Chapter VI
CONTRADICTIONS

The preceding two consecutive chapters deal with the nature and process of modernization at individual and institutional levels. In course of the discussion inconsistencies in the process have also been brought to the focus. The inconsistencies in any of the aspects of social, cultural or personality systems are either the symptoms (or the results) of the contradictions in them or if allowed to accumulate and continue for a long time may lead to contradictions in these systems. In the present chapter an attempt is made to analyze the nature and bases of contradictions obtained in the three systems while they undergo modernization and change. But the analysis of contradictions in social structure form the major part of our discussion.

The word contradiction is often used but rarely defined. It is in fact a highly abstract concept and hence difficult to comprehend and explain. Roughly speaking, by contradiction we mean discrepancy or inconsistency between two or more structures or substructures; be they statement of fact, personality aspects, status role arrangements or institutions. But the term conveys a broader meaning than the discrepancy between structures. In addition to the absence of agreement between two (or more) structures or substructures, the term refers to the denial or negation of one by the other. If someone, say for instance, supports a bill for the prohibition
of dowry or to raise the age of marriage or pleads Hindu as medium of instruction in his public life but demands dowry at the marriage of his son(s), settles marriage of his children at a lower age, or sends his children to English medium schools in his private life. His acts in the two life-settings are contradictory. Because his acts in the public life are not only inconsistent to but also negate the acts of his private life.

Contradiction and conflict are used interchangeably. But it is erroneous. Although the two concepts are very close in meaning, the difference between the two is considerable. The former may occur within one or more structures but the latter cannot be contained within a single structure (Bailey 1960: 7-8). A structure may contain rules for the resolution of conflict that arise in it while it may also play a crucial role even in maintaining the structure. Thus conflict plays dual role. It produces changes but at the same time it may reinforce the old system and hence resists changes. But contradiction is symptomatic of social change. "Conflict", says Bailey (1960:239) "can only be recognised as a contradiction by the absence of self regulating factors... Thus a man allies himself to a group B and in doing so defects from group A. If the result is to bring into action a large group of which both A and B are parts, and yet which is in some sense neutral

1. "The structure", says Bailey (1960:7) "itself will contain rules for the resolution of conflict, and conflict will even play a crucial part in maintaining the structure. The law, as often is said, is strengthened in the breach. In another sense, conflict in one group may bring into action a larger group and so maintain its existence, as when caste councils meet to settle conflicts between lineages."
between them, and if this larger group settles the conflict, then we are not here dealing with contradiction." The same can be put in terms of rules and institutions. Bailey (1960:239) further observes, "if a man follows rule A and deviates from rule B, and if there is a third rule or institution designed to settle such situations on the grounds that in this particular situation one or the other rule is appropriate, then this is not contradiction. If the group which comes into action is not neutral between A and B but is in fact one of the sanctions of B (or A, as the case may be), and if it is effective, there is a contradiction between the two allegiances and not merely a conflict. Similarly if the third rule or institution is simply an assertion of one or the other rules as being invariably and automatically the right one, this is contradiction."

The structures may negate each other but they may not necessarily be under conflict. When contradictions deepen, they may generate conflicts. Sheer presence of contradictions do not cause conflict. Similarly, there may be intra or inter-group conflict(s) be that group family(ies), caste(s) or nation (s), but not contradiction. The lower caste people who senskritize themselves generally come into conflict with members of their own castes or the castes of their ranking, because they assign a lower status to those members of their own castes or the castes of their ranking, who have not undergone senskritization along with them. The castes under senskritization also come in conflict with the upper caste people because they and those who had been once superior to them in
ritual position. But such claims, as is generally made by one caste to merit itself superior to other(s), come under the purview of caste system. They do not involve a third structure. Hence conflicts generated through such claims among different caste groups, as per above definition, do not accompany contradictions. Conflicts in society may take place for reasons other than the contradictions such as clash of interests on some immediate or long-run issues.

Contradictions, as explained above, involve in any social situation the presence of more than one social structure (or substructure). According to Lynch (1968: 209-40) contradiction in the contemporary Indian social situation occurs between the caste structure, and the democratic structure based on citizenship. The existence of contradiction is known through the presence of a third structure, i.e. state in this case. Here the state, instead of being neutral sanctions the democratic structure, since it professes equality among citizens and negates inequality based on caste.

Contradiction can also be seen at individual level. In political sphere the lower and the intermediate castes emphasize their lower status to get educational and economic advantages and political power for their upliftment, but in their social life they emulate the way of life of upper castes to attain a status equal to the higher castes. A parallel case from upper castes may also be mentioned in this context. On secular front especially on matters like
reservation of seats in assembly or parliament, or in government jobs, etc. the upper castes people oppose all sorts of reservations and demand equality of treatment from the government. In other words, they are against the protective discrimination of the government either for the scheduled or for the backward castes on secular front but on ritual front they, surprisingly enough, are not prepared to give equal status to them.

Depicting situations of conflict and contradiction in case of Jatavas of Agra in the post Independence period Lynch (1968: 236-37) points out that "... having realized the point where reference group behaviour on the sanskrit model is no longer eufunctional, some castes, such as the Jatavas, have turned to political participation. Structurally this shift is due to the fact that these castes now occupy and activate the "dominant" status of citizenship and also the status of voter. Conflict is now within the field of politics, in terms of attempting to make citizenship and achievement the recruiting principles to the structures of opportunity and power, on the one hand, and on the other to destroy caste and caste ascribed rank as the recruitment principle to these structures. However, since both these statuses can now be ascribed as dominant there is contradiction within the social structure."

In Marxist terminology contradiction is basic to nature and human society. According to Mao (1967: 315-46) each difference contains contradiction and that the difference in itself is a contradiction. It is universal and absolute at least in the sense that "contradiction exists in the process
of development of all things, and that in the process of develop-
ment of each thing a movement of opposite exists from begin-
nning to end."

The universality of contradiction may be seen in
different areas of life as well as in different realms of knowl-
edge "in mathematics: + and -; differential and integral;
in mechanics: action and reaction; in physics: positive and
negative electricity; in chemistry: the combination and dis-
sociation of atoms; and in social science: the class struggle"

It is relative or particular in the sense that "such
contradiction and each of its aspects have their respective
characteristics. The particularity of contradictions enable
us to study the qualitative differences between different
forms of the same phenomenon or the process. The mechanical
movement, sound, light, heat, electricity, combination and
dissociation of matter all denote some sort of motion."
"All these forms are independent, but in essence each is
different from the others. The particular essence of each
form of motion is determined by its own particular contrac-
tion." "It (inner contradiction) is the internal cause or,
as it may be called the basis for the immense variety of things
in the world". "The law of contradiction in things is the
law of unity of opposites - a fundamental law of nature,
In dialectic materialist framework change whether in
texture or society is explained in terms of contradiction.
"Changes in society", says Mao (1967: 314), "are chiefly due
to the development of internal contradictions in society, that
is, the contradiction between the productive forces and the
relations of production, the contradiction between classes and
the contradiction between the old and the new; it is the deve-
lopment of these contradictions that pushes society forward
and gives the impetus for the suppression of the old society
by the new. Does materialist dialectics exclude external causes?
Not at all. It holds that external causes are the basis of
change, and that external causes become operative through
internal causes. In a suitable temperature an egg changes
into a chicken, but no temperature can change a stone into
a chicken, because each has a different basis."

On the basis of above discussions, we may say that
contradiction denotes the presence of negative or contradicting
elements in a structure. A structure may inhere contradictions
or contradictions may get evolved while it undergoes moderni-
ization and development. Presence of contradiction in itself is
not sufficient to generate conflict in the structure. It is
only when the contradictions get solidified to reach to a
societal stage that the contradicting structures come under
clash with each other so as to give rise to a new structure.
Thus, society undergoes change through conflict in a way to
resolve contradictions but in the process of evolving new
structures by resolving old contradictions, new contradictions germinate which in due course of time solidify themselves to give rise to further conflicts and changes in society. In initial stage solidification of contradiction is slow and takes a long span of time to get solidified. During this period the society undergoes changes but they are peripheral, slow and unimportant whereas in the final stage the processes of change become fast and fundamental.

Coming precisely to our specific problem contradictions in village life is explicaded at four broad levels.

1. **Attitudinal Contradiction**

At attitudinal level people may be seen to have two mutually opposite viewpoints or notions - modern and traditional, rational and irrational, logical and illogical, simultaneously. On one hand, they advocate principle of nature of science, but on the other they are guided by religious belief and dogmas in their personal life.

People say that correct planning and hardwork are the only key to success, but in practice many of them are seen to rely upon the statement of seers, bear stones prescribed by them and offer sacrifices to and worship God and goddesses for the success in their life. Consultation of priests and astrologers at time of marriage or the election or for installing a new business, joining new assignment, or sowing seeds or harvesting crop etc., are some of the
glaring examples of contradictions in the life of rural-folk.

In case of illness many people, even educated ones, in villages consult wizard and physician at the same time. In the cases of some infectious diseases like small pox, cholera, they take medicines and worship goddess Jurga simultaneously. Moreover, many of the villagers may be seen to abstain from shaving and hair-cutting on particular days in a week or during pitripakshe, avoid purchasing oil on saturday or travels on dishashuls. It is still a common practice among the people in villages to drop their journey or postpone it at least for a while, if a cat cuts across their path or a person of Teli caste comes in front of them while they begin the journey from their homes.

2. **Behavioural Contradiction**

Double standards of behaviour are not very uncommon for village people too. In some context people may be seen to behave in one way while in other they behave just opposite. When the higher castes people move from the villages to cities they sit with Chamar's side by side without any inhibition and take meal with them on the same table. But when they come back to their villages observe strict distance with them. Similarly, when one goes to see a groom for his daughter's marriage decries dowry and says that he won't prefer to marry his daughter to a person who insists on dowry. But when somebody comes to settle marriage of his son, the same person expects a handsome amount of dowry from the party
of bride. A number of social legislations to prevent such unhealthy practices regarding marriage and divorce, prohibition of dowry, eradication of untouchability etc., have been passed by the government recently and some are still under the process of finalisation. Yet we are still far from our goals. Legislation, in the view of Srinivas, in itself is a source of contradiction, as it was passed not with a view to modernizing the society but with a view to giving a look of modernization without a serious intent (1970: 14).

3. Cultural Contradiction

It is typical of the people of India that they usually behave contrary to what they think without taking any cognizance of it. In other words, people behave differently on different occasions but in a similar situation. This inconsistency in their thinking and behaviour have almost formed the part of their life. What is important is that people do not pay any serious attention to or experience any kind of strain in the change of their behaviour at the two distinct occasions. It is mainly because contradictions are deep-rooted in our society and that they are part of our social and cultural pluralism. Indian culture contains both types of elements - hierarchy and relativism, simultaneously. In principle Hinduism believes in equality of all human beings when it says, "Ignavasyo jayam servan, Jatkinchya jeyatyam jeyat"
(whatever is in the cosmos, God Lives there), but in actual life people practise untouchability. The people believing in untouchability opine that mere a touch of chendale defiles the people who can be purified only by throwing sacred water on their body. In principle Hinduism preaches "Ek o brahma suittyam nesti" (God is one) but in practice people worship thousands of Gods and goddesses including their family and village shrines. "Indian thinkers," says Srinivas (1970: 14), "are able to accept the propitiation of a village goddess with buffalo sacrifice while at the same time asserting that the highest form of worship is offering a fruit or flower to a single God, if not contemplation on an attribute-less Brahman."

There is a wide gap between what is in mind and what is in existence. And it is not uncommon in a modernizing society. A modernizing society incorporates elements of both modernism and traditionalism and it, therefore, inners more contradictions. According to Srinivas, "... it is likely that there is more contradiction in behaviour in developing countries because of the pace of social change and extent of the break with traditional culture. It is perhaps only a transient phenomenon, and the compulsion to be consistent might increase as the modernization process gathers momentum" (1970: 14).
4. **Structural Contradictions**

At the time of Independence the problems that called our attention most were the abject poverty and grave inequality. A number of measures like introduction of land reforms, initiation of community development projects, extension of irrigation facilities, power supply, cooperative credit societies, etc. were adopted with a view to modernizing rural economy so as to eradicate rural poverty, raise income and standard of living of the people and reduce the gap between the rich and the poor in villages. It is beyond doubt that these measures yielded positive results, leading to increase in production, average per capita income and overall development of the villages. Despite the fact, the rural poverty and inequality have increased rather than lessened. The facts are very disappointing indeed. In 1967-68, forty per cent (40%) of the rural population was below poverty line, but after a decade (1977-78) this percentage went up to nearly forty eight per cent (47.65%). This shows that during the last one decade about eight per cent (8%) of the total population was pushed back to poverty. The economic inequality in our country is such that ten per cent (10%) people from the below get only two per cent (1.8%) of the total income, while only one per cent at the top grab nine per cent of the total income. In other words, sixty per cent (60%) of population is getting only twenty one per cent (20.8%) of the income, whereas twenty
per cent (20%) of the upper class people get fifty three per cent (53%) of the national income (Dinesen, Dec. 17-23, 1976:10).

At 1960-61 prices per capita income in Eastern Uttar Pradesh was much lower than that of the country or the state as a whole. It was roughly 50 per cent of the country's and that 60 per cent of the state's figure. Moreover, at the current market price it is found that the rural indigence is greater than that of the country; and it is still greater in the case of villages under study. Moreover, when we compare the figures for the two villages we find that the percentage of population below the poverty line is substantially less in the modernized village (VA) than the backward village (W). That is to say that a substantial increase in the level of modernization of a village results in a corresponding decrease in the percentage of households living under indigence. But while percentage of households living under indigence reduces as village gets more and more modernized the inequality in income of the households, as


3. As per 1976-77 prices it is found that 46% of the country's population live below the poverty line. The percentage of the poverty stricken people in rural area is 47.65 whereas in urban area it is only 40.71.

4. Rural indigence has been measured on the basis of average per capita monthly income of a household with respect to rupees 61.80 or below as per 1976-77 prices. Our data have been collected during September 1977 - February 1978 corresponding to more or less the same price rates. While on India level 47.68% of the rural population has been found to live below the poverty line, corresponding figures for the two villages, modernized and backward, have been worked to be 53.4% and 57.4% respectively.
we saw in the preceding chapter, increases. The average per capita monthly income in VA, the relatively modernized village, is substantially higher than that of the backward village W side by side inequality in the distribution of income is also high in the modernized village.

Precisely, our analysis reveals that modernization fosters more unequal distribution of income in the rural society. In other words modernization leads to greater inequality in the rural structure. It is in fact the most glaring contradiction the rural structure projects as it undergoes modernization. If the two results on which we arrived at in the preceding chapters, that is, increase in the per capita income and inequality with the increase in the level of modernization, are taken together, it may be inferred that the benefits of the development in the villages goes into the hands of a few. The capitalist landlords by all means profit while the entrepreneurs from among the middle and the lower peasants are likely to sell their land on account of the payment of long overdue's of electric bills for their pumpsets. Due to the faulty procedure of government in respect of the assessment of the electric charges for agricultural consumption, and discrepancy in realisation of the charges on concessional rate from the consumers for the use of electricity for agricultural purposes, as we discussed.

5. See preceding chapter.
in the preceding chapter, the rich in the two villages are not growing richer at their own but they are growing so at the cost of the poors. The big landlords, the owners of commercial farms and industrial establishments in villages, proprietors of rural commercial enterprises, the middlemen in the trade of village-produce etc. are day by day accumulating wealth while the traditional experts and artisans — oil pressers, blacksmiths and carpenters, potters, sheep-keepers, barbers, etc. who fail to move along with the fast-growing changes are losing their secure earnings and are forced to labour and indigence by and large. Moreover, the middle and the poor peasants find it difficult to prolong at their own and are gradually being reduced to labour.

The rising poverty and deepening income gaps are the major reasons for the growing discontent and tension in villages. They largely breed political violence and instability. People by now have become conscious, educated and aware of the things around them. They can no more be held together by birth either in the name of yama dharma or through preaching the principles of kama and punarjanna. Various legal and developmental measures have been adopted to obliterete social disabilities of the weaker sections such as women and scheduled castes, and heap up the riches between the rich and the poor since independence. The traditional emblem of seeming inequality and exploitation in society, the rejas, the jajirdars, the zamindars and the
A nadman have been completely wiped out from the village scene. Nevertheless inequality and exploitation in society continue unabated. Though they are less crude and apparent in nature, but the form of exploitation that operates in villages with the capitalist landlords at the one end and the landless labourers at the other, is more fierce and acute than it existed ever before.

The three major classes - capitalist landlords, peasant and labourer, constitute the agrarian structure in the present time. The first generally comprises higher castes people. It includes very few people from among the middle and the lower castes who have accumulated wealth and power. The second group consists of three types of households: firstly, the higher castes households, who have been reduced to small land holders and possess limited resources of their own, secondly, the households of the dominant middle castes who generally possess a sizeable amount of land of their own, and thirdly, better-placed households from among the non-dominant middle castes, artisans and the lower castes. The lower castes by and large fall under the third category, that is, labourers. Apart from them quite a few households of lower middle castes and artisans castes also come under this category.

The peasants occupy an important place and play a significant role in the rural social structure. They give rise to the growth of a new middle class in the agrarian structure
of the post Independence period. It is mainly the upper middle castes (in our case Ahir) and some better off households of the middle and the lower middle castes who possess dominance over this class. People from the higher and the lower castes who fall under this class occupy the second place. They find that in all kind of political and other moves, launched in the name of class their interests are by and large ignored. Because of being dominant in the middle class the upper middle castes people on one hand fail to give equal status to the lower castes people who aspire for it by virtue of being educated and/or economically independent. On the other hand, they are also not prepared to recognize the superior status of the higher castes households who fail to find a place in the upper or the capitalist landlords class.

The new middle class generally dominated by the upper middle castes is gradually growing stronger in the agrarian structure as the land from the higher and the lower castes is passing to them especially since Independence. This new class after accumulating significant power and strength tends to gain some kind of domination over the lower class and exploit their services and for which the latter is not prepared. The lower class is mainly comprised of lower castes people and they until recently have been doing the services of the higher castes people. The upper class, as we know is consisted of a few capitalist and feudal landlords coming mostly from the higher castes. It restrains
admission of the affluent peasants especially from the middle and the lower castes.

The new middle class has grown up as a continuous source of conflict in the agrarian social structure. On the one hand, it is under conflict with the upper class/castes in its attempt to equal to or surpass them in political and economic power. On the other hand the middle class by denying equal treatment to the lower class/castes and using its power and privileged position to exploit the services of these weaker people, it has invited frequent clashes with the latter throughout the north India.

The three classes compete for political power as means to attain social, economic and educational progress. The process of acquisition of political power and formation of power block is partly determined by the class and partly by the caste elements. In the course of modernization the sources of inherited inequalities whether of a social, political or economic order are under erosion and access to opportunities have become possible for all the people on the basis of their specialized knowledge and individual merit. Moreover, the government's policy of protective discrimination helped people from the lower echelon to occupy higher positions in society. These measures enabled the people of the lower and the lower middle castes to acquire power and privileges and raise their social status. The elite play an important role in modernization. They, as
we have already made clear, play a dual role in rural transformation. On economic issues they represent class cum caste interests, while on political front, they work for the caste cum class interests.

In fact, there is a complete absence of class consciousness among the people in villages. Strictly speaking, till date, economic classes in agrarian structure exist only in statistical and hypothetical terms. In view of the lack of class consciousness the political (or the power) elite tends to raise caste sentiments of the village people. Caste being an institution of masses helped the rural elite secure a sound political base in villages. This is a natural outcome of political democracy (or the politics of number) in a modernizing society like ours. The new power elite, say for example the leaders of the middle castes/classes, instead of approaching the individuals of their own class but from different castes, say for example, peasants of the higher castes, prefer to appeal the people of lower class but from their own castes, say labourer of the middle castes, to join themselves in their struggle for power. Thus at political level the caste elements over-rule class factors. The middle castes elite succeed to/isolate their castemates from the labourers. They say their men that they are equally deprived as the lower (or scheduled) castes labourers are, and in some cases they are less educated and more poor than many of the scheduled castes people, yet they are not entitled to the
benefits the scheduled castes people have been given. But after attaining political positions and power, the leaders talk for the benefit of their castemen only to the extent that their own interests are not affected. That is, after a certain level the class interests cut across the caste interests. Say for instance, the middle castes leaders fight for their castemen for all such things, reservation in government jobs, special provisions for educational fellowships, priority in granting business licences etc. which do not harm their interest, but they hardly concede to demands which may damage their own economic interests. Take for example, after reaching a stage, further ceilings upon land may bring also the middle castes rich peasants under its fold. In fact, it is from these people that most of the power elite of the middle class come. Therefore, they oppose proposals like further ceilings over land, cooperative farming etc. though a large number of their own castes people who are poor and working as labourers may benefit out of these.

Likewise, the upper castes power elite succeed to win support of the poor peasants of their castes by alienating them from their class. They do so by appealing them that in addition to the losses they suffered due to the abolition of zamindari and subsequent land reforms after Independence they are going to loose the positions they gained in service and business by virtue of their merit with the inclusion of the middle castes under the fold of reservation. Thus we/that
the elements like power of number, reinforce caste as a basic tool for the mobilization of the masses in the present political process. In addition to the former the policy of protective discrimination that makes provisions for even well-off families of the castes who come under its fold to benefit, serve as major sources of contradiction in the political modernization of people.

Modernization leads to greater social and political awareness. People who are even at the bottom of the system have become aspirant. But there is a wide gap between the level of aspiration and the level of achievement of the people. The gap is more pronounced in case of the lower class people. Under a democratic socialist set up even an illiterate landless labourer expects to have as minimum a secure earning and a dignity of life. This he comes to know from educated people of the village, city dwellers, mass media and leaders on election campaigns, that a popular government is pledged to do for a common man. But when he turns his mind up to the rich capitalist landlords of his village living in magnificent bungalows, or the public leaders, officers and businessmen leading decent life, all the dreams he cherished are broken. He finds himself more helpless, deprived, exploited, and neglected than ever before. He starves while others prosper. It is true that people no more come to call him for begar, threaten to dispossess him of his house or land, or claim to rule him, but the deprivation and exploitation
he suffers is no less than ever before. He aspires for equality and dignity but gets degradation, inequality and indigence. The accumulated feelings of continued deprivation and helplessness on the part of a large number of have-nots, who do not have any source of income than to work for others, are likely to solidify the contradiction between the political equality at one end and the economic indigence, social degradation at the other. These contradictions if continue to precipitate into the system for a long time may exert the amount of pressure which in turn may lead to the breakdown of the liberal democratic model unless some remedial measures to ameliorate the conditions of the poor and curb the gap between them and the rich is not worked out earliest.

Eradication of poverty and reduction of inequality are the minimum basic points to be achieved in order to hold the people together to progress their ends through peaceful democratic measures as put forward by the drafted Constitution. B.R. Ambedkar, the pioneer of the Constitution while commenting on the problem of equality and social justice rightly feared for such a disturbing situation in society. "On 26 January 1950", says Ambedkar (quoted in Iyer 1976: 65), "we are going to enter into a life of contradictions. In politics we will have equality and in social and economic life we will have inequality ... We must remove the
contradiction at the earliest moment or else who suffer from inequality, will blow up the structure of political democracy which this Assembly has so luxuriously built up."  

The political and social crisis in the recent past in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar reflects the uprising of the middle castes and their confrontation with the lower and the higher castes. A major reason behind these disturbances is the non-inclusion of the affluent elite of the lower and the middle castes into the higher class dominated by the higher castes people. Even the poor and the low educated people of the higher castes discriminate against the lower and the middle castes elite and assign them an inferior position for the middle and the lower castes people occupy a low place in ritual status as compared to the higher castes people. Because of non-permeable, caste-based rigid structure of society, the circulation of elite instead of being easy and smooth is obstructed. The obstruction the caste-based structure imposes upon the circulation of elite in a modernising society helps polarization of castes into politics. When a lower or a middle castes elite is denied on ritual or any other basis the higher status he deserves by virtue of his merit on the secular matters such as education, earning, higher political or bureaucratic office etc., he is very likely to organise his caste and kinsmen to fight for achieving the same. The denial of the place a man deserves

6. There was a great rumour in the higher castes circle that an intermediate caste leader disclosed in an
in the social structure and for which constitution also makes a guarantee, is a most seeming contradiction throughout rural India. Thus, unless the ritual compartmentalization of the social structure is fully replaced by the secular division, or the former gives an easy access to the elite coming from the low ritual background, there always be stress upon the system from the side of the entry seekers of which tensions and conflicts would be the natural outcome.

One of the major reasons for the intensification of conflict in the agrarian structure is that both the losers and the gainers develop the feeling that injustice is being done to them in the system. Hence, both of them harbour discontent against the system. The losers, generally the

---

...election meeting largely attended by his castemates during the Janata rule that by the time we held power in the state and the Central, we will be able to recruit a significant number of our own men at higher posts in police and administration with the result that the higher castes people will be added to marry their daughters with our rising youngmen. Whatever may be the truth but it reflects the aspirations of the rising middle castes, the holding higher secular positions for acquiring the corresponding positions on ritual-social plane. It reflects their resentment as well as spirit to achieve what they desired by making the higher castes, who hitherto had been denying their claim, helpless by consolidating their own position in politics and power. The conscious attention paid to such rumours by the higher castes people reflects their fear and also their feelings to organize themselves to throw out the middle castes from power if they want to prevent the forceful penetration of these castes and secure their superiority. As a matter of fact, no serious attention has been paid and conscious efforts have been made either from the government or from the social work agencies to weaken ritual and caste considerations in order to strengthen secular democratic forces.
higher castes people, work out all means and ways to regain their status and dominance but fail to achieve the same at least in practice. The gainers, generally the middle and the lower castes people, work hard with inspiration at the gaining end. But still they find that their position is largely unchanged. Thus people at both the ends inhere frustrations and a feeling of discontent against the system which generate tension in it.

Although, it is the ascriptive ritual status that predominately determines individual's status in the rural setting, yet there are positive indications, however faint they may be, that the existential conditions are likely to overcome ritual hindrances. Those Rajputs who have made an access into business seem to have more links with businessmen than their own castemates in the villages. They take much interest in discussing with the businessmen the market rates and government policy of taxation in relation to octroi and sales tax. Similarly, increasing interactions at almost equal plane may be seen among some higher castes households occupying economically low place and lower castes households occupying relatively higher place: in their respective castes as a necessity of the changing conditions of life. A case from VJ may be taken as an example. A Rajput household at times of need receives loan and help from a Chamor household; in return the latter is given backing and
support from the former. The head of this Rajput household and his grown up eldest son are so very powerful that they can beat anyone at any time in the village whether he is a drum beater or the village pradhan. Both the households have one pair of bullocks each. They till their land jointly as per their turn and work at each others field on cooperative basis. They take meal at each other's house and use each other's utensils privately. Once a member from the Chamra household gave his bag to a member of the Thakur household to carry to his house as he was to make a night halt at one of his relatives house living beside the Mehmajpur market. Such cases of extra-caste cooperation especially between a Rajput, the powerful erstwhile ruling caste, and a Chamra, a weak, labour caste, are though strange and rare yet real and important especially from the point of the emerging social structure in the villages. Moreover, the Thakurs in VI who mortaged a part of their lands to Noniya, Lohar and even Chamars were compelled by their deteriorating economic conditions to do so. Furthermore, a gradual decline in the connubial and commensal restrictions and increasing openness of castes, as we observed in the preceding chapter, is likely to strengthen extra-caste economic and social cooperation at equal plane in the long run. Such trends have also been observed in other parts of the state. Rukoro (1979: 310) in his study of Aurari, a village in western
Uttar Pradesh, evidenced that class identity is beginning to cut across caste groups and communities as a Seiyid (big landlords and erstwhile Zamindars - dominant castes in the village) landless worker has more affinity to a landless Chamar than his caste fellowmen who have landed interest. It may then be inferred that modernization leads to the conditions under which the poor among the higher castes are likely to be alienated in their day to day economic and social intercourse from the rich and resourceful people of their caste and come closer to their economic peers from castes lower to their own.

One may trace modernizing trends in Indian peasant economy partly in agreement with Lenin's (1956: 1972-89) characterization of the then Russian peasant economy as commodity economy. "Peasants are no more independent units. They are subordinated to market for both consumption as well as husbandry. Consequently, it bears contradictions like competition, struggle for economic independence, snatching up of land (purchasable and rentable), concentration of production in the hands of a minority, the forcing of the majority into the ranks of the proletariat, their exploitation by a minority through the medium of merchant capital and the hiring of farm workers which are inherent in every commodity economy and capitalist system. The sum total of all these economic contradictions results in disintegra-
tion of peasantry that is, the old patriarchal (or patronage type) type of peasantry is dissolved and new types of rural inhabitants, the characteristics of commodity economy and capitalist production, viz. rural bourgeoisie (chiefly petty bourgeoisie) and the rural proletariat, a class of commodity producers and a class of agricultural wage earners are created.

Although, as we discussed, there is a visible trend that the middle and the petty peasants classes are being pampered and the upper middle class is in continuous effort to penetrate into the class of the capitalist landlords by increasing its size of land and extending its hold over the means of irrigation, equipments and local commerce and industry. But there is certainly no positive evidence or visible trend of differentiation of the Indian peasantry into two polar opposites at least at the present level of modernization. It is mainly because in peculiar Indian situation the castes and other ritual elements dominate over the class consciousness. The caste system impedes polarization of masses into two distinct and mutually antagonistic classes as it hinders entrance of lower and middle castes elite to join the upper castes elite to give rise to a single upper class. Likewise, it also prevents the middle and the small peasants from the upper and middle castes who are almost reduced to pauper to unite with the labourers of the low castes to fight against inequality and exploitation.
It is because of the complex interplay of the social and economic factors in typical Indian rural situation that give rise to a peculiar combination of social and economic contradictions; with the result that conflicts more frequently occur between the middle castes/class and the lower castes/classes instead of between the upper and the lower castes/classes that might have led towards the possibility of a socialist change in the countryside of the kind as Lenin (1973: 5) puts in "of going over from small, industrial forms to a large scale social production after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the take over by the working people."

To sum up, we find that the modernization of village structure results into the emergence of a trichotomous structure comprised of a small group of have - the capitalist landlords possessing relatively big size of landholdings and owning necessary resources, abundance of riches and generally a higher ritual status, and a large group of have-nots living under grave indigence, and a growing middle class of peasants. The growing dissatisfaction and discontent among the poor (irrespective of the caste) whose number is day by day increasing and conditions deteriorating at one end while at the other the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a privileged few, are likely to intensify contradictions in the social structure. It may either lead the system to collapse or facilitate a democratic compromise giving
the lower class people relatively more social and economic freedom and equality. Another possibility may be visualized as: the growth of a middle class in the rural structure will patch-up and curb the rising gap between the rich and the poor. Thus the growth of middle class helps save the system from break down by avoiding clash between the two extreme classes — the rich and the poor. But as we pointed out earlier that in peculiar Indian situation the caste and the class interests are so intricately intertwined that no single criterion, be that caste or class, works alone to determine individual's status in society. The two mutually antagonistic criteria, ritual and secular, operate side by side, with the ritual as the dominant mode for determining individual's status in rural society. The former, being rigid in nature, tends to compartmentalize and hence prevents easy passage of individuals from one status to other. Thus in the initial phase of modernization where the ritual criterion is not fully replaced by the secular, the system is likely to bear heavy strains, which may culminate in caste cum class conflicts. Because of compartmentalisation of the structure on ritual basis the middle class is likely to prevent normal transmission of individuals at both the ends. Thus instead of acting as a bridge for the two extreme ends the middle class is likely to turn out to be a permanent source of conflict for the other two. The barriers demarcated by the caste act as
major setbacks for the movement of elite from both the sides. Thus the lower class elite while tend to seek an entry into the next higher (i.e., middle) class come into conflict with the members of that class. Similarly, the elite of the middle class are prevented from entering into the upper class by the members of that class on ritual basis.

This is one of the major reasons that the conflict between the two polar opposites (that is, the upper and the lower extremes) the rich haves and the indigent havenots, which should have been more fierce and fundamental is at the present moment tertiary and that the conflict between the middle castes/classes, and the lower castes/classes is more prominent, with the conflicts between the middle and the upper castes/classes as secondary. Thus it is the mobile elite, generally from among the middle and the lower castes/classes who are not given passage to the next higher class which in fact they deserve by virtue of their achievements on secular ground carry the seeds of conflict and in turn exploit caste sentiments to give rise to caste cum class conflict in society at the present moment.

The rural society is moving towards greater income differentiation and the efforts to create an egalitarian structure seems to have failed. The contradiction as regards the rising gap between the affluent rich and the indigent poor is day by day gathering momentum. If the system fail
to resolve this contradiction, it is likely to generate the forces which may weaken the existing democratic model and lead to the emergence of a new model of modernization. A model devoted to socialism, widens inequality, strengthen differences on the basis of birth and works for the benefit of privileged few, leaving the masses into extreme poverty, ceases to exist any longer because of its self created weight of contradictions.

SLOW PACE OF POLITICIZATION: we saw in chapter four that individual modernism, secularism and politicism are positively correlated with one another. It implies that an individual who is modernized is likely to be secularized and politicized too. The latter two, that is secularism and politicism, represent the aspects of individual's personality - attitude, orientation and behavioural responses, related to religion and politics respectively. They are in fact parts of modernism, which broadly represents a rational attitude and behaviour among the individuals towards environment, material or non-material.

Attitudinal and institutional modernization represent two related aspects of the same process. The differential rate of growth between individual modernization (or modernism) and its components, secularism and politicism indicates inconsistency in the above aspects of individuals attitude and behaviour. It also reflects discrepancy in the pace of modernization as regards the related insti-
tutions viz. social, religious and political. If there is a substantial difference in the levels of modernism, secularism and politicism of the individuals then corresponding discrepancies in the modernization of social, religious and political institutions are not ruled out. Our analysis substantiates that the people are far less politicized than they are modernized and secularized (see chapter four). The differential rates of individual modernization, secularization and politicization project the imbalanced growth of social structure. A democratic model tends to achieve modernization through politicization and secularization of people. A relatively slower pace of politicization witnesses contradictions in the structure undergoing modernization.

Politicalization constitutes an important part of modernization. Whatever goals a society sets out for its modernization some model is designed and methods are worked out to achieve these goals. While designing a model it is important to take into consideration that which section of society has to lead the changes and which others to carry out and follow. In all these matters political institutions have to play a dominant role especially in the modern time. In a liberal democratic framework the strengthening of civil institutions and politicization of the general masses are the essential features of modernization. For a nation which selects democratic model to
reach its goal - modernization, has no meaning if the general masses are not adequately politicized. Inadequate politicization of people leads to serious confusions regarding the ends and the means. This gives rise to violence and disorder in the system. As Black (1966: 29) points out that "In a reasonably well integrated society institutions work effectively, people are in general agreement as to ends and means, and violence and disorder are kept at a low level. When significant and rapid changes are introduced, however, no two elements of a society adapt themselves at the same rate and the disorder become so complete that widespread violence breaks out, large number of people emigrate, and normal government becomes impossible - all of which has happened frequently in modern societies."

The new mass-based institutions - panchayat and cooperatives and schools are yet to stabilize and get hold of people in the villages. Unless it is not done modernization will lack the support of masses, and hence fail to reach the goals. As long as modernization is a tool in the hands of a privileged few, directed from the top in the government, it will benefit only a few who control resources and share power at the cost of all others who lack these things. Non-strengthening of the democratic peoples-institutions to get hold of power at various levels is one of the major reasons behind the imbalanced growth, that is, wealth is accumulated in hands of few and the majority is
reduced to being pampers. Unless representatives of the masses and not of the privileged few on the top get hold of the power and control the newly introduced institutions at all levels - planning, implementation and governance, modernization can not be a people's programme involving mass participation. Instead, it will be modernization of modernized leaving the masses under poverty and backwardness.

Reformative measures instituted after independence aimed at solving problems of economic inequality, poverty and stagnation. But they failed to cherish these goals. It did result in changes in the composition of elite at national and state levels but the changes in the power structure and social stratification especially at village level are remote. The old system of stratification and power structure in the villages has not undergone any radical change. Nevertheless, growth of the new elite either from among the lineage group of traditional power holders or outside, is consistent with the process of political modernization.

Politicalism, as explained earlier in chapter four is measured on a thirteen points scale based upon the items that show individual's interest, and degree of participation in politics. What call our attention most is the fact that quite a significant number of people educated and serving in responsible positions including some engaged in business showed no or less interest in politics.
Some of them did not even vote at some of the previous elections. Either they did not bother to see themselves registered as voters at places they served or they did not go for voting. When asked one of them replied that politics as it has been operating in our country for the last one decade appeared to be a game in the hands of third raters. "Being a government servant," he said, "I am not supposed to take part in politics except listening the speeches of the leaders and voting. I do not find any leader worthy of listening to. I do not vote as I know that my vote alone is not going to change the make up of the national politics or fate of the people at large." Another said, "I lost all faith in electoral politics." Decline in the overall percentage of voting at the mid-term parliament poll (1979) or elections of dissolved assemblies (1980) and appeals from the various learned comers for the boycott of voting, manifest people's resentment over dirty politics of the selfish and ambitious third grade politicians and their uncharitable avaricious and severe character. It shows alienation of people including, as said above, an important section of educated working class people holding high public offices, from the general stream of the political process.

We know that a people model can no longer function effectively by alienating the people at large. And also
a people government can no longer remain in power by losing confidence and active support of the people. The politics of caste, creed and regionalism seems to have failed to solve people's problems. If dissatisfaction among the people for, and alienation of the general masses from the electoral politics continued to prevail for long, the present democratic model will ultimately collapse paving path to a new model which reflects the hopes and aspiration of the masses.