Introduction

Revolutionary changes in epistemological process with increasing reliance on reasoning and systematic logical thinking in place of speculative, theological and metaphysical assumptions began to crystallize during the Renaissance period in Europe. Changes in the process of human thought led to the industrial revolution in England (1760-1830) and subsequent political revolution in France (1789-1794). The socio-economic changes that were initiated through the growth and development of science and technology first in the West Europe and later diffused to rest of the world came to be conceptualised as Europeanization, Westernization and Americanization. The concept synthesizing all these aforesaid trends in society is recently known as modernization.

India was exposed to modern European thinking and scientific technology only in the nineteenth century as a British colony. Britishers, though for the sake of their own interests, created certain forces that generated new changes in various spheres of social life. They initiated drastic changes in land settlement, revenue collection, and village administration. This process could let loose the centuries-old rural inertia and made village-population more mobile through the extension of transportation facilities such as roads, railways, and sea-routes. This could widen personal communication by creation of facilities like post and telegraph. They also geared country's economy by establishing factories, mills and mines, and evoked new awareness among the Indian by instituting scientific and
Machines replaced muscles. Moreover, it displaced men from his traditional abode. Technology shortened spatial distance and cut across closed social bonds. It saved men's time, and made his control over nature more pronounced. But at the same time it also led to an increase in his interests and involvements. The natural energy not only replaced animate power but also generated forces and created conditions that formed the basis for the radical changes in human relations. Modernization of agriculture and other means of production, trade and commerce led to the changes in the power-structure, social and economic relations, personality and value systems. The village which had been relatively stable prior to the advent of modern era has set upon rapid changes precipitating contradictions and experiencing various strains in its structure. The process is not simple. It is not one-sided. Changes in social structure, in turn, not only facilitated but to some extent determined the nature and course of scientific and technological developments too. The complex and rapid changes taking place in the social structure especially in the third world countries posed great challenge before the social scientists. The present study is a piece of endeavour the sociologists have made in response to the above challenge.
The Problem

There are three mutually related aspects of social reality in which modernization can be observed and interpreted. These are individual, culture and social structure. The present study tends to reveal the nature of and the major trends in the process of rural modernization both at the individual and institutional levels and illuminate the contradiction the social structure projects during the course of transformation. Modernization in the realm of culture (the body of knowledge, norms and values) does not directly come in our present discussion. It appears as subsidiary only where its mention is necessary to throw light upon the changes in the other two realms that is, individual and social structure.

At individual level the study attempts to measure attitudinal modernity and seeks to examine the factors which are causally related with it. At institutional level it seeks to analyze modernizing trends in major rural institutions viz., marriage, family, system of stratification, economic and power structure. While doing so it also tends to examine their interrelation and interaffects. In other words, attempt has also been made to understand how changes in one institution affects changes in others. For instance, increasing industrialization and mechanization of agriculture emancipated people from semi-serfdom, and hereditary labour bonds, and created new classes in society leading to the creation of new power positions. Likewise, changes in power structure and
subsequent enactment of land reforms and other measures affected the ownership of land and economic domination of the people in the villages.

During the course of modernization whether at the level of individual or institutions, changes within or between structure(s) or substructure(s) are not always compatible or consistent with each other. Contradictions and conflicts are as real parts of a system as consistency and consensus are. Efforts to resolve contradictions that lead to changes in human personality and social structure give rise to the growth of new contradictions into the system. Modernization tends to resolve contradictions which a traditional village structure inheres, and thereby alleviates tensions. But in the process it creates other types of contradictions, and thus promotes new and/or reinforces old tensions in the system. This along with the nature of modernization the study also seeks to reveal the nature and bases of contradictions that have emerged during the process of individual or societal change.

More specifically the study aimed to achieve the following objectives:

(i) to devise a measure for the modernization of villages.

(ii) to examine whether distribution of income is tied with the level of modernization. Does modernization foster more equal distribution of income?

(iii) to measure individual modernism, politicism and secularism of the village people and examine covariance between them. In addition it also tends to find out the factors that determine them.
(iv) to analyse modernizing trends in the rural structure and to see how changes in anyone structure or sub-structure impinge upon changes in others.

(v) to see whether individual modernism, politicism and secularism of the village people are tied with the level of modernization of the villages, Are the people of a modernized village comparatively more modernized, politicized and secularized?

(vi) to examine the nature and bases of the growing contradictions in the village structure.

**Extant Literature**

A bulk of literature in modernization has appeared during the last two decades or so. The whole literature can be classified into three categories:

(a) studies on formation and development of concepts and theory; (b) studies on individual modernization (or modernity), and, (c) studies on societal modernization (including value change). Quite a good number of studies on modernization belong to the first category. They are primarily theoretical in nature. They tend to develop new concepts and theories and/or modify or redefine the old ones by making a critical examination of them (Weiner, 1966; Bendix, 1967; Gusfield, 1967; Jinger, 1971; Black, 1966; 1976; Eisenstadt, 1973, 1977). These works have been brought to focus under the conceptual and theoretical discussions of the process in the last two consecutive sections of this chapter.

Studies of the second category are primarily quantitative in nature. They seek to measure individual modernization
(or modernity or modernism) and analyse causal factors. Kahl (1963) emphasized upon socio-economic status as the major determinant of attitudinal modernity. Aмер and Youtz (1971) controlled alternative modernising influences such as urban and factory experiences, media exposure, membership of voluntary associations, and parental modernity etc. to study the role of formal education in the development of individual modernity. Schmaiberg (1971) studied impact of education and urbanization in the development of modern attitude among the Turkish women. These scholars look at modernization as continuum and not a discrete dichotomy.

Individual modernity, according to Portes (1973:16), is a syndrome of psycho-social orientations characterized, intrinsically, by a certain mental flexibility in dealing with new situations and, extrinsically, by similarity of an ideal type of behaviours proper to urban industrial societies. His study of lower class Guatemalans reveals that urban residence and social status determined by education, occupation and quality of dwelling are about equally strong determinants of modernity (1973: 31). Daykin and Kertel (1978) studied relative impact of place of residence (rural-urban) and socio-economic status on individual modernity. They found that urban residents are more modern than villagers and that within each residential sector, sons are more modern than their fathers. Rural-urban differences in modernity for the older generation are small as compared to those for the younger generation.
Moreover, rural sons appear to be more modern than the urban fathers (1978: 384). Trivedi (1974) observed that the urge for modernization is greater in the instrumental realm. In categorical realm the general tendency is to preserve the traditions.

On the basis of the data collected from six developing countries including India, Smith and Inkeles (1966, 1974) developed an overall modernity (OM) scale for the measurement of individual modernization. Inkeles (1966) classified the characteristics that make men modern as external and internal. In the former he puts environmental factors (i.e. attributes of one's life space) such as urbanization, education, mass communication, industrialization and politicization. In the latter he includes such personality traits as attitudes, values and beliefs, peculiar to modern men. It is only when man has undergone a change in spirit and acquired certain new ways of thinking, feeling and acting that we come to consider him truly modern (Inkeles 1966: 140). Major personality traits characteristic to a modern man are: (i) readiness to new experiences and openness to innovation and change; (ii) forming opinion over diversified and distant problems and issues; (iii) better sense of time; (iv) belief to do planned and organized affairs; (v) efficacy; (vi) calculability; (vii) dignity for himself and others; (viii) faith in science and technology; (iv) belief in distributive justice (Inkeles 1969).
Inkeles (1965, 1969) specified education, occupational experience (factory and other modern productive and administrative enterprises), exposure to mass-media, urban environment, development of national state and its associated apparatus of government, bureaucracy, political parties and military etc. as the major sources of modernizing influence upon individuals.

Contrary to the former, studies in societal modernization are primarily qualitative in nature. They are of two types - macro study and micro study. Generally, macro studies have been conducted in societal level (Lemer, 1958; Eisenstadt, 1966; Levy, 1966; Singer, 1972; Black, 1975; Vajpeyi, 1979). But there are some works which study even international systems (Nettle and Robertson, 1968). Micro-studies on the other hand attempt to analyse modernization in a limited area: be that a village, or sometimes a group of villages or a small region. Once the area of a study is delimited, intensive microscopic analysis becomes easy. These studies may further be categorised as, (1) studies of change confined to some particular aspect(s) of social life such as social stratification (Dumont, 1972; Mathur, 1964; Shama 1974; Singh, 1978a; Ahmed 1977; Colm 1978); Family and Kinship (Shama, 1973, Cough, 1956, 1973; Sen, 1965; Kolenda, 1970); Communication (Majumdar, 1958; Rao, 1966; Roy, Waisenen & Rogers 1969, Sinha, 1976); Leadership (Beals, 1969, 1973; Chakravarty, 1975; Mishra, 1977); Social interaction (Sen Gupta, 1970, Bose and Jodha, 1965); ritual (Rhattacharya, 1976);
Education (Chatnager, 1972); economic development (Epstein, 1979) etc. and,

(2) Village monograph - It presents an overall picture— ecology, demography, social, economic, political and cultural life of a village. A monograph provides background knowledge of village life and insight for further research. Based on such works, gainful abstractions and tentative generalizations can be drawn and put for further investigation and tests.

A large number of research work on village community appeared in late fifties (Dube, 1955; Marriott, 1955; Srinivas, 1955; Lewis, 1958, 1963; Ghurye, 1960; Deals, 1963; Chattopadhyaya, 1964; Karve and Donle, 1963, Coswami, 1967; Chauhan, 1967, Visser and Visser 1969; Mukherjee, 1971; Shukla, 1976). Though these studies touched upon change, their primary area of focus was stability and maintenance of the village social structure. Later, the modernization of rural technology, expansion of education, introduction of land and other social and economic reforms, and extension of democratic institutions and community services etc. in villages brought about the rapid changes in the Indian village society. And it became a subject of prime concern for the scholars (Dube, 1955; Coul, 1967; Baranbas, 1939; Ishwaran, 1970; Panchanadikar and Panchanadikar 1970; 1978; Godwin, 1972; Mathur, Shukla and Singh, 1973; Mulay and Ray 1973; Venkatarayappa, 1973; Jamnu, 1974, Miller, 1975, Sharma,
1975; Subrahmanyan, 1975; Agrawal, 1976; Lakshminarayana, 1976; Hiramani, 1977). Besides these, there are some village studies that too like the former studies, followed largely structural-functional framework but they laid more emphasis upon conflict than cohesion in their analysis of village social structure (Orenstein, 1965; Singh, 1967; Betelle, 1969, Aiyappan, 1965, Singh, 1974).

M.N. Srinivas is a great exponent of structural-functional model in the study of Indian villages. He largely holds the view that village is an organic system (1960, 1967), a cohesive unit, composed of mutually integrated substructures. An emphasis upon solidarity and consensus in the analysis of social system may be seen in most of his works. Srinivas utilizes caste-framework in the study of Indian village society (1962, 1976). "... even today", says Srinivas (1979, 242) "agricultural production requires the cooperation of several castes, and even traditionally competition between different castes did occur though it was not very common. The use of caste idiom is widespread, though the idea of hierarchy is being increasingly rejected by those groups traditionally confined to the bottom."

Srinivas postulated the concepts like Sanskritization and Westernization for indicating endogenous and exogenous sources of change respectively in Indian society (1952, 1966). Since then these concepts serve as dominant tools in the analysis of social change in India (Mukherjee, 1977: 87). Sanskritization refers to changes in the ritual status and
social position of an individual or group within the established framework of caste and traditions. Whereas Westernization refers to the changes in the social and cultural system emanating from the contacts of the West, especially, Great Britain.

Srinivas's (1959) concept of 'dominant caste,' from methodological viewpoint, is an extension of his caste-framework, so that more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of rural society may be procured. It is an extension in the sense that it serves as a link between the caste and class frameworks, in the analysis of Indian village society. "A caste, to quote Srinivas, (1967: 18) "may be said to be dominant when it preponderates numerically over the other castes and when it also wields preponderant economic and political power. A large and powerful caste group can more easily be dominant if its position in the local hierarchy is not too low". Thus a dominant caste may or may not be high in ritual status. Major characteristics of a dominant caste are: (i) sizeable amount of cultivable land, (ii) strength of numbers; (iii) high place in local hierarchy; (iv) formal education; (v) administrative jobs and, (vi) urban sources of income (Srinivas, 1966: 10-11).

Earlier works of Dube (1955; 1957) were primarily aimed at substantiation and evaluation of the success of the developmental planning and programmes for the village communities. The sociological issues in these studies were secondary. But
many of his later works are categorically devoted to modernization. Based on works of some eminent scholars like Daniel Lerner, J.S. Coleman etc. Dube describes following attributes for modernization: empathy, mobility, high participation, interest articulation, interest aggregation, institutional political competition, rational ends-means calculation, new attitudes to wealth, work, savings and risk takings, faith in desirability and possibility of change, socio-economic and political discipline and capacity to put off immediate and short-run satisfactions for higher satisfaction in the long run (1967: 37-8).

According to Dube, modern society is a rational or scientific society. Its objectives can be achieved through (a) radically altering the structure of economic opportunities, and, (b) introducing critical institutional changes. These objectives can be attained only through a series of complex formal organizations with highly specialised and differentiated roles (1974: 9).

What strategy a society should adopt for its effective modernization? Dube (1971: 510) suggests following measures (a) directed change in the system of attitudes, beliefs and values, (b) growth of infrastructure to adapt to foreign technology, and, (c) laying the foundations of institutions and organizations which could in time resume responsibility for inadequate innovations and technological growth to the country's needs and problems.
Dube emphasizes upon the need for an adequate national framework for modernization. Such framework for modernization has several components, viz., (i) the cohesive bond of society must be strengthened, (ii) social restraints and social discipline must be developed, (iii) need of expertise in policy making and in its implementation, (iv) an effective reward system which encourages excellence of performance and curbs inefficiency and corruption (1974: 11-12).

Dube views culture to play a significant role in modernization of society. Some elements of Indian culture like Karmadharma, pursartha self-action, truth, non-violence, harmony and tempered resignation promotes modernization. While there are some other elements viz., cyclical view of life, hierarchical segmentation, transcendentalism, purity-pollution, male-ascendancy and familism that are incompatible with the modern ethos (1967: 44-45). "In initial stages", Dube observes (1974: 10) "traditional values may be impediment to behavioural changes but if the incentive for the latter are strong, behaviour does change and value changes often follow". Modernization, in view of him, does not destroy country's root in history. Japan has been able to maintain a degree of Japanese ness so can India maintain its Indianness (Dube 1967: 50).

Yogendra Singh (1973) makes a critical examination of the major concepts and theories which have been utilized in the study of social change. He pin-points two major areas in the study of social change. (1) The area of change - social
structure (caste, family, village system, political, economic and occupational structures and social categories such as elite, professional groups and working classes) and tradition, and, (ii) sources (endogamous and exogamous) which generate changes in the social system. As a major trend he foresees increasing contradictions and conflicts in the Indian social system, and hence emphasizes the need for a dialectical model for its study. "... the contours of emerging social contradictions become visible. The class structure is slowly but steadily moving towards polarization. The upper and the middle classes have gained maximum benefits and have extended their base of social, economic and political power ... The poor and the have-nots, the Harijans and the backward tribes remain at the bottom of social hierarchy ... This process breeds tension, organized resistance... It would increasingly generate conflicts and contradictions. To grasp this reality of the Indian social system, a dialectical model of reasoning is assuredly more effective and offers great promise" (Singh, 1977: XXI).

Singh classifies into two sets the theoretical orientations applied in the study of modernization. The first set deals with the nature and direction of the process. It categorizes the approaches as evolutionary (with presumption that all societies will ultimately evolve a similar cultural form of modernization despite their historical dissimilarities) and relativistic (which recognizes possibilities of divergent patterns in modernization owing to diversity in historical
tradition. Secondly, on the basis of conceptual components and variables used in the analysis of the process, the approaches for the study of modernization may be categorized as - systematic and compartmental. The former utilizes a macro approach while the latter applies micro analysis. The above two sets of approaches when combined give us four possible categories - evolutionary-systematic, evolutionary-compartmental, and relativistic-systematic, and relativistic-compartmental (1978b: 40-41).

Deviating partially from Srinivas, Andre Betelille, a student of his, emphasized upon the need for a class framework to complement the existing caste framework for the study of Indian agrarian structure (1977a: 23-24, 142-43). Betelille (1977b: 1978) too followed the general postulates of the structural-functional model in his analysis of Indian agrarian system, but instead of emphasizing upon interrelatedness and interdependence between the components of the system in ritual terms, as Srinivas and many others did, he focussed upon various forms of inequality, conflict, tension, and unrest in it. Introducing his work entitled, "Studies in Agrarian Social Structure", Betelille (1977a: 1) makes the point clear at the outset: "... the essays presented in this book seek to explore a certain field of enquiry from various points of departure ... the main concern is with patterns of inequality and conflict as these arise from the ownership, control and use of land. Other problems and issues (family, kinship, and religion etc.) are discussed only when they touch upon this main concern."
Betelille's (1977a: 33, 49) concept of class is used on people's model (i.e. in terms of native categories) rather than the sociologists' model. Depending largely upon Weberian perspective, Betelille, speaks of status, class and power as the bases of social stratification. Accordingly, he attempts to relate the three - caste, class and power, in his study of the village Sripuram (as he named) of Tanjore district (Betelille, 1969). Focussing upon the patterns of and changes in the social stratification, Betelille finds that in a traditional structure caste, class and power are fused with each other. The Brahmins occupied ritually highest position; they were the landowners and they also constituted the traditional elite. But in the modern period, the traditional systems of stratification are becoming more and more free of each others. The ownership of land, occupation, leadership positions and education etc. have become much caste free.

E. Kathleen Gough's basic foundations are primarily based upon structural functional model (1960, 1967, 1971). But in her analysis of Indian social system in general and caste in particular she appears to be more close to Max Glueckman than Radcliffe Brown (Deshpande, 1979: 116). As she places more emphasis upon the cleavages and conflicts and their resolutions in the analysis of village social system and its maintenance.

Gough essentially utilizes a caste framework in studying Kumbapettai, a Tanjore village, but her major findings are given in class terms. Moreover, her analysis of caste is
more in Weberian tradition that is in terms of status, class and power, and it hardly utilizes purity pollution framework as emphasized by Srinivas and his followers. For she speaks of changes in the caste based statuses of people in terms of the changes in the distribution of economic and political power in the village.

Taking note of the heterogeneous economic composition of Brahmin, non-Brahmin and low castes people in the village, Gough concludes that caste community is no longer homogeneous in occupation and wealth. And that caste is today a limiting rather than a determining factor in the choice of occupation (Gough, 1971: 32). Keeping in view the situations that prevail in the area Gough looks forward to the weakening of the caste identities as a major trend in Indian villages. "In Tanjore village in 1952", observes Gough (1971: 59), "indeed one major conflict over-rude all others; that between the landed and the landless. It results from the acute agricultural over-population, the concentration of land-ownership within a small fraction of the population, and the failure to develop industrial employment for surplus villages. It seems logical to conclude that such economic and class conflicts, whatever their outcome, will in the future weaken the identities of caste."

D.P. Mukerjee employed dialectical approach in interpreting historical facts in the analysis of social change. Social change is generated through the resolution of conflict and contradictions. DP envisages contradiction between the
newly emerged class interests and the tradition, culture and value systems, or in traditions itself, that is, between the traditions which are central to dharma and the new ones that are emerging with the development of urban middle class during last one century (Mukerjee, 1953).

A.R. Desai's (1967, 1975) sociological insight is largely based on Marxist perspective. He (1975) critically examines four dominant non-Marxist approaches of modernization from historical materialist standpoint and puts forward Marxist model as the only accurate path for the liberation and modernization of the third world countries. He characterises capitalist aid to the developing world as 'myth' 'pillage' or 'exploitation', and economic cooperation as indirect subjugation, neo-colonial subjection of the third world. In fact, aid pattern, according to him, is the basic obstacle in the development of these countries. In his opinion, capitalist class and the colonial exploitation are the historic source and the contemporary cause of underdevelopment, and that these must be eliminated first to permit such development (1975: 16-17). As regards India, he observes that unless it is recognized that the Indian state is a class state of Indian bourgeoisie and that the development of Indian society has followed capitalist path of modernization we will form a wrong notion of the implications of Indian development.
NEED FOR THE STUDY

As there is already a vast body of literature available on modernization more specifically on social change in rural India, the question might legitimately be put forward: what the need of the present study is? In what way this study is going to add to our knowledge of village society? These are some of the pertinent questions that need to be answered before we begin our investigation.

The significance of the present study can be indicated on the following two major counts.

1. Theoretical significance. (a) Studies in modernization are largely concerned with individual or societal changes. But the studies of the first category, that is in rural modernity, are less common than the study of changes in rural structure. Many new institutions and norms of life have recently been introduced in villages as a part of the social, economic, political or educational development programmes with a view to bring out changes in rural society. But changes in institutions are arduous and take a long course of time. Moreover, the success or failure of the programmes depends to a large extent upon the degree the individuals become modernized so as to welcome or resist these changes. The present study, thus, is an attempt to bridge the gap between the studies of individual and those of societal modernization. It not only gives due attention to the study of individual modernization, but also tends to examine both the aspects of the process simultaneously which has not been duly attended to by the
previous studies. In so doing, it resorts to examination of the bearings the modernization of village has had upon the modernization of villagers.

(b) Individual secularism and politicism are closely related with modernism. In fact they are parts of modernism. But they have generally been dealt separately by the previous scholars. The study of interrelation and interaction between them have been neglected by and large. Likewise, interrelation and interaction between changes in the specific social isolates like family, caste, occupational and economic structure etc. have also not been adequately examined as compared to the changes in each of them separately. We make an endeavour to fill up this lacuna. Thus, at the individual level, while studying modernity we seek to examine also the relation between individual modernism, politicism, and secularism. Moreover, at societal-level-analysis we tend to see that how changes in one aspect of social structure affect changes in others.

(c) So far village studies have largely been conducted in structural functional tradition and are primarily based on consensual or equilibrium model. The discrepancies and inconsistencies lying in the different aspects of or in the nature and pace of modernization, and the contradictions which emerge or are renewed during the process of change have been neglected by and large. In fact, when we take into consideration different aspects of the process together, many of the discrepancies and contradictions in the system become distinct and visible. Unless we understand them our knowledge of village
structure will remain incomplete and that the formulation, modification and execution of the policies and programmes as regards modernization and development of villages or its people cannot be satisfactorily worked out. Because contradiction in rural modernization has been a less explored area, we tend to give wide coverage to the analysis of its nature, type and social foundations in our study.

2. Regional implications

Study of modernization has three practical aspects:
(a) rational utilisation of resources; (b) removal of regional imbalances, and, (c) reorientation of the development process, i.e., development of the country as a whole instead of the pockets of affluence. It is needless to say that some parts of the country or sections of population are highly developed and modernized whereas some others are equally backward. Regional imbalance in development not only impedes progress but also leads to tensions, unrest and disturbances in society. The present condition of the northeast regions of the country is a burning example of this fact. The role of the social scientists in bringing out the lacunae and inconsistencies in of the planning and process/intra and inter region development is of immense importance especially in a developing country like ours - full of diversities, graded inequality and contradictions. It is an act of grave negligence on the part of our planners, policy makers and executives that some regions are still very backward and poor. Scholars are also not
responsible for this. They generally studied the areas of affluence such as Punjab, Delhi, Western Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat and southern part of India and that the backward regions like Madhya Pradesh, Eastern Uttar Pradesh and North east part of the country were left almost untouched.

Modernization, especially in initial stages, is largely conditioned by the physical and cultural factors of a country or region. Regional differences have great bearings upon the nature and pace of modernization, say for example, the innovative, adoptive and entrepreneurial character of Punjab differ from that of Chhattisgarh of Madhya Pradesh. But at the same time the impingement of modernization on socio-cultural life and value patterns of individuals in Punjab is quite different from that of almost equally modernized Gujarat. The present study highlights the structure and process of change in the Eastern Uttar Pradesh where a large section of country's population live under grave scarcity and extreme poverty. They are predominantly governed by traditions and customs. A comparison of the findings of such studies from different regions belonging to different levels of development may deepen our insight and help formulate the programme and strategies for effective modernization of the nation as a whole reducing regional disparities and imbalances.

DEFINING THE CONCEPTS

Modernization

Modernization is generally equated with various types of social and cultural changes. Many a time it is used as
synonym or defined in terms of economic development (Chattopadhyay, 1971: 134). Economic development broadly refers to four distinct, but interrelated processes: (i) In technology it denotes change from simple and traditional technology to scientific technology; (ii) In agriculture it refers to a shift in farming from the farming for subsistence to commercial production; (iii) In industry it denotes transition from the use of human and animal power to industrialization, and (iv) In ecology it specifies movement of population from farm and village to urban concentration (Smelser, 1966). Precisely, economic development refers to mechanism of production process and industrialization. Thus a society in economic terms, is modernized if it is highly industrialized and traditional, if it is based on subsistence agriculture.

Industrialization involves large scale production through the use of inanimate power and machines. It also involves large scale organization of men, money and materials which includes monetization, urbanization and mechanization. Following are the three major types of relations between modernization and industrialization:

(1) Modernization is a direct consequence of or caused by industrialization. In other words, modernization is the social effect of industrialization (Jones 1976: 36).

(ii) Modernization is functionally associated with industrialization (Moore 1978: 96-7).

(iii) Though modernization and industrialization are historically related processes, they are separate and indepen-
dent phenomena. Modernization may occur without development (Jacob, 1971).

Industrialization primarily denotes economic changes. It refers to a particular economic process that resulted as a consequence of eighteenth-century technological revolution: the use of inanimate power, that is, heat, oil, electricity and nuclear, and machines in production. Modernization, on the other hand, is a broader concept. It includes changes even in technology and economy. But it is not specifically concerned with the changes that originated in the eighteenth century technological revolution. Modernization of technology or economy refers to any advancement, innovation or inclusion of any new device or technique(s) into the system generally of a higher order.

Techno-economic advancement may accompany or cause social advancement. Likewise, social advancement does not always resist but many a time facilitates and sometimes it even necessitates techno-economic advancement. Large scale production needs functional differentiation of social roles and growth of various new institutions. Industrial development not only depends upon technical, managerial, and professional skills but also on a congenial social atmosphere both inside and outside the place of production. The economic factors like investment criteria, resource allocation economic growth etc., are directly related to non-economic factors like population growth, urbanization rate, socialization of youth, development of rational attitude, achievement criteria,
mass media exposure, and organization of technical and professional education. It has largely been recognized even by economists that economic growth involves more than economic variables (Nash Manning, 1968; Roselitz, 1968). Sociologists emphasized the role of non-economic factors in the economic growth of society (Myrdal, 1968; Core 1971; 233). "... large scale change" says Dube (1967: 33), "cannot be compartmentalized: techno-economic changes necessarily produce some change in the socio-political order and what is more important is that without some socio-political infrastructures the extent and speed of socio-economic changes are severely limited."

Modernization denotes both the types of changes - economic and social, albeit changes in social structure constitute the central part of the process. If industrialization serves as a source of modernization the latter also serves as a source for the former. Many changes in social structure do not bear any relation to industrialization. In fact, the real source of both the processes, as we will see while we define modernization, is science. Whatever rapport industrialization seems to bear directly upon modernization, may be regarded as the indirect effect of science upon the latter. Likewise, there are many direct effects of science on social structure which do not involve industrialization at all.

A general trend in sociological literature may be seen to refer socio-cultural changes in Indian society for the pre-British period as sanskritization, with the advent of British, Westernization, and for the period after Independence
as modernization. Sanskritization, primarily, refers to the changes in the social and ritual status of an individual or a group who occupy a low place in the caste-echelon and who tend to emulate a higher caste, usually, Kshattriya in the north India, in order to raise his social and ritual status equal to the latter. Sanskritization, thus, is a concept which denotes changes in a limited sphere of social intercourse. Moreover, with radical alterations in the system of distribution of economic and political power after Independence, the general trend among people, irrespective of caste and class is to acquire the qualities most befitting to the modern conditions of life.

Westernization is a cultural phenomenon. It refers to the adoption of specific goals and modes of behaviour as set out by the advanced Western countries. Thus, Westernization is essentially a value-loaded term. It denotes preferences for the model laid down by the Western countries. Modernization, in the sense — a rational transformation of social order (Sharma, 1978: 43), is a value-free term and hence transcends cultural delimitation. The interpretation of modernization given in terms of Westernization by many scholars (Toynbee, 1962: 24; Lerner, 1958, 1968; Moore, 1978) is criticized by others that it suffers with ethnocentric bias and ideological preference (Alatas, 1975: 55). Except in Philippine no where else the twin processes may be seen to move together. Because

1. For a detailed discussion and criticism of the Western model see last section of this chapter entitled: theoretical orientations.
of close colonial contact or otherwise, many Asian countries acquired Western knowledge, adopted Western technology and to some extent Western life style. But at the same time, they preserved their culture and retained their life style too. Science, which we consider to be the basic source of modernization, is universal in nature. Consequently, modernization is also a global and not a parochial phenomenon. It is like science, neither Indian, nor Western or Chinese or Russian (Smith, 1965: 12-16).

As we designed to study only those alterations that occur in individual's attitudes and actions, and in the village social structure in the context of some specific goals and direction which has been laid down by the country, we prefer to use the word 'modernization' in place of change. The latter is a general term which denotes all sorts of changes taking place in the structure and function of society, including in its broader purview changes in the culture and individuals' personality too. Moreover, there is a difference in the viewpoints of the two analyses - the analysis of change and the analysis of modernization. The former analyses social-cultural changes generally from a purity pollution perspective, whereas the latter, being ethically neutral, seeks to examine changes in terms of rationalization of attitude and behaviour.

Towards a definition of modernization - Various definitions of modernization have been given by the social scientists. Many scholars conceive modernization as a process that denotes transition of society from one level (considered generally as
lower, say for example, traditional, pre-industrial, underdeveloped etc.) to another (considered generally as higher to the preceding ones: modern, industrial, developed etc.) (Lemer, 1958; Moore, 1978; Rostow, 1960; Eisenstadt, 1966). There are others who consider such a view as misleading and faulty. Because no society in the world is fully modern or traditional. A highly modernized society may comprise some elements of tradition. Likewise, a traditional society may have some elements of modernization. Moreover, societies may devise models of their own or they may adopt models other than the Western and that they may attain modernization level without losing their identity and character. But the dichotomous or the continuum concept of modernization, as we will see in the last part of this chapter, explicitly or implicitly projects a preference for the Western model.

There is another category of scholars who conceptualize modernization on the basis of some specific changes as given below: in social structure-differentiation of structure, specialization of role, and higher order integration of both, institutions and roles (Parsons, 1960, 1964), in value pattern-universalism, specificism and achievement orientation (Parsons, 1951); secularity, rationality and social mobility (Lemer, 1958); Rationality, social justice, individual freedom, economic prosperity etc. (Gunnar Myrdal quoted in Sharma 1973:46) or nature and degree of adoption of modern technology (Levy, 1966). These accounts, though non-prescriptive in nature, conceive
modernization through one or the other aspects of the process. But any definition of modernization must take into consideration the social reality as a whole and bear clear impression about the nature, source, content and goals of the process.

The basic foundations of our definition of modernization is largely based on the works of Mark G. Field (1976) and T. Anthony Jones (1976). Modernization, as we mean, denotes the process of development in the three mutually related aspects of social reality—culture, personality and social structure, in such a way that advancement in the realm of thought, that is, the development of scientific knowledge, brings about changes leading to universal, rational and positivistic values, structure and role differentiation and creation of secular institutions, and development of scientific, secular attitude and modern personality. To reiterate, out of the three major dimensions of modernization, as mentioned above, our primary concern here is only with the individual and societal modernization. Culture or value aspect has been discussed only when it borders upon the main concern.

Nature of modernization - Following are the major characteristics of modernization.

(1) Complexity - Modernization denotes multiplicity of changes taking place in various aspects of society. Some important among these changes are - industrialization, urbanization,

2. Our discussion is primarily based on the works of Huntington (1976); Jones (1976), and Bendix (1967).
social differentiation, social mobilization, secularization and politicization. These processes interact in various ways and are intricately related with each other to give rise to a complex nature of the process. Moreover, the interrelatedness and intereffectiveness of the various processes of change in modernization give the process a systemic nature.

(ii) **Universality** - Modernization is a global process. Universality, in fact, is inherent in scientific knowledge which form the basis for the growth of modernization. The ever growing education, transport and communication etc. not only extend contacts but also broaden outlook, inculcate tolerance and bring close contact and rapport among divergent people, groups and nations. This gives rise to the emergence of a relatively homogenous system of values and patterns of behaviour and relationships.

(iii) **Adaptability** - Modernization puts before individuals and groups need to adapt to the new changes taking place in society. In the process of rapid socio-economic changes, individuals are likely to aspire for various positions and are supposed to perform different kinds of roles. Those who fail to go along with these changes perish. In the course of modernization a number of new institutions emerge in order to meet the demands of the rapid changes and fulfill new aspirations of the people. However, most of the old institutions instead of being eliminated get themselves modified to adapt to the altered conditions of life.
(iv) **Dynamism** - Modernization implies change. It is an ongoing process. With the advancement of scientific knowledge and technical skill, the conditions of life undergo a radical change. A society based on subsistence agriculture, clan or village government is traditional or primitival, as compared to modern society regulated by inanimate sources of power and governed by complex organizations and formal institutions. Likewise, the latter is liable to give way to a post-modern or an ultra-modern society articulated by nuclear fission and sustained by test-tube babies.

(v) **Irreversibility** - Modernization is an irreversible process. Because once a society sets upon modernization and reaches a stage in industrialization, urbanization or educational development is not likely to fall back in near future. There may occur 'temporary breakdowns' or 'occasional reversals' in some or other element(s) of modernization but the process as a whole is irreversible in nature. It is goal-oriented. It is desirable. Though a large number of people, who for wishful opposition or inability, fail to adapt to the changes, are eliminated during the process. Yet it is through modernization that the people act to achieve they desire and aspire for a higher standard of living, better conditions of life etc.

(vi) **Revolutionary and evolutionary nature** - Modernization is a process both revolutionary and evolutionary in nature. It is revolutionary in the sense that it involves large scale alterations amounting to radical change in social structure.
As modernization of a country goes ahead, the bulk of its agriculturally settled population is transferred to cities. This brings about revolutionary changes in the structure of society no less than the innovation of agriculture must have brought about by bringing the nomads to settle down as agriculturists (Bendix, 1967). It is evolutionary in the sense that it takes centuries or generations to bring about such changes. Furthermore, the models or the more detailed patterns of modernization may differ from one society to another, yet societies essentially pass through somewhat similar stages of development while they move from traditional to modern.

(vii) **Diffusiveness** - Modernization by nature is diffusive. Once the scientific and technological frameworks and concomitant institutional kernels of a modern society are established or attained they get diffused beyond their original or natal boundary.

(viii) **Equalizer or homogenizer** - Modernization tends to reduce all sorts of inequality - regional, national, cultural, linguistic, social and economic etc. It erodes regional patterns and weakens local institutions. Modernization promotes a tendency to move towards equality and commonness. The universal character and equalizing or homogenizing tendency of modernization led many people to assume that modernization leads to the convergence of societies. This view needs a sharp examination and we will take up this issue in the preceding theoretical discussion at the end of this chapter.
(ix) **Tendency to retain one's own character** - Modern societies though tend to have some universal character albeit there is an explicit tendency in all modernizing societies to retain their uniqueness or identity.

**Source of Modernization**

As is clear from our definition that the basic source or the prime cause of modernization is science. Science helps differentiate analysis of modernization from the analysis of social change. The latter is based on technology and hence it is older. The former by virtue of being based on science is recent. "There is little doubt", says Jones (1976:33) "that science has become a continued source of innovation in society, both directly by creating new occupational roles, making new forms of social organization and communication possible, altering longevity and so on and indirectly as a source of innovation in productive technology," Briefly, the role of science in modernization can be illustrated with the help of the following paradigm.

**Goals**

Once the laws that govern nature and society are explored they are used to enhance man's control over his environment - physical or social. Modernization is a part of that endeavour. Thus modernization is a goal-oriented process. The first step in modernization process is to lay down its goals. It is only after the goals are specified selection of model and mode of action etc. are done.
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The emphasis a society lays upon a goal or a set of goals may differ from one country to other, whether a socialist or a democratic. But the major goals are almost common to all of them. These are, (1) higher standard of living, (ii) better conditions of life for the people, (iii) social security and, social justice, (iv) equality and, (v) freedom.
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Modernization, as we defined, denotes changes in all the three aspects of social reality - culture, personality and social structure. In fact individual, society and culture represent different dimensions of the same reality. Individual and culture are social in nature and growth, individual and society are sustained and governed by the culture, and the society and culture are created and carried by men. Thus it is the social reality or the totality of the social facts, when manifested in individual units it is individual, in terms of relationship between the units it is society, and in terms of unifying norms, values and goals of actions it is culture. The three systems though have their separate historical existence yet are closely related to and intricately interwoven with each other and hence are inseparable. Changes in anyone aspect of the social reality may cause, coincide or accompany changes in other aspects albeit change in the realm of thought assumes greater importance as it acts as prime source of modernization in the three.

Briefly, some major changes that take place during the course of modernization in the three realms are indicated in the following chart.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Type of Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL STRUCTURE</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>High birth rate (no check on birth), high mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Demography &amp; Ecology</td>
<td>Health and Hygiene</td>
<td>Indigenous treatment, unsatisfactory ventilation, and drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>separate, excluded untouchable hamlets</td>
<td>Mixed and clustered settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Economy</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>Commercialised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chart 1 cont'd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Traditional Type of Society</th>
<th>Modern Type of Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of planning</td>
<td>family</td>
<td>state and organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of co-operation</td>
<td>low, customary, competition</td>
<td>organised, high competition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational differentiation</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>customary, bondage, unorganised</td>
<td></td>
<td>Froa, growing conscious against exploitation, organizing against atrocities and also on matters like relegation of low ritual tasks and increased wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of economic relation</td>
<td>Hereditary, customary, patronised</td>
<td>contractual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>kind</td>
<td>cash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Low facilities for transport, communication, cooperative society, fertilizer depot, bank, block school, market, post offices etc.</td>
<td>higher facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Agrarian</td>
<td>Industrialized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Family</td>
<td>size of household Large</td>
<td>small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>late</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chart 1 contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Modern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband-wife relation</td>
<td>Family bonds subordinate conjugal bond, husband and wife relation is defined and family observed in the context of family as a whole on matters like (a) choice of spouse (b) meeting and interaction between them (c) obligation to each other (d) low importance is given to conjugal kins (from the wife's side) as compared to others</td>
<td>By and large conjugal bond subordinates other bonds in wife relation is defined and family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegiance and obligation to parental authority and kinsmen</td>
<td>greater</td>
<td>lesser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to women</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Status role structure</td>
<td>determinant of status</td>
<td>Ascriptive qualities viz., birth, lineage, age</td>
<td>Achievemental traits viz., occupation, income, Education, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mobility (spatial and status)</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>relatively high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allegiance and control</td>
<td>community based viz., family, caste clan, kinship, priest etc.</td>
<td>socially based, viz., government, factory, labour union etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Power &amp; control</td>
<td>Means of control</td>
<td>tradition</td>
<td>law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power structure</td>
<td>Feudal, authoritarian</td>
<td>democratic, socialist, dictatorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of analysis</td>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Traditional Type of Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution of power</td>
<td>Caste or clan council</td>
<td>Village Panchayat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power elite</td>
<td>Elders and influential members of family, caste, clan, kins etc. Village headman</td>
<td>Village pradhan, members of panchayat, political party leaders, rich and educated people in village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Predominantly theological and metaphysical</td>
<td>Predominantly scientific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of knowledge</td>
<td>Sacred, importance to sacred belief and superstition</td>
<td>Profane: rational attitude towards religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>High, emphasis upon observation of ritual, conventional and religious acts</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious involvement</td>
<td>Ascriptive, diffused and particularistic</td>
<td>Positivistic, specific, achievemental, universalistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of values</td>
<td>Religious, ethical</td>
<td>Ethically neutral, secular, humanitarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value-base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Openness to innovation</td>
<td>Low/nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to new experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Less informed, interested in local affairs</td>
<td>Well informed, interested in national and international affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of analysis</td>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Type of Society Traditional</td>
<td>Type of Society Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of time</td>
<td>low/nil</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmopolitan-ness</td>
<td>low/nil</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass media participation</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social participation</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political participation</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change proneness</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activism</td>
<td>fatalist, passivist</td>
<td>aspirant, striving, competitive, entrepreneurial, innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response to new Less responsive opportunities of life</td>
<td>less responsive</td>
<td>highly responsive, rational, maximisation of new opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Science is Greek in origin. It is European in development. But its principles, techniques and findings are neither Greek nor European. It is mainly in this sense that the science is universal. Modern technology and industry are the product of science. But in existential terms they are the capital of a nation or culture and hence they may be called as Western, European, American or Eastern. Though the basic principles of science are same for all but in what field and to what degree scientific research is encouraged and more importantly to what service of the mankind it is applied involve human element and hence may differ from society to society and culture to culture. Here lie normative considerations, value judgments or the question of model for the modernization of a society. Societies innovate or modify their norms, values, and patterns of relations so that they might keep pace with the new ideas and changed conditions of life. In so doing it is not necessary that each society has to formulate its own model. Usually they imitate any one of the established models or a mixture of them. But in most of the cases they do not blindly accept a foreign model. They adapt themselves to an exported model in their own ways.

There are various models of modernization as discussed in the ensuing comments upon modernization theories at the end of this chapter. Most dominant among them are the liberal democratic (or capitalist or Western) model and the socialist model. The former emphasizes individual freedom and
tends to achieve the goals of modernization through democratic planning, individual and institutional efforts with the incentive, guidance, assistance and welfare from the state. The latter proceeds through the state planning and state implementation of the developmental programmes. Most of the third world countries follow a democratic-socialist-model made out of a mixture of the above two models.

**Direction:** The question of direction has been taken at the end of this chapter where we discuss convergence theory of modernization. Studies on modernization show that the process of societal transformation among the late starters is not exactly the same as among the early starters. It is only the time which will say whether all the societies will ultimately develop some basic common characteristics of modernization. But our present body of knowledge leads us to the fact that there operate various ideological and organizational barriers (Dube and Dube 1976), and structural and cultural constraints that block the prospects of modernization of a large mass of people in developing countries. And hence as Singh (1976:6) makes out that "the movement from tradition to modernity in these societies is not straight but involute marked by numberless indigenous adaptations and contradictions."

**Pace:** Modernization denotes a higher speed than evolution or change as occurred during ancient or the middle ages. The pace of modernization in the three dimensions mentioned earlier is not uniform. It may also differ from one countr
to other depending upon their historico-cultural background and resources. The differential rate of modernization among societies or in the different aspects of a society may be accounted for the following facts. (i) In instrumental realm the change is faster but in categorical realm it is slower.

(ii) The pace of modernization is highly affected by the role of the agents (viz., state, U.I.O. etc.) and institutions (education, government, mass media, etc.) of modernization. If they play their role effectively, the modernization is faster.

(iii) The role of elite in modernization is of great importance. There are two classes of elites - higher and lower, in society. The higher elite is the small section of society that generates and controls the forces of modernization. The more harmonious the relation among the higher elites of different categories political, economic, managerial, administrative, religious, educational etc., the faster the modernization in society.

The lower elite comes mostly from the middle class. They are in fact not the creator but carrier of modernization. Higher is their participation in modernization, faster is the rate of the process.

(iv) Besides above, speed of modernization also depends upon the following characteristic features of a country - material resources, the will and determination of the people for change, the nature and amount of constraints the society poses to modernization and the level of scientific and technological advancement.
Modernity: "Attitudinal modernity", according to Smith and Inkeles (1966: 353) "may be defined as a set of attitudes, beliefs, behaviour etc. especially characterizing persons in highly urbanized, highly industrial and highly educated social settings... When (modernity) applied to individuals it refers to a set of attitudes, values and ways of feeling and acting presumably of the sort either generated by or required for effective participation in a modern society."

Secularization - Secularization represents a specific class of change within the larger category of cultural change. It does not mean rejection or discrediting of religion as is generally believed. Rather, it is an act of emancipation from the religious domination in ideas, beliefs and practices. Secularization replaces religion (belief in supernatural which govern human thought and action) by reason.

Secularism implies religious tolerance. "A secular policy", says Gore (1971: 237) "may not be anti-religious, but it is certainly a policy which is non-religious. Secularism is based on a firm acceptance of rationality as the guide of action." Srinivas (1966: 119) characterizes secularization as ceasing religious observances, increasing differentiation in different aspects of society with the result that the economic, political, legal and moral aspects of society are becoming increasingly discrete to each other and rationality, in which traditional belief and ideas are replaced by modern. Loomis (1971: 303-11) regards secularization, in Indian context, as deviation from the norms relating to caste system and sacredness of animals.
**Politization:** Politization is generally meant political socialisation (Saksena 1972: 100). By politicization, we mean a process whereby individuals and groups (caste, class or small radical groups etc.) tend to achieve political power: political status and governmental positions as their most cherished goal in order to gain economic interests, social status and an imperative influence over others. The efforts of seeking political dominance may range from a village Panchayat, cooperative or banking management, school and university unions to the state and parliament membership.

**MAJOR THEORETICAL ORIENTATIONS**

The term modernization first developed in American sociology after the second world war and carried wide popularity in sixties. Sociologists, however, have been interested in the study of social change since the inception of sociology as a discipline. The pioneers of sociology - Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, and Karl Marx, offered an evolutionary explanation of social change. They sought a universal trend in the development of society. Society passed through a series of evolutionary stages in which each successive stage showed a marked complexity, a higher level of technology and social differentiation as compared to the preceding ones, leading finally to the growth of a complex modern society. This comparative evolutionary model was carried further by Emile Durkheim and Max Weber. Durkheim (1956), though a critic of

---

3. For discussion on modernism, secularism and politicism see also chapter IV.
positivist evolutionary theory implicitly utilized evolutionary theme while he made distinction between mechanical and organic divisions of labour. Weber (1904) developed an ideal type model for the purpose of comparison of economic ethics of world's major religion in order to trace the development of capitalism.

Before we proceed to the theoretical scheme and methodological considerations, we would like to discuss first the controversy as regards who, the individual or the institution, plays a dominant role in determining the nature and course of modernization. Two mutually antagonistic viewpoints are given in this regard. One may be called as societal interpretation of modernization. According to the theorists of this category modernization can be interpreted on the basis of transformation of institutions - social: Marxian model: with emphasis upon economic relations, urban: It assumes that the attributes characteristic of a modern man are largely the product of industrial urban setting (Park, 1951), cultural: Weberian model. They, with some variations, believe that the individual attitude and personality structure are the product of social structure and that they undergo changes as the social conditions are altered.

On the other hand, theorists of the other group tend to provide individual or psychological interpretation of modernization. They maintain that unless the attitude and aspirations of individuals are not transformed society cannot be altered. Briefly, they emphasize upon the role the human
nature plays in determining the nature and process of modernization. The role of elites in generating and sustaining changes in society is crucial (Shils 1961). Smith (1965) is one of the great exponents of individual-based interpretation of modernization. He conceives modernization to proceed through the changes in both -- individual and institution; albeit changes in the former are central to the process.

"Modernization", says Smith (1965: 24) "is ... a dialectical process in which intellectual awareness and things like industrial and scientific construction, better health, and much else, proceed side by side intertwining and each furthering the other. I intend seriously to urge, that ... fundamentally in this complex process intellectual and moral awareness is primary, economics and technology is secondary and subordinate." He further maintains that "Marx was simply wrong in his dogma that matter precedes thought, and a great deal of slowness of economic progress in Asian and African countries is the price paid for men accepting this ideological error. Matter influences thought undoubtedly but does not determine it. And the more modern men are, the more fully they will allow the material world to influence their ideas, and yet use their ideas to control and determine the material world (Smith, 1965: 28).

The two viewpoints noted above are partial in nature. They tend to explain the reality from one or the other angle. Moreover, they are deterministic in interpretation as one leads to a social determinism while the other advances a
psychological determinism. A midway interpretation in this regard as given by professor Leamer seems to be appropriate to deal with the controversy. He maintains that individuals and their environments modernize together and that changes in one is furthered by the changes in the other. "Modernizing individuals and institutions, like chicken and egg reproduce these traits in each other" (Leamer 1958: 78).

There are two major streams of thought on modernization in the sociological literature of the post-war period. First, there is the critical variable theory which tends to explain modernization in terms of single type of social change. Theorists of this group equate modernization with rationalization or rational control of man over physical and cultural environment (Schwartz 1972: 76) or technological development (Levy, 1966: 9) or industrialization (Moore, 1978: 96-113). This theory, in view of many scholars, adds nothing new to modernization and is nothing more than a synonym of some old concept.

Secondly, a remarkable development in the macro comparative studies of the post-evolutionary period was the study of typologies, more precisely of dichotomies such as Durkheim's, mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity, Tonnies's, gemeinschaft and gesellschaft, Weber's, traditional and rational; Marx's and Engels', feudal-agricultural and bourgeois-industrial. The traditional and modern dichotomy is the latest among all the above. It was originally employed to differentiate industrial from the non-industrial societies
or the West European from other societies. Now it is used to denote the underdeveloped and the developed societies (Bendix, 1967).

The twentieth century dichotomous approach to modernization was greatly influenced by the nineteenth century evolutionary theory of social change. The dichotomous theory conceptualizes the transformation of societies in terms of bipolar transition (Lemer, 1958: 43-75, Black 1966: 9-26; Eisenstadt 1966: 1-9). Thus, modernization in the view of dichotomous theorists, denotes the process of transformation of societies from traditional to modern. Initially, works of this category tend to make a comparative macro-societal studies of the relations and contrasts between the two - the Western and the non-Western or the traditional and the modern societies. A variety of indices, for example, socio-demographic - urbanization, occupational structure, and mass media exposure, structural - particularistic universalistic, ascription-achievement, specific-diffused, personality types - closed and open; and environmental - restricted-limited, expensive-adaptive etc., were sought and utilised to distinguish between modern and traditional societies (see for such distinction; Lemer, 1958, 1968; Black 1966; Smith, 1965; Parsons, 1951, Rostow 1960; Eisenstadt, 1966; Dube, 1967).

However, owing to the growing need for the development, the focus of scholars shifted from making out characteristic differences between the traditional and the modern societies to the study of transition of societies from tradition to
modem. Moreover, as Moore (1967: 25) points out that the dichotomous analysis of social change needed much attention upon comparative statics rather than the process and procedures, rates and sequences. Hence, instead of dichotomy a concept of tradition-modern continuum was evolved (Smith and Inkeles, 1966, 1974; Inkeles 1976).

In general, according to Eisenstadt (1977: 62) there underlie two major assumptions in the study of transition. Firstly, the process of modernization in different institutional spheres - economic, political and other, tends to follow relatively similar pattern, and secondly, once the central institutional framework of modern system is established in any of these parts of the larger system it would lead similar irreversible structural and organizational developments in all other parts.

Thus we see that the initial model of modernization besides being dichotomous was unidimensional too. It proposed a universal development of societies on the line of the West. This gave rise to the development of a convergence theory. The convergence theory of modernization, to quote Eisenstadt (1973: 15), holds that "all modern industrial systems will ultimately develop similar major institutional features."

Rostow (1960) traces similarity in the process, and also in time-span taken to reach successive stages in the development by the societies irrespective of their cultural conditions and political set-ups. Inkeles also reached at similar conclusion. "The findings", to quote him, "support the
theory that the institutional environments of modern society induced standard pattern of response despite the countervailing randomizing effects of persisting traditional pattern of culture" (Inkeles, 1960: 1). Levy (1966) observes that the structural uniformity among the societies increases as the level of modernization increases irrespective of the initial conditions from which the change take place.

But the evidences obtained through the studies of modernization and development of the countries other than the Western, say for example, Japan, U.S.S.R., China and those of the third world, did not correspond to the above assumptions. Consequently, the dichotomous and the unilinear convergence postulates of modernization were challenged, revised and rejected (Alatas, 1975). Tradition and modernity instead of

4. There is hardly any doubt that 'all the societies modernize in accordance with the Western model' is a highly untenable postulate unsupported by facts obtained through most of the studies of the non-Western countries either from the Third World or from the developed socialist nations. But it does not mean that modernization leads to a contrary result, that is, to social, cultural and psychological divergence whether inside or outside a society. Our assumption of science as prime source of modernization, a cut point that differentiates modernization from social change, implies that the process will invariably lead to somewhat uniform characteristics among the modern nations, caused and sustained by the science. But it is not necessary that they be the Western or the Russian or the Japanese. Even so called modernized societies are under the process of modernization.

The basic impact of the universal character of science on human society reflected through modernization is the rational transformation of attitudes, norms and values, and social order. It is because of science which infuses a rational view towards life and things in the people that the modernization projects a universal, equalizer, homogenizer character.
being taken as mutually exclusive concepts one as the antithesis or the polar opposite of the other, came to be regarded as interrelated and intertwining concepts, one complementary to the other (Bendix, 1967; Gusfield, 1967; Rudolph and Rudolph, 1967; Myrdal, 1968; Srinivasananda, 1976; Srinivas, 1976). Singer (1971: 57) tends to synthesize the two concepts in the light of the fact that the Indians retained traditions although they are becoming modernized. Srinivas (1968: 11) regards dichotomy as absurd and misleading as no society is absolutely modern or traditional. Moreover, not all the Western countries are equally modernized to yield an ideal composite model which can be followed by the non-Western or the traditional countries. In reality, the two can hardly be

(footnote continued)

Only future will decide that what the form of modern societies will be but a universal trend towards the development of some major common characteristics in all the three realms of social reality may be seen. A universal trend in the realm of culture may be observed in terms of Parsonian pattern variables, as put by Portes (1973: 16), "... a culture that is universalistic, defines roles in specific rather than diffuse terms, and allocates rewards on the basis of achievement and not ascription." Likewise a remarkable similarity may be seen among both, the modernized, Western and the developed socialist countries. As Jones (1976: 38) points out that both of them have reached a stage "where science has become the major determinate of industrial production, where high levels of education and knowledge have radically changed the character of labour and where the rational planning, calculation and organization of resources have become the major focus of governmental action." Moreover in the realm of personality structure, Inkeles (1976: 50-59), basing upon his findings in the socialist and non-socialist countries, points out some common traits characteristic to a modern man, whether a communist or a non-communist. These traits are (i) weakening of ascriptive ties, (ii) higher interest and participation in local affairs, (iii) keeping up informed with national and international affairs (iv) openness to new experiences in natural, mechanical and interpersonal dealings, (v) belief in personal and social efficacy, (vi) better sense of time (vii) maximization of opportunities.
exclusive as one shares elements of the other. The most popular criticism offered against these postulates, as said earlier, is that it carries American or Western ethnocentricism and ideological overtone (Tipps, 1976: 69-74).

The evolutionary speculative generalizations of nineteenth century were gradually replaced by empirical researches. New analytical approaches and methodological tools were designed to study the nature and process of change and modernization. Empirical researches in modernization were conducted, conceptual and theoretical base for modernization was laid down in the framework of structural functional theory - a dominant theoretical current in sociology after the Second World War. Structural functional approach in the realm of sociology was systematically organized by Parsons, though Radcliffe Brown and to some extent Malinowski were among others who successfully employed this analysis earlier in the field of social anthropology. The theory paid greater attention to the study of integration, functioning and maintenance of a system nevertheless analysis of change was not altogether neglected. In other words, it emphasizes upon interrelatedness of parts of a system, boundary maintaining mechanism of social control, a general consensus around common values and goals. Moreover, it attempts to explain institutional changes primarily on the basis of organizational needs of the system (Parsons, 1951, 1968; Parsons and Shils, 1951; Parsons and Smelser, 1956; Smelser, 1959). This approach to quote Eisenstadt (1977: 61) "... defined societies (or politics)
as systems, that is as entities that have boundaries of their own to distinguish them from their environments and that have mechanisms that maintain such boundaries and assure their continuities."

The structural functional theory, though occupied dominant place and acquired wide popularity and acceptance in sociology of the post-war period, is highly criticized for the reason that it places undue importance upon control and boundary maintenance of a system. Excessive reliance placed upon the consensus and continuity in the system, renders the structural functional model ineffective for the analysis of conflict and change. The model tends to undermine the individual, his interest, autonomy, and conflicts against the needs of the system. Thus structural-functional model, in view of many theorists, seems to behave as conservative and static and hence fails to give a fuller explanation and analysis of social change and modernization.

The incompetency of the structural functional model to properly accommodate the analysis of the conflicts and inherent contradictions into a system, the ways and means the system resorts to resolve them, and the changes the system undergoes, during the course of action gave rise to the growth of various new approaches and models for the analysis of change and modernization in sociology. The proponents of conflict model (Dahrendorf, 1959, Rex, 1961, Coser, 1956) laid emphasis upon conflict and struggle for power etc. in a society. The tension management model, as propounded by
W.E. Moore (1978: 11-12, 79-80), stresses upon the study of conflict and change in a system. It lays emphasis on intrinsic source of change. Change is considered both as tension producing and tension reducing. Tension may arise out of the disturbances in the relational framework within a structure or between structures (say economic, political, etc.) which may lead to the changes into the system.

The structural functional model deals primarily with the problems of structural maintenance and hence is useful mainly in singular societies. Some theorists (Smith 1971: 27-66; Kuper, 1971: 7-26), therefore, proposed a plural model. The plural model shows greater concern with the problem of cultural integration in plural societies. As against the singular (or unitary) societies the problem of cultural integration is, generally, more pronounced in plural societies.

According to Kuper (1971) the equilibrium (or consensus) and the conflict models fail to give a general theory of modernization applicable to all types of plural societies. Moreover, in some way or the other both the models entail some degree of coercion and violence in modernization of plural societies. He, therefore, emphasized the need of a midway that is a theoretical synthesis of the two models that encourages non-violent evolutionary change from a society under sectional conflict to a society having sectional and democratic adjustments.

There are some other models, which attempt to highlight some or other aspect(s) of social life which were largely
ignored by the structural functional theorists. The exchange model as propounded by Homans (1961) and partly followed by Blau (1964) stressed upon the individuals interests and motives in their mutual give and take in daily life. Symbolic structuralists, Levistrauss, (1963, 1966, 1967, 1969) as the chief proponent, distinguished between the 'people's models' and the 'social scientists models' of social realities. Accordingly, they put forward the notions of 'surface structures' and 'deep structure' and emphasized upon the latter in the analysis of change. Symbolic interactionists (Menis and Meltres, 1967; Cicourel, 1973) stressed upon the study of individuals continuous interactions in the analysis of institutions, its development, maintenance and change.

The above analysis revealed that the Western model, once dominant in the analysis of modernization, was rejected for its ethnocentric and ideological bias and in its place many other models came to emerge. Theoretical interpretations were sought to sound these models. The studies in modernization especially in the Third World and socialist countries revealed the role of historical-traditional forces in shaping the form and mechanism of structural development of societies. Accordingly, due weightage was given to these indigenous forces in the analysis of modernization. It was presumed that societies while under the process of change owing to their conditions, contradictions and degrees of tensions may generate forces that may affect their choice of the form and goals of modernization. This paved the base for the consolidation of another
dominant model named socialist (or communist) model.

Marxian analysis of modernization (Habermas, 1971; Weirtheim, 1964) has sought attention of many social scientists of developing and developed nations in the past one decade. Though, Marxian framework appears to have developed into many branches and paradigms but in essence they all focus on the dialectic between the relation of production and production alienation in their analysis of social structure and change.

Human labour forms the basis of Marxian sociology. It constitutes the essential part of the mode of production which in turn determines the relation of production and finally class structure in society at all levels of development. "Contradictions in social and cultural life", says Singh (1978c: 18) "emerge when human labour tends to get encapsulated .... through the operation of narrow interests of groups and classes ... the encapsulation of human labour leads to its alienation... contradictions accumulate under these circumstances and at a certain historical moment they become unbearable for the system, which collapse under its self created weight of contradictions." Once oppressed labour class during the period of its revolutionary ascendence liberates old ideas, norms and institutions and seeks dominance over the dominant mode of production. But after achieving ruling power the class develops and vests its own interests into the new system and hence resists further changes in its period of dominance. But in the meantime a new class from
among the oppressed in the new system emerges which in due course of time overthrows the system to give way to a further new system to cope with the demands of new technological conditions. The process of change thus goes on eventually leading to a classless (which may from Marxists' viewpoint be called as modern) society in which all sorts of exploitation be they based on caste, religion, race, nationality, wealth, power, or skill of individual or group or class completely ceases.

Though Marxian model possesses great theoretical virtue and political implications, yet, it harbours some serious limitations. "Marxism's conception of modernity," says Singh (1973c: 12) "is truly ethical ... it does not accept the independence of categorical values. On the contrary it refutes logical or substantive autonomy of values over social structure as such. It tries to resolve the contradictions of culture, ethical values and meanings through categories of structure. Herein lies its teleological paradox."

Phenomenologists rely more upon cognitive reality derived through human experiences rather than empirically verifiable facts. In other words, they tend to capture social reality cognitively through drawing out essences by observing the nature, process and mechanism of a phenomenon. Thus, the phenomenological model employs a descriptive and intuitive approach to the study of modernization and change. It seeks to analyse modernization on the basis of cognitive responses

Berger (1977) criticizes the capitalist and the socialist models as they entail high human price in modernization of societies in general and for those of the third world in particular. In both the cases, that is, striving either for growth or for revolution, a huge cost is required to be paid especially by the generation which undergoes the process of change first. A large section of population is uprooted and most of the mass of people which is unwilling to or fails to adjust with or resists the changes is eliminated. Thus a viable model for modern societies must be capable of creating such institutional arrangements that take account of the counter-modernizing resistances. "A key area for such institutional innovation", says Berger (1977: 14) "will be in the creation of intermediate structures - intermediate, that is, between the modern state and the undifferentiated mass of uprooted individuals typical of modern societies. These policy imperatives cut across the capitalist/socialist dichotomy."

To sum up, there are in general two major forms of models followed by the contemporary societies in their modernization.

(1) Totalitarian Model: There are three subtypes of this model: (i) Fascist or military dictatorship, (ii) one party dictatorship and, (iii) administrative, technocratic and bureaucratic domination. The essence of all these models is
the centralization of power. In the first two cases it is
the political elements while in the third case it is the
administrators, technocrats and bureaucrats who hold and
wield power and keep domination over the system. It is through
them that the forces that direct social change in the structure
are devised and generated.

(2) Liberal democratic/Western/Capitalist model: The model
lays emphasis on social structure. It holds that moderniza-
tion may best possibly be achieved through democratic planning
and implementation of the developmental programmes guaranteeing
individual autonomy and freedom. While the latter maintains
that the totalitarian model hampers industrial progress and
impedes modernization, the Marxist, the most prominent among
the former, characterizes the latter as exploitative, leading
to class conflict in society. To quote Dube (1967: 36) "out
of the various models developed so far the capitalist and the
communist models have taken a concrete shape by now. But a
democratic socialist model based on the synthesis of the two
and adopted by many of the third world countries is yet to
emerge."

In fact, the vague, unprecise and loose theoretical
meaning the term modernization carries with, the underlying
differences in the socio-historical basis of the societies
undergoing modernization, and the ethnocentric biases exhibited
by the contemporary major approaches of modernization etc.,
together put great constraints in the way of development of
a viable model for modernization equally acceptable to all and applicable to all forms of societies in the world. T. Anthony Jones' assessment of the situation is noteworthy here. He observes that there is at present no theory in so-called modernization theories and that the likelihood of developing adequate theory in this field will remain remote until, (a) instead of characterizing total societies in terms of an ad-hoc checklist of attributes, a less holistic approach is adopted which systematically deals with carefully delineated sets of relationships between variables, and, (b) the analysis of socialist societies is firmly incorporated into general theorizing (Jones; 1976: 26).