

# Review Essay

## Emerging India and Swaraj

by Tamer Söyler

**Anand Kumar**

*Understanding Globalisation and Emerging India*

**New Delhi: Palm Leaf Publications, 2011. xi + 277 pp.**

In *Understanding Globalisation and Emerging India* (hereafter referred to as UGEI), a collection of texts from different genres which most have appeared previously, the sociologist Anand Kumar of the Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India (hereafter referred to as JNU) argues that India is a scene of an interplay of both modernization and struggles against globalization. On the one hand, UGEI acknowledges the empirical reality of emerging India and positive sides of India's integration to global economy. However, UGEI also observes increasing levels of inequality in Indian society as a result of overwhelming processes of globalization. According to UGEI, it could still be considered as an intelligible effort if one tries to understand inequality along classical sociological categories of class, caste, religion and gender. However, the emphasis now has to be on relative deprivations in order to understand the current configurations in Indian society. While the economy of one of the most important countries of the Global South is rapidly being globalized, this is how one can grasp social transformations taking place in Indian society. Even if the case studies of UGEI mainly relate to India, the book is not just about that country. As the title of the book suggests, the book is primarily about understanding globalization from a world-systems perspective. And emerging India's integration to global economy, social consequences of the globalization processes and a Gandhian interpretation of alteration of Indian life-worlds are the complementary parts of the book.

To give readers a snapshot of the book, it consists of a preface, an introduction and twenty two chapters. The chapters are organized in three separate parts: "Understanding Globalisation and its Challenges", "Globalisation and India" and "Globalisation and Gandhi". Before moving on to the specific points regarding the content of the book, a few words should be added about the editorial choice of clustering chapters of different nature under three parts. Although dividing the book into three sections makes an editorial sense, the separation is so generic that the criteria of clustering is not immediately evident to readers. The titles do not reveal much about the contents of the book and cut readers off without immediate insight of what will be offered in the coming chapters. This is quite predictable for books of this kind. As the author indicates in his acknowledgements, the book is a result of an effort to put together his work of last several years in one place. In other words, this is more of an anthology than being a book of its own. There is no doubt that there is a need for anthologies in scholarly literature. Scholars are expected to put their writings together periodically. This practice has multiple benefits: scholars can have analytical overviews of their work which in return can inspire them in determining the future direction for their intellectual pursuits; new generation of scholars can learn from experiences of earlier generations and intellectual traditions can be constructed so that individual works of scholars can be placed in their respective traditions and so on. From this point of view, well-edited collections with good indexes for easy browsing are always a service for researchers who are interested in similar fields of research.

According to the conventional taste of academic writing, benefits of putting an anthology together is higher if either the author or the editor (or, a third person) puts an extra effort in reviewing the material compiled. The result of such a review which ideally reinvents and re-constructs retrospectively the main line

of arguments which are implicitly dominant in one's work, can result in a long essay outlining the issues related to research. A good example of this approach is Clifford Geertz's *The Interpretation of Cultures* (1973). After Geertz was urged by his editor to write an analytical introduction, he came up with his extremely influential conceptualization which is now known as "Thick Description". As we see in the case of Geertz, his analytical introduction did not only make the reading experience of his collected essays a lot easier, it also forced readers putting an extra effort to associate Geertz' empirical findings with his meta-level analysis. Thick Description stimulates readers' social scientific imagination. Because of one or the other reason, this has not been the approach of UGEI. All these points are raised to explain why it is difficult for the reviewer and readers to arrive at a conclusion whether or not the texts of UGEI add up to anything like a personal standpoint or an approach of the author. This, of course, creates a dilemma for the reviewer. He or she is stuck between deciding in favor of applying an interpretative framework which is explicitly not put forward either by the author or the editor and writing a classic review which serves the purpose of marketing than critical thinking. As this issue deserves some attention and elaboration, a word or two needs to be said.

As Wittgenstein tells us in his *Philosophical Investigations* (1953), there are sometimes good reasons for scholars (or, for editors) not to force their ideas (or, urging the scholars to force their ideas) to a direction against their "natural inclination" (Wittgenstein, 1953, Preface, para. 2). Doing the opposite, scholars would risk their thoughts to be "soon crippled" (Wittgenstein, 1953, Preface, para.2). Therefore, scholars have to decide whether or not sometimes to present their thoughts as an album of ideas (Wittgenstein, 1953, Preface, para. 3). Because Wittgenstein concluded that his thoughts "should [have] proceed[ed] from one subject to another in a natural order without breaks" he decided not to publish his notes (Wittgenstein, 1953, Preface, para. 1). Luckily, Wittgenstein's notes were published posthumously so that we have access to one of the most important books of the twentieth century. It is a fact that *Philosophical Investigations* is not as structured as *Tractatus* (1922). However, this perhaps could be considered as a small price to pay for a reader who cannot stand reading a text without a clear structure, whatever it may mean. After all, the most sophisticated structural constructs are simply useless without convincing contents, if possible, a set of novel ideas. If one should explain this with an analogy (again, excuse the philosophical bad habit which terrifies a structural midset), this is similar to talking in a dozen of languages but stating the same uninteresting idea in different words. Therefore, according to the line of thought put forward here, it should be the content, not the form, possesses the highest value in evaluations.<sup>1</sup> Despite the fact that to be recognized by the public and the communities of intellectuals, even the most ingenious ideas needs to clothe themselves with conventional forms, novelty usually do not need such dressing. To state the obvious, unfortunately, despite the fact that one does not necessarily need genuineness to accomplish this, it is being claimed that there is no abundance of ingenious minds in today's academia to overthrow such conventional forms of expressions. Under strong pressure of economic liberalization, this lack of oppositional minds results in universities of today being transformed into businesses (and sometimes, literally businesses) which hold productivity and efficiency as core criteria for success. Having found themselves in an academic rat race, scholars are forced to follow readymade methodologies and forms which promise efficiency and success. Reading scholarly works, then, most of the times, do not appear to be a better experience than, for example, watching different Hollywood B-movies with the same boring story line. All these points do not come down to meaning three things. First, one should not start thinking that because the practice of following readymade formats is killing creativeness, anything goes. There is of course a spectrum of alternatives between mindless doodling and producing replicas of intellectual leaders. Second, this is not to say that Wittgenstein, Geertz or any other, perhaps even Plato, were in favor of the idea that one should refrain from analytically making sense of his or her ideas. On the contrary, that is why, although he was skeptical at the beginning, Geertz appreciated in the end that he was urged by his editor to write an introduction to the anthology of his writings. And because Wittgenstein believed in the ideal to express his thoughts in a "natural order and without brakes", he decided that he would not be able to publish his work in his lifetime. Third, this does not mean that Wittgenstein and Geertz were of the opinion that unless one provides a rigid structure, one should better not state any opinion. As Geertz perfectly coins, he was against the approach of "pretenders to high science

<sup>1</sup>Because of the same reason, while writing this review, in order to avoid falling into an obvious hypocrisy, I consciously stayed away from what I call "the business of proof-reading".

and high technique" (Geertz, 1973, p.v) which did not really fit to the requirements of what Wittgenstein called the "the very nature of the investigation" (Wittgenstein, 1953, Preface, para. 1). The apparent but often ignored antagonism between positivistic social science frameworks and phenomenological sensitivities of qualitative work needs to be taken into account as a fundamental point.

Although all these remarks seem to be irrelevant at best and contradictory at worst at the first sight, T. K. Oommen, to whom Anand Kumar dedicates a chapter (Chapter 9), explains crystal clear why this is not the case. According to Oommen, there is no doubt that a social scientist is required to aim for establishing "fully-fledged" theories and founding a new "school of thought" (pp. 113,114). However, Oommen acknowledges, this is obviously not always possible. Those who were mistaken and thought that they could always manage producing "authentic" work, unfortunately, have most of the times produced chauvinist products in the name of authenticity. Remaining in the same line of argument, Oommen explains that although Indian social scientists have not managed well in asserting their names in social science circles (with, of course, a good number of exceptions), they have successfully set the background for researchers from all around the world by capturing and registering the complex empirical realities of their society (pp. 113,114). This situation, of course, has created a landscape of hegemonic international intellectual division of labor. While the Western institutions and scholars were supposed to be the minds behind serious intellectual production, non-Western institutions and scholars' duty was no more than gathering empirical data for their analysis. If such a division has ever existed, it is not accepted by the intellectuals of the Global South anymore (Söyler, 2012b). From these statements it may validly be deduced that, although it is interesting to create a meta-level logical universe, or to push an idea to a conclusion, there is sufficient evidence to believe that science does not progress unidimensionally. Contributions come in different forms and shapes from all directions and contribute to the present configurations of our understanding of the world around us in a kaleidoscopic manner (Rehbein, 2010). To put it bluntly, one cannot convincingly argue that there exist ultimate criteria for deciding on the level of one's contribution to social science literature. Contributing to social sciences today can take at least three forms. First, the scholars from the Global South can generate enough "noise" to deconstruct earlier narratives (Sitas, 2012). One must take into account that there is a recent tendency in Western social science circles which dismisses the practice of attentive deconstruction efforts from the Global South in the name of "de-provincializing" Western social sciences (Söyler, 2012b). Intellectuals of the Global South must respond to this tendency. Second, scholars from different parts of the world must contribute to the overall process of generating alternative narratives. As it is already mentioned, one has to go beyond indigenous knowledge perspectives and offer an alternative but analytical logic which is intelligible to the scholars from different parts of the globe (Sitas, 2012). And finally, there must be an intellectual dialogue (not a monologue where the docile one listens and follows the dominant one) which is critical in character and takes place between equal partners (Sitas, 2012). Against this background, as T. K. Oommen writes in the preface of UGEI, all the questions the book poses may not be new. But it successfully deconstructs some of the questions and puts forward the idea that "the answers to some of the old questions have changed" (p. xii). Even though it does not answer new questions to everybody's satisfaction, UGEI poses a set of new questions and contributes to the process of narration making in social sciences and humanities. And finally, UGEI gets involved in a critical dialogue as an equal partner and stimulates our intellect. We may now return to the guiding thread on which the previous two paragraphs were formed.

It is said that those who are interested in philosophy, and more specifically Western philosophy, are either Platonic or Aristotelian in the way that they see and understand the world around themselves. Even if for one second one takes this claim serious, one will immediately realize that there are no possible ways to test this hypothesis. However, in relation to this essay, there is a point in this observation. Even those who are distanced to philosophy know that compared to other philosophers of his rank, Plato had a more humorous and less systematic way of arguing. Reading Plato one never gets a fully structured line of thought which is worked out so fine that one would need no further exploration. In a way, readers are invited into the text, and are being provoked to complete the job Plato has left unfinished. As none of these thinkers needs introduction, I will content myself with stating that Aristotle's approach was quite the opposite. I would now like to put forward a set of questions which follow perfectly from the points I have been making so far: If the design of the argumentation of the scholar is, in the end, a matter of choice as to what he or she

wishes to achieve, why would anyone bother about structuring his or her arguments? While, at its extreme, one could argue that the attitude of presenting an album of ideas instead of sketching a rigorous structure could be interpreted as a postcolonial attitude, why would a reviewer still bother applying an externally constructed structure in his or her review of a postcolonial scholar?<sup>2</sup>

Does disciplining one's ideas not prove already the other's internalization of the hegemony of objectivist ways of doing social science? Remaining within the context of UGEI, one can argue that there are at least three reasons to justify the attitude of applying a framework to a body of unorganized ideas: First, the author himself clearly states that one should not turn to the conformism of "conspiracy" and "hegemony thinking" (p. 6). As Sitas emphasizes in a similar vein, the alternative models of the Global South should be analytically structured (Sitas, 2012). Without such an "intellectual apparatus" (p. 5), postcolonial efforts will end up turning the gaze without elevating our postcolonial consciousness (Rehbein, 2012). Second, the author encourages the readers to interpret his work by dedicating the book to his "creative" students along with his teachers and colleagues. Although the reviewer does not even come close to considering himself creative, as a matter of fact, he happened to be a student of the author for some period of time, therefore, he responded to the call and took the liberty of undertaking this job. Third, by interpreting UGEI, the reviewer tries to make the book intelligible to himself which in return helps the reviewer indirectly communicating his ideas to those who have similar ways of being-in-the-world and therefore, share a similar type of understanding. Such a subjective bias is intentional as the reviewer regards the obsession with self-proclaimed objectivity as one of the problems of modern social sciences. This review, then, by drawing on the reviewer's interpretation of the author's being-in-the-world and his understanding of the world around himself, tries to sketch a rather subjective interpretation of the book. It risks being perceived as a rather eccentric piece of writing but in the meanwhile it does promise readers to deliver two different but overlapping views: an interpretative framework for those who would like to approach the book in a more guided way and a brief summary for those who would prefer to approach to the book without a prior conceptual understanding. These preliminary remarks have brought us right to the heart of the subject, without, however, dealing with the central issues occupy the book. The rest of the review is dedicated to outlining the chapters which are covered in UGEI listing the shortcomings and the contributions of the book.

Simply put, the topics UGEI deals are as follows: globalization in general, globalization understood from the world-system perspective, globalization in the Indian context and Gandhian way of understanding globalization. According to the main arguments of UGEI, there are multiple threads in globalization discourses and as media's depiction of globalization is usually followed by scholars who apparently spent most of their times following the headlines (and planning their future work accordingly), the dominating view of globalization, regrettably, is marked by perspectives from world economy and international relations. As a sociologist, the author sees a serious problem in the domination of economic perspectives in understanding globalization simply because it ignores the socio-cultural and political aspects of the related processes to a great extent. Drawing on world-systems analysis, UGEI sheds some light on macro-scale patterns in world

<sup>2</sup>I agree with Dr. Gernot Saalmann (Albert-Ludwigs-Universitaet Freiburg) - who kindly read the first draft of this paper - that contrasting "album of ideas" with "rigorous structures" is just too strong (Saalmann, 2012). However, I would like to take readers' attention to the point that, may that really be the case, because of the fact that the womb has not become sterile which gave birth to hegemonic social science practices, such an exaggeration, one must observe, is intentional. Although I agree that one cannot find social scientists today who proclaim being as objectivist -or, hegemonic- as I caricatured in this review, as Fanon would have argued, this is not because they have internalized, or even understood, so-called subjectivist -and to put it more accurately, anti-hegemonic- critiques of positivist social science models. I think, for an attentive eye, there is convincing evidence out there that as the spirit of the times is favoring more and more contingency factors in social-scientific investigations of social life, seemingly, objectivists are forced to withdraw from the social science field, for now. Let me be intentionally provocative here by ignoring the conventions of academic diplomacy: those who have committed the crime of epistemic violence, do know that their "legitimate" ways of looking at non-Western societies (e.g. modernization, primordialism) are rendered unacceptable in today's world. Therefore, they would never dare today to state their biases loud and clear enough so that they could be confronted. Because they do not openly speak their minds, I claim, an ordinary academic work veils much more than it unveils. Trying to find what is hidden under the discursive strategies of the author, the reader hopelessly tries to find a gap so that she or he can put forward a critique. It should be clear to readers that we are talking here in favor of witch-hunting or sheer relativism. On the contrary, as Saalmann emphasizes, because there is (and there can be) no objectivity as such in investigation of social worlds, social scientists are urged to structure their arguments as clearly as possible to escape from falling into an arbitrary subjective interpretation of the world (Saalmann, 2012). From this point of view, I think, my arguing in favor of clear threads in argumentation does not necessarily contradict postcolonial position and deserves to be labeled as Western-centric.

history and puts a special emphasis on international division of labor. UGEI argues that after the rise of the Global South, core countries in the previous configuration of the modern world-system are today losing their hegemonic advantage. The recent financial, or to put it more accurately, the systemic crisis has proven that the US is losing the privileged position it occupied in the modern world-system. UGEI's case studies tackle issues which are primarily related to India and serve the purpose to substantiate the idea of an emergence of a new world-system configuration. UGEI deconstructs the term 'emerging' and poses the question of what emerging could entail for India. To respond to this question, UGEI dedicates the third section of the book with five chapters to Gandhi's critique of modernity and his understanding of what it means to be emerging. UGEI reaches an all-encompassing conclusion that while the modern world-system is being transformed, democratizing globalization should be the primary goal of social scientists and public intellectuals. To walk towards this goal, UGEI argues, Gandhi's critique of modernity and his conception of *swaraj* is a matter of the utmost importance. UGEI draws implicitly or explicitly on Western and non-Western thinkers such as Martin Heidegger (1927) and Amartya Sen (1999) and argues from an existential analytical point of view that *swaraj* is about being-in-the-world and the autonomy or the authenticity of being is determined by the capabilities of the social actors (Söyler, 2010a). Speaking in terms of Sen's capability approach, according to UGEI's main line of thought, if capabilities are not realized and transformed into functionings, one's authenticity will be disturbed (Sen, 1999; Söyler 2012a, 2012b). From this point of view, UGEI discusses, the narrative of emerging India conceals more than it unveils. That will be instructive to note in passing here that UGEI does not arrive at its conclusions merely from meta-level philosophical thinking. UGEI draws on the author's lifelong experience of social activism (Kumar, 2010; Söyler, 2010b).

Against the background of the aforementioned four pillars, the outline of the book could be understood as follows: in Part I, UGEI sets the background for a socio-cultural and political understanding of globalization. In Part II, with rich examples from the Indian context, it investigates the phenomenon of emerging India. According to UGEI, in the heart of the problem lies the fact that India is moving away from state initiated developmental planning and policy oriented social and economic management. UGEI argues that for long it has been put forward as a self-evident phenomenon that liberalization and privatization will cure all the problems of emerging India. This is disturbing the freedoms of the Indian people in the Amartya Sen sense of the word. In Part III, UGEI substantiates its arguments in reference to Gandhi's critique of modernity. In addition to this, the readers who went beyond selective readings of postcolonial studies literature will also realize that UGEI deals with most of the topics which have been occupying the minds of postcolonial thinkers for decades. To generalize and embed subtopics in broader themes, one can discuss that the topics covered in the book comprise the postcolonial debates of global capitalism (e. g. Chapters 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16); imperialism, colonialism, hegemony (e.g. Chapters 1, 2, 3, 22); universality, singularity and particularity (e.g. Chapters 4, 7); nationalism (e.g. Chapters 5, 15); hybridization, heterogenization, homogenization (e.g. Chapter 4); ethnicity, indigeneity, identity, representation (e.g. Chapters 6, 14); feminism and gender equality (e.g. Chapter 15); history (e.g. Chapters 1, 7, 11). Although not always references are put, UGEI gets into a dialogue with Homi Bhabha, Partha Chatterjee and Aijaz Ahmad (e.g. nationalism), Frantz Fanon (e.g. imperialism, colonialism, hegemony), Dipesh Chakrabarty and Edward Said (e.g. history), Kwame Anthony Appiah and Gyan Prakash (e.g. ethnicity, indigeneity, identity, representation). As it was already mentioned above in reference to Ari Sitas, Boike Rehbein, I. Wallerstein and T.K. Oommen, one overall message the readers can extract from UGEI is that it is an urgent duty for the new generation of social scientists to transcend the Western-centric structures of social science knowledge which the world has inherited from the nineteenth century. To summarize by paraphrasing one of names from the new generation of postcolonial scholars, Nikita Dhawan (2012), one should not excuse or accuse Western-centric sources of social sciences. One should rather abuse it, so that we can elevate our level of understanding by critical engagement. According to the reviewer's selective interpretation, this is one of the most significant messages of the book.

The book has a set of shortcomings which could be categorized in five sections. First, despite the fact that UGEI draws on the world-systems approach quite often, it does not provide an overview of the book's understanding of this school of thought. Had the book not already given repetitive introductions for other key concepts (e.g. globalization), one could have regarded this as an editorial preference. Although the

chapter dedicated to Anand Kumar's interview with Wallerstein (Chapter 8) serves the purpose of setting the theoretical background for world-systems approach, one can argue that this chapter is dislocated for a conventional taste of a reader. (the same could be argued for other chapters, such as Chapter 3, which could have made more sense in Part III, rather than Part I). Editorial preferences such as this one forces readers to compartmentalize the ideas they extract in the course of their reading. That is why, in order to make sense of ideas expressed in multiple chapters, readers' active participation into the text is required. To make the best out of the book, readers will need to construct an overarching framework retrospectively. Second, the book suffers from simple editorial flaws. These comprise spelling, citation, format or punctuation mistakes (e.g. pp. 6, 8, 10, 13, 23, 24, 25, 26, 51, 100, 136, 138, 160, 151, 196, 201, 225, 226, 228, 230, 237, 238, 239, 240, 242, 248, 255, 257, 258, 264). One can always stick to the idea that an ideal reader is expected to be more interested in what is expressed in a text than how it is expressed. As Wittgenstein coins it, one should not "spare other people the trouble of thinking [...] [b]ut, if possible, [...] stimulate someone to thoughts of his [sic] own" (Wittgenstein, 1953, Preface, para. 9). From this point of view, editorial errors should not be regarded as a matter of the utmost importance. However, readers who are used to reading texts which contain clear flow of ideas with well defined threads, the fluency of their reading will most definitely be disturbed by the editorial preferences and flaws of the book. Third, because the book is an anthology of texts of various genres which are published in different times, the book suffers from inevitable repetitions. On the contrary, when there is a need for elaboration of important concepts or issues, the book hops on to the main topic without setting the background first. Fourth, although the quotations at the beginning of some of the chapters (e.g. Chapters 2, 4, 5, 10, 17, 17, 18) are somewhat relevant, since it would have not made any difference if they were left out, it could have been more useful if brief information about the origins of the essay, talk or interview were given at the beginning of the chapters. Fifth, UGEI is naturally making rich use of Indian concepts. This would create problems for readers who are not familiar with Indian society and the relevant literature. If the book has targeted a larger audience which is not limited by Indian readers, the editor could have entertained the idea of putting a separate glossary section to explain the key concepts or terminologies used in the book.

Despite its editorial flaws, the book raises a set of important issues to think about. Obviously, the selection and representation of threads are tricky issues. However, after an attentive reading, four issues appeared of great significance to the reviewer: The responsibility of social sciences and sociology in a changing world; the necessity to go beyond Western-centric social theory; alternative ways of seeing relative deprivation; and postcolonial (or, anti-hegemonic) way of being-in-the-world as an umbrella framework to put seemingly contradictory perspectives together in a critical manner. I will now take each issue in turn to the best of my ability and examine it in briefly: First, UGEI criticizes research efforts which usually end up in ambiguous descriptions of what is happening in corresponding fields in particular and in the social worlds in general. The book dismisses hidden postmodern strategies of refraining from describing against what a social struggle is going to take place in near future. According to UGEI, social scientists (especially sociologists) bear the duty to guide activists who are struggling and protesting against the overwhelming dynamics of the current world-system. Therefore, it is simply not good enough when the academics state that the change is needed and coming, but the vocabulary of change has not been generated yet (Schwengel, 2012). One needs to go to the direction of historical sociology and study long periods for an adequate analysis to find a persisting pattern so that one can make sense of current configurations in the world. When one sees the shifts in the ontological realm, one could manage generating guiding concepts for the new consciousness. This has been after all the primary duty of critical social scientists since the foundation of social sciences. Second, UGEI deconstructs the phenomenon of 'emerging India'. The book poses the question of what it means to be emerging or to be developed or to have a "good life" (Rehbein, 2011). UGEI puts forward a rather classic postcolonial critique of modernization theory: a so-called universal model which is based on Western-centric empirical data and is supposed to be applied all over the world with local adaptations. According to this model, there is an externally defined universal form (e.g. Western modernity) which goes through filters such as cultural orientation, social structure and economic system of the respective country, and becomes the non-Western content. UGEI argues that the situation is more complex and ambiguous. Thinking in terms of modifications or evolutions can only invite temporary snapshot observations and superficial reactions.

One needs to concentrate on deeper and long-lasting characteristics. T.K. Oommen's Chapter is dedicated to investigating the problems of this approach along with some other issues (Chapter 9). It is normal and desirable that the postcolonial discussion of Western-centrism embedded in modernization theory is expressed in UGEI, and there is no reason to go over it here again. One should simply observe that, in sum, the main point is to give primacy to the empirical data from the Global South over the externally defined and imposed Western conception of modernity. In other words, the empirical basis of today's social theory has to be expanded and comprise emerging countries such as India and China. One sees a strong impact of civilizational analysis in Kumar's work which is one of the important intellectual threads in India (Söyler, 2012b). Third, the book puts forward a broader perspective on deprivation. As it is briefly explained in earlier sections, drawing on Amartya Sen (1999), the author understands that deprivation is related to one's situation of being cut from his or her freedom. This is to relativize and sociologically contextualize the concept of deprivation by personalizing it and adapting it to different ways of being-in-the-world. In this regard, UGEI sheds some light on the separation of work and education (Chapter 15). It criticizes that, for example, unless there is occupational diversification for the agricultural laborers, there will be little chances for the government to attract laborers and their kids to literacy programmes. In other words, the book argues that unless one gets into the socio-cultural roots of multi-dimensional aspects of deprivation, developmental strategies would fail. One's relative deprivation is very much related to one's being-in-the-world which is to a great extent shaped by the respective social structure (Söyler, 2012a; 2012b). Since this person's understanding of the world around him or her is determined by his or her thrownness, unless this fundamental social landscape is not altered, one cannot expect social change (Heidegger, 1927). It is very interesting that the author handles work and education together. Work, when it is understood within the context of division of activities, is the most suitable entry point to one's being-in-the-world. And education is about consciousness, altering the concepts of good life for the people of the respective investigation. When being-in-the-world is altered, the conception of good life will be transformed and this is supposed to give people other life directions for their future. And if the new consciousness is shaped by a liberal ideology as it appears to be the case in India, UGEI asks how one can maintain the Gandhian goal of self-reliance. Fourth, UGEI introduces an interesting comparison between Fanon and Gandhi. The book argues that, although from the point of understanding the role of violence in political struggles, Fanon and Gandhi differ to a great extent, as far as the postcolonial struggles and thinking are concerned, these differences appear to be more epiphenomenal, pointing to the mere surface of the arguments, rather than to their explanatory cores. In other words, UGEI argues that against the conventional Western conception of postcolonial thinkers, none of them differ from each other substantially (Pathak, 2011). A good example is given by UGEI is Fanon's contention that the oppressor never withdraws sincerely. According to Fanon, the oppressor acts the way that he acts as a consequence of the power struggle. When he is defeated, he will naturally retreat. However, Fanon argues and UGEI underlines it, while withdrawing, the oppressor does not change his position and continues not to understand. He capitulates, but his consciousness is not transformed. This is precisely the point in Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj* (Söyler, 2010a). Gandhi has never seen the main problem of India in the political and military domination by the British. Gandhi was occupied more with the all-encompassing and so-called self-evident aspects of domination. Both for Gandhi and Fanon the key to emancipation was to "unthink" those internalized facts about being-in-the-world (Wallerstein, 1991). The author successfully argues that from the broader framework of postcolonial situation, the differences between Fanon, Gandhi or any other thinker is minor. The discussion is especially quite relevant for the debates related to the future of non-Western-centric social theory.

This is a book definitely worthy of serious consideration, especially for those readers who are willing to go put an extra effort in making sense of the issues raised within the broader framework of postcolonial discussions. It provides a good overview of the topics which are of primary significance to social scientists working on India. More importantly, it raises a set of important and new questions that present-day social scientists who undertake research in the field of sociology will have to explore to come up with convincing solutions. The book's appearance is well timed. 37th All India Sociological Conference was held in December 2011 in Delhi. The 40th World Congress of the International Institute of Sociology (IIS), "After Western Hegemony: Social Science and Its Publics" took place in Delhi in February 2012. And finally, an International

Conference titled “Studying Social Sciences in the Era of Globalisation” was hosted by JNU in April 2012. As a consequence, the book has met its public at ease. In studies of globalization of non-Western contexts, one can observe, the Western scholar is still tempted to interpret non-Western forms of being-in-the-world as local adaptations of the Western universal. For those who can grasp its message, UGEI gives the hints that the good old ways of doing Western-centric social science has come to an end. Against the ontological background of the rising Global South, it has become an epistemological requirement that scholars from all over the world work together in a kaleidoscopic manner to construct intellectually tenable positions to do social science. The author shares his optimism that despite methodological challenges and power imbalances this could be done.

## References

- Dhawan, N. (2012, March). Lecture given at International Conference on Humanism, Democracy and Culture: Postcolonial Discourse and India, Kaithal, Haryana, India.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Heidegger, M. (1962) [1927]. *Being and Time*. (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.) London: SCM Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1996) [1927]. *Being and Time*. (J. Stambaugh, Trans.) Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kumar, A. (2010). *Quest for Participatory Democracy: Towards Understanding the Approach of Gandhi and Jayaprakash Narayan*. New Delhi: Rawat Publications.
- Pathak, A. (2011, April). Lecture given at Conference on Making of Casteless Society in India: Discourses and Mobilizations, New Delhi, India.
- Rehbein, B. (2010). Critical Theory after the Rise of the Global South. *Transcience: A Journal of Global Studies*, 1, 1-17.
- Rehbein, B. (2011). Differentiation of Sociocultures, Classification, and the Good Life in Laos. *SOJOURN: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*, 26(2), 277-303.
- Rehbein, B. (2012, April). Lecture given at International Conference on Studying Social Sciences in the Era of Globalization, New Delhi, India.
- Saalmann, G. (2012, May). Personal communication.
- Schwengel, H. (2012, April). Lecture given at International Conference on Studying Social Sciences in the Era of Globalization, New Delhi, India.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sitas, A. (2012, April). Lecture given at International Conference on Studying Social Sciences in the Era of Globalization, New Delhi, India.
- Söyler, T. (2010a). Gandhi, Civilization, Non-Violence and Obama. *Transcience - A Journal of Global Studies*, 1 (1), 22-27.
- Söyler, T. (2010b). Quest for Participatory Democracy [Review of the book *Quest for Participatory Democracy: Towards Understanding the Approach of Gandhi and Jayaprakash Narayan*, edited by A. Kumar and M. Tiwari]. *The German Journal on Contemporary Asia*, 117, 102-103.
- Söyler, T. (2012a, April). Lecture given at International Conference on Studying Social Sciences in the Era of Globalization, New Delhi, India.
- Söyler, T. (2012b). Lecture given at International Conference on Humanism, Democracy and Culture: Postcolonial Discourse and India, Kaithal, Haryana, India.



- Wallerstein, I. (2001) [1991]. *Unthinking Social Science: The Limits of Nineteenth-Century Paradigms*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Wittgenstein, L. (2005)[1922]. *Tractatus-Logico-Philosophicus*, (C.K. Ogden, Trans.), Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1958)[1953]. *Philosophical Investigations*, (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.), Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.