has been the life-world, icons of the Dalits been blacked out. Further, he has raised the question on the effectiveness and objectivity of method of data collection. He is critical especially of anthropologists who have been using on the method of participate observation of data collection. In this context Oommen argues that it is not possible because the Brahmin social scientists are prevented from interviewing or interacting with the ex-untouchables respondents. In the end Oommen suggests that:

“While cultural monism is flaunted by the traditionally privileged caste Hindus as the hope of India, cultural pluralists advocate secularism, that is, the dignified co-existence of all group and communities to be controlled by a strong centre as the Panacea by modernists.... The cultural Subalternists, the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, believe that, in spite of the constitutional promise of equality, justice and fraternity, the specificity of their needs, aspirations and contributions are ignored...

the European model of nation-state that coerced the weaker and smaller collectivities to abandon their identity to avail to equality...utterly united for India” (Oommen 2011: 241).

References

Dahiwale, S.M. 2005. *Understanding Indian Society: The Non-Brahminical Perspective*. Rawat Publication, Jaipur.

Kumar, Vivek. 2010, "Teaching Caste and Hindu Social Order: Dalits In Indian Sociolog",y, Maitrayee Chaudhary (Ed), *Sociology In India: Intellectual And Institutional Practices*, Rawat Publication, New Delhi.

_____, 2009. *Locating Women in the Indian Caste System, Media and Women's Movement, Social Change*, March, 2009, Vol. 39, No. 1, Pp. 64-84.

_____, 2006. *India's Roaring Revolution: Dalit Assertion and New Horizons*. Delhi Gangdeep Publication.

_____, 2005. "Situating Dalits in Indian Society", *Sociological Bulletin*, Vol. 54, No. 3, New Delhi.

Oommen, T.K., 2011. "Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and the Nation: Situating G.S. Ghurye", *Sociological Bulletin*, Volume 60, No. 2, New Delhi, Pp. 228-244.

_____, 2010. *Social Movements: Issues of identity*. New Delhi, New York: Oxford University.

_____, 2008. *Reconciliation in Post-Godhra Gujarat: The Role of Civil Society*. New Delhi: Pearson Longman imprint of person edition, 2008.

_____, 2007. *Knowledge and Society: Situating Sociology and Social Anthropology*. Oxford University Press.

_____, 2005. *Crisis and Contention in Indian Society*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: New Delhi, Sage Publication.

_____, 2004. *Development Discourses: Issues and Concern*. Regency Publication, New Delhi.

_____, 1986. *Indian Sociology: Reflections and Introspections*. Bombay popularize Prakasan.

_____, 1985. *From Mobilization to Institutionalization: The Dynamics of Agrarian Movements in 20th century Kerala*. Bombay Press.

_____ 1984. *Social Structure and Politics: Studies in Independent India*. Delhi, Hindustan publication.

_____ 1984. *Social Transformation in Rural India: Mobilization and State Intervention*. Delhi, India, Vikas publication.

Ram, Nandu, 1995. *Beyond Ambedkar: Essays on Dalits in India*, Har-Anand Publication, New Delhi.

Sarkar, R.M., 2006, *Dalit in India: Past and Present*, Delhi Serial Publication.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

The present study has tried to analyze the contribution by one of the senior most sociologist T.K. Oommen. We have to try to map up his academic works published time to time during his long career spanning for more than four decades. According to sources Oommen has tried to produce knowledge in five main areas of Sociology. These five areas were Social Theory, Social Transformation, Sociology of Profession, Sociology of Social Movements and Political Sociology. We have specifically tried to analyze his contribution into seven chapters including introduction and conclusions. As far as if we try to analyze Oommen's works then we will locate him both in the sociology as a discipline and sociology as a profession. As an individual we have found that Oommen has produced academic knowledge for the discipline of Sociology but this spills over the other subjects like Law, Community health and political science. As a profession he has nurtured various organizations. From Department of Sociology in a University, to a national society of Sociology and finally Sociological Association at the institutional level, he has shaped and given direction to number of organization. That is why one is farad to say that Oommen is among out of the few sociologists who have lived of Sociology and not for Sociology.

He has not been working in academic circles or professional organizations but has contributed immensely by his engagement with the state or at the behest of state. That is why he has been involved in so many, high powered committees of the state. Whether, the peace committee offer 'Gujarat episode' in the year 2002. He has been a member of him powered committee of the prime minister to understand the social economic status of the Muslim community of India (Sachhar committee). He has contributed immensely in the Course formation committee of IAS, organized by Administrative reform Department. His endeavor did not go in vein because T.K. Oommen was confirmed 'Padam Vibhusan Award' in the year 2008 by Government of India. This is the second highest civilian award of the nation.

Sociology is relevant in India as a discipline, it should endorse and its practitioners should internalize the value package contained in the Indian constitution, the differing interpretations of these values notwithstanding. Although these values have not originated in India and we have borrowed them from the west, undoubtedly

they are basic human values. But our societal ethos does not permit total displacement of the old and institutionalization of the new, at any rate all of a sudden. There is always a debate on the taking sociology as the subject, for example who opt the sociology or who do not opt. If we will locate ourselves in the timeframe, what we will find is that, we are living in one of the most dynamic period of time that is twenty first century, which is characterized by the most dynamic concept Globalization. So we are in the global era. Every day in some form or other we are experiencing the dynamic nature of society. If we look at our own life and our social milieu we can perhaps make it how things are getting changed. Our biography and history is sufficient to prove this.

In this Juncture of time if we will look at Sociology, which tries to cover all most all aspect of human social life, it seems very difficult to give a particular meaning of sociology i.e. what is sociology is all about? Because Sociology does not deal with one dimension of human social life as other social science like Psychology, History, and Political Science and Economics studies. Sociology covers diverse dimensions of society. Everyday a new phenomenon is being added to the subject matter of Sociology and the practice of Sociology even complicates its area of study more. When we hear first the word Sociology it creates a very deep sense of curiosity within us. We want to know what the discipline is all about. In another world what is Sociology? How it studies society? How is it different from our (commonsense) understanding of society? Many times Sociology is understood as a formal body of knowledge which seeks to comprehend, document and analyze the network of social relationships in the society. Study of social relationships in a society is central to Sociology. Question may arise why only study of social relationship is central to the task of Sociology? Why not other relationship? So I think a small example can give us some insights why social relationships are central to Sociological inquiry.

Comming to his contribution in the realm of Indian Sociology. Plea for contextualization of Indian sociology has been considered as of the important contribution during his formulation years. This we have analyzed in chapter III accordingly. The process of contextualization of Sociology in India involves the following dimensions, first, recognition of the fact that tradition/past contains both assets and liabilities viewed in terms of the present needs and aspiration. The ingenuity of people lies in rejecting the liabilities without apology and accepting assets unequivocally. Second, we should not be shy of adopting appropriate values and

institution from other societies and cultures and should judiciously graft them on to our own society. Third, in doing this we should take into account the central tendency in our society, which seems to be one of gradual adaptation and reconciliation. At the same time, we should recognize that such a societal ethos is capable of bringing about social transformation only at a slow pace. Therefore, it is necessary to mobilize people to protest against exploitation, injustice and oppression. Fourth, the social engineering involved here the selective retention of our tradition, informed borrowing from other cultures and the judicious mutation of the two will have to be a process peculiar to India, and the primary task of Indian sociologists today is to understand, analyze and facilitate this process. In the concluding lines we can say that Indian sociology is thus a hybrid, a product of the creative confrontations and dialectical interactions between an intense desire to retain Indian tradition, a passionate quest for evolving and maintaining a distinct national identity and an abiding interest to acquire a prominent place in the world community of academic sociologists.

Oommen's work on dedicated and committed scholarship and work culture reminds us what C. Wright Mills has written, "on intellectual craftsmanship". He argues, "scholarship is a choice of how to live as well as a choice of career;...the intellectual workman forms his own self as he works towards the perfection of his craft; to realize his own potentialities and any opportunities that come his way, he constructs a character which has its core the qualities of the good workman" (Mills 1959: 216). That aptly reflects the personal traits of T.K. Oommen.

However his life and intellectual journey is always guided by his concerns for society and humanity as a whole. That he never turns back to the grave of a problem faced by mankind, whether it is the Tsunami or the Gujarat carnage he is found standing beside the needy. His sociological imagination is always guided by making a difference in the quality of human life. Thus, we can say that Indian Sociology is thus a hybrid, a product of the creative confrontations and dialectical interactions between an intense desire to retain Indian tradition, a passionate quest for evolving and maintaining a distinct national identity and an abiding interest to acquire a prominent place in the world community of academic sociologists. Thus we can see that professor Oommen has started his life at the beginning point of Sociology and now he reached the highest

point of the Sociology. His journey in the emergence of Sociology has a particular space in Indian Sociology.

Further as suggested by Oommen is that if sociology in India has to be relevant and have rigour then it has to anchor in the Indian value system. According to Oommen (2007: 39) “Independent India has two sets of competing value packages: one, traditional values of hierarchy, holism, and pluralism, and two constitutional values of socialism, secularism and democracy... if sociology is to be relevant for India as a discipline, it should endorse and its practioners should internalize the value package in the Indian constitution, the differing interpretations of these values notwithstanding” (Oommen 2007: 40). However, it is true that Oommen moves from Indian Sociology to A South Asian Perspective to Sociology for one world.

Oommen also talked about the cultural globalization and says that the culture is multi layered phenomena. Sociologists have distinguished culture into two forms: the material and non-material culture. They said that material culture moves fast than the non-material culture that’s why there is emergence of the condition of the cultural lag. This means that the non-material culture is to go behind the comparison of the material culture. We find some items of material culture which would spread much more quickly, for example Macdonald and Kentucky chicken or even Italian pizza are more popular as compared with several other food items. He also talked about the specialty of the culture in particularly as nation and region. And this in turn would give birth to numerous permutations and combinations. Therefore the important thing which came to my mind is not to speak about the world culture in singular but to look at the plurality of world cultures and to understand how it has come about, which historical process is involved.

The IV Chapter of the present study tries to make an effort contribution of Oommen in the field of ‘Sociology of Movements’ is unique and unparallel in the discipline in India, Asia and in many of the western countries. As one of the pioneers of the study of social movements he has given virtually a new area of research in the discipline. Otherwise before him most of the sociologists argued that movements can be studied only by historians. But nobody had tangled that historians study only terminated movements, which is only sociologists and social anthropologists are

capable of studying ongoing movements. Oommen is also responsible for changing the mindset of researchers regarding the study of social movements and its relationship with development. He has written that in conventional social science. Social movements used to be viewed as mechanism of coping with stress and strain and why were rarely seen as sources of change and development.

Even when role of ideology was recognized, social movements were not perceived as vehicles of creative ideas. Secondly when movements' studies surfaced, the initial tendency was to look upon movements as indicative of social pathology. Against all these Oommen has tried to establish that movements are vehicles of innovative and creative ideas, the participants can be called as martyrs and can produce a society based on a qualitatively different collective consciousness. Oommen still laments Sociology has not been able to play a creative role in providing a role in the sphere of social movements and its relationship with social policy. This has been so because of limited emphasized base from which conceptualization of the social reality takes place. Hence in a way Oommen is inviting researchers to explore this area, special when contemporary India in flense.

Sociology of professions is another important area in which Oommen has contributed immensely. Thus ,professional is a type of higher grade, non manual occupation with subjectively and objectively recognized occupational status, possessing a well defined area of study or concern or providing a definite service after advanced training and education. The finely graded nature of professions also generates fierce internal competition at all levels, acute rank awareness and a struggle between individuals to gain advancement within the promotional structure of the profession. This also generates a culture of whispers, rumors and people being either in or out of favour and being continually judged as to their competence and merit. This in turn generates strong social tensions within the profession and helps to sustain a climate of suspicion, and petty jealousies.

At the end, Oommen strongly said that in the light of our discussion we can safely conclude that defining “Profession of Sociology is not easy task and each of the perspectives seems to have focused on one or another dimension. These are: one, a set of objective attributes, second, a set of subjective perceptions by the professionals, or the social researchers or lay public, and the third, a set of factors which influence the

actual functioning including individual motivations, group interests, the system of stratification etc. As noted at the outset, our primary interest is to investigate the consequences that theoretically independent professions may face concomitant to the shift in their work-milieu to organizations, particularly government organization. Admittedly, all the attributes of a profession may not be equally affected because of the changed context of functioning. One has to identify those attributes which are more amenable to change and adaptation due to organization impact” (Oommen 1978: 7-8).

Thus T.K. Oommen through this contribution to Indian Sociology has questioned the very basis of sociological knowledge of Indian Sociology. He has successfully depicted the domination of the twice-born castes in Indian Sociology, who dominate at different levels of the disciplines- as practioners, as organizational builders and as producers of knowledge. On the other hand through Sociology of knowledge perspective he has been successful to show how has been the life-world, icons of the Dalits been blacked out. Further, he has raised the question on the effectiveness and objectivity of method of data collection. He is critical especially of anthropologists who have been using on the method of participate observation of data collection. In this context Oommen argues that it is not possible because the Brahmin social scientists are prevented from interviewing or interacting with the ex-untouchables respondents. In the end Oommen suggests that,

“While cultural monism is flaunted by the traditionally privileged caste Hindus as the hope of India, cultural pluralists advocate secularism, that is, the dignified co-existence of all group and communities to be controlled by a strong centre as the Panaca by modernists.... The cultural Subalternists, the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, believe that, in spite of the constitutional promise of equality, justice and fraternity, the specificity of their needs, aspirations and contributions are ignored... the European model of nation-state that coerced the weaker and smaller collectivities to abandon their identity to avail to equality...utterly united for India” (Oommen 2011: 241).

It is not that Oommen has been engaged only with Indian Sociology. In fact in his book “Knowledge and Society: Situating Sociology and Social Anthropology” written with the “Sociology of Knowledge Perspective”, he has been the debate on Sociology from local to global level via South Asian region. Reviewing his book Welz

(2009), argues that “how could Indian Sociology, a Sociology from the resist those discursive forces that set the tone in the global social scientific context? Then he argues in an answer form. That is, Oommen suggest a historical approach, or civilization analysis, ‘national societies (not to be confused for nation states) should be the more units, and intra-societal institutions and organizations should be the micro units of analysis”.

Bibliography

Books

Ahmad and Gupta. 1967. *Opinion and Survey of Scientists and Technologist's*. New Delhi: Council of Scientific and Industrial Research.

Ahmad, Imtiaz. 1972. *For Sociology of India' Contribution to Indian Sociology*.

Bierstedt, Robert. 1963. *The Social Order*. New York: Mac-Graw Hill.

Baxi, Upendra and Parekh Bhikhu. (Ed.) 1995. *Crisis and Change in Contemporary India*. Delhi: Sage Publications.

Bailey, F.G. 1958. *Caste and the Economic Frontier*. Bombay: Oxford University Press.

Beger, Peter. 1966. *Invitation to Sociology*. Penguin Books.

Beteille, Andre. 1974. *Sociology and Ethno-Sociology*. *International Social Science Journal*, 24 (4):703-4pp.

_____. 1977. *Inequality among Men*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Bottomore, T. B. 1962. *Sociology, A Guide to Problems and Literature*. Allen and Unwin.

Bettie, J. 1964. *Other Cultures*. London: Cohen and West.

Chatterjee, Partha. 2003. *The Social Sciences in India*. Pp. 482-497, (Ed.) Theodore M. Theodore.

Chitins, Suma and Philip G. Altlab. 1979. *The Indian Academic Profession*. New Delhi: Macmillan

Connell, Raewyn. 2007. *Southern Theory*. Polity Press. Ch. 8 ('Power, Violence and the Pain of Colonialism').

Dahiwal, S.M. 2005. *Understanding Indian Society: The Non-Brahminical Perspective*. Jaipur: Rawat Publication.

Dhanagare, D.N. 1999. *Themes and Perspectives in Indian Sociology*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Debat, R. Singnaroy. 2004. *Peasant's Movements in Post-Colonial India*. New Delhi: Sage Publication.

Elliott, Philip. 1972. *The Sociology of Professions*. Macmillan Press.

Furnilvall, J.S. 1948. *Colonial Policy and Practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Feuer, Lewis S. 1969. *The Conflict of Generations*. London: Hineman

Jacob, M. Joseph. 1988. *Doctors and Rules: Sociology of Professional Values*. London and New Delhi: Routledge.

Kaul, Ashok. 1992. *Sociology in India: Missing Links, Adaptations and Disillusionments*. Pp. 93-9. (Ed.) Josef Langer, *Emerging Sociology*, Avebury.

Kirkpatrick, Joanna. 1980. *The Sociology of an Indian Hospital Ward*. Columbia: South Asia Books.

Kumar, Vivek. 2006. *India's Roaring Revolution: Dalit Assertion and New Horizons*. Delhi: Gangdeep Publication, India.

_____. 2009. Locating Women in the Indian Caste System, Media and Women's Movement. *Social Change*, March, 2009, Vol. 39, No. 1, Pp. 64-84.

Inkles, Alex. 1993 *What Is Sociology: An Introduction To The Discipline And Profession?* (Phi) Learning Private Limited.

Madan T.N. 1991. *Religion in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Mukherjee, Ramakrishna. 1977. Trends in Indian Sociology. *Current Sociology*. 25(3), Pp. 1-193.

Mukherjee, Ramkrishna. 1989. *Indian Sociology or Sociology of India?* Pp. 135-50 (Ed.) Nikolai Genov, *National Traditions in Sociology*, Sage.

Mukherjee, Radhakamal. 1960. *The Philosophy of Social Sciences*. New Delhi.

_____. 1945. *Indian Working Class*. Bombay: Hind Kitab.

_____. 1964. *The Dimensions of Values, a Unified Theory*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Mukerji, Dhurjati Prasad. 1943. *Modern Indian Culture: A Sociological Study*. Allahabad: India Publisher.

_____. 1945. *Introduction to Indian Music*. Poona: Kutub.

_____. 2000. *Diversities: Essays in Economics, Sociology and Social Problems*. New Delhi: Manak.

Mukherji, Partha Nath. 2006. Rethinking Sociology in an Era of Transformatory Changes. *Sociological Bulletin* 55, No. 2.

Mukerji, Dhurjati Prasad. 1943. *Modern Indian Culture: A Sociological Study*. Allahabad: India Publisher.

Millerson, Geoffery. 1964. *The Qualifying Associations: A Study in Professionalization*. Rutledge and Kegan Paul Ltd London Press.

Mills C. W. & Hans Gerth. 1946. *Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford.

Mitra, Subraha K. 1992. *Political Protest and Participation Local Eids And The Politics of Development in India*. Rutledge.

Marris, Jones. W. H. 1982. *Government and Politics in India*. Cambridge.

Marshall, T.H. 1964. *Class, Citizenship and Social Development. With an Introduction*. By Seymour Martin Lipset. New York: Doubleday.

Oommen, T.K. 2010. *Social Movements: Issues of Identity*. New Delhi, New York: Oxford University.

_____. 2008. *Reconciliation in Post-Godhra Gujarat: The Role of Civil Society*. New Delhi: Pearson Longman Imprint of Person Edition.

_____. 2007. *Knowledge and Society: Situating Sociology and Social Anthropology*. Oxford University Press.

_____. 2005. *Crisis and Contention in Indian Society*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: New Delhi, Sage Publication.

_____. 2004. *Development Discourses: Issues and Concern*. New Delhi: Regency Publication.

_____. 2004. *Nation, Civil Society and Social Movements, Essays in Political Sociology*. Sage Publication.

_____. 2002. *Pluralism, Equality and Identity: Comparative Studies*. Oxford University Press.

_____. 2000. *The Christian Clergy in India: Social Structure and Social Roles*. New Delhi, India: Thousand Oaks, California, Sage Publication.

_____. 1997. *Citizenship, Nationality and Ethnicity, Reconciling Competing Identities*. Polity Press.

_____. 1997. *Citizenship and National Identity: From Colonialism to Globalism*. New Delhi, Thousand Oaks, and London: Sage Publication.

_____. 1995. *Alien Concepts and South Asian Reality: Responses and Reformulations*. New Delhi/ Thousand Oaks/ London: Sage Publication,

_____. 1990. *State and Society in India: Studies in Nation Building*. New Delhi/ Newbury Park London: Sage Publication.

_____. 1990. *Protest and Change: Studies in Social Movements*. And New Delhi / Newbury Park: Sage Publication.

_____. 1988. *Ethnicity, Immigration and Cultural Pluralism India and The United States Of America*. JNU, New Delhi.

_____. 1986. *Indian Sociology: Reflections and Introspections*. Bombay: Popularize Prakasan.

_____. 1985. *From Mobilization To Institutionalization: The Dynamics Of Agrarian Movements In 20th Century Kerala*. Bombay Press.

_____. 1984. *Social Structure and Politics Studies in Independent India*. Delhi: Hindustan Publication.

_____. 1984. *Social Transformation in Rural India: Mobilization and State Intervention*. Delhi: Vikas Publication. India.

_____. 1978. *Doctors and Nurses: A Study in Occupational Role Structures*. Macmillan Company of India, Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras.

_____. 1974. *Field Studies in the Sociological Of Education: The Report on Punja*”, S.N. Ranade, New Delhi.

Patel, Sujata. 2010. *At Crossroads: Sociology In India*. Pp. 280-291 (Ed.) S. Patel, the Isa Handbook of Diverse Sociological Traditions, Sage.

Rao, M.S.A. 1978. *Social Movements and Social Transformation in India: A Study Of Two Backward Classes Movements*. New Delhi: Macmillan Publishers.

Parsons, Talcott. 1966. *A 'Full Citizenship for the Negro American? A Sociological Problem, in Parsons. Talcott & Clark, Kenneth B. (Eds.) 'The Negro American'*, Boston: The Riverside Press Cambridge.

Parsons, Talcott. 1966. *Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs and New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Parsons, Talcott. 1977. *Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory*. New York: The Free Press.

P, Blau. 1956. *Bureaucracy in Modern Society*. New York: Random House.

Rajani, Kothari. 1973. (Ed.) *Caste in Indian Politics*. Orient Longmans Ltd.

Roche, Maurice. 1987. *Citizenship, Social Theory, and Social Change*, *Theory and Society*. 16 (3) 363–399.

Samuel P., Huntington. 1969. *Political Order in Changing Societies*. Yale University Press: New Haven.

Soysal, Yasemin. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Post National Membership in Europe*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Simmel, Georg. 1950. 'The Stranger' In Kurt. H. Wolf (Ed.) *The Sociology Of Georg Simmel*. Illinois: The Free Press of Glenco.

Srinivas, M. N. 1952. *Religion and Society Among The Coorgs Of South India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Suma, Chitins and Philip G. Altbach. 1979. *The Indian Academic Profession*. New Delhi: Macmillan.

Sharma, Jyotirmaya. 2003. *Hindutava: Exploring the Idea of Hindu Nationalism*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.

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

_____. 2000. *Culture Change in India: Identity and Globalization*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Smith Bardwell L. (Ed) 1976. *Religion and Social Conflict in South Asia Netherlands*. E.J. Brill Publications.

Smith D.E. 1963. *India as a Secular State*. U.S.A. Princeton University Press.

Srinivas, M.N. 1994. Sociology in India and its Future. *Sociological Bulletin*, 43, No.1

Taylor, Charles. 1992. *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, Nj: Princeton University Press.

Turner, Brian S. 2006. *Classical Sociology and Cosmopolitanism: A Critical Defence of the Social*. *The British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1) 133–151.

Welz, Frank and Anand Kumar. 2000. *Interview with T. K. Oommen*.

Welz, Frank. 2009. *100 Years of Indian Sociology: From Social Anthropology to Decentring Global Sociology*. *International Sociology*, 24: 635-55.

Articles

Burawoy, Michael. 2007. "The Future of Sociology." *Sociological Bulletin* 56, No. 3.

Gupta Dipankar. 1993. "Between General and Particular Others: Some Observations on Fundamentalism", *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, Vol. 27, No.1.

_____. 1995. "Secularisation and Mineralisation Limits of Heroic Thought", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. Xxx, No.35, 1995.

Ghurye, G.S. 1938. 'Sex Habits of a Sample of Middle Class People Of Bombay'. Report Presented At The Second All-India Population And First Family Hygiene Conference.

_____. 1956. 'Sexual Behaviour of the American Female', *Sociological Bulletin* 3, No. 2 158-183.

Gusfield Joseph R. 1976. "Tradition And Modernity: Misplaced Polarities in the Study of Social Change", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vo1.72.January 1976.

Hardgrave Robert L. 1964. "Caste In Kerala: A Preface to the Elections", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vo1.21, November 1964.

Heiskala Risto. 1990. "Sociology as A Discursive Space-The Coming Age of A New Orthodoxy", *Norway, Act Sociological*, Vo1.33, No (4). Pp. 305-320.

Houtart Fnncois. 1978. 'Socio -Religious Movements in Kerala- A Reaction to the Capitalist Mode of Production', *Trivandrum, Social Scientist*, Vo1.6, No.11, 1978, Pp. 3-34.

Isaac Thomas. 1991. 'The Kerala Shock', Madras, *Frontline*, July 20-August 2, 1991.

_____. 1991. 'Muslim League-The Inevitable End', *Frontline*, March 2- 15, 1991.

_____. 1991. 'Kerala's Verdict', *Frontline*, February 16-March 1, 1991.

Iyer Ramaswamy R. 1994. 'Hindus and Muslims: Towards A New Modus Vivendi', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol, Xxxi, No.24, 1994.

Jain Ravindra K. 1994. 'Civilisations And Settlement Societies: Cultural Development and Identity at the End of the Twentieth Century', *Eastern Anthropologist*, Vol47, No.1, 1994.

John Binoo K. 1986. "CPI (M) Choosing Between Marx, and Muslim League", *Sunway*, March 23-29, 1986.

John K.C. 1977. "Factions in Kerala, Muslim Christian Vote Split", *Times of India*. February 21, 1977.

Koolman Dick. 1995. "Communalism and Indian Princely States- A Comparison with British India", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol Xxx, No 34, 1995.

Burawoy, Michael. 2007. "The Future of Sociology." *Sociological Bulletin*, 56, No. 3 (2007).

Ghurye, G.S. 1938. Sex Habits of a Sample of Middle Class People Of Bombay. Report Presented At The Second All-India Population And First Family Hygiene Conference.

Mukherjee, Ramakrishna. 1977. "Trends in Indian Sociology." *Current Sociology* 25, No. 3 (1977): 1-193.

Mukherjee, Partha Nath. 2006. "Rethinking Sociology in an Era of Transformatory Changes." *Sociological Bulletin*, 55, No. 2 (2006).

Oommen, T.K. 2010. "Indian Labor Movement: Colonial Era to the Global Age", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 44, No. 52, 26 Dec 2009- 1 Jan 2010, Pp. 81-89.

_____. 2009. "Development Policy and the Nature of Society: Understanding the Kerala Model", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 44, No.13, 28march-3apr. 2009, Pp. 25-31.

- _____. 2007. "State Policy and the Socially Deprived In India: Situating Muslims and Christians of Schedule Castes Origin", *Indian Journal of Federal Studies*, No. 1, 2007, Pp. 19-30.
- _____. 2006. "Coping With Development Pathologies: Resistance to Displacement", *Sociological Bulletin*, Vol. 55, No. 2, May-Aug.2006, Pp. 267-280.
- _____. 2005. "Complexity Of Identity: A Critique Of The Human Development Report 2004", *Radical Humanist* , Vol. 69, No. 3, June 2005, Pp. 32-35.
- _____. 2002. "State versus Nation in South Asia: Linking Language and Governance", *South Asian Survey*, Vol. 9, No. 2, July-Dec. 2002, Pp. 275-286.
- _____. 2001. "State versus Nation: Linking Culture and Governance in South Asia", *South Asian Survey*, Vol. 8, No. 2, July-Dec. 2001, Pp. 213-238.
- _____. 2001. "Civil Society: Religion, Caste and Language in India", *Sociological Bulletin* Vol. 50, No. 2, Sep. 2001, Pp. 219-235.
- _____. 2000. "Vision of Nation Building in India", *Indian Journal of Federal Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2000, Pp. 82-90.
- _____. 2000. "Professionals without Professionalism" *Seminar* No. 495, Nov 2000, Pp. 24-28.
- _____. 1999. "Conceptualizing Nation and Nationality in South Asia", *Sociological Bulletin*, Vol. 48, No. 2, March-Sept, 1999, Pp. 1-18.
- _____. 1998. "Citizenship, Nationality and Ethnicity", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 103, No. 5, March. 1998, Pp. 1414-1417.
- _____. 1997. "Climate Change and the Quest for Sustainable Development", *Mainstream*, Vol. Annual, 20 Dec. 1997, Pp.89-94.
- _____. 1997. "Individual and Society in India: Reconciling Equality and Identity", *Iassi Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 1, July-Sep 1997, Pp. 70-76.
- _____. 1997. "From Plural Society to Pluralism: Towards A Just and Human Social Order in India", *Social Action*, Vol. 47, No. 3, July-Sep. 1997, Pp. 259-271.

_____. 1996. "Reconciling Equality and Pluralism: A New Agenda For The Developed Societies", *Sociological Bulletin*, Vol. 45, No. 2, Sep. 1996, Pp. 143-160.

_____. 1995. "Contested Boundaries and Emerging Pluralism", *International Sociology*, Vol. 10, No. 3, Sep 1995, Pp. 251- 68.

_____. 1995. "Anatomy of Globalization: More A Moral Crisis than A Development Dilemma" *Mainstream* Vol. 9, Dec 95, Pp.75-83.

_____. 1994. "Changing Trajectory Of Constructing The Other West Europe And South Asia", *Sociological Bulletin*, Vol.42, No. 2, Sep. 1994, Pp. 161-175.

_____. 1974. "Student Politics in India: The Case of Delhi University", *Asian Survey*, Vol. 14, No. 5, Sep. 1974, Pp. 777-794.

_____. 1971. "Agrarian Tension in Kerala District: An Analysis", *Indian Journal Of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 7, No. 2, Oct. 1971, Pp. 229-268.

_____. 1969. "Political Leadership in Rural India: Image and Reality", *Asian Survey*, Vol. 9, No. 7, July 1969, Pp. 5151- 521.

_____. 1997. "Climate Change and 'The Quest for Sustainable Development'", *Mainstream*, Vol. Annual, 20 Dec. 1997, Pp.89-94.

_____. 1997. "Individual and Society in India: Reconciling Equality And Identity", *Iassi Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 1, July-Sep 1997, Pp. 70-76.

_____. 1986. 'Insiders and Outsiders in India: Primordial Collectivism and Cultural Pluralism in Nation-Building', *International Sociology* 1: 53-74.

_____. 1988. 'The Nature of Sociological Research and Practice Worldwide: A Perspective from India', *International Sociology* 3: 309-312.

_____. 1990. 'Sociology for One World: A Plea for an Authentic Sociology', *Sociological Bulletin* 39.1 & 2: 1-14.

_____. 1991. 'Internationalization of Sociology: A View from Developing Countries', *Current Sociology* 39: 67-84.

_____. 1995. 'Contested Boundaries and Emerging Pluralism', *International Sociology* 10: 251-268.

Srinivas, M.N. 1994. "Sociology in India and Its Future", *Sociological Bulletin*, Vol. 43, No.1.

Welz, Frank. 2009. 100 "Years of Indian Sociology: From Social Anthropology to Decanting Global Sociology", *International Sociology*, Vol. 24(5), New Delhi.