

Indian Society: Sociological Perspectives
Dr. Santhosh R
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology, Madras
Week-05
Lecture-25

Marxist Sociology of A. R. Desai

Hello everyone, welcome to today's session. So, in this session we will be dealing with the Marxist school in Indian sociology and particularly we will be focusing on the scholarship, one of the pioneering Marxist scholars of Indian sociology A. R. Desai or Akshay Ramanlal Desai.

So, we will have a brief overview of what constitute the Marxist school in sociology primarily through A. R. Desai's work. So, before going into his writings and his ideas on Marxist sociology in India, we will have a brief overview of the biographical details of A. R. Desai because that gives a broad background to his writings and his ideas. So, as you can see, we have in a very old photo of A. R. Desai, he passed away in 1994, he was one of the pioneering set of sociologists in India who was a contemporary of M.N. Srinivas who we will deal in great detail in this course. So, as you can see, he is one of the pioneers of introducing the Marxist approach to understand Indian sociology. So, it is a very self-described framework that he adopted. His writings has fundamentally used the Marxist approach to understanding Indian society and it is very notable that he is one of the early students of G. S. Ghurye, one of the pioneers of Indian sociology and he did PhD with him at the University of Bombay. So, he belongs to broadly the Bombay School of Sociology. So, as a Marxist, his focus of his works has been nationalism, is one of his most important, his magnum opus was a sociological understanding of Indian nationalism. We will come briefly look at in the next slide. So, he also looked at how the social configuration of Indian nationalism and he also explored the various community development programmes for economic development in India, in how the planning economy has operationalized in the early decades of India and he also looked at written on urban slums.

He has a book called the social profile of urban slum if I remember correctly and also the demographic problems, peasant movement you know. So, you can see the kind of areas that he has written as are broadly what usually Marxist framework will focus on, only on the economic, social, fundamental, material issues of the people. And apart from

that he was also served as a national fellow at the Indian Council of Social Sciences. He was also an institutional builder, he was a leader, he was in the leadership roles, he is an office bearer of the Indian Council for Social Sciences research between 1981 and 85 and he was also the president of the Indian Sociological Society. So, you know Indian Sociological Society is the apex body of sociologists in India, the official body of the sociologists in India and he served as the president during 1980-81.

And the class that we will be dealing with today is a presidential address that he basically gave as a president of the Indian Sociological Society, we will have a look at it in a moment. So, just to look at the important works, his most important work is a book titled social background of Indian nationalism 1948, it was written at his early stage of his career and considered as the one of the most pioneering body of work or scholarship that that would lay down to the Marxist school Indian sociology itself. So, it is one of the rare, one of the earliest Marxist work on Indian sociology, Indian nationalism specifically. And he has also written on other books called Indian path of development, a Marxist approach, agrarian struggles in India after independence, a profile of Indian slum which was one of his later work and the changing profile of rural Indian human rights of the agrarian poor. So, we can see his, rose steadfastly adhered to this Marxist framework and basic material economic and the basic social aspect of Indian population that that remained his framework throughout his life.

So, in today's class we will be particularly discussing one of his most famous essay called, it is titled as the 'Relevance of the Marxist approach to the study of Indian society'. This essay was his presidential address delivered on the fifteenth all India sociological conference in 1981. So, as I said before he was a president of Indian sociological society in 1980 to 81 and on the conference of the ISS, Indian sociological society called as the all-India sociological conference, which holds annually, he gave this very important lecture which subsequently published as an article in sociological bulletin which is a journal of Indian sociological society. So, we will be particularly focusing on this particular lesson.

So, he starts his discussion by looking at the importance of the juncture in which he was delivering this particular essay which is on 1980s. So, what happens in 1980s globally and the national level? So, if you look at 1980s is also a period of great discontent towards the project of national building in India itself. So, as India attained independence in 1947, the initial decades was more or less decades of hope. He called it as decades of hope because there was a lot of hope on the newly independent young nation especially in terms of the path of development that is going to unleash in India, and which was morally within the framework of a planned economy. But what happens in the subsequent decades is that India remains to be largely an underdeveloped, a largely poor nation

despite having certain achievements in some fields of education, science and so on.

But India remains largely an underachieved nation to many people, to many commentators and by 1980s the disillusionment towards the national project be it in terms of political development, be it in terms of economic development, social development because all these aspects that has considered fundamental drawbacks to Indian society, be it caste, communalism and corruption, all those things persisted even after three, four decades of Indian independence. And you have to remember that 1981 was soon after the period of emergency which also considered as a great backlash to the most cherished Indian democracy. And the global scale, there was also a lot of changes happening. 1980s, the kind of world system that were formed after the two second world war specifically, the bipolar world in which one front was led by the capitalist idea led by the United States and the socialist block led by the USSR. And you know how the world was divided and how India took a middle path and so on.

But however there was a lot of changes happening in the global scale as well. The influence of socialism was wearing down, the collapse of USSR was looming large and a lot of third world countries who was equally and more or less influenced by both block, especially the Soviet block was also changing lot of crisis in its policy, its economical development outlook and so on. So, all these changes was happening and this is in this context that he specifically delivering this lecture and he says and asks this lot of global social transformation happening both at the global and national level. He was asking this fundamental question which we will see throughout this lecture that whether the conventional or the traditional existing sociological framework that both sociologists in India and elsewhere have been using whether such framework was successful in capturing this large dynamic fast transformation happening in the world society as well as the national society. So this is a fundamental question that you will see that he will deal with in the essay.

And specifically he was saying that you know one of the major changes that relevant to sociology as a discipline that is happening in Indian context is the massive growth of higher education in India in the form of large scale expansion of university and other specialized institution complex which he calls as a form of knowledge industry. So, India was one of the most important social changes from 1950 to 1980s and India was a massive expansion of education. Though a lot of people were not gaining literacy but if you consider the absolute numbers the kind of people who are coming into the knowledge economy, coming into literacy, coming into schools, colleges and also specifically in social science institutions was in thousands and in lakhs and I think that is a very important and for Desai that is a very important change, aspect that is particularly significant to sociology in India. And he says this institutional framework with the

growth of education, with the growth of social science institution network amounts to a shape of a gigantic knowledge factory which engage in large scale manufacture of knowledge products comprised of micro-surveys and macro-field reports. So he was talking about how the emergence of social science institutions leads to a variety of production of social science knowledge, you know publication of the various surveys, various macro-surveys or ethnographic field reports and he actually cites out several important works that is indicative of the growth of such production of knowledge, social science knowledge economy in the recent times, in his times in 1980s.

But then even though there was a growth of the knowledge economy within social science he find that something basically disturbing about the entire enterprise of knowledge. He says the production and dissemination in social science during that period, the quality of the object behind, the function performed and in reserve by the massive products turned out by social science knowledge industry exhibit very undesirable features and he says this is not just his opinion, he also quote that there has been such a discourse of this condense towards the kind of social science knowledge products that have been produced and he identify that several of the practitioners in the discipline have realized the need to examine the problems at a deeper level. So he says lot of social science or sociologists practitioners ask this fundamental critic and question whether the kind of materials and knowledge that have been produced in Indian social science, broadly social science institutional framework and particularly in the sociological paradigm whether they helps to grasp the real nature of the transformation that is being brought about the Indian society and he post this as the four most important question. So, he says that you know it is also felt necessary to examine whether the knowledge generated through the body of research, whether it helps to unravel objectively and precisely the impact of the transformation. So, whether the sociologists' sociological knowledge accurately captures the kind of the nature of the transformation that has been ongoing in Indian society and secondly whether the sociological knowledge accurately captures the implications of this transformation on various classes and various sections of Indian population.

So at both these levels both the sociology in India was successful despite the sudden or the gigantic growth of social science knowledge industry in India. So, this is the fundamental question that he poses, and he says that very many sociologists very important sociologists before him in the recent times in early late 1970s and early 80s has pointed out some major limitations of the knowledge generated in India especially in the field of social science and he kind of list out too many of them. So, I have put together some of the central limitations that people have identified with respect to social science knowledge in India. So, we will just briefly go through each of them. So, the first one is the theoretical models and conceptual frames of reference coveted up to now appear of

doubtful validity.

So the most important thing that the major theoretical framework and conceptual frames of references that has been used is now appear to have a doubtful validity whether these concepts, these framework accurately captures or helps to capture the realities of Indian social science, realities of Indian society. So there has been lot of questions on the accuracy and the utility of the framework that has been used and secondly several methods of research to comprehend social reality of India found inappropriate and doubtful value to unravel the truth and the transformation which is a part of continuation of the first criticism whether these social science framework helps to understand you know whether these are appropriate to understand the Indian reality and the transformation of Indian society and why because sociological teaching and research cast in colonial mode even after independence you know how sociology as a discipline has a very tends to problematic origin right through colonialism in India and we will deal particularly on a separate session on decolonial framework in sociology which actually cast important questions about colonial underpinnings of sociology as a discipline. We will deal with in later classes but that kind of questions has already been posed whether sociological I mean because of the social colonial over or colonial continued use of colonial framework in sociological teaching and research you know the problem of inaccurate understanding of Indian society or the failure to understand the social transformation in India continues to happen you know that has been important criticism and they also pointed out to the lack of awareness of Indian sociological tradition. This is a very important question that you will keep confronting as you study sociology in India that whether there has been a true whether there is a genuine can we look at can we have a very genuine Indian form of sociological tradition and the critic says that Indian sociologists until 1980s you know you have to remember that all this kind of writings was happening in 1980s so you have to think of that particular time period so whether the sociological writings or sociological knowledge until 1980s whether they were successful in carving out a truly Indian sociological tradition or they were merely imitating the western tradition so that is another important question that has been posed as a limitation right and there is also a related criticism that sociology in India was torn from Indology and history right it has it is the it is yeah so sociology was torn away from Indology and history so sociology has been forcefully moved away from discipline of Indology and history it has not been historically contextualized sufficiently it has not used Indological insights that pertaining to Indian society it failed to build its own sociological traditions so and what happens as a result is that our sociology does not address itself to the living concerns of to do and tomorrow and it is not identifying critical problems pose right questions and devise appropriate procedures of investigation so this seems a very serious problem here it not only fails to have adequate appropriate framework or theories to understand Indian society it fails to ask the right questions fails

to have right appropriate methodology and therefore fails to find any important policy or framework or important suggestions to address basic social problems in Indian society so this is a very serious there is a serious consensus among several of the practitioners Desai says that the sociology in India is an acute crisis fundamental crisis both in terms of its method both in terms of the questions that is asked both in also in terms of the framework theoretical framework that adopts all of those continue to be insufficient inappropriate inadequate to understand the transformation in Indian society and also the implications of this transformation particular classes sections and sections of Indian population so then Desai comes back to this question so having summarized the important limitations of sociology which has been raised by sociologists even before him he come back to the question that what have led to such a state of affairs in sociology right, that you have to ask a very fundamental question why Indian sociology is in crisis and he concludes that it was the framing of the very approaches for teaching and research in sociology that has that contributed to the production of knowledge products described earlier which is very insufficient to understand sociology. So for Desai, it is the problem lies in the very approaches that has been adopted for teaching and researching in sociology in India and he says what is the problem with such approaches he says the Indian sociology were rooted in the dominant style of sociology which is being overwhelmingly pursued in India based on specific paradigms that were dominant in the US and Europe so he says the sociological framework approaches were rather mere limitations or imitations of the sociological paradigms that were popular in US and Europe what were they they were primarily the conservative and liberal paradigm system matters by people like Talcott Pearson and Robert Merson in the USA and parallel crystallized by scholars like Radcliffe Brown and others in anthropology in the UK so you know that people like M.N. Srinivas who popularized sociology was trained in in the British social anthropology tradition greatly influenced by Radcliffe Brown and and you will see the later criticism that how such as sociological trans knowledge transition from UK to India was mired with lot of colonial assumptions and lot of problems that fails to unearth some fundamental sociological characters of Indian society so you will deal with those critics of sociology in India in the later classes particularly in the decolonial critic so but Desai kind of you know kind of presuppose that or kind of make the same criticism much earlier in 1980s itself. So for Desai since the dominant sociological paradigms in India was highly influenced by the sociological traditions in the West primarily in the US and the UK which were largely liberal and conservatives as a result sociological traditions in India has completely disregarded the Marxist approach to understand society because all that major pioneers including G.S. Ghurye, M.N. Srinivas and all those institutional builders in India in Indian sociology was primarily non-Marxist and not only they were non-Marxist they also adopted an attitude where the potential of Marxist approach to understand the Indian reality was never fully realized so that has been and he says that potential to use Marxist approach has been bypassed underrated

and sometime and most often been dismissed prima facie by castigating it as a dogmatic value-based and therefore lacking objectivity and neutrality so you know this very often criticism against Marxism as economic determinism so Desai says and such criticism has been used without having exploring the strength of the Marxist sociological framework and he says this is the fundamental problem that looms Indian sociology he says the bypassing of Marxist approach took the Indian sociologist further away from relevant sociological enquiries on very crucial issues with Indian society was experiencing namely the question of immense poverty, growing inequality and other aspects of his backwardness. So Desai says that why do despite all the social transformation why do some basic social material social problems continue to persist in India such as poverty gender and caste inequality and other forms of regional linguistic backwardness and he says all this non-Marxist sociological traditions which are dominant in India failed to understand this question because they did not consider using Marxist framework and Marxism as it is being focused on this fundamental question will be very important to understand to address the limitations of Indian sociological traditions so we will go how Desai kind of having posed his criticism having said how the existing sociological traditions having failed now he will foreground the relevance of the Marxist approach in understanding Indian society so firstly on the first relevance or the most important relevance of Marxist approach Desai sighs argues that Marxist approach has the potential to ask the right questions most important questions with regard to Indian society as existing and transforming so if you do not ask the right questions you won't get the right answers right so for Desai for Marxism helps to ask the most fundamental questions so that and he says and once you ask the most relevant questions it enables the researchers to conduct research in the right direction enable one to formulate adequate hypothesis assist one to evolve proper concept adopt and combine appropriate techniques and can help you to locate the central tendencies of transformation with its major implications so you will see that by mean by by thinking of right question Desai indicates that social in India has to ask the questions about the fundamental social problems which is related to the material lives of Indian people such as problems of discrimination problems of inequality problems of poverty and backwardness right if you ask such fundamental questions you will get fundamental answers right answers so that is the first relevance of Marxist approach according to Desai it helps the sociologists to ask the right kind of questions yeah secondly if you ask the right kind of questions what happens that Marxist sociology will direct you to focus on the most basic and primary and he says almost life-giving activity is very important term life-giving activity carried on by human being such as the production through instruments of production to extract the fabricate products from the nature so essential for the survival and persistence of human species. So for Desai what is fundamental to human society is the production reproduction to their own life right and and if you have to understand any problem of society be the question of religion be the question of family be the question of castes you need to ask certain

questions about how that society has been basically organized and at the core of the social organization for any society according to Desai is a question of production right and how do production and subsistence how do that society substance how do the society finds its substance and how do it reproduce itself what kind of social relations have been formed in in in terms of its organization of production so if you ask that questions that will give the sufficient background to understand the social problems in that society so for him Marxist approach will direct you to ask questions about what what actually sustains human life right and he says Marx himself has formulated the basic significance of this activity in the following words he quote very important quote from Marx that men can, so how do we and the very famous quote by Marx says 'how do how do man and he mean man, human being distinguish other animals it is through the arena produced right so he says man human being them themselves begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce the means of substance so this is the fundamental problem so sociology Marxist sociology will redirect your questions to questions of subsistence and production by extension and the third important aspect which is also part of the relevance is that as a result as you ask questions on subsistence. This is a fundamental problem, so the Marxist sociology, will redirect your questions to the questions of subsistence and production by exemption and the third important which is also part of relevance, is as a result as you ask questions on subsistence and production, it will redirect the questions on what he terms as a property relations right. So how so basically you know this Marxist classification of social relations in each epoch human beings or society has been classified into different classes the bourgeoisie and the proletariat the feudal Lords and the serfs and so on there are a lot of intermediary class as well and how do their class position is been determined how their status how their position in each class is determined it depends on what you do it's not what you think right so if in the Marxist approach if I make my subsistence by selling my labor power I am a worker I am a laborer or in Marxist terms I am a proletariat right so such understanding of social organization is very important for thus to understand the social problems and he says that sociological Marxist sociological view will foreground or bring the questions of property relation who owns and who doesn't own and how do those people who owns property make a profit out of it and how do they exploit those people who doesn't own anything but can only live by selling their labor power and make subsistence so how do different classes find the subsistence and how do we understand the sociological problems and transformation happening in India in the broader context of this relations of property or property relations so this is another important contribution for central tenant of Marxist sociology and he says Marxist approach considered property relations are crucial because they shape the purpose nature control direction and objectives underlying the production right so production social production of subsistence is very is a fundamental tenant of Marxist sociology if you study any social problem if you are approaching if you are adopting a Marxist

framework you have to look at the forms the social organization of production to understand any any social problems be religion be caste be gender, be it popular culture be it education so if you are looking any sociological aspect you need to have a focus a fundamental focus on on property relations and social organizations of production that's what Desai suggests, yeah so for Desai if you if you adopt a Marxist approach we will understand the type of proper relations existed and then you will understand the character of the state right once you understand what kind of social relations has been formulated as a result of the property relations you will understand the character of the state and what kind of social transformation that the Indian state aims to achieve what kind of policies what kind of legal normative notions it adopts what kind of policies it formulated for the transformation of Indian society so you will understand the class character of the state and you will understand the class character of the state only if you adopt a Marxist approach and have an understanding of the property relations so this is a major point for him. Yeah now Desai turns attention to the question that a problem that there is a deep prejudiced latitudes among scholars primarily non-Marxist scholars to Marxist approach and he is one of the most common charges against Marxist approach the most common prejudice against Marxist approach is that Marxism is a form of naive economic determinism right so according to that Marxist will only look at economic relation and then derive their understanding of political and social aspect of a society based on on this economic understanding and and Desai says that is not right even Marx himself even in his preliminary formulations even his early writings he he never tried to reduce everything to economic terms on the other hand for Marx studying economic aspect the questions of basic activities namely that of activity of producing things for human survival is a very necessary condition to understand any social problem not a sufficient condition right so according to the Marxist so for Desai Marxist schema is not a form of economic determinism rather to look at basic economic activities is a is a necessary condition to understand social problem not a sufficient condition so you cannot you cannot understand social problem without looking at economic problem but nevertheless you can also understand social problem by only looking at economic problem so that is the major and difference or major defense against the problem of economic determinism that Desai makes and he says that Marx instead of being trying to derive everything from economic activity he was rather attempt to uncover the interrelationship between this basic basic activity so he was trying to understand Marx was basically trying to understand the relation between economic activity which is activities of production and non-economic activity all other forms of social organization right how does it how do there's a relation so he never assume a very causal derivative relationship instead he tries to understand that very independently sometimes sometimes very relatively depends on the context and but he says if one needs to understand the social problem one need to look at the problem in in the in the broader context of of totality of social relations both economic and non-economic social relations you cannot

understand them as isolated as independent from each other that's what Marx says so for Desai property relations which shape the vital activity needed for very survival persistence and development of human species should be viewed as an axial for understanding any society and the changes takes place within it so this is an axial of understanding it so you need to have that understanding to understand any other forms of social changes it is not sufficient why it is not a derivative or deterministic relation from economic and non-economic and he says and Marx also suggests that any sub-formations within society need to be understand in a broader historical context as well you know on the historical level of means of production and the nature of property relations so both the historical evolution of the means of production and the nature of property relations is a is a very important framework for Marxism and any social problems need to be contextualize within this. So, this is a basic defense or basic point that Desai makes against the charge of Marxism as being equated to naive economic determinism. So next he makes a very important point I think this is one of the fundamental aspect of the Marxist approach that Desai outlines he says unlike any other framework or approaches within social sciences or sociology Marxist approach does not see sociology as a discipline as a very autonomous discipline it never sees and it because as we know the various discipline sociologies or anthropology, history, political science sociology deals with different aspect of society right but how does the society operate society never operates in a very differentiated manner you know and the for example the question of state that political science traditionally is preoccupied with or or the question of civil society or social you know broad society that sociology is occupied with or the question of economic activities which economics is occupied with all of them does not operate in a very isolated manner right you know how enmeshed the state in Indian societies it can or how how how closely linked our our social aspect social relations familiar relations and economic activities are so so for following this greater intermingling or or this non-existence of boundaries between social and economical and political so following that Marxist approach also tries to see social science in a very comprehensive view it does not seems to make this bifurcation within disciplinary subjects in a very demarcated thick manner but on the other hand it always has a tendency to blur them to see to to blur the distinctions between various disciplines in sociology and and it also does not study various aspect of social specific social formation tone of the social conduct so you cannot as I was repeating and this is a very central aspect of the Marxist sociology you cannot understand a social problem in an isolated way from the total context in which it operate right if you have to understand the problem of divorce in Indian society or a particular society, you have to understand how does the the the profit relation, the social relations, the forms of hierarchy, social organization in that society; only then you will understand a very specific problem as a problem of divorce or problem of child marriage for example how will you understand you know or child labor or or problem of any other problem problem of communalism for instance in the Marxist approach you will never

understand how do communal feelings or mobilizations or growth in a particular context without understanding the social organization of that particular context. So, you will never see that as isolated from the total context. So, he says further in the Marxist approach history is a shank of all well-conducted studies of man and society. Shank is something that binds together it is the central part so history has a very central role in the Marxist understanding or Marxist approach so therefore with this centrality of history a Marxist approach to society which is Marxist sociology will never see any society as a very isolated natural non-dynamic object rather Marxism will see any society as something continuously on the move because it will see it has been historically changing right. So, he says the Marxist approach also demands a specific society let's say Indian society for instance should be studied as a historically changing system, comprised of contradictory forces some of which sustain and others which change that society. So very important right so if you are approaching a Marxist approach to Indian society you will not see Indian society as something that came to being only with the emergence of Indian independence you will see to understand Indian society you will have to have a very long term view how society in India emerged over the years right you look at how the productive relations have been emerged how different classes have been emerged, how different political forces have been emerged in the society right from let's say a very prehistoric times and how there has been a movement of of people movement of ideas movement of productive relations movement of technologies over the years and then you will understand the present society has part of a long chain of development dynamics and you will understand there are different forces at play a society is not something carries of a different carries similar kinds of people right it has different forces and some forces will be at conflict some will be at cooperation right so it has different people and there are different forces some are contradictory some are conflicting some are cooperating and some forces or the conflict between some forces will change the society. So, the society as you can see today will not be the same society as you see 10 years down the line how because the social forces comes into conflict, comes into contact and change some fundamentals part of the society so you will always see society as movement within history and this is a very important insight within the Marxist sociology. Yeah so, any Marxist approach to sociology will then endeavors to locate within specific society the forces which preserves and forces which prompt it to change. So he says there there will be two kinds of forces broadly one that kind to reproduce the same kind of society it does not want the social organization in a particular moment to change for example like take caste for instance, so the social force in India which does not want the caste system to change it needs that hierarchical social organizations and then there are other social forces in India which actually seeks to transform caste as a system right it needs to annihilate caste it need to change caste. So, there are different forces pertaining to change and continuity right. So, you need so as Marxist you need to identify such different social forces on any specific aspect of society and and and and

then only then you will understand how the society is changing. So, so Marxism the central focus of Marxist sociology will be the change in any given society. Yeah so now let us summarize today's discussion so basically we have started with a brief discussion of A.R. Desai's ideas about limitations of sociological knowledge systems knowledge production in India and he laid out several limitations of sociology in India that has been identified by people before him and then he kind of argues that such limitations continues to happen in Indian sociology because the sociology in India has been dominated by certain non-Marxist paradigms such as the the structural functionalism and other conservative and liberal tradition between within UK and US and how such non-Marxist school has come continually dismissed the Marxist insights of sociology and he says how foregrounding a Marxist understanding of society kind of address some of the fundamental problems some of the limitations of Indian sociology and for him to advance to Marxist approach in sociology is nothing but give a central importance to property structure property relations in any society right, it provides historical location or specification of social phenomena, so if you have a Marxist approach you will you will not see anything in abstract but you will be able to locate any any social problem any social phenomena in a very specific historical and social location right; and then he says you know Marxist approach then you will provide a matrix of concrete studies and concept to understand a particular phenomenon in a specific type of society right and and most importantly Marxist sociology or Marxist approach to Indian society will will helps you to locate the different social forces at play both that has that works for historical continuity and that works against historical continuity and seek social changes transition and and eventually lead to transition from one socio-economic formation to another and in that way it will help to accurately capture the social transformation happening in the Indian society and he says a very important point to summarize that you know by and large modern sociology in India has completely ignored property relations you know some a central point or central object of Marxist sociology he says the modern non-Marxist sociology has completely obliterated to the extent that it prides in appearing as a science of non-property aspect of social life. So so there is this clearly distinction that let economics study all the property relations all the fund all the aspect of the fundamental social organizations of human life economic activity and sociology be a complete a discipline that has been completely devoted to study non-economic aspect and he questioned this fundamental bifurcation and he then seeks to bring back the focus of of basic economic and social activities basic aspect of property relation to the core to the focus or to the center of Indian sociology and and and this is his fundamental tenant fundamental argument of of of his of his envisioning of a Marxist sociology for Indian society. So, I hope you got at least an outline and an idea of the central principle of what constitute a Marxist sociological approaches. So even though A.R. Desai was one of the pioneering pioneering Marxist sociologists later on recent time there has been a plethora of sociologists who has been produced within a Marxist framework and and and and as

you know the kind of in in soon after he was writing in 1980s and later 19 in late 1980s you must be familiar with the movement within Indian social science the emergence of subaltern studies though it is in a it it happens largely as a historical scholarship it has it has contributed some of the fundamental fundamental insights about Indian society from abroad Marxist school at least in the initial period and later you have people like Vivek Chibber a more serious a more committed someone who has been more affiliated with a very traditional Marxist view whose contributed very important insights about Indian society from a Marxist point of view, so I think we will sum up today's class. Thank you.