CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first part contains a brief review of the available studies on ethnicity and the second part gives the theoretical framework adopted for the study.

Review of literature

Studies on ethnicity are related to a number of concepts like race, tribe, class, immigrant groups, religious groups, language groups, nation etc. Some of these studies are briefly reviewed below. Due to the extensive bulk of literature on the topic, we have confined our appraisal to South Asian regions, especially India.

In 'Ethnicity and Nationalism: Theory and Comparison', Paul Brass presents a distinctive theoretical perspective on ethnicity and nationalism, by drawing examples from a wide variety of situations, especially from south Asia, Eastern Europe and Soviet Union.

He bases his theory on two arguments: The first is that there is nothing inevitable about the rise of ethnic identity and its transformation into nationalism, rather, the
conversions of cultural differences into bases for political differenciation between people arises only under specific circumstances. Thus ethnicity and nationalism are not 'given' but are social and political constructions. He considers ethnicity as a variable which is intrinsically related to the specific types of interactions between the leadership of centralizing states and elites from ethnic groups. Thus he presents the theory of elite competition as the basic dynamic which precipitates ethnic mobilization. These second theoretical argument stresses the crucial role of the relationships between elites and the states particularly the roles of collaborators with and opponents of state authority and state intrusion into regions inhabited by the ethnic groups¹. He uses the term elite to refer to formations within ethnic groups and classes that often play critical roles in ethnic mobilization².

Urmila Phadnis in her book, 'Ethnicity and Nation Building in South Asia' provides a comparative appraisal of the dynamics of ethnic identities and movements in South Asia especially regions like India, Pakistan, Bangla Desh, Sri Lanka, Nepal and Bhutan and Maldives.

Based on data collected through field work, she describes how ethnic groups are formed. She has put forward two hypotheses: (1) ethnic identity is a significant but not a sufficient requisite for evoking ethnicity⁴. Rather, it is the mobilization and manipulation of group identity and interest by the leadership that leads to ethnicity⁴. (2) The higher the states (material as well as emotional) of the community and its leadership in the power
structure, the greater the possibilities for strengthening the building of the nation as an amalgam of ethnic pluralities. She has presented a critical appraisal of the theoretical approaches and understands the problems of ethnicity and nation building within the conceptual framework of ethnic pluralism.

'Discourses of Ethnicity- Culture and Protest in Jarkhand', by Susana B. C. Devalle analyses ethnicity as a process through the specific case of adivasis of Bihar's Jarkhand region. She examines the relationship between historical structure, human experience and social consciousness in the construction of ethnicity. She contends that the present salience of ethnicity in Jarkhand could be apprehended by looking at the historical dimensions of society in the process of ethnic conscoius bulding, and she traces it to the colonial situation in India.

'Ethnic Minorities in the Process of Development' by Jaganath Pathy sets to examine some common theories about ethnic minorities especially the Scheduled Tribes. By studying eleven tribes of Orissa, he strives to bring out the multiplicity of forces responsible for ethnic dynamics among these tribes and analyses the mechanisms that perpetuate their subjugation. The process of development has provided a new salience to ethnic movements. He observes that the policy of integration of minorities into the Indian mainstream actually has resulted in forced acculturation and resultant genocide (or extinction of ethnic cultural identities of people). Each culture possesses autonomy and therefore development of different ethnic groups with relative autonomy and self government should be encouraged.
Leila Narayan, in her book ‘Ethnicity in Urban context’ focuses on cultural and structural aspects of ethnicity. Both qualitative and quantitative methods are used to understand the process of cultural change and continuity and also the extent of integration with the host society. Using the network approach, interaction of Gujaratis within their community and with the wider society has been analysed. In this study the focus is on the overarching identity of Gujarati language and within it the differentiation based on religion. So she has distinguished between Gujarati Jain and Gujarati Brahmin. She has found that while language functions as an interest tie, it does not function as an affective tie. It is the subgroup identities of religion and region that serve affective ties.

‘Ethnicity and Urbanization- a Case Study of the Ethnic Identity of South Indian Migrants in Poona’ by K.S.Nair examines the integration process of South Indian immigrants in the background of an urban plural society. He argues that in Indian cities, assimilation does not occur as in America or in Africa. Out of three types of integration given by Landaekar, namely, compound group integration, extrinsic sub group integration and intrinsic sub group integration, Nair discusses the last two types. He has come to some important conclusions - (1) residential segregation of immigrants in a city is an important factor that contributes to simulation of the culture of the place of origin (2) native culture makes functional adaptations in urban society.

S.L. Sharma’s article on ‘The salience of Ethnicity in Modernization: Evidence from India’ holds that modernization does not wipe out ethnicity, it may even bring about
a resurgence of ethnicity. By considering the effects of modernization on three aspects of ethnicity, namely cultural, organizational and political, he concludes that modernization has failed to marginalize ethnicity in India. Rather, it has stimulated ethnic consciousness and conflict. He feels that modernization has generated formidable ethnic challenges in India's casteism, communalism, nativism and ethnonationalism. Having noted the increasing salience of ethnicity in modernization, he gives instrumental rationality as a plausible explanation for it.

N.K. Bose in his paper, 'Calcutta - a premature metropolis' observed that the persistence of ethnic groups in Calcutta is a 'by-product' of economy of scarcity (Bose 1965). Martin Orans working among the Santals in the urban centre of Jamshedpur, noted that Santals were combining with related tribal groups to a multi-ethnic political solidarity formation, which resulted in the Jarkhand movement (Orans 1965).

Dr. Behra's data from Brajarajnagar and Sambalpur towns about 'Ethnic Exclusiveness among Protestant Christians' from a sample of 361 protestant converts reveal that ethnic consciousness seems to prevent any meaningful social integration among converts. The converts are so loyal to their own ethnic groups that sometimes they relegate their denominational affiliation to the background. In the field of social interaction, a convert gives first preference to the members of his own ethnic group in his denomination.
Revindar Kaur’s study on ‘Jat-Sikhs: A Question of Identity’ brings out the contrast between the position of Jats in rural village and the urban Khatri Sikhs. The position of Jats at the village level is secure and they never felt the need to adopt visible expressions of identity in the form of the five ‘K’s’. On the other hand, the urban Sikhs have found it necessary to adopt it. Their marginal position in urban society, unlike the secure majority position of the Jat-Sikhs in rural areas, led them to adopt the cultural identity by adopting the ‘five-Ks’ identity’.

Fox in ‘Lions of the Punjab, Culture in the Making’ shows how the urban Sikhs have organised themselves repeatedly to maintain boundaries vis-a-vis Hindus due to the fear of losing out in the market for urban jobs and administrative posts.

Ranu Jain’s study on Jain-Oswals of Calcutta brings out the dynamic nature of ethnic group especially the role of ‘exclusion - inclusion’ in the boundary - maintenance. She was able to find three distinct categories in the community of Jain Orwals, each choosing three different types of identity as their ethnic feature. She has dealt with the circumstances leading to the different choice of the ‘ethnic feature’ by these three groups and thus proves the assumption of ‘selection of ethnic feature in accordance with the prevalent situational demands’.

‘Malayalees in Delhi: A Problem in Urban Ethnicity’ by T.A. Menon gives a brief account of the various expressions of ethnicity like language, food and food habits.
religious practices and festivals and interaction with the wider social system. He argues that there are certain areas of interaction where ethnicity is expressed and where it is not expressed. He has found that kinship and ethnicity have played an important role in the life of Malayalees in Delhi rather than economic factors. He has come to the conclusion that certain modifications have taken place in various spheres of life in the regional culture of Malayalees in Delhi, but ethnicity was the main guiding force. They rely on their own ethnic associations and institutions for emotional identity.

‘Ethnicity and Nation Building: The Syrian Christians in Kerala- a case study’ by G. Gopakumar gives an analytical case study of the experience of Syrian Christians in Kerala in nation building and observes that the Syrian Christians of Kerala have a long history which dates back to 52 AD with the arrival of St. Thomas to Cranganor. Though this traditional community has adopted a Western religion, it has adapted to the local milieu. In the process, it has practised caste superiority, which unlike the Hindu caste system was more rigid and hierarchical. Political role of Syrian Christians since independence have helped them to move with the mainstream. Similarly the enterprising character of these people and economic progress have helped them to reduce social tensions with other ethnic groups. At present the Syrian Christians belonging to various denominations are very well a part of Kerala society. Thus inspite of the plural character of Syrian Christians, they have undergone cultural assimilation in Kerala society.
Theoretical Framework

Social scientists have analysed the various dimensions of ethnicity in terms of different theories and models. Important among them are assimilation and integration' and 'cultural pluralism'. The framework we have adopted is based on an analysis of these theories and their applicability to the present situation.

DEFINITION OF ETHNICITY

The concept of ethnicity has been used by social scientists differently. The first recorded usage of the term is that of David Riesman in 1953. The 1973 edition of the 'American Heritage Dictionary' defined it as (i) the condition of belonging to a particular ethnic group (ii) ethnic pride. Since then we come across different definitions.

The term ethnic group has been defined in many ways. One of the classic definitions is that of Max Weber (1961) who viewed an ethnic group as a human collectivity based on an assumption of common origin, real, or imagined. But this definition is too broad and under it almost all identifiable groups become ethnic groups and therefore loses much of its analytical value.

According to Frederic Barth (1969) the term ethnic group is generally understood in anthropological literature to designate a population which is
(i) biologically self perpetuating,
(ii) shares fundamental cultural values, realised in overt unity in cultural forms,
(iii) makes up a field of communication and interaction,
(iv) has a membership which identifies itself and is identified by others, as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order. However, he has modified this to emphasize the fact that ethnic groups are categories of ascription, and identification, by the actors themselves, and thus have the characteristic of organizing interaction between people.

Gordon (1964) points out that when an identity is used (for him national origin, religion, and race) and is successful in producing a cohesive group which can be recognized by others, it becomes an ethnic feature. So ethnic group requires identification and recognition by 'others' in addition to 'self identification.

Wallerstein argues, (1965) membership in an ethnic group is a matter of social definition, an interplay of self definition of members and definition by other groups.

There is an on going debate about the attributes of an ethnic group between the subjectivists and objectivists. The subjectivists stress on the structural aspects of ethnic identity and the objectivists emphasize the social psychological dimensions. The
objectivists affirm that ethnic identity manifests through cultural markers, but the subjectivists stress on the self and its feelings of identity. The syncretistic or composite approach has attempted to combine these two approaches and instead of stressing the preeminence of one approach over the other, they bring about a linkage between the two approaches.

Taking the syncretic approach, Urmilla Phadnis has defined an ethnic group as a historically formed aggregate of people having a real or imaginary association with a specified territory, a shared cluster of beliefs and values connoting its distinctiveness in relation to similar groups and recognised as such by others. This definition has five components - (i) a subjective belief in real or assumed historical antecedents (ii) a symbolic or real geographical centre (iii) shared cultural emblems such as race, language, religion, dress, and diet, (iv) self ascribed awareness of distinctiveness and belonging (v) recognition by others of group differentiation.

For Cohen, ethnic group is “a collectivity of people who (a) share some patterns of normative behaviour and (b) form a part of a larger population, interacting with people from other collectivities within the framework of a social system.”

As defined by J.Milton Yinger, "an ethnic group is a segment of a larger society whose members are thought, by themselves and/or others, to have a common origin and to share important segments of a common culture and who in addition, participate in
shared activities in which the common origin and culture are significant ingredients. This definition suggested by Yinger has three ingredients: (i) the group is perceived by others in the society to be different in some combination of the following traits; language, religion, race and ancestral homeland with its related culture (ii) the members also perceive themselves as different and (iii) they participate in shared activities built around their (real or mythical) common origin and culture. Taking each of these as a variable, Yinger mentions eight different varieties of ethnic identity—(1) full (2) unrecognised (3) private (4) hidden (5) symbolic (6) stereotyped (7) imagined and (8) non ethnic.

For the present study, the following definition of ethnic group is adopted— an ethnic group is a segment of a larger society whose members are thought, by themselves and or others, to have a common origin and to share important segments of a common culture and who in addition, participate in shared activities in which the common origin and culture are significant ingredients and who share some patterns of normative behaviour.

"The term 'ethnic' is old, but 'ethnicity' is relatively " new. There are several approaches and perspectives on ethnicity. As a cultural construct, ethnicity signifies a composite of symbolic markers, real or putative, used by the members of an ethnic group who define themselves and are defined by others as having a distinctive identity (Cohen 1974:x). These characteristics may include any combination of the following— (i) cultural attributes such as language, religion, and values (ii) territorial attributes like religion or locality, and (iii) biological attributes like descent and kinship (Burgess 1978:269)."
As a political construct, ethnicity is viewed as a means to gain power. A few others have considered ethnicity as a variable interdependent on other variables like power and economic relations.

Some other social scientists view ethnicity as a situational construct and they argue that it is not so much the attributes of ethnicity that are important, but the property of the situation in which they obtain and operate.

Oommen for example, argue that ethnicity is a “product of disjunction between territory and culture”18.

The primordialists view ethnicity as something ‘given’ and not ‘chosen’. To them ethnicity is a natural bond between people, immutable or primordial. (Greetz, 1963). The instrumentalists (A.Cohen) on the other hand consider ethnicity as utilitarian designed for the pursuit of collective goals.

In the Marxist analysis ethnicity is an emergent process. Class and relations of production are given an important place and ethnicity is seen as a natural outcome of differences. In some cases it is seen as an instance of ‘false consciousness’19.

For Gordon, ethnicity is the sense of peoplehood of an ethnic group. In his words, “an ethnic group may be defined as a group of individuals with a shared sense of
peoplehood based on presumed shared sociocultural experiences and/or similar physical characteristics. Such groups may be viewed by their members and/or outsiders as religious, racial, national, linguistic, and/or geographical. Thus what ethnic group members have in common is their ethnicity, or sense of peoplehood, which represents a part of their collective experience.""

Burgess has defined, "ethnicity is the character, quality of condition of ethnic group membership, based on an identity with and/or a consciousness of group belonging that is (including cultural, biological or territorial) and is rooted in bonds of a shared past and perceived ethnic interest.""

Ethnicity is a sense of ethnic identity, which has been defined by De Vos as consisting of the subjective, symbolic or emblematic use by a group of people... of any aspect of culture, in order to differentiate themselves from other groups.""

Paul Brass has modified the last phrase of this definition to read "in order to create internal cohesion and differentiate themselves from other groups". He adds, "ethnicity or ethnic identity also involves, in addition to subjective self consciousness, a claim to status and recognition either as a superior group or as a group at least equal to other groups. Ethnicity is to ethnic category what class consciousness is to class.""

For Cohen ethnicity is essentially a form of interaction between cultural groups operating within common social context."
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

There are several approaches to the study of ethnicity. They can be classified as (i) Social Psychological and (ii) Sociological. Mainly we have followed the sociological approach in our study.

In the Social Psychology of ethnicity, mainly three theoretical frameworks dominate- Psychoanalytic, configurationist, and interactionist.

The psychoanalytic perspective represents a holistic non experimental approach in that ethnic identity is studied in terms of unconscious processes that transcend the physiological functioning of the human body and affect the personality structure.

Noteable contribution in this approach is provided by Erikson. Identity (ego identity) for him is the integrated essence of what the individual means to him or herself (Erikson 1963). “It is primarily an unconscious phenomenon that results from a series of childhood identifications and passes through a number of inner conflicts from infancy to old age”. “Identity however is crystallized through a set of crisis during adolescence which reflect each of the inner conflicts previously experienced or subsequently to be experienced in various stages of the life cycle.”

His discussion of inferiority feelings and self hate of black people is in tune with the psychoanalytic approach.
The configurationist perspective represents a holistic experimental approach to the study of ethnic identity, with the assumption that an individual’s behaviour and interpretation of it are dependent upon the perceptions of one’s social role and social context.

Gordon Allport uses this perspective and develops a conception of the relationship between the development of in-group loyalty (as in ethnic group identification building ethnic identity) and out-group hostility (as in prejudice). He believes that in-group loyalty (or ethnic group identification), creating a sense of identity is built up as the individual learns about out-group hostility (or prejudice). He gives the image of in-group loyalties as concentric circles with the family constituting the smallest and the firmest of one’s in-groups, followed by neighbourhood, city, state, nation, racial stock and mankind. Naturally the in-groups grow weaker and weaker, the larger their circle of inclusion. So “one loyalty may lie closer to one’s core than another, but as the conditions of the moment change, “outer” loyalties may become more important than “inner’ ones- outer circles can move inward and inner outward and inner outward”26.

The interactionist approach emphasizes the view that the human being is the product of the process of social interaction27. As Rose has noted (1962: vii-ix), there are two strands to interactionist theory -(i) the focus on social organization and social process and (ii) the focus on socialization.
The interactionist framework is an elementalistic non experimental view which regard ethnic identity as emerging alongside ethnic stratification through mechanisms of symbolic communication and interaction. "What is of decisive importance is that human beings interact in terms of the conceptions that they actually are but in terms of the conceptions that they form of themselves and of another. So human beings can anticipate each other’s behaviour, and adjust their own behaviour.

Theories of Assimilation and Integration

Assimilation is the process of erasing the boundaries between one group and another. "Assimilation occurs when individuals and groups forsake their own cultural tradition to become part of a different group and tradition." It is a process of merging of two cultures. There are two models of assimilation- (a) Melting Pot and (b) Anglo conformity.

(a) Melting Pot- The term ‘Melting Pot’ was used by Israel Zangwill (1909) to describe a situation of assimilation of various cultural groups in America. “In melting pot assimilation, each group contributes a bit of its own culture and absorbs aspects of other cultures, such that the whole is a combination of all the groups.” This concept was criticised by advocates of total assimilation (Gouldner 1970 and Glazer 1954).

(b) Anglo-conformity model- The term anglo-conformity refers to an attitude which held that various ethnic cultures should be totally abandoned in favour of the
original and ‘superior’ American culture. “Anglo-conformity is equated with “Americanization” whereby the minority loses its identity completely to the dominant WASP culture.” This approach has been more prevalent in recent decades.

The two models are differentiated in the following formulations by Newman (1973)

Melting Pot: A+B+C=D
Anglo conformity : A+B+C=A

“Integration is a two way process: the immigrants must want to assimilate and the host society must be willing to have them assimilate. The immigrants must undergo cultural assimilation or acculturation ie, learning the day to day norms of the host culture pertaining to dress, language, food and sports. This process also involves internalizing the more critical aspects of culture such as values, ideas, beliefs and attributes. Structural assimilation involves developing patterns of intimate contact between the “guest” and “host” groups in the clubs, organizations, and institutions of the host society. Cultural assimilation generally preceds structural assimilation, although the two sometimes happen simultaneously.”

In ‘Assimilation in American Life’, published in 1964, Gordon has presented a multidimensional model of the assimilation process and applied it to the American social scene. This model distinguished seven assimilation dimensions or variables: cultural, structural, marital, identificational, attitude receptional (absence of prejudice), behaviour
receptional (absence of discrimination), and civic (absence of value and power conflict). These theoretical models of variables and propositions were used to analyse the traditional ideologies of 'Anglo-conformity', 'the melting pot' and 'cultural pluralism'. However Gordon (1964) has concluded that while cultural assimilation has taken place on a large scale in American society, structural assimilation for many immigrant groups has been minimized. The American ethnic relations according to Gordon, was revealing a picture of 'structural pluralism' or 'structural separation' in 1960s, and hence the idea of inevitable assimilation is questionable.

But subsequent events in American intergroup relations during the 1970s have led Gordon to reexamine the assimilation process. For an analysis of this complex situation, the variables of power and conflict are built to the assimilation theory. He observes that what actually happened in subsequent period was not actually an intensification of structural separatism, but the unexpected emergence of black power movement along with some of the processes encompassed in "liberal expectancy" - the expectancy that various groups will decline in modern and modernizing societies.

Theories of Cultural Pluralism

To signify a multi-ethnic society, the term 'Pluralistic society' was coined by E. Barth. Similarly the term 'cultural pluralism' and 'salad bowl' were used to describe the situation where minorities co-exist respecting each others' diversity. (Ishewaran 1971,
Etkin 1970). Cultural Pluralism can be defined as a situation in which the various ethnic groups in a society maintain their distinctive cultural patterns, subsystems, and institutions. (Newman 1973). Whereas an integrationist believes in the possibility of eliminating ethnic group boundaries or in boundary reduction, a pluralist is convinced of boundary maintenance. Cultural pluralism is founded on the assumption that individuals never forget or escape their social origin, that all groups bring positive contributions that enrich the larger society, and that groups have the right to be different but equal”36.

Gordon has distinguished two types of cultural pluralism on the basis of the nature of contact among groups (1978). Cultural Pluralism at the tolerance level is characterized by secondary contact and formal relations between ethnic groups; eg. among blacks and whites in the old South. At the good relations level, there is more frequent and informal contact among groups. At this level, pluralism and some forms of integration can co-exist. This type of pluralism would involve “employment integration, common use of public accommodations, inter-ethnic composition of civic organizations, and frequent symbolic demonstrations of inter-group harmony which emphasize common goals and values”37.

Frederic Barth in his ‘Ethnic Groups and Boundaries’ (1969) delves deep into the process of boundary- maintenance of ethnic groups. Barth builds his theory from the fact that “ethnic groups are categories of ascription and identification by the actors themselves, and thus have the characteristic of organizing interaction between people”38. He does not believe that each ethnic group has maintained its culture through geographical
and social isolation, but that boundaries persisted despite a flow of personnel across them: "categorical ethnic distinction do not depend on an absence of mobility, contact and information, but do entail social processes of exclusion and incorporation, whereby discrete categories are maintained despite the changing participation and membership in the course of individual life histories".

According to Barth, "a categorical ascription is an ethnic ascription when it classifies a person in terms of his basic, most general identity, presumably determined by his origin, and background. To the extent that actors use ethnic identities to categorize themselves and others for purposes of interaction, they form ethnic groups in this organizational sense." ("Ethnic categories provide an organizational vessel that may be given varying amounts and forms of content in different socio-cultural systems. They may be of great relevance to behaviour, but they need not be; they may pervade all social life, or they may be relevant only in limited sectors of activity")46). Thus Barth considers ascription as the critical feature of ethnic groups and therefore, the continuity of ethnic units, he assumes, depend on the maintenance of social boundary ie, the continuing dichotomization between members and outsiders and maintaining its group identity even when members interact with others. The methods used for maintaining the boundary are the subprocesses of incorporation and exclusion47. This can be manifested by (i) identification of another person as fellow member of an ethnic group or (ii) by a dichotomization of others as strangers. Thus it is found that ethnic boundary canalizes social life. "Entailed in boundary maintenance are also situations of social contact
between persons of different cultures: ethnic groups only persist as significant units, if they imply marked differences in behaviour i.e., persisting cultural differences. Moreover, it is found that the persistence of ethnic groups in contact implies not only criteria and signals for identification, but also a structuring of interaction in terms of a set of prescriptions governing interethnic encounters in some sector (e.g., market place) and a set of proscriptions on other sectors preventing interethnic interaction (e.g., religious and domestic sectors).

Horowitz has recognised several varieties of ethnic change. Focussing on changes in group boundaries, he has found both assimilation (the process of erasing the group boundaries) and differentiation (narrowing of boundaries by the creation of additional groups) in his study of three ethnic groups in the foothills of the western Himalayas. The several possibilities of boundary changes given by Horowitz are given in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes of ethnic fusion and fission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amalgamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+B =C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+B=A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A=B+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proliferation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A=A+B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A+B=A+B+C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more groups unite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one group assumes the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one or more groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups (often)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by BeeHive Digital Concepts Cochin for Mahatma Gandhi University Kottayam
to form a new identity of two) produce a larger group. another. or more component parts. within their ranks.

There are several authors who believe that assimilation and pluralism are happening simultaneously. Glazer and Moynihan (1970) perceive the process of becoming "hyphenated" Americans as involving cultural assimilation.

Cultural pluralism results in separate ethnic communities, many of which are characterised by a high degree of institutional completeness (Breton 1964) ie, they include institutions and services that meet the needs of the group such as ethnic churches, newspapers, mutual aid societies and recreational groups- the growth of full range of institutional services geared to the particular minority. Thus the assimilation process has an impact on the social structure of the city as well, as distinct ethnic neighbourhoods and enclaves are formed as a result of the network clustering. These ethnic enclaves are a sort of consolation for the recent immigrants who have language problems.

Schafer (1984) compared ethnic communities to decompression chambers. "Just as divers use the chambers to adjust to the rapid change in water pressure, immigrants use the communities to adjust to cultural change they are forced to make upon arriving a new country." 

"Today we are witnessing a resurgence of interest by various ethnic groups in
almost forgotten languages, customs, and traditions. Greely (1971) calls this resurgence of ethnicity "a new tribalism", characterised by increased interest in the "high culture" of one's ethnic group, visits to ancestral homes, the increased use of ethnic names, and renewed interest in the native language of one's own group".

**Salience of Ethnicity in Modernization**

In a modern plural society, ethnicity persists in the form of marked cultural differences in situations of interaction. There are mainly two strands of debate- (i) modernization leads to deethnization (ii) modernization leads to ethnic resurgence. A number of scholars have reported that ethnicity persists in modern societies. (Murphee 1988)

A wide variety of interpretations are available about the term modernization. This process by which the world departed from the traditional religious world, first drew the attention of Alexis de Tocqueille. De Tocqueille envisaged modernization primarily as a gradual but deeply penetrating process of democratization in which not only political but also social- cultural and economic structures and consciousness itself as well, began to change and alter. Some decades later, Durkeim focussed on the expanding differentiation and specialization of structures and functions due to increasing demographic density and increased division of labour. Whatever this modernization might bring about, Durkeim believed, its unintended consequence was the threat of normlessness and pluralization of values- anomie.
Marx, the father of communism, linked modernization to the rise of capitalism and expansion of exploitative structures which would cause above all, structurally rooted alienation. While for Durkeim, the division of labour was a moral fact, for Marx, it was a form of alienation. Moreover, Marx distinguished division between the owners and non owners. He thus related the structure of society to the type of division of labour involved in its system of production by drawing a division between the bourgeoise and prolitariats.

The theory of modernization was further elaborated in the writings of Max Weber, the well-known German sociologist. For Weber, the process of rationalization underlie all modernization. In Weber's works rationalization is a pervasive process of change, changing the entire society. Accordingly in his analysis, science represents a rational mode of cognition, capitalism, a rational system of economy, democracy and bureaucracy, rational systems of polity, and administration and protestantism an instance of rational cultural system. But two types of rationality can be recognized- ie, normative and instrumental (Wertrationalitat and Zweckrationalitat). The idea of normative rationality (value-oriented) implies that some values are intrinsically rational, while others are not. On the other hand instrumental rationality (goal-oriented) uses rationality as a means category. It is utilitarian in nature. According to Weber, an act is rational in so far as (i) it is oriented to clearly formulated unambiguous goal, or to a set of values which are clearly formulated and logically consistent; (ii) the means chosen are according to the best available knowledge adapted to the realization of the goal (1974). Thus instrumental rationality may be either goal-oriented or value oriented. In either case, its character is
utilitarian. Based on these two types of rationality, two conceptions of modernization emerge - (i) modernization as a value syndrome comprising the supposedly rational values of reasoning, differentiation, universalism, achievement and individualism and (ii) modernization as a set of rational interests and strategies involving calculation, consumerism and competitiveness.

S.L. Sharma, in his article 'The Science of Ethnicity in Modernization: Evidence from India' analysed the linkage between modernization and ethnic resurgence in India using the concept of modernization based on instrumental rationality. He has focused the effects of modernization on three aspects of ethnicity, namely cultural, organizational and political. In all the three aspects of ethnicity, he found there is a sharpening of ethnic sensibilities in India. His analysis of Indian scene shows that modernization has not worked itself out in terms of normative rationality. The values of affective neutrality, universalistic norms, achieved identity and self-directionality have failed in India. Rather, modernization has grown here in terms of instrumental rationality and led to revigoration of ethnicity. Not only have ethnic groups acquired the character of interest groups under the influence of the materialist ideology of modernization, but also they have used modern technology to organize themselves into formal associations to pursue their sectarian interests. Thus in the course of modernization based on instrumental rationality an ethnic group may get sensitized to the goal of improving its economic and political lot and try to rationally utilize its resources of affectivity, primordial ties, common identity and collective solidaritry to achieve the envisaged goal. Or it may
construe its ethnic tradition or identity into a value and rationally utilize the means available by moderization such as improved communication technology, modern weaponry and organizational network in pursuit of the same.

From the above strands of thought, we understand that modernization need not always lead to a failure of ethnicity as the ‘liberal expectancy’ (Gordon) believed. At times it has gained salience due to modernization. In the present situation in Kochi, how has the process of modernization through its subprocess of urbanization affected the ethnic identity of Gujaratis? Apparently it has not dissolved the ethnic distinctions, for the Gujaratis in Kochi still preserve their culture and identity in all possible ways. For a systematic analysis of the bearing of modernization or urbanization on the ethnicity of Gujaratis, it is pertinent to find out the social markers of ethnicity, which the Gujaratis employ to maintain their boundary. Similarly it is essential to understand their interaction pattern, which they may use either to accentuate ethnicity or for boundary maintenance. Moreover it is highly necessary to probe into the cause for this persistence of ethnic identity. So the researcher has focussed on three aspects of ethnicity: cultural, interactional and the subjective aspect of sense of ethnic group identification.
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CHAPTER III