

PART A

Wednesday, August 8 2018, 2:14 AM

(a) Indology (GS. Ghurye)

- Indology is a branch of social sciences dealing with interpretation of ancient texts and linguistic studies to understand Indian society.
- Features:
 1. Assumes that Indian society & culture are unique and that this 'contextual' specificity of Indian social realities could be grasped better through 'texts'.
 2. It is a historical and comparative method based on Indian texts in the study of Indian society. Use ancient history, epics, religious manuscripts and texts etc. in the study of Indian social institutions.
 3. Believe that India cannot be studied through European concepts. (Socio of India)
 4. Make sense of India through lens of Indian culture.
 5. Implicit assumption here is that there has been cultural continuity in Indian society as the texts are centuries old.
 6. Emphasise the role of traditions and groups rather than indiv as basis of social relations. Also religion, ethics and philosophy as basis of social organisation.
- **Yogendra Singh:** when field studies in many areas of interest became difficult, textual analysis was useful in continued study.
- **RN SAXENA:** agreed with relevance of indological approach and stressed on Dharma, Artha, Kama, Moksha.
- **DUMONT and POCOCK:** emphasise that Indology is both representative of people's behaviour as well as a guide to their behaviour.
- Indological approach is grounded in 18-19th century **orientalist approach**, which was initiated by Europeans to know India better. The development of sociology in india owes deeply to the contributions made by orientalists like **Sir William Jones, Henry Maine, max Mueller**. These scholars studied the rich ancient cultural and philosophical tradition of India.
- The study of Sanskrit provided a powerful stimulus not only to Indology but to other disciplines as well, such as- philology, comparative mythology and comparative jurisprudence.
- The Indological writings dealing with the Indian philosophy, art and culture are reflected in the works of most of the Indian scholars. Ananda Coomarswamy, B.K. Sarkar, Radhakamal Mukerjee, G.S.Ghurye, D.P.Mukerji are some of the examples who have revealed this in their works.
- Book view can be religious (Mahabharata, Ramayana, manusmriti, vedas, Upanishads etc) or non-religious (Indica, Arthashastra, Ain-i-Akbari etc). Can be unauthenticated like most of the texts left behind or authentic like govt. census.

Limitations of indological approach:

1. Fundamentally based on assumption that Indian society unchanged for 3000 years.
2. Equate Indian culture to Hindu culture, and hindu culture to brahmanical culture. Brahmins are just 15% of Hindus. Divisive ideas. Brahmanical culture did influence India but that was only one of the many factors.
3. Treat entire Indian society as monolithic and has over simplified.
4. Ignore that texts represent ideal conditions and are the creative works of author.

GS Ghurye (1893-1983)

- Doyen of Indian sociologists, symbol of sociological creativeness.
- He was an **ethnographer** who studied tribes and castes of India using historical, Indological and statistical data.
- **Diffusionist theory** (followed by **Rivers** and **Franz Boas** as well). Aryans did not move physically across India, but it was the culture that spread through diffusion.
- Practitioner of theoretical pluralism.
- Ghurye emphasised integration. According to him, the guiding force in Indian society was the Hindu ideology. Even the Indian secularism was a product of the tolerant spirit of Hinduism.
- His students inc MN Srinivas, AR Desai, Irawati Karwe. Ghurye was a staunch nationalist in his approach but wasn't intolerant to different views. Eg: AR Desai, pioneer of Marxist sociology in India was his student.
- His books: '**Caste and Race in India**' explained origin of caste purely on basis on Rigveda where varna meant colour.
- Ghurye on India: India is surviving as a nation because of common value consensus. No central authority.
- Ghurye on religious beliefs and practices:
 - Religious consciousness in ancient India, Egypt and Babylonia was centered around temples.
 - In his work on the role of Gods in Indian religion, Ghurye traced the rise of major deities such as Shiva, Vishnu and Durga to the need to integrate local or sub-regional beliefs into a macro-level system of worship.
- Role of sadhus in Indian Tradition:
 - In his work, Indian Sadhus, Ghurye examined paradoxical nature of renunciation in India.
 - Indian renouncers have acted as the arbiters of religious disputes, patronised learning of scriptures and even defended religion against external attacks.
- Ghurye on Rural-urbanisation in India:
 - He held the view that the urbanisation in India was not a simple function of industrial growth. In India, the process of urbanisation, at least till 1980s, started from within the rural area

itself.

◦

Hence, in many rural regions, one part of a big village was converted into a market; in turn, this led to a township which developed administrative, judicial and other institutions.

◦

With coming up of metropolis type manufacturing the urbanisation has started making inroads into the rural hinterland. But, he believed, village continued to survive in its original form.

- Ghurye on caste and kinship:

◦

He examined the caste system from historical, comparative and integrative perspectives. A particular group was never attached to a particular occupation.

◦

Ghurye has described caste system as Brahminical system and believes that conquered non-Aryan race becomes shudras who were debarred from religious and social activity of Aryans.

◦

Gradually it became a form of specialization and hereditary. No hierarchy, only difference.

◦

The term 'varna' literally means colour and it was originally used to refer to the distinction between Arya and Dasa, in ancient India. According to the Rig-Veda, it was not applied to any classes, such as Brahman, Kshatriya, etc. However, the classes which existed at that time later came to be described as varna and the original distinction between Arya and Dasa gave place to the distinction between Arya and Shudra.

◦

Ghurye traces elements of caste outside India like Egypt, Western Asia, China, Japan, America, Rome and Tribal Europe.

◦

Caste as an exploitative system not part of original culture and magnified with fall of hindu rulers. Later rulers used it as a tool of division and political benefits.

◦

The **gotra** and **charana** were kin-categories of Indo-European languages which systematised the rank and status of the people. These categories were derived from names of sages of the past. These sages were the real or eponymous founders of gotra and charana. In India descent has not always been traced to the blood tie; lineages were often based on spiritual descent from sages of the past. Outside kinship we might notice guru-shishya relationship.

◦

In contemporary India, he noticed that scramble for privileges was damaging unity of society.

- Ghurye on tribes:

◦

He saw them divided into three classes:

1.

Such as the Raj Gonds and others who have successfully fought the battle, and are recognized as members of a fairly high status within Hindu society

2.

- Large mass that has been partially Hinduized and has come into closer contact with Hindus
- 3.
- Hill sections, which “have exhibited the greatest power of resistance to alien cultures that have pressed upon their border.
- Ghurye calls the tribal populations of India as imperfectly integrated segment of the Hindus.
- Argued for their assimilation in hindu culture and argued that that's been the case thru history.
- Ghurye on art and architecture:
 - According to him, the Hindu, Jain and Buddhist artistic monuments shared common elements.
 - But Muslim art was Persian or Arabic and had no roots in this soil. He did not agree with the view that the Muslim monuments in India represented a synthesis.
- Ghurye on hindu Muslim relationships: Ghurye's works often discussed Hindu-Muslim relationships. He regarded Hindus and Muslims as separate groups, with little possibility of mutual give and take. Ghurye's works have focused on the disturbances during his life-time.

Criticism:

- Overglorifying Hindu cultural tradition- talks of synthesis of Aryan, dravadian culture and caste, tribal culture. It lacks methodological empiricism and highly text based & biased.
- More about how unity is maintained and not how unity is questioned. Ignores how throughout history Brahmanic tradition has been questioned. Sociological romanticism in his writings.
- Talks of one Indian culture. but **SC DUBEY** points out that in case of India there are multiple cultures- each family, village, caste, mass, nation has a culture.
- **BERREMAN** has criticised Brahmanical view on the following basis: The Brahminical view takes a position that the people conform to universal values unquestioningly while the truth is that individuals have their own will. The Brahminical view is based on sacred Sanskrit texts. These texts are, in fact, biased and of limited scope. The perspective that emerges from them, therefore, presents caste as rigid, stiff, stereotyped, and idealized construct.
- They don't lay emphasis on other movements like Bhakti movement which were integrative in character too, but selectively pickup scriptural cannons.
- **SRINIVAS** and **PANINI**: Ghurye insisted on fieldwork, though he himself was an armchair scholar.
- Often ventured into generalisations on the basis of unrepresentative data. Ex. social tenisons in India.

(1893-1983) Founder of Indian Sociology. Trained several reputed sociologists - MN Srinivas, AR Desai, etc.

Tried to understand India through the lens of cultural texts -> Textual or Indological Approach. Used **ANTHROPOMETRIC DATA**, ie biological features such as eye color, size of nose etc.

ON CASTE:

Caste came to India from Aryans, prior to arrival of Aryans, other local communities were present. The Aryans, in order to distinguish themselves from other communities, tried to be self sufficient through DoL amongst themselves leading to formation of caste system. Through interaction of Aryans with other communities, they diffused the caste system, making it India wide. Started as an Aryan concept and became an all India phenomenon.

Caste is fully functional to Indian society because it gave self sufficiency, stability and enhanced social cohesion. Evolved as a system of difference, giving people the right to chose their occupation. Rejects that caste is divisive and exploitative. Said that when caste first evolved, one's caste depended on his karma (or actions). Caste was dynamic and based on individual's choice of profession. It is not enforced but mobile in nature, which can be observed in ancient texts. He gives example of **Valmiki**, who was born as a Shudra but turned himself into a Brahmasya (supra Brahmin) through merit. **Vishwamitra** was born as a Kshatriya (Rajshree) but chose to be a sage (Vramshree) through dedication and meditation). **Indra** - King of Gods (Devraj) didn't ascribe his post by birth but earned it by virtue of being the most exemplary King on Earth - that the Gods elected him as their King.

Caste is a system of DoL, not heirarchy. It differentiates -> Fission.

Caste is not based on principle of economic logic alone. One doesn't chose an occupation solely based on economic benefits but as a form of duty with a sense of service and fraternity.

ON GOTRA:

- Gotra is a clan of a person.
- **Clan** is when the founder is not established, rather assumed. Ex: Suryavansh of Lord Rama.
- **Lineage** is when the founder is known and established. Ex: Raghukul of Rama.
- Said that people in North India have different occupation even while belonging to same Gothra. Ex: Varishta Gothra. Gothra unifies -> Fusion.

CHARAN: in ancient India, people from cross sections of the society went to **Gurukuls**, where teachers gave them knowledge as per need and carrying capacity. Gurukul was important in destroying egoism and levelling people which gave them common values irrespective of background. Ex: Karna and Bhishma, Krishna and Sudhama learnt from the same teacher. Character building was the main objective of this education. National character was built through these schools when the graduates carried their values from macro to micro level systems

Therefore, caste was the diversifying element of Indian society and Gothra, Charan were the unifying aspects. Inorder to understand India's distinctive unity in diversity, one must look through these elements together, else it will give a distorted image.

Criticism:

1. Doesn't acknowledge plularistic fabric of Indian society
2. Dismisses contri of Muslims and Christians
3. Doesn't accept the north south divide in Indian culture

POWER:

Lord Octon: "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

For Ghurye Indian conception of power is different from rest of the world. As per him, King is a personification of knowledge, sacrifice and highest ideals. Limitless power entrusted in him is used for peace. Here he cited ex of Lord Krishna.

TRIBES OF INDIA:

Book -> '**Scheduled Tribes of India'**

Tribes are the original settlers of the country. They constituted a uni-occupational entity (ex. hunting gathering, fishing farming etc.)

Saints of ancient India were the vehicles of diffusion that carried caste and multi-occupational system of Aryans to the tribes. This was done through performing arts such as Ram Leela, where the glory of Ram was spread. Indigeneous tribe had their own conception of God and sanits both accepted and assimilated tribes' conceptions to create an inclusive Hinduism. Ex. Kali, Ganesha, Indra and Jagannath were tribal Gods who are widely worshipped in Hinduism. Since there was not much difference between no conflict of hostility between caste and tribes => **Hindu Method of Acculturation.**

Ghurye criticised **Verier Elwin's** ideas on tribal isolationism. He said that tribals were backward Hindus and that the process of Voluntaristic Acculturation was obstructed by colonial policies, leading to tension and demands for secession.

***Acculturation:** learning other's culture.

Enculturation: learning one's own culture.

On Muslims: he considered muslim rulers as invaders who disturbed Hindu culture. It was due to this negative dialectics, that regionalism and partition demands occurred. Said that there is a great ideological divide b/n Hindu and Islamic culture.

Hindu Culture:

Hinduism is not a religion but a cultural tradition that evolved from amalgamation of local traditions. Mix of diverse traditions but with a common essence. **Ex. Karva Chauth in NI is similar to Savithri Puja in OR.** It is self amending in nature and includes local Gods and traditions to promote unity.

Triad of Essential Hindu Values: That hold India together

1. Three Gods: Brahma, Vishnu, Maheshwara
 2. Purusharth: Dharma, Artha+Kama, Moksha
 3. Guna (qualitites): Sat (noble), Raj (Bodily pleasure), Tamas (Indulgence)
 4. Ashrams: Brahmacharya, Grihastha+Vanaprastha, Sanyas
 5. Three virtues: Dana (charity), Dama (self control), Daya (compassion)
 6. Attributes: Mana (desire), Buddhi (mind), Ahankar (egoism)
 7. Duties: Adhyayan (pursuit of knowledge), Dana (donation), Yagyan (controlling greed)
-

Conclusion: Like a discreet butterfly, Ghurye moved from one theme to another with equal interest, erudition (*means knowledge*) and ability. Rare spirit of inquiry and commitment to advancing the

frontiers of knowledge was one of Ghurye's precious gifts to Indian sociology and social anthropology. The range of Ghurye's interests is encyclopaedic.

1b. Structural functionalism (M N Srinivas)

MN Srinivas (1916-1999):

- PhD from Oxford university - met Hobhouse (learnt liberal philosophy) & AR Radcliffe Brown (learnt how to study small societies by applying structural functional approach)
- PhD topic- **Society & Religion among Coorgs in Mysore**. Studied village Rampura & wrote a book- '**Remembered village**'.
- Colonial assumptions about an unchanging Indian society led to curious assemblage of Sanskrit studies with contemporary issues in most South Asian departments in US & elsewhere. It was strongly believed that an Indian sociology must lie at conjunction of Indology & sociology.
- By inclination, he was not given to utopian constructions: his ideas about justice, equality & eradication of poverty were rooted in his experiences on ground. His integrity in face of demands that his sociology should take into account new & radical aspirations was one of most moving aspects of his writing. By use of terms such as Sanskritisation, "dominant caste", "vertical (inter-caste) & horizontal (intra-caste) solidarities", Srinivas sought to capture fluid & dynamic essence of caste as a social institution.

Methodology:

- **Structural Functionalism:**
 - focus on the understanding of the 'ordering' and 'patterning' of the social world.
 - Their focus of attention is mainly the 'problem of order' at a societal level.
 - Based on the assumption that societies can be seen as persistent, cohesive, stable, generally inherited wholes differentiated by their culture and social structural arrangements.
- Srinivas strongly advocated ethnographic research based on Participant observation
- He was much impressed by AR Radcliffe Brown's structural functionalism (and not Merton's - which was in response to parson's theory). Parson's SF was not suited for a country like India which had many traditional elements. Brown's theory was much more suited.
- Introduced tradition of macro sociological generalisation on micro anthropological insights.
- India is not exactly traditional where every structure is linked to every other structure or exactly modern where structures are clearly defined & established. Hence, need of British sociology of Brown and not American sociology of Parsons.
- Brown gave 3 concepts to study sociology which were applied by Srinivas:
 - 1.
 - Structural unit (eg: mudra/brother-sister r'ship)
 - 2.
 - Structural form (eg: school of bharatnatyam/parent-child r'ship)
 - 3.
 - Structural morphology (eg: Bharatnatyam/Family)

- He was a strong advocate in studying reality outside framework of great theories. He wasn't in favour of using much jargons & great theoretical designs. Thus, he focussed on field study & brought sociology closer to social anthropology in case of India. As India lives in villages, Social anthropology more applicable.
- He gave example of dynamic structure - where in Rampura village people unified across castes to protect common village pond from government action.
- **EDMUND LEACH** criticizes- says outsider's view important to prevent any biasness but Srinivas countered- If sociological perspectives are clear, analysis is bound to be objective. Infact, insider would be more sensitized & give more authenticity to research.
- Synthesis of British social Anthropology and American Sociology (*Intro*). Later followed by his students MSA Rao (Urban studies), AM Saha (Family and Kinship), BS Baviskar (Cooperatives) etc.
- Crticism:
 - micro analysis, can't be representative
 -
 - Conservative - speaks about change in structure
 -
 - Fails to explain revolutionary changes
 -
 - Suffers from objective idealism

Book View versus Field View:

- **Book view (bookish perspective):** Religion, varna, caste, family, village and geographical structure are the main elements, which are known as the bases of Indian society. The knowledge about such elements is gained through sacred texts or from books. Srinivas calls it book view or bookish perspective. aka Indology.
- **Field view (field work):** Srinivas believes that the knowledge about the different regions of Indian society can be attained through field work. Prefers empirical study to understand our society. Small regional studies rather than the construction of grand theories. Important to understand the nativity of the rural Indian society.

Srinivas on caste:

- Caste is not static system as assumed by Westerners while differentiating it from class. Infact, class is dynamic & undergoes changes over period of time.
- Book view of caste is driven by holism but field view is driven by empiricism.
- Varna view of caste is very incomplete & there are huge number of castes. Conflict erupts not just between different castes but is also present within castes.
- Differentiates - varna scheme refers at most only to broad categories of society and not to actually existing effective units. Relations between castes are governed, among other things by concepts of pollution & purity, & generally maximum commensality i.e. inter-dining occurs within caste.
- Varna scheme has certainly distorted picture of caste but it has also enabled ordinary men & women to understand & assess general place of a caste within this framework throughout India. It has provided a common social language, which holds good in all parts of India. This sense of familiarity, even when not based on real facts leads to a sense of unity amongst people.

- He noted: A caste is considered to be high if its characteristic way of life is high & pure & it is considered to be low if its way of life is low & polluting. By term 'way of life' we mean whether its traditional occupation is ritually pure or polluting. For example, occupation of Brahman Priest is ritually pure while traditional occupation of a leather working caste like Chamars of U.P. is considered to be ritually polluting.
- But remarkable aspect of caste system is that presumed hierarchy of 'way of life', which includes diet, occupation, etc. does not often correlate with observed order of caste ranking found in several regions of India. For example, in spite of trader castes being vegetarian (which is considered to be ritually higher) in Rampura, a village of Mysore, they are ranked ritually lower than non-vegetarian peasant castes of same village.

Srinivas on different structures:

- **Family:** We did not shift from joint to nuclear but from joint to extended families. (Marxist - joint family used to prevent fragmentation of property, Colonial scholars - not rational but driven by moral values).
- **Village structure:**
 - Srinivas contested colonial notion of Indian village being a completely self-sufficient republic. He saw this as their justification for lack of development.
 - Village is not just a geographical area but a social space. Village solidarity is manifested during marriages, fairs, festivals, disasters etc. Village is not a closed entity & people of village always interact with outsiders. Despite urbanization, a village is not losing its perpetual character.
 - Argued that individuals in his village had a sense of identification with their village & an insult to one's village had to be avenged like an insult to oneself, one's wife, or one's family.
 - Other than SI, there was village exogamy practised. inter-village services were exchanged + markets did exist at village level for exchange of goods.

Westernization:

- Srinivas: "Westernisation characterises changes brought about in society & culture as a result of over 150 years of British rule, & term subsumes changes occurring at various levels—technology, institutions, ideology, values".
- Runs in direction opposite to that of Sanskritization, but whereas latter has affected whole Indian society for centuries, former is a comparatively recent & largely an urban phenomenon.
- Basic similarity between both is at cultural level.
- Westernization is a vast, multidimensional & complex process which impinged upon various domains through a number of institutions & hence had a significant bearing on caste mobility.
- The British rule provided fresh avenues for social mobility altering the nature of preexisting institutions such as schools and colleges which opened their doors to all castes and establishing new ones such as army, bureaucracy and law courts which recruited members on the basis of merit and hence provided ample source of mobility.
- Westernization did not begin and end with British rule. It provided tracks which furthered and accelerated the mobility process which gained further momentum after Independence.

- Independent India took rationalistic egalitarian and humanitarian principles from the British and created further room for mobility.
- Criticism:
 - Only explains Indian system, based on caste. Not useful for other societies.
 - Srinivas ignored contradictions in western values and generalised it as rational. Ex. racial prejudice, racial segregation, exploitative nature of western economy.

Dominant caste:

- According to Srinivas, a caste is said to be dominant when it is numerically strongest in village or local area & economically & politically exercises a preponderating influence.
- Status of a dominant caste appears to rest on such criteria as control of economic resources; numerical strength; a relatively high ritual status in caste hierarchy; and educational status of its members.
- Numerical strength alone may not place a group in a bargaining position. It needs an economic power base to backup its strength. Once economic rights are in possession, however size of a group does become important. Control of resources by members of a dominant caste lead in turn, to making decisions for others, which constitutes real dominance. Ritual ranking of a caste no longer remains the major basis of its position in the social hierarchy.
- Numbers alone do not guarantee power. Caste groups numerically preponderant, but with divided loyalties, creating disunity, may not wield power. It is only when a caste group becomes politically united that it becomes apolitical force.

Srinivas on change:

- 2 kinds of changes:
 1. **Orothgenetic** (coming from within)-eg--Buddhism, Jainism etc
 2. **Heterogenetic** (coming from outside)- eg--British type industries.
- Based on these, 3 kinds of people:
 1. Internal Sanskritization & External Sanskritization
 2. Internal S & External Westernization
 3. Internal Westernization & External W - maximum
- Book- '**caste: its 20th c avatar**', notes how ideologically incompatible caste groups are coming together to capture power.
- His last lecture on '**obituary to caste**', caste comes in where there is need & society is not as caste-centric as it was in past.

Srinivas on gender issues:

- **Dowry:** article in 80s- '**some reflections on dowry**'- dowry is modern sati. Rapid economic transformation is responsible for commodification of women who are used as instruments of consolidation of private wealth. Caste both imposes constraints & creates dominant ethos which

underlie practice of dowry within Hindu society. Increasing social & economic differentiation has increased demands and expectation on part of groom's family.

- **Position of women-** house. 'social world of woman was synonymous with household & kinship group while men inhabited a more heterogeneous world'. Masculine & feminine pursuits were clearly distinguished. He pointed out that two sets of occupations were not only separated but also seen as unequal.

Criticism:

- Srinivas admits that while collecting genealogies & household census, he deliberately excluded Harijan ward. He thought that he should approach Harijans only through headman -> resulting in his account of village being biased in favour of upper caste Hindus.
- In his endeavour for promoting sanskritization, he has marginalized and alienated religious minorities.
- The construction of sanskritization and dominant caste put him closer to Hindutva ideology of cultural nationalism. One can say that his understanding was more elitist or presents only upper caste view.
- What Srinivas characterized as sanskritization in the idiom of sociology currently fashionable, had been described by the proto-sociologists **Lyall and Risley** as 'Aryanization' and 'Brahminization' by **Mukherjee** in the first chapter of his book Sociology of Indian Sociology.
- Pioneers like **Coomaraswamy** and **DP Mukherji** were not unaware of the 2 processes and took note of them in their value preferences and research orientation.
- **Yogendra Singh:** they are history specific and contextual specific (S&W)

Conclusion: Srinivas occupies a pre-eminent place among the first-generation sociologists of India. His focus on 'field view' over the 'book view' is a remarkable step in understanding the reality of Indian society. This reflects sociology of nativity. His field work among the Coorgs relates his approach as structural-functional and represents an exposition of the complex interrelationship between ritual and social order in Coorg society.

SANSKRITISATION

- According to Srinivas, "Sanskritisation is process by which a low Hindu caste or tribe or other group changes its customs, ritual, ideology & way of life in direction of a high & frequently twice-born caste".
- Two different forms:
 1. As historical process by collective recognition: generally by King, priestly class or other dominant castes.
 2. Contextual or local meaning due to unilateral attempt of a caste or sub-caste to move upward in hierarchy. Absence of consensus and often faces resistance by the dominant castes. Slow and non-spectacular process of cultural mobility of castes.
- Structural pre-requisites:
 1. Change in the self-image of castes or groups followed by higher status aspiration.
 - 2.

Some improvement in social and economic status of these castes

3.

The closure of stratification system in respect of other avenues except emulation

4.

The absence of social & psychological pressures among aspiring castes to identify upper caste status as negative reference group either due to deeper commitment to ideology of traditional society or force of habit

5.

The absence of organized opposition from the upper castes to such behaviour

- For reference groups culturally patterned expressiveness of Kshatriya is more accessible & has been more widely used than culturally patterned asceticism of Brahmins.
- **K. M. Pannikar** maintains that last true Kshatriyas were Nandas who disappeared in fifth century. Since then Sudras have produced an unusually large number of royal families. In fact it was always king, secular power, that determined hierarchical order of castes on advice of Brahmins.
- Sankritisation provided symbolic justification through caste ideology for changes in economic interest & political power.
- These changes are are **positional not structural** & mobility here refers to community mobility that spans many generations (not indiv or family). While individual castes move up or down, the structure (caste sys) as such remains the same.
- Prevalent throughout history & has assumed various forms.
- Castes located in middle of stratification system sought mobility by trying to emulate upper caste behaviour ideologies & ritual. This fostered traditionally ordained framework of 'Great Tradition'.
- **Maratha Sagar, Dhangar of Maharashtra, Kurmi & Yadava of Bihar, Koli of Gujarat, Kaibartta of West Bengal, Lingayat of Karnataka & Teli of Orissa** are reported to have adopted sanskritization as a strategy to seek elevated corporate status.
- Not only in castes but also in tribes - **Bhils of WI, Gonds and Oraons of CI and Pahadiyas of Him** region have undergone.
- Another pattern of Sanskritization involved increasing Puritanism (censorious moral beliefs) on part of castes who rejected superiority of twice born e.g. **Koris of eastern Uttar Pradesh** refused to accept water from Brahmins. Such a process of **desanskritization** contributes to crystallization of new groups & greater political mobilization.
- **Re-sanskritization** - formerly westernised or modernised groups discard many symbols of modernization & revert to traditional sanskritic life styles.
- Sanskritization was chief channel of mobility in pre-independent India. But socio-economic changes in post independent India & new found status of 'citizen' & 'voter' that lower caste groups have activated make political participation serve as a fundamental alternative towards mobility instead of Sanskritization.
- **Navayana Buddhism** (Dalit Buddhist mov) can be interpreted as a rejection of Sanskritization.
- Is like a middle range theory introduced by Merton which he uses to study social structures, social relationships & social change, establishing balance between empiricism, historicism & Indology.
- **The fatavas of Agra** whose cases he cites could never be accepted within the membership fold of the upper castes; their interaction with upper (Kshatriya or Brahmin) castes could never be either commensally or connubial, the two most significant and key forms of interactions which define the structure of the caste system.

Criticism:

- **JF STALL:** it is a complex concept or a class of concepts. The term itself seems to be misleading.
- **Yogendra Singh:** fails to account for many aspects of cultural change in the past and contemporary India as it neglects non-sanskritic traditions.
- Sanskritic influence has not been universal to all parts of the country. In NI, especially Punjab, Islamic tradition provided as basis for cultural imitation. (**Prof Channa**)
- Imtiaz Ahmad: protest oriented

Sanskritisaton	Westernisation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sacred outlook • upward mobility by imitation • mobility w/in framework of caste • taboo on meat eating and consumption of alcohol 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • secular outlook • upward mobility by development • outside framework of caste • promoted

Conclu: MNS stands tall among first gen sociologists. His focus on field view over book view is a remarkable step in understanding reality of Indian society. He reflects Sociology of nativity.

1c. Marxist sociology (A R Desai)

Marxist Approach to Indian Society:

1. **SA Dange:** Founder of Communist Party of India, Book - '**From Primitive Communism to Socialism'**
 - Cultural Marxist: Brahmins in ancient India were respected due to their economic necessity not cultural significance.
 - They performed magical rituals to induce fertility in soil and bring rainfall.
 - Caste was thus a product of economy, not culture.

2. **Kosambi:** Classical Marxist, Class Approach to Caste
 - In ancient India, Brahmins gave ideological justification to the rule of Kshatriyas.
 - In reciprocation they received land grants.
 - Brahmins not only advised the rulers on taxation system, laws and other governance aspects, they also codified discriminatory laws in ancient texts.
 - Brahmins were not economic necessities but agents of exploitation. Therefore, caste in India was similar to class.

3. DP Mukherjee: Book - '**Social Structure of Values'**

- Dialectical Theory to Social Change
- When British appeared in India, they carried western values with them. Indians had their own values too. Social change in India resulted due to dialectic between the two values. A product of this dialectics is the Indian Middle Class - which is confused, rootless and has contradictory ideas. This middle class subsequently became the carrier of social change.
- Ex: Dayanand Saraswati preached infallibility of the Vedas, at the same time rejected caste system, idol worship and promoted anglo-Vedic education.

4. **Utsa Patnaik**: used Marxist approach to study agrarian structure in India.

5. **Contemporary Marxists** like **Randheer Singh**, speak about acceleration of world capitalism in India, where the Indian rich are connected to the global rich in promoting each other's interests. This is resulting in a new avatar of capitalism, ie Globalisation. The aim is to create a massive consumerist class of Indians, who join market to make money and spend it on ever expanding materialistic and consumeristic desires. This would lead to Proliterisation of Masses, who would strive to live in a false sense of happiness.

6. While AR Desai spoke about capitalism resulting from colonialism, contemporary Marxists speak about globalisation. What Zamindari and other land tenure systems meant to Desai are SEZ, Land acquisition and corporate farming for **neo marxists**.

AR Desai (1915-1994)

He used Theory of Base and SS to understand Indian society.

Indian economic history passed through 3 different stages of development:

1. Pre-colonial
2. Colonial
3. Post Colonial

Pre-Colonial:

- Traditional India society had village committees.
- Land was a collective property without private ownership. Village committee allotted land to peasants based on their needs.
- Production was for subsistence and was through collective participation.
- Part of produce was given to the king voluntarily due to his responsibility to provide security and irrigation.
- Artisans and craftsmen only produced for utilisation of local community in return for agricultural produce. This exchange was regulated by Jajmani System.
- External trade, surplus production, accumulation of capital and appropriation of profits were all absent leading to a non-exploitative system and absence of advancement of technology.
- **Indian feudalism** was different from that of western in the sense that agriculture and industry (artisans) co-existed and there was a symmetrical production relation between different classes. Whereas in the west, it led to an exploitative system and industry dislocated feudalism.

- Neither Hindu nor Muslim Kings changed the basic economic system of Indian villages. Muslim rulers tried to change the super structure to an extent through religion, culture and system of administration. But since the economic base remained same, villages were unaffected.
- This is why early British Scholars like Charles Metcalfe called Indian villages as Little Republics.
- Different from these villages are the urban areas, where rulers, elites and traders lived. Their flourished on the taxes collected, trade and commerce.
- There was occasional interaction between the rural and urban systems in the form of taxes and exchange of goods, but otherwise both were different systems.
- The rural system was characterised by equalitarian production relationships due to common economic base. Whereas the urban system had assymmetrical production relationships due to varied economic base.

Colonial:

- The British directly hit at the roots of Indian villages' economic base.
- They integrated village economies with the rural system and international trade, destroying their self-sufficiency.
- In place of village commune appeared modern peasant proprietors or zamindars, as private owner of land.
- British government also introduced railways, postal services, centralized uniform law, English education, modern industry and many more, which brought qualitative change in Indian society.
- Their exploitative means unintentionally unified India and led to INM - Railways and Post.

Post-colonial:

As promised during the INM, the State projected a socialist and democratic agenda and released several welfare policies such as land reforms, cooperative industry etc. But these were failures due to lack of enthusiasm and strong will in implementation.

Peasant Struggles:

- Two volumes entitled ***Peasant Struggles in India*** (1979) and ***Agrarian Struggles in India after Independence*** (1986)
- Agrarian struggles, at present are waged by newly-emerged propertied classes as well as agrarian poor, especially agrarian proletariat, where the former fight for a greater share in fruits of development.
- The poor comprising pauperized peasants and labourers belonging to low castes and tribal communities struggle for survival and for a better life for themselves.
- Thus, Desai maintained, progress could be achieved only by radically transforming exploitative capitalist system in India.

State and Society:

- '***State and Society in India***' book, critique of theories of modernization accepted by a large number of academic establishments.
- Assumption that "modernization on capitalist path a desirable value premise" - valuable ideological vehicle to ruling class pursuing capitalist path.

- Repressive role of state and growing resistance to it - In Violation of Democratic Rights in India (book), Repression and Resistance in India (book), Expanding Governmental Lawlessness (book), he highlights violation of democratic rights of minorities, women, slum dwellers in urban India, press and other media by state.
- According to Desai, polarization of class interest, especially of bourgeoisie, is foundation of modern society in India. It has thus inherent in it class contradictions and logic of its dialectics.

Relevance of Marxist Approach:

- In fifties and early sixties, American structural-functionalism and British functionalism dominated social sciences in general and sociological researches in particular.
- Desai undeterred by these imperialistic influences continued to write on Indian society and state from perspective of an involved scholarship.
- He provided a forum for radical-minded scholars to broaden their horizon of research.
- PRI, Land reforms
- Land acquisition, SEZs, Oxfam Report

Conclusion:

- Desai applies historical materialism for understanding transformation of Indian society. He explains how national consciousness emerged through qualitative changes in Indian society.
- He believed that Indian society can't change through the present system of democratic socialism. Need to look at it in the context of history and roots - Indian Freedom Struggle, which was led by bourgeoisie and the post-independence power system, which is held by bourgeoisie. Hence the public policy in India is driven by capitalism but ideologies glorify socialism. There is a dichotomy between ideology and actions leading to a **paradox of development**.
- Ex: Land reforms were introduced as reinforcement of socialist agenda but there was no net real change from it. The NSSO data of 1970s indicated that the % of poor didn't substantially change post reforms.
- PRI are touted as grass root democracy but in reality, they have been functioning of centres of power for the wealthy and their proxies.

Indian Middle Class:

AR Desai saw the Indian MC as coming from specific families which went for colonial occupations. They spearheaded the INM demanding political liberation while ignoring that the immediate necessity was economic liberation of starving and impoverished masses. Freedom of speech, liberty, press rights were highlighted more than the basic right to life, food and survival. Their focus on the super structure is the reason why Indian independence didn't result in economic independence of its people.

In the INM, MC voiced the voice of the rulers. In present day, they have transformed into global citizens, represent the interests of the MNCs they are associated with and are eager to join the Indian diaspora to avail better opportunities available outside. In both times, they have put their interests ahead of others and broke the time-space boundation.

(a) Social background of Indian nationalism.

Growth of Modern Nationalism in India:

- A.R. Desai's book '**Social Background of Indian Nationalism**' - account of the colonial period and the rise of nationalism from a Marxist perspective. Traces the growth of the nationalism in **five phases**, based on particular social classes which supported and sustained it:

1.

Phase 1 (till 1885):

- Very narrow social base
- Pioneered by the intelligentsia who were the product of the modern education.
- Considers Raja Rammohan Roy and his followers as the 'pioneers of Indian nationalism'.

2.

Phase 2 (1885-1905):

- Represented 'interests of the new bourgeois society in India'.
- Modern education -> middle class
- Indian and international trade -> merchant class
- Modern industries -> class of industrialists
- Voiced the demands of the educated classes and the trading bourgeoisie such as Indianization of Services, association of the Indians with the administrative machinery, stoppage of economic drain etc.

3.

Phase 3 (1905-1918):

- National movement became militant and challenging and acquired a wider social basis.

4.

Phase 4 (1918-CDM end 1934):

- Social base of the national movement was enormously enlarged.
- The movement which was hitherto restricted mainly to upper and middle classes, further extended to sections of the Indian masses.
- However, according to Desai, the leadership of the Congress remained under the strong influence of the Indian capitalist class
- Two other significant developments:
 - 1.
 - Rise of socialist & communist groups tried to introduce pro-people agenda

2.

Consolidation of communalism sought to divide society

5.

Phase 5 (1934-39):

- Growing disenchantment with the Gandhian ideology within the Congress and further rise of the Socialists who represented the petty bourgeois elements.
- Outside the Congress various movements - peasants, the workers, the depressed classes and various linguistic nationalities started agitations.
- Further growth of communalism.
- However, according to Desai, all these stirrings were not of much consequence and the mainstream was still solidly occupied by the Gandhian Congress which represented the interests of the dominant classes.
- He interprets the '**peaceful and bloodless**' approach of struggle adopted by the nationalist leadership as a basic guarantee to the propertied classes that their interests would be safeguarded.
- Although the masses came into nationalist fold during the Gandhian period, they were not politicised and the lower classes of agricultural workers and poor peasants in most parts of country were never politically mobilised, 'so that the social base of the national movement was still not very strong in 1947'.
- And even when they were mobilised, the masses remained outside the decision making process and the gulf between them and the leaders was 'unbridged'.
- The nationalist leaders in all phases of the movement stressed that the process of achievement of national freedom would be evolutionary, and not revolutionary. The basic strategy to attain this goal would be pressure-compromise-pressure. In this strategy, pressure would be brought upon the colonial rulers through agitations, political work and mobilisation of the people.
- According to him, India's nationalism is the result of the material conditions created by the British colonialism. The Britishers developed new economic relations by introducing industrialization and modernization. The economic relationship is predominantly a stabilizing factor in the continuity of traditional institutions in India, which would undergo changes as these relations change.
- Criticism: **Yogendra Singh** is critical of this dialectical approach as it doesn't have an empirical backing.

Nationalism meaning:

- Sense of loyalty towards one's own nation
- Creates a sense of psychological bond with the nation. The bond of affinity is strong to such an extent that people belonging to a particular nation are suspicious of foreigners.
- Nationalism implies the consciousness of one nationhood and its related sense of political identity, which results from political consensus.
- Its sociological manifestation is the idea of a nation-state.
- In the West, historical origins of democracy and nationalism can be associated with the breakdown of the feudal hierarchical system of estates and rise of the philosophies of the Reformation and the Enlightenment.
- Both nationalism and democracy in India have come into being in a different historical context. The cultural consequences of these systems may be as radical for India as it was for the West, but its historical manifestation cannot be identical. From Rammohan Roy to Gandhi, the nationalistic consciousness was oriented towards the Indian tradition; in this matter there were differences of degrees but not of kind.
- According to **HANS KOHN** "nationalism is a state of mind permeating the large majority of people. It is the supreme loyalty of a man towards his nation."
- According to **Prof Ashirvatham**, Nationalism is an ideology by which nationalities are transferred into political units.
- The term nation has been used to denote a human group with the following characteristics:
 - Idea of a common Government whether as a reality in present or past, or as an aspiration of the future.
 - A certain size and closeness of contact between all its individual members.
 - More or less defined territory.
 - Certain characteristics clearly distinguishing the nations and non-national groups.
 - Certain common interests of individual members.
 - Certain degree of common feeling or will associated with a picture of the nation in the minds of the individual members.

Origin of nationalism in India:

The growth of nationalism in India can be traced back to the period of ancient India. Traced through different stages:

1. Nationalism under ancient India:

- The Rigvedic hymns refer to India as "Bharata Varsha or Bharata Khanda"
- Feeling of nationalism was strengthened in the age of Mauryas and Guptas
- The supreme loyalty towards the king itself was considered as nationalism

The idea of nationalism did not receive concrete shape during ancient India; nationalism was almost equated with Regionalism.

2. Nationalism in the medieval period:

- Among Muslim rulers Mughal rulers made some contribution to idea of nationalism.
- During the Mughal rule the imperial authority of the king was respected and loyalty towards the king was treated as nationalism.

3. Nationalism in the pre-independence period:

- The freedom struggle which took place in India marked concrete idea of nationalism.
- Sepoy Mutiny: 1857
- Formation of Indian National Congress: 1885
- Swadeshi movement, Non cooperation movement, Civil disobedience movement, Quit India movement, RIN Revolts and INA trials
- Sub nationalism - divided India

4. Nationalism in the post independent period:

- Constitution of India, National symbols, Single citizenship, Single constitution, Fundamental rights, strong centre.
- Inhibitions: Separate status to J&K, Parochialism and divisions on linguistic basis
- Multiplicity of religions, casteism
- Growing threats- terrorism, secessionism, ethnic wars etc

Different types of Indian nationalism:

- **Economic nationalism:** Drain theory by Naoroji. Later Gandhiji - foreign goods boycott movement etc.
- **Social nationalism:** Many reform movements of downtrodden and against social atrocities. Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Vidyasagar, Jyotiba Phule etc.
- **Cultural nationalism:** Tilak used Ganesh festival to propagate. Temple entry, Khilafat, and Akali movement were integral part of Indian nationalist movement. Debendranath Tagore 'Bharat Mata', Tagore on Nationalism, Bengal School of painting etc.
- **Political nationalism:** Transport, Press, English language brought leaders together
- **Revolutionary nationalism:**
 1. Recognition of the True Nature of British Rule
 - 2.

Growth of Confidence and Self-Respect

3.

Education, International Influences, Westernisation

4.

Dissatisfaction with Achievements of Moderates

5.

Reactionary Policies of Curzon

6.

Existence of a Militant School of Thought

7.

A Trained Leadership Had Emerged.

- **Trans-national nationalism:** Gadhar party (Canada), Mohan Singh and INA
- **Calamity driven nationalism:** Plagues, famines, floods, cyclones, wars bring Indians together
- **Sports nationalism**

Important factors in building up of nationalism in India:

- Understanding of Contradiction in Indian and Colonial Interests: The nationalist movement arose to take up the challenge of these contradictions inherent in the character and policies of colonial rule.
- Political, Administrative and Economic Unification of the Country: A professional civil service, a unified judiciary and codified civil and criminal laws throughout the length and breadth of the country imparted a new dimension of political unity to the hitherto cultural unity that had existed in India for centuries. From the nationalists' point of view, this process of unification had a two-fold effect:
 - Economic fate of the people of different regions got linked together
 - Modern means of transport and communication brought people, especially the leaders, from different regions together
- Western thought and action: The liberal and radical thought of European writers like Milton, Shelley, John Stuart Mill, Rousseau, Paine, Spencer and Voltaire helped many Indians imbibe modern rational, secular, democratic and nationalist ideas. This ever-expanding English educated class formed the middle class intelligentsia who constituted the nucleus for the newly arising political unrest.
- Role of Press and Literature: The second half of the nineteenth century saw an unprecedented growth of Indian-owned English and vernacular newspapers, despite numerous restrictions imposed on the press by the colonial rulers from time to time. It was a form of political participation for people to read newspapers in public.
- Rediscovery of India's Past: The historical researches by European scholars, such as Max Mueller, Monier Williams, Roth and Sassoon, and by Indian scholars such as R.G. Bhandarkar, R.L. Mitra and later Swami Vivekananda, created an entirely new picture of India's past. The theory put forward by European scholars, that the Indo-Aryans belonged to the same ethnic group from which other nations of Europe had evolved, gave a psychological boost to the educated Indians.

- **Progressive Character of Socio-religious Reform Movements:** These reform movements sought to remove social evils which divided Indian society; & had effect of bringing different sections together & proved to be an important factor in growth of Indian nationalism.
 - **Rise of Middle Class Intelligentsia:** This class, prominent because of its education, new position and its close ties with the ruling class, came to the forefront. The leadership to the Indian National Congress in all its stages of growth was provided by this class.
 - **Impact of Contemporary Movements Worldwide:** Rise of a number of nations on ruins of Spanish & Portuguese empires in S.America, and national liberation movements of Greece and Italy in general and of Ireland in particular deeply influenced the nationalist ranks.
 - **Reactionary Policies and Racial Arrogance of Rulers:** Lytton's reactionary policies such as reduction of maximum age limit for the I.C.S. examination from 21 years to 19 years (1876), the grand Delhi Durbar of 1877 when the country was in the severe grip of famine, the Vernacular Press Act (1878) and the Arms Act (1878) provoked a storm of opposition in the country.
-

National integration:

- **Weiner:**
 1. A process of bringing together culturally and socially discrete groups into a single territorial unit and the establishment of a national identity.
 2. The process of establishing a national, central authority over subordinate political units and regions which may or may not coincide with distinct cultural or social groups.
 3. The problem of binding Government with Government.
 4. The problem of evolving the minimum value consensus necessary to maintain a social order, referring either to the norms and processes to be accepted or to the goals to be achieved.
- National integration implies a sense of belongingness as feeling of togetherness and of unity. It is a process in which people of a nation are made to know, feel and act as people of one nation. A person should have a set of loyalties such as loyalty to the State he lives, to his region, religion, language etc. But national loyalty is primary.
- Brief History of Nationalist Foreign Policies of India:
 - At independence, India was member of 51 international organisations & signatory of 600 odd treaties.
 - So, the emerging themes during 1880-1914 were:
 - Solidarity with other colonies fighting for freedom, such as Russia, Ireland, Egypt, Turkey, Ethiopia, Sudan, Burma and Afghanistan
 - Pan-Asian feeling reflected in:
 - Condemnation of annexation of Burma in 1885

- Inspiration from Japan as an example of industrial development
 - Condemnation of international suppression of the I-Ho-Tuan uprising (1895)
 - Condemnation of the imperialist efforts to divide China
 - Defeat of Czarist Russia by Japan which exploded myth of European superiority
 - Congress support for Burma's freedom
 - World War I: nationalists supported the British Indian Government in the belief that Britain would apply the same principles of democracy for which they were supposed to be fighting.
 - 1920s and 1930s - Identifying with Socialists: In 1926 and 1927, Nehru was in Europe where he came in contact with the socialists and other leftist leaders. Earlier, Dadabhai Naoroji attended the Hague session of the International Socialist Congress.
 - After 1936 - Anti-Fascism: The 1930s saw the rise of Fascism in Europe and the struggle against it. The nationalists saw imperialism and fascism as organs of capitalism.
 - Post-independence and non-alignment
-

(b) Modernization of Indian tradition

MAHAPATRA: <search all - in dictionary and google search>

Theories on modernity:

1. Modernisation Theory
2. Cognitive Theory
3. Little Tradition Great Tradition Theory
4. Structure Functional Theory
5. Dialectical Theory
6. Post Modern Theory

Cognitive Theory:

- Mind is the storehouse of culture and drives modernity.
- Says Indian society is driven by traditions and can never become modern.
- **LOUIS DUMONT**: makes comparison bw Indian and European society.
 - Structure may change but culture is static with superiority of Brahmins.
 - Brahminic Sociology. Says "caste is written in stone and wall".
 - Values that determine Indian behaviour:

1.

Hierarchy: Homo equalis vs. Homo Hierarchicus.

2.

Holism: lack of independent existence in isolation to group that one is part of. Individualism is hallmark of modernity and Consti also ushers it, but people refuse to accept it. Ex. Corruption can be explained as a result of holism, greed for generations.

3.

Transcendence: Truth beyond comprehension. Case Study: **For ex. Chenchu Tribes gave up the houses built for them under Chenchu Rehabilitation Program of AP Govt.**

Instead choose to find place in forests. When looked into, found that they had a belief that tree cover of house was protective spirit. Their practise of burning huts after an epidemic was not possible in concrete houses.

4.

Cultural Society: impact of culture on all decisions and behaviour.

5.

Other worldly views

- **TN MADAN: 'Modern Myth and Locked Minds'.** Deals with inadequacies of Indian secularism in the face of rising fundamentalism. Indian mind is a closed mind and refuses to go for modernity/change.

Functionalists:

- PV A and PV B; Mechanical and Organic Solidarity.
- May be applicable for west but not to India.
- In India, there is no binary, rather, the negotiation of modernity with tradition.

LTGT Theory: MILTON SINGER and MCKIM MARRIOT

- **Rural Urban Continuum Theory: ROBERT REDFIELD.** In his **peasant studies of Mexico**, observed that there was cooperation and continuity between modern urban areas and traditional rural areas instead of a dichotomy. There was passing on of ideas from urban elite to rural areas and products from rural to urban.
- Redfield explained culture change from evolutionary level. Culture operates at 2 levels:
 - 1.
 - Mass culture (Little trad)
 - 2.
 - Elite culture (Great trad)
- In initial stages, not much difference bw both because elites emerge from masses itself and are like first among equals. Ex. Tribal chief and his advisors.
- Then elites get exposure to other cultures and change GT. Ex. when muslim rulers came to India.
- Elites often GT communicate with elites of other societies and make traditions composite. Ex. Indian consti borrowed from several others.
- European society went through all 3 stages. But in India structural change happening in GT but there isn't much cultural adaptability, hence Redfield's theory can't fully explain.

Singer and Marriott:

- Applied LTGT to study India.

- Indian society primary (close connect bw masses and elites) and Europe is secondary.
- For Ex. decision of elites to ban cow slaughter is equally related to masses.
- Europe -> modernisation of tradition, ie demolition of trad.
India -> Indianisation of modernity.
- Used 2 concepts: **Universalisation** and **Parochialisation** (ie restricting GT to restricted community) - Marriott gave ex of Kuan Ka Devtha Puja to dig wells. But with technology, this Puja got parochialised.
- Odissi was practised by Devdasis, now universalised.

SF Theory: MNS

Sanskritisation: Orthogenetic changes

- In his study of Coorg Tribes of Mysore, found that they went for vegetarianism and immitated cultural traits of Brahmins to elevate their position -> Brahminisation
- Found it is all-India, hence Sanskritisation - to explain mobility w/n caste system and tribal entry and assimilation in caste system.
- This competition is strengthening our culture and enabling mobility.
- Caste is a dynamic system because cultural change can bring structural change in caste hierarchy.
- Ex. Jat agitation shows that today secular consolidation has become more important for those that attained ritual mobility in the past.
- Criticism:

1.

HAROLD GOULD: Sanskritisation is a form of protest against Brahminic hegemony rather than immitating it.

2.

PROF. CHANNA: It is not an all India phenomenon. Ex. In Punjab, Islamisation is more prominent. In UK, tribalisation of Brahmins is present due to difficult conditions to survive. In UP, rather than immitating core values and culture, lower castes go for conspicuous behaviour.

Westernisation: Heterogenetic

- Doesn't call it modernisation - which is a value-loaded concept and assumption of rationality.
- Due to British rule, changes in tech, insti, value system.
- But westernisation didn't completely replace sanskritisation.
- Ex. Printing Press used for printing Ramayan, Pandit using microphone is a ceremony
- transportation system used to visit pilgrimages - strengthening religiousity.
- W/n a university, Sanskrit dept. coexists with biotech dept.
- Continuity of tradition and co-existence of modern elements.

*Orthogenetic changes: from w/n. More of change in culture.

Heterogenetic changes: from outside. Change in structure more.

Dialectical/Marxist Theory:

- **DP Mukherjee:** considers Modernity as a 'British Package' delivered to its own product - Indian Middle Class.

- This MC encountered a dialectics of Values bw trad at family and modernity at profession.
- Indian society didn't completely abandon trad values. Ex. explains why Arya Samajh was more successful than Brahmo Samajh, Gandhi's huge popularity.
- AR Desai, Utsa Pattnaik etc. <check Tushar above and copy>

Modernisation Theory:

- 2 models:
 1. Classical Modernists: Univ Theory to Modernity. Trad should be demolished to achieve modernity. Weber (rationality, B, LR authority), Parsons (PV A and PV B)
 2. Contextual approach: Gunnar Myrdal and Yogendra Singh
- **Myrdal**: depending on carrying capacity, values and institutions, consequences of modernity will differ. Modernity doesn't have a uniform impact.
- **Yogendra Singh** - '*Modernisation of Indian tradition*' applied Myrdal's theory to India.
- Ex. Hindi cinema is melodramatic, superficial yet modern. Classic ex of Indian modernity.
- Contemp work culture, consumerism, pol and eco globalisation - imprints of modernity.

*Globalisation is cultural and inherent to Indian way of life - **Vasudeva Kutumbakam**. But today, it has become more of a mechanistic economic and political process. (Hyper modernity). Globalisation - integrating world's hearts and minds, ie ideologies and technologies.

Nehru's statement "Dams are temples of modern India" - ultimate example of quest for modernity yet with traditional undertones.

Post Modern Approach:

- Critical of modernity. Eco disparity, cultural loss, social disenchantment etc.
- **BIKU PAREKH**: hospitals, dams, industries are sources of sorrow in modern India. Today - crisis of modernity.
- Regional variations in modernity due to India's fragmented response to modernity, because of cultural diversity of India
- **TN MADAN**: Modernity is oneness, oneness is dullness, killing the scope of creative intellect. Techno scientific modernity is a planetary cancer. Relations turning into mere transactions.
- Consumerism: happiness, status and class defined by consumption.
- **AVIJIT PATHAK**: '*Indian Modernity*'. Modernity is a form of consumption that gives artificial pleasure where as trad is a human experience. Ex. Ram Leela was meant for human participation, TV Serial Ramayan is meant for visual indulgence.
- Indian modernity is partial because it went for modernisation w/o commitment to universal rules, went for democracy w/o civil culture, media w/o journalism ethics etc.

Theoretical framework for modernity:

- Giddens talks about different stages of modernity: radical modernity, high modernity and late modernity.

- Beck and Bauman theorizes modernity in its worse form – it is a risk society, full of dangers-a holocaust.
- Ritzer, on the other hand, defines modernity in terms of hyper rationality.
- Habermas argues that Europe has still to scale its share of modernity. It is an ongoing project.

Tradition:

- S.C. Dube has given a six-fold classification of traditions in India.
- The classification of traditions is:
 - Classical traditions
 - Emergent national traditions
 - Regional traditions
 - Local traditions
 - Western traditions, and
 - Local sub-cultural traditions of social groups.
- Looking at all the explanations of Indian traditions, it can be safely said that these are multiple traditions consisting of varying hierarchies.

The Meaning and Role of Tradition in India:

The structuralist, ethno-methodological approach:

- With the publication of Louis Dumont's *Homo Hierarchicus* (1970), there appeared 'structuralist' approach to the study of traditions.
- In his study of caste stratification in *Homo Hierarchicus*, Dumont has established that India is a religious society and the concept of pure and impure is solely guided by traditions. The hierarchical caste stratification, in fact, is a tradition-bound social order. It is based on the principle of inequality.
- He looks at India from a cultural perspective and considers that modernity is an impossibility in India. He sees traditional linkage and its resurgence in form of caste in power as an obstacle to modernity in India.
- The Dumont effect made it clear that traditions must be used to understand Indian society.
- **TN Madan** counters Louis Dumont in his book - 'Modern myths and locked minds' where he questions the very basic premise of need for west-like modernity in India.
- Similarly according to **Ashish Nandi**, question should not be that why India isn't modern but does India need modernity?

Dimensional approach to social structure:

- Yogendra Singh identifies dimensional approach to the study of Indian structure. This approach does not consider tradition as its focus of enquiry. Instead, it applies multi-dimensional perspective to the under-standing of society.

- Many studies of social structure in India, however, do not consciously use the notion of tradition as a normative framework in their analysis. Instead, social structure is defined in a multi-dimensional perspective using sets of social variables or categories. The approach sometimes approximates the Weberian typological formulation and dimensions of social structure such as 'status', 'wealth' and 'power'.
- Yogendra Singh (1972) identifies structural modernization as India's powerful aspect. It consists of normative variables such as social mobilization, growth of communication, market domination, media exposure, democratic political institutions, and values, morals and norms. He observes: Modernization is supposed to follow as a result of the presence of these variables in the social system; their intensity and proportion would determine the nature and extent of modernization in specific situations.

Value-themes in entire social system of Indian society prior to beginning of modernization:

- Organized on the principles of hierarchy, holism, continuity and transcendence. These four value-themes were deeply interlocked with Indian social structure.
 - Hierarchy: not only in system of caste & sub-caste stratification but also in concepts of human nature, life cycles (ashramas) & moral duties (dharma).
 - Holism: relationship between individual and group. Former was encompassed by the latter in respect of duties and rights. Precedence here was given to community or sangha and not the individual. This assumption of individual by collectively persisted all along the line of traditional social structure, e.g., family, village community, caste.
 - Transcendence: legitimating of traditional values could never be challenged on grounds of rationality derived from the non-sacred or profane' scales of evaluation.
- Organization of tradition based on these value. Components could not be called typical only of the Indian society, since at one level similar phenomenon also existed in traditional West.
- This temporal depth of civilization in traditional Indian society has relevance:
 - for analyzing the direction of the process of modernization might eventually take
 - for understanding causality & sequence thru which modernization has made impact
 - might reveal the manner in which initial structural and cultural conditions of modernization in India contribute to such institutional adaptations which may be universalistic in orientation yet particularistic in form. The form of traditional institutions may remain intact but their substance might undergo major transformations incorporating modernization.
- The emphasis on historicity in preference to universality defining the context of modernization the pre-eminence of structural changes in society to render adaptive process of modernization successful in the developing countries particularly India and eclectic nature of cultural and ideological response of India to challenges of modernization represent some of unifying principles.

- Historically, social structure and tradition in India remained impervious to major elements of modernity until the contact with the West began through colonization. The earlier encounters with Islam only reinforced the tradition - basically organized on value themes which were traditional
- Though Islam has messianic, non-hierarchical & monotheistic non-idolism values, in its Persian transformation had already imbibed some elements of hierarchical stratification when came to India.
- Despite the apparent dissimilarities, the contact between the Great traditions of Hinduism and Islam was only a contact between two traditional systems. Its impact on family, caste and village community was insignificant, and in macro-structures too it did not set out any basically new forms.
- Islamic polity and judicial administration were essentially feudal and patrimonial; the legal principles and norms were also hierarchical and did not fully recognize the principles of equality and equity in political and civil rights. This explains why Islamic impact unlike that of the West failed to contribute to modernization.

Social Changes in Traditional India:

- Distinction between social change & modernization: In traditional India there were continual instances of social change without implying modernization. These changes were from one traditional structure to another, without, transcending them for a qualitatively distinctive evolutionary differentiation. The changes were initiated both through orthogenetic and heterogenetic causal sources.
- The traditional cultural structure comprising the little and Great traditions in India experienced many changes before the beginning of the Western contact.
 - Buddhism and Jainism emerged as protest movements against the Hindu caste system. These movements had political and economic impact. Jainism - urban movement, and both Jainism and Buddhism led to the emergence of new mercantile castes in urban centers.
 - Orthogenetic movements - Sikhism, Bhakti, AryaSamaj, Brahmo Samaj. The changes confined within framework of traditional social structure & values; structural changes were very few, and those which took place were limited in respect of the types of roles. eg Sangha.
 - The role differentiations also had an elitist character since all were led by members of upper class.
 - The main structural deprivations here were those of power and social status, which **Dumont** rightly characterizes as an equation between 'power and religion'.
 - In all traditional societies, system of social stratification is closed. No legitimate structural means to climb up in social hierarchy, the change of faith, or of customs and rituals might offer a relatively secure means of gambling for higher status.
 - Also revealed by analysis of little and great traditions by **Redfield & Singer**. An important causal factor here is that of 'relative deprivation' of groups and castes in comparison to other groups and castes ,this form a part of the theory of reference group analysis.

Structural Changes and Sanskritization:

- Endogenous changes in tradition of Hinduism confined to Sanskritization before Western contact.
- Sanskritization took place in two different forms:
 1. as historical process by collective recognition of lower castes to the ranks of upper castes as a result of their acts of chivalry, rise in economic and power status and political alliances.
 2. Sanskritization has a contextual or local meaning and generally amounts to unilateral attempt of a caste or sub-caste to move upward in hierarchy.
- Hence, Sanskritization may often disguise the seed-beds of effective modernization. Sanskritization is psychologically or even structurally, akin to modernization in so far as the motive forces to challenge the deprivations imposed by Great tradition are stronger.
- However, if the reaction of upper castes is hostile or is perceived to be so by lower castes, it is likely that latter (lower castes) would define the former as a negative reference group, and from this a break-away movement in the caste system would follow.
- Particular mention may be made of conversion to Islam in the medieval period, to Christianity during the British period, and current neo-Buddhist movement among scheduled castes and tribes in India.
- Numerous examples to show (like fatavas of Agra) that Sanskritization as a process only refers to changes in cultural attributes of a caste & not to a structural change in its system
- After Independence, with political & legal rights available to fight out, not Sanskritization but formation of politically oriented caste associations is in practice.
- *The other person who studies India using structural approach is **Robert D Lambert** who in his study of Pune highlights changes in family structure towards nucleated living and relationships based on contract.

Processes of Modernization:

- Modernization in India started mainly with the Western contact. Brought about many far reaching changes in culture & social structure of Indian society.
- Not all, however, could be called modernizing. Basic direction - towards modern'n-in process- variety of traditional instis also got reinforcement. This demonstrates the weakness of assuming a neat contrariety between tradition and modernity.
- However, only after the establishment of British rule in India, modern cultural institutions and forms of social structure were introduced. The Western tradition at the time of contact had itself undergone fundamental transformations through Industrial Revolution and social reformation. Its place was now being taken by rational individualism in economy and society.
- Attitude of the British rulers and administrators about modernization in India: With the exception of a handful of Orientalists who were overwhelmed by the textual grandeur of Indian tradition, majority were only impressed by contrasts which Indian society presented to their Western society.
- The significance of British contribution to modernization mainly lies in the creation of such networks of social structure and culture which were modern and pan-Indian.

- Initially, sub-culture or Little tradition of Westernization, small nucleus of interpreters, trader-cum-middlemen emerged who were slowly being socialized to Western ways; subsequently, emerged sects which emphasized assimilation of Western cultural norms, e.g. Brahmosamaj, Prarthana Samaj - these ran a crusade against obscurantism Hindu traditions.
- Its components were: a universalistic legal system, expansion of Western form of education, urbanization and industrialization, spread of new means of communication and transport and social reforms.
- Along with these modernization norms, structural modernization also took place. Growth of industrial entrepreneurship also contributed to the emergence of industrial working class and trade unions organized on corporate lines as in the West.
- There was, however, one important feature of Indian modernization during the British period. The growth of this process was selective and segmental. It was not integrated with the microstructures of Indian society, such as family, caste and village community. For a long time caste and ethnic factors were given recognition in recruitment of officers to army and middle and lower ranks of bureaucracy. Later, in the twentieth century, as the nationalist movement gathered momentum, a communal electorate system was introduced.
- These historical factors have deeply influenced the process of modernization followed during postcolonial period. It increased contingency of traditional institutions to Indian process of modern'n.
- Freedom movement ushered in a new political culture of modernization. At its centre was the personality of Mahatma Gandhi whose one foot was always deeply embedded in tradition. **Abhijit Pathak** writes that Gandhi though a traditionalist in many ways, chose Nehru as his successor, who had a modernistic view of development. Thus, India's modernity based on contradictory platforms.
- Following Independence, modernization process in India has undergone a basic change from its colonial pattern. Introduction of adult suffrage & a federal parliamentary form of political structure have carried politicization to every sector of social organization. Conscious legal reforms in Hindu marriage & inheritance laws have deeply affected foundations of traditional Hindu family structure. Community Development Projects, panchayats etc have carried the cultural norms and role-strictures of modernity to each and every village in India. Caste has in the process undergone radical transformation of roles, developed new functional adaptations and activated aspirations unleashed by democratization of polity and power structure. As the process of modernization becomes all encompassing, it also generates inter-structural tensions and conflicts between traditions (past and contemporary).

Approaches to Modernization:

- Most approaches could be grouped under two broad categories: structural and evolutionary.

 - Structural approach is rather preponderant in social sciences. It seeks to analyze modernization with the help of selected social or normative variables. Such variables as 'social mobilization', 'communication', 'media exposure'; democratic political institutions etc
 - Evolutionary approach to modernization based on more systematic theoretical assumptions. It treats modernization as an evolutionary stage in the life of human society.

- Methodological formulation - structural functional and dialectical: Its methodological formulation may either be structural functional or dialectical; similarly direction of evolution may also be either unilinear or multilinear. A major difference between dialectical (Marxist) and structural-functional evolutionary approaches to modernization is that the former treats 'breakdown' in the established political, economic and structural framework of a society as a necessary and inevitable condition for development towards modernization.
- Structure functional evolutionary treatment is drawn primarily from an organism analogy. There are many assumptions in **Parsons'** evolutionary theory of modernization which may not be accepted by other sociologists. For instance, his assertion that democratic association is the highest evolutionary stage in the modernization of Indian tradition: analysis process of modernization could be variously interpreted or even refuted both by Marxist and non-Marxist sociologists.
- **Gunnar Myrdal** in a recent **study on Asian prospect of development and modernization** writes: Yet it may be doubted whether this ideal of political democracy with political power based on free elections and with freedom of assembly, press, and other civil liberties - should be given weight in formulating the modernization ideals. This is not because the ideal is at present not very fully met, and may not be met in the future: value premises represent merely an angle from which actual conditions are viewed and need not be 'realistic' in that sense..Stratification is one important factor which causes bottlenecks in rapid modern'n of India by its rigidity & non-egalitarian character.
- Formulations closely resembling those of Parsons but without similar theoretical presumption have also been made by Marion J. Levy, E.S.N. Eisenstadt and Gunnar Myrdal. Much responsibility for either 'breakdown' or smooth transition to modernization is attributed by these sociologists to structural and normative 'initial conditions' in the developing societies. Diff b/w China & Japan (?)

Indian Scenario:

- Modernization, in its initial stages in India, according to **EISENSTADT**, did not lead to any serious breakdown because of the peculiar structural characteristics of the Indian society. Here, cultural system was fairly independent of political system.
- Louis Dumont writes: "This domain (polity or artha) is relatively autonomous to absolute values" there was also independence between the political system and the system of caste stratification.
- Castes had their own panchayats and plural traditions, and similarly there also existed autonomy for groups and regional committees. Modernity, mainly developed as a sub-structure and subculture without pervasive expansion in all sectors of life.
- The cultural pre-requisites of a comprehensive modernization necessitate adaptive changes in the system of values. For instance, secularism, untouchability, non-parochialism are cultural demands of modernization in contemporary India which its traditional value system continues to resist.
- Objective analysis of important trends of social & cultural changes in India which are relevant to modernization:
- In cultural sphere, major changes have been introduced by legislations. These seek to abolish social inequalities and exploitations handed down by tradition and accord democratic rights and constitutional privileges to all members of society. This has led to a trend away from Sanskritization.

- However, the tradition also gets reinforcement in the process; modern media of communication and transport are increasingly used for spreading ritual order and for rational organization of religious groups and their mode of activities and social participation.
- Inconsistencies are similarly there in structural changes that India has undergone during the postcolonial phase of modernization. Micro-structures like caste, family and village community have retained their traditional character; caste has shown unexpected elasticity and latent potential for adaptation with modern institutions, such as democratic participation.
- These contradictions are, however, further magnified at the level of macro- structures, such as the political system, bureaucracy, elite structure, industry and economy. The colonial period of modernization had homogeneity in elite structure. These elite from industrial, civil and military bureaucracies, as well as political spheres came from similar class-caste stratum; they had equitable exposure to Western education, and socialization.
- Thus, major potential sources of breakdown in the Indian process of modernization may, in one form or another, be attributed to structural inconsistencies, such as: democratization without spread of civic culture (education), bureaucratization without commitment to universalistic norms, rise in media participation (communication) and aspiration without proportionate increase in resources and distributive justice, verbalization of a welfare ideology without its diffusion in social structure and its implementation as a social policy, over-urbanization without industrialization and finally modernization without meaningful changes in the stratification system.
- **Gunnar Myrdal** refers to similar impediments to modernization in India and other Asian countries in his work ***Asian Drama***.
 - Nationalism and democratic institutions themselves, according to him, have grown in a structurally uneven form in these countries.
 - “In Europe, strong independent State with a fairly effective government and a common pattern of law enforcement,” he says, “preceded nationalism, and both preceded democracy;” in South Asian countries democratic ideology if not reality, has, due to special historicity, preceded strong and independent State & effective government & this is further complicated by onslaught of nationalism.
 - In India planned economic growth has not made as deep an impact towards liberalizing the structural bottlenecks for modernization as should have been expected.
 - According to Myrdal, India’s ‘soft-state’ policy after Independence inhibited its leadership from going to the root of the problem, that is, introduction of basic changes in the institutional structure of society.
 - Myrdal’s well known position on theory of social change and development is that of circular causation and cumulative change. The crucial factor in development is an ‘upward’ movement of the social system as a whole with all its component ‘conditions’.
 - These conditions for South Asian countries as described by Myrdal are: Output & income; Conditions of prod’n; Levels of living; Attitudes towards life & work; Institutions; & Policies.

Myrdal's theory of modernization could best be evaluated through the distinction he introduces between 'independent' and 'instrumental' values. The 'independent values' of a traditional society differ from those of a modern society, and more often they are mutually contradictory. But the 'independent values' cannot be demonstrated to be false or irrelevant without transforming them into 'instrumental values'. Since, the institutions and attitudes towards life and work in a traditional society come to be valued for their 'independent values', it is necessary to demonstrate their poverty over 'independent values' of a modern society in order to motivate people to renounce them for the latter.

◦

Caste, which represents institutionalized form of inequality sanctioned by tradition now fights battles against inequality and inegalitarianism its own rational self-transformation into associations.

Historicity of Modernization:

- The problems connected with historicity of modernization emerge from the 'initial conditions' of different societies from where modernization as a process starts.
- There are both logical and substantive grounds why growth of modernization might vary in pattern from society to society.
- Often, modernization is defined through attributes which are too abstract and partial in nature.
- Modernization is understood as growth of a uniform set of cultural and role structural attributes, but attention is not paid as to how these attributes develop typical adaptations within the traditional conditions of each society.
- This limitation, can be avoided if we conceptualize both tradition and modernization as sets of values and role-structures which interact as they come into contact and between them a selective process of assimilation and syncretism starts.
- The crucial role in selective acceptance is played by the system of values. These values in each society are differentiated into
 1. categorical or independent
 2. instrumental
- All role structures whether traditional or modern inherit both categorical and instrumental standards, and this leads to a combination of both; a person who is well-trained in the modern role-structure with high instrumental value, for instance a surgeon or an engineer or a scientist, may be deeply committed to traditional categorical values.
- This is logically quite possible, because the categorical values enjoy autonomy over the instrumental values. Such instances are quite common in the Indian society, but it is presumed that no society would be an exception to this rule.
- As for modernization in India, we find a growing trend that traditional role-structures are giving way to modern ones. Generally, ritual order and religion which are essentially based on categorical values of a traditional nature do not show evidence of decline, nor is there an easy possibility of their disappearance in the near future. This would explain the diversity in the pattern of modernization in different societies.

- But it would be wrong to deduce from this argument that modernization will not bring about structural and cultural similarity among the peoples of the world.
- As modernization proceeds, it would create uniform sets of role-structures with accompanying modern value commitments, instrumental or categorical. Inconsistent combinations of roles and values may still persist but a large sector of societal and cultural life of societies would share uniformity of standards with other modern societies. The divergence of political ideologies, contradictions in cultural and racial identities coupled with inequality of resources among nations create basic schism in the value-structure of modernization. Hence, particularistic growth pattern of modernization seems to be more credible than universalistic form of its development.

Modernity: Disenchantment and its Challenges in India:

- In the early period of this encounter brought by modernity of British Raj, there grew disenchantment towards tradition. But, with the widening of modernization & globalization, there has grown disenchantment against modernization too. Many of expectations of modernity remain unfulfilled. Challenges from the grass roots create bottlenecks for the processes of modernity. On one hand, people feel that the age-old traditions have become irrelevant to fulfill their needs and on the other, they are dissatisfied with the processes of modernization. This is precisely the situation of disenchantment.
- Ethnicity and its challenge
- Emergence of new social movements
- The increasing pace of modernization has given rise to a new kind of social movements such as environmental movements, gender movements and human rights movements
- Challenge by fundamentalism
- Pervasive ideas of freedom and development: **V.S. Naipaul** (1990) says - awareness which modernisation has given to people would mobilize them to commit not one but millions of mutinies
- Empowerment of women

Debate on Tradition and Modernity in India:

- **Yogendra Singh** has defined Indian society and its traditions with reference to hierarchy, holism, transmigration or continuity and transcendence.
 - In west also, when modernization began after enlightenment, there was a serious debate on religion, science, state and fundamentalism. Feudalism was challenged by rationality, capitalism and science.
 - In India, modernity needs to be analyzed in the context of liberalism, democracy and capitalism. The princely rulers were highly antagonistic to modernity. Their survival depended on continuity & strengthening of tradition. Thus, it is meaningful to discuss modernity in terms of India's traditions.
1. **D.P. Mukerji's** analysis of tradition: He was a Marxist but preferred to call himself a Marxologist, i.e., a social scientist of Marxism. He argued that there is dialectical relation between India's tradition and modernity, British colonialism and nationalism and individualism and collectivity, i.e., sangha. His concept of dialectics was anchored in liberal humanism. He believed, encounter between tradition and modernity, therefore, ends up in two consequences:

-
- Conflict and
-
- Synthesis.
-

It was through assimilation & conflict of such varying forces that Indian culture became what it is today, neither Hindu / Islamic, neither a replica of western mode of living / a purely Asiatic product. D.P. tried to provide a classification of Indian traditions under three heads, viz., primary, secondary and tertiary.

-
- The primary traditions have been primordial and authentic to Indian society.
-
- The secondary traditions were given second ranking when the Muslims arrived in the country. And third- by the time of the British arrival, Hindus and Muslims had yet not achieved a full synthesis at all levels of social existence.
-
- In tertiary traditions differences survived prominently.

2. **D.N. Majumdar:** His understanding of Indian traditions, therefore, came through his study of tribals. Close to his interest in tribal groups, he also conducted studies of Indian villages. As a social anthropologist, Majumdar's area of interest was culture. The content of his culture, naturally, was tradition. Functionalist. Both agree to a synthesis of tradition and modernity. D.P. talks about adaptive changes to modernity whereas Majumdar argues that those who are misfits to modernity will be obliged to fit themselves with the modernizing system.
3. **G.S. Ghurye:** For Ghurye, tradition was a heuristic method for sociological analysis. Indian traditions are actually Hindu traditions and to understand Indian society one must know the Hindu traditions. In his work, ***Social Tensions in India*** (1968), he argues that Hindus and Muslims are two separate and cultural distinct groups that can hardly have any chances of integration.
4. **M.N. Srinivas:** considers village as the microcosm of Indian society and civilization. It is the village, which retains the traditional components of India's tradition. Srinivas thinks that the only meaningful social change is that which takes place among the weaker sections for attaining higher status by imitating values of twice-born. For him, Indian traditions are high-caste Hindu traditions, lower caste traditions are no Indian traditions. Obviously, Srinivas anchors tradition into sanskritization. Srinivas was actually interested in caste. He considered it to be the 'structural basis' of Hinduism. He was not fascinated by Hinduism in its holistic form. He looked for it in the caste system. Besides caste, Srinivas looks for yet another source or manifestation of tradition. He found it in the notion of 'dominant caste'. Srinivas in a straightforward way rejects secularism and stands in favour of Hindu traditions. In his critique of Indian secularism which appeared in a short article in the Times of India in 1993, he finds secularism wanting because he believes that India needs a new philosophy to solve the cultural and spiritual crisis facing the country and that philosophy cannot be secular humanism. But, any tradition emanating from caste system cannot be nation's tradition as the constitution has rejected caste. He is not comfortable with concept of modernity as considers it a value loaded concept. He tries to explain it using sanskritisation and westernization. Hierarchy is not fixed (counters Louis Dumont's homo-hierarchicus)
5. **A.R. Desai:** Doctrinaire Marxist. He rejects any interpretation of tradition with reference to religion, rituals and festivities. It is essentially a secular phenomenon. Its nature is economic and

it originates and develops in economics. He finds it in family, village and other social institutions. Desai thinks that when traditions are linked with economic relations, the change in the latter would eventually change the traditions. Despite merit of the dialectical approach applied by A.R. Desai in the definition of tradition, Yogendra Singh argues that the merits are not without their weaknesses. What is wrong with A.R. Desai is that he is very profound when he applies principles of Marxism in analyzing Indian situations, but fails at the level of empirical support.

Thus 2 approaches to modernity in india:

-
- Cultural- Louis Dumont and others
-
- Dialectical- DP Mukerji, AR Desai, Randhir Singh

6. **Randhir Singh**: studies post-independence modernity in Indian agriculture. He says, it has given rise to bourgeois and petty bourgeois in countryside in the form of rich landlords, travel agents etc as turned agriculture on capitalistic lines. Similarly, in mining belt, tribals have been displaced. It has gratified to class interest.

Modernity in India:

- **Anthony Giddens** says: The other widely expressed way of coming to grips with our lack of true modernity is to say that there are “multiple modernities”, and that the Indian variety is just another expression of modernity.
- **Dipankar Gupta** in his book, ***Mistaken Modernity*** (2000), modernity in this country has to be defined in terms of social-historical and cultural conditions of different regions or social segments of nation. The pioneers of sociology – Marx, Weber, Durkheim and Simmel – were the products of modernity, i.e., capitalism, democracy and industrialism. Indian social conditions were different. Our challenges were serious. There was colonialism and in princely states, feudalism. Our first priority was to get freedom, and our ambition was to build India into a nation. Our pioneering sociologists, G.S. Ghurye, M.N. Srinivas, D.P. Mukerji, B.K. Sarkar, Radhakamal Mukherjee, drew their value premises & perspectives on the approach to studying Indian society from nationalist reformation leadership of the 19th century. All these men had not encountered challenges of industrialism and capitalism. Nor had they any experience of western modernity.
- **Yogendra Singh** spells out the issues of social relevance and says that pioneers of sociology in India wanted to focus on social change. Indian sociologists paid very little attention to the study of modernity and its impact on Indian society. Modernity as a distinct form of enquiry came late during the seventies.
- According to Srinivas, definition and meaning of modernization boils down to the following points:
 - Westernization and modernization are interchangeable, though in India's social change westernization is preferable.
 - Modernization includes humanitarianism and rationalism.
 - Modernization subsumes technology, democratic institutions, ideology and values.
 -

Building of nation-state.

-

Development of political culture.

-

There is sanskritization at the level of caste system; there is westernization or modernization at the nation-state level. Modernization is more widespread at the individual level than sanskritization.

-

Traditionalism goes hand-in-hand with modernization.

- **Yogendra Singh** on modernity: Modernization approximates to such a cultural order. It symbolizes a rational attitude towards issues, and their evaluation from a universalistic and not particularistic viewpoint; modernization is rooted in the scientific worldview; it has deeper and positive association with levels of diffusion of scientific knowledge technological skill and technological resources in a particular society. It includes the following important elements or features of modernity:

-

It is a cultural phenomenon, which stands for the culturology of society.

-

It is rational attitudes towards societal issues and problems.

-

Its norms are universalistic, applicable to the totality of all the societies.

-

Its worldview is scientific.

-

It contains scientific knowledge and technological skill

-

Encourages internaliz'n of humanistic & philosophical attitudes - inherent to sc'fic knowledge.

- What Yogendra Singh argues is that modernity is a universal- cultural phenomenon, whereas tradition is local and is observed by the immediate society only. The challenge of modernity with its universal features and characteristics is the same in all societies but the responses to it are varying.
- This gives rise to multiple modernities. And, therefore, Yogendra Singh very rightly says that “the substantive adaptation to modernization should be distinguished from modernization per se since in all likelihood, not for a long time to come (perhaps never), anywhere in the world shall we have a fully modern society”.

Dipankar Gupta: India's mistaken modernity:

- In his book, ***Mistaken Modernity: India between Worlds*** (2000), Dipankar defines the concept of modernity in India's context and says: “The mode of relations among people in our country is still not modern. Family connections, privileges of caste and status, as well as the willingness to break every law in the book characterize our social relations very deeply. Modernity is an attitude, which represents universalistic norms, where the dignity of an individual as a citizen is inviolable . Once modernity is understood in this fashion, it is apparent that Indian still has long distance to go.”

- He says, Contemporary is not necessarily modern: Some people think that whatever is contemporary is modern. Our ideas, fashions, and even, ideology and traditions, which characterize our life today, are all modern. Spending lakhs of rupees on the celebration of festivals and marriages, which was never done earlier, is considered as modern. There is an exorbitant excitement in the celebration of certain religious festivals such as Ganesh Mahotsava, Garba, Diwali and Holi.
- Is technology, the only modernity?: In Dipankar's views, technology is only one part of modernity. Modernity involves certain other features also such as human values and relationships.
- Only consumerism is not modernity: Capitalism is the bedrock of modernity and it enhances an increasing standard of consumerism. The situation in India is different. In our country, consumerism has given rise to inequality; the poor have become poorer in the race of uplifting their standard. And, in such a situation, it is mistaken to align modernity with increasing consumerism.
- Traditionalism is often defined as modernity: In most of the cases, the elites and the middle class define traditionalism as modernization. Fundamentalism and the ideology of Hindutva could be referred to as new forms of modernity. In fact, traditionalism has reappeared in the form of modernization.
- Such a modernization is fake. Dipankar says that a modern society is one in which at least the following characteristics must be present:
 - Dignity of the individual;
 - Adherence to universalistic norms;
 - Elevation of individual achievement over privileges or dis-privileges of birth; and
 - Accountability in public life.

Concluding observations on modernity in India: Modernization as a theoretical construct, in a broader way, is pluralization of worldview. In the west, it is argued that it is a multi-dimensional process & begins from evaluation of new classes, technology & communications resulting from decay of feudalism and emergence of capitalism and democratic nation-state.

Modernization and Social Change in India:

- Changes in Indian society are massive indeed. But what is the direction of this massive change.
- Yogendra Singh says, there has emerged a tradition among Indian sociologists to evaluate social change in India from structural components of caste, family and village. Some of these components include:
 - Sanskritization and westernization,
 - Little and great traditions,
 - Parochialization and universalization,
 -

- Dialectical process, and

-

- Cognitive historical or ideological processes.

- Diff aspects of social change:

-

- Sociological writings on secularism: With secularism in place, sociologists observe that religious violence is rearing its head again. AshisNandy in his conclusion says that as India gets modernized, religious violence is increasing. Quite like Nandy, T.N. Madan is also sceptical about the future of secularism when he says that in South Asia secularism as a shared credo of life is impossible.

-

- Sociology of science and technology.

-

- Industrialism and factory system. The five changes are as under:

-

- Economic relations are determined by contract.

-

- There has emerged complex division of labour. This has created functional interdependence.

-

- Achieved status.

-

- Vertical and horizontal mobility.

-

- New aspirations for improvement.

-

- Modernization and social change in societal institutions

-

- Equity, mobility and the education of the disadvantaged

-

- Modernization and emphasis on professions

Islam and Modernization in India:

- The earlier encounters with Islam only reinforced the tradition - basically organized on value-themes which were traditional;
- Ideally, Islam had no place for hierarchical differentiation of individuals within its community of believers; its world view was messianic - in contrast with the Hindu view of continuity; the principle of transcendence in Islam was strictly monotheistic and here too it differed from Hinduism.
- The principle of holism which no doubt was present both in Islam and Hinduism also varied in sociological meaning in the two civilizations. In Hinduism, holism implied individual's social and moral subordination to the group without theocratic implications, so basic in Islam.
- Despite these dissimilarities in ideal value-themes of the Hindu and Islamic traditions, there took place a synthesis between them which reinforced the traditional character of Indian society without significant break-down in its organization.

- Though Islam has a messianic, non-hierarchical and monotheistic non-idolism values, in its Persian transformation had already imbibed some elements of hierarchical stratification when it came to India from there, and in the midst of the caste-stratified Hindu society, more so, owing to large-scale conversion to Islam by caste Hindus, Islamic social structure in this country soon developed its own pattern of caste hierarchy.
- In political structure too feudal monarchical system followed by the Muslim rulers was not fundamentally different from those of the traditional Hindu rulers, and even where there were variations attempt was made to accommodate Hindu norms of political order through institutional adjustments. Hindu princes and administrative functionaries held important offices at the courts of Muslim rulers in the North.
- Consequently, there took place a high degree of cultural as well as institutional syncretism between the two systems without major breakdowns.
- From the view-point of modernization, therefore, the Islamic contact was more tradition-reinforcing than otherwise.
- The Islamic tradition in India came from a heterogenetic source; its establishment by conquest introduced a complex emotional variable right from the beginning which has continued through time.
- Value-themes of Islam were holistic but the principle of hierarchy or caste was not accepted in theory; the idea of continuity was also less pronounced as Islam, like all religions of Semitic origin, was based on the conception of historical time; its value-theme on transcendence too was rooted in the principle of absolute monotheism.
- These contrasts of history and value-themes could not, however, render Islam as a systematic exogenous source for radical transformation in the Indian tradition.
- Despite the apparent dissimilarities, the contact between the Great traditions of Hinduism and Islam was only a contact between two traditional systems.
- Large-scale conversions to Islam during the Muslim rule in India might be said to have offered a structural outlet for the deprived Hindu castes for social, economic and cultural mobility. But the extent to which the converts succeeded in it was always limited.
- **Ashrafs** (the four immigrant Muslim groups) generally maintained their social distance from these converts in matters of marriage and kinship ties; they never recognized them as their equals.
- The caste hierarchy continued within the convert Muslims and in most cases traditional occupations and caste rituals were also maintained.
- Yet, it is reasonable to believe that there must have been some advantages; being a Muslim in a political set-up where Muslim kings and chiefs were the rulers did offer security and other peripheral benefits to these groups.
- Conversion: A stronger motivation behind conversion could be **structural deprivations** (in terms of new economic opportunities, security and power) rather than cultural deprivation of the caste system. The spirit behind conversion may not have been merely that of escape but also of innovation. However, the groups which took readily to the Islamic faith were from the lower castes for which psychological appeal of belonging to the ruling community must have been stronger apart from the material benefits they must have anticipated. The main structural deprivations here were those of power and social status, which **Dumont** rightly characterizes as an equation between 'power and religion'.
- In all traditional societies where the system of social stratification is closed and there are no legitimate structural means to climb up in social hierarchy, the change of faith, or of customs and

rituals might offer a relatively secure means of gambling for higher status.

- Both Hinduism and Islam in India have maintained these little traditions. Plurality of the little traditions was preserved through caste structure and its local cultural expressions especially among the castes of lower and intermediate ranks. These castes, both Hindu and Muslim, formed their own plural traditions and micro-structures.
- Little and great tradition: (**SC Dubey** contradicted this theory as used by Milton Singer by calling it euro-centric- Milton had proposed primary civilization where elite culture is derived from mass culture and secondary civilization where elite culture is different from mass culture. Over a period of time all converted to modern. Eg Europe) (?)
- Kinship and social ties of castes hardly ever extend beyond the radius of two hundred miles in any part of India; the diversity of languages and communication barriers traditionally delimited the scope of caste interaction. Thus, plural traditions of these castes formed the little traditions in India. Two important processes of change which have traditionally been active in the little traditions are those of Sanskritization and Islamization.
- Sanskritization refers to the processes of change from within the Hindu tradition whereas Islamization has been in response to the contact with an external tradition. Both these processes reflect a tendency among the strongly deprived groups to adapt or change their local traditions in conformity with the normative elements of a Great tradition, whether orthogenetic or heterogenetic in origin. There is considerable literature on Sanskritization which has grown since the pioneering studies conducted by M.N. Srinivas. Similar empirical studies on the process of Islamization are, however, lamentably scarce, although both Sanskritization and Islamization are at one point homologous processes. This homology arises from the similarity of structural contexts in which the motivation for these changes comes into being.

Islamization:

- An Encounter between Two Traditional Systems: For social change Islamic influence on India was limited & not conducive to modernization. However, its diffusion gave birth to emergence of new great and little traditions, although it is not clear to what extent Islam led to innovations in micro & macro-social structures of Indian society.
- Its impact on family, caste and village community was insignificant, and in macro-structures too it did not set out any basically new forms. Islamic polity and judicial administration were essentially feudal and patrimonial; the legal principles and norms were also hierarchical and did not fully recognize the principles of equality and equity in political and civil rights. This explains why Islamic impact unlike that of the West failed to contribute to modernization. The cultural changes which the impact of Islam initiated emerged from the growth of Islamic Great tradition on Indian soil.
- Since Islam established itself in India by conquest some element of force in the spread of this tradition cannot be ruled out, but an important reason for its growth was structural factors which in early Hindu tradition motivated castes towards Sanskritization.
- It is revealing that both Sanskritization and conversion to Islam or Islamization had been most popular among the lower castes of India.
- The structural pre-requisites for Islamization too were the re-definition of self-image, frustration from closure of existing system of stratification & anticipation that conversion would improve social chances; same factors were active also in Sanskritization.

- Important difference, however, was in the reaction of the Hindus to such changes which presumably was of definite hostility and isolation. Islamization at every stage might have meant an active and hostile reaction from the original membership group towards the converts and their complete exclusion from its membership. This was not the case in Sanskritization.
- Hence, Islamization also led to some structural changes through continual differentiation and segmentation of new castes who got converted to Islam.
- As the sub-culture of these Muslim castes even to this day suggests, they did not renounce many of their former rituals and practices.
- This led to formation of little traditions of Islam. With formation of little traditions of Islam, Islamization further developed structural similarities with Sanskritization. The lower caste converts began to strive for the status of Ashrafs (the Muslim upper castes or groups) and a caste of pseudo-Ashrafs emerged. As in Sanskritization, here too the claim for higher status is not recognized by the upper Muslim castes.
- With the establishment of the British power gradually the relations between Hindu and Muslim groups and traditions began to be politicized.
- This was sparked off by many factors, such as the emergence of Hindu revivalist movements (e.g. the Arya Samaj professed to reconvert Muslims to Hindu faith). The result of this politicization was finally the division of India, adding a new dimension to the minority status of the Indian Muslims.
- There has now emerged a new awakening among the Muslims to level off the differences of their little traditions and of caste 'sub-cultures of the past by encouraging purist conformity with the Great tradition of Islam.
- Tabligh movement, for instance, is directly oriented to this goal. Muslim communalism has also become active and forceful in some parts of northern India and Kerala.
- The process of vertical mobility to new caste status by Islamization is now being replaced by emphasis upon horizontal solidarity of the entire Muslim community.
- Thus, we see how Islamization as a cultural process has completed a full cycle in India. It began as a process of external impact and conversion of low caste Hindus to Muslim Great tradition, then it emerged as a process of status mobility within the Islamic social structure very much like Sanskritization, and finally it regained its earlier orthodoxy
- Sub-cultural frills which ate outside the tradition of Islam are purposely renounced with the view that Muslims must consolidate themselves into an organic whole irrespective of divergent Little traditions (of language, caste & sub-caste etc)
- This turn in the process of Islamization corresponds with the new movement among the lower Hindu castes to form caste associations and establish horizontal solidarity instead of seeking status mobility within the caste system through Sanskritization. The causal background for both seems to be structurally identical. It emanates from the realization that in a democratic society power and status mobility would more easily be gained by consolidation of one's rank and formation of effective power and protest groups rather than by imitating a traditionally defined higher status which is difficult to get.
- It may well be that latent reasons for such changes both in the Hindu and Islamic cultural tradition are disguised protest movements against the established system of stratification and power.
- Attempt is not only towards forming horizontal communal solidarities but also to give them organizational shape of modern corporate groups, based on rational norms, allocation of duties and obligations and rational means of communication and propaganda. This aspect of the

movements which may apparently seem to be traditionalizing is highly relevant to our analysis of modernization.

- Modernization implies a policy of cultural liberalism and pragmatism. These values are generated within a particular type of cultural and social framework. However, the dominant elites in Islam—the ulema—constitute a conservative force which does not have an equivalent in the Hindu tradition.
- The development of powerful political elites and middle classes in countries like Pakistan, Indonesia and some Arab nations which could override the influence of the religious elites has contributed to the process of cultural modernization. The case of Turkey is one where the religious elite were almost overthrown by the political
- Modernization in the Muslim countries of the Middle East, as reported by **Lerner**, is coming through the rise of urbanization, leading to literacy, to greater access to media.
- The fact that the Muslim community is now showing trends of high political mobilization and identity formation, may ultimately be a forerunner to the development of socio-cultural forces and leadership sympathetic to modernization.
- A source of greater resistance to modernization lies in the immutability of Islamic social codes. However, even social codes, as analyzed by scholars, have not been rigid for all times.

- **Clifford Geertz** writes: Renovation of 'Islam' as a religious system tends to find its centre of gravity in educational reform, rather than reorganization of ecclesiastical hierarchy or re-orientation of theological speculation
- Traditionally, education was imparted to Muslims through madarsas. These madarsas had neither modern methods of teaching nor of learning and did not emphasize the teaching of modern secular subjects like science and humanities.
- The situation, however, changed with the arrival of the British. In 1875, Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College, which later became AMU, was established; in 1919, Osmania University was established at Hyderabad, and then Jamia Millia of Delhi where medium of instruction was Urdu.
- At present although many traditional Muslim institutions of education continue to impart instruction on traditional lines, the trend is towards the modern education. Even the old institutions have tended slightly in the direction of modernization.
- Modern influence affects even the Dar-ul-Islam at Deoband, a theological college in Uttar Pradesh, which is one of the homes of extreme orthodoxy.
- The Calcutta Madarsa, which is controlled by the Government, has a modern site, and the Delhi Arabic College has to submit to the standards of the Delhi University.
- An interesting feature of modernization of Islam in India is that the pull towards this cultural system is never without an agonizing consciousness of deviation from the traditional path. New sources of legitimating of modernizing adaptations by Muslims have not yet been fully institutionalized.
- This lack of confidence is the major bottleneck in the growth of new principles of legitimating which are necessary for modernization. Logically, the Hindu community can help remove this suspicion and strengthen the forces of modernization in Islam. Until then, modernization will continue to be a half-hearted response and will remain eclectic in nature. The reasons are more

expedient than real. But then, is this not a universal psychology in modernization of all developing societies? Islam alone is, therefore, not an exception.

Theory of Tradition-Modernity Continuum!: Ferdinand Tonnies

- Modernity is explained from historical-evolutionary perspective.
- Tradition is Gemeinschaft and modernity is Gesellschaft. For Tonnies, the meaning of Gemeinschaft is community and for Gesellschaft it is society.
- European society has passed from tradition to modernity, that is, Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft through a rationalizing process involving a move from relationships based upon family and kin to those based on rationality and calculation.
- Gemeinschaft was the world of close, emotional, face-to-face ties, attachment to place, ascribed social status, and a homogeneous and regulated community. It is basically a traditional society.
- Gesellschaft is linked with a society, which is characterized, by urbanism, industrial life, mobility, heterogeneity and impersonality. This is precisely a modern society.
- Tonnies' continuum – from tradition to modernity – resembles Durkheim's theory of solidarity. Durkheim explained modernity in terms of mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity. Both for Tonnies and Durkheim, rationalization of society is the key determinant of modernization.
- At a later stage **Parsons** developed his pattern variable on the model of Tonnies. Parsons distinguished tradition and modernity on the value orientations in pattern variable. Thus, he said that there is distinction between particularism and universalism, ascription and achievement.
- Tonnies' theory of tradition-modern continuum needs to be explained in a proper perspective. He says that no traditional or modern society is exclusively traditional or modern. There are elements of modernity in traditional society and vice versa. What is important is that traditional society in the process of rationalization becomes modern society.

Modernisation of Indian tradition:

- European modernity- ideal for the world-renaissance-art of questioning and enquiry-secularism in Europe.; Education- secular- liberated from church domination.; Value transformation- political sovereignty- equality-fraternity-democracy
- **Nehru**: glorified Indian modernity; India-selective modernity Europe-absolute modernity
- **Gandhiji**: not a symbol of modernity- varna system but not based on birth- believed in hinduism but also believed in equality.
- **Peter Berger**: modernity-cancer-throws people out of country-alien in other places- confusion among masses-social hopelessness among the new generations.
- **Anthony Giddens**: modernity has glorified bourgeois capitalist interest.
- **British era modernity**: Bengal intellectual capital- Delhi political capital-Bombay economic capital.
- Tradition and modernity in dialectical relationship- can modernity effect is same across traditions can modernity and tradition share same set of attributes. Modernity is not endogamous to India-a European concept.
- Weber: modernity-rise of rational legal authority.
- Parson and Durkheim- modernity-technocratic division of labour-social integration-chances of mobility.
- After first WW- modernity was questioned- armed race.

- **Peter Worsley and Anthony Giddens:** modernity double edged weapons- economic development vs homelessness, disillusionment and dependency- in recent times rebellion against modernity

Modernity and tradition in India:

- British justified colonial rule saying- they can liberate people from uncivilised society to advancement and morality- Hence early reform leaders accepted western thoughts to modernise India.
- Yogendra Singh- Brahmo Samaj- first step towards modernity-Arya Samaj- blend of modernity & tradition.
- Abhijit Pathak- Indian intelligentsia accepted modernity with scepticism- from Dayanand Saraswati to Gandhi and Nehru Anglo Sanksritik education.
- Vivekananda and Aurobindo Ghosh- Connectivity between Indian and western values.
- Tilak used ritual festivals for political unification.
- Gandhi also used religious unity not political unity.
- MN Srinivas in his analysis of westernisation and social change in India. He considers modernisation is a value loaded concept because it is generally perceived as anything modern is necessarily good. He prefers to use westernisation as against modernisation to understand social change in India advocating 150 years of British rule has resulted into technological changes, institutional changes and value transformation in Indian society. However these changes are selective, optional than being completely wholesome. He gave the example of modern technologies like printing press, telephones, newspapers and other agencies of mass media to imply how they glorified traditional values without compromising their modern desirable roles. Therefore tradition and modernity are mutually coexistent and India and one can't replace outrightly the other. Thus Indian modernity selective, preferential and partial modernity.
- **Yogendra Singh:** highly forceful to dismantle tradition- book "**Modernisation of Indian tradition**". Self-assurance to women, respect to their dignity and equality can be considered as impact of modernity in India. Modernity-technology-industry-agriculture-massive employment opportunity-occupational mobility. But the benefits have not been reached to all sections of society. Competitive character among all the stakeholders. Political modernity: democracy- political parties- constitutional rules- citizenship-acceleration of public participation in democratic process- traditional domination of selective bodies has gone- peasants, factory workers, rural people are demanding mobility and political power.
- Traditional values are verge of extinction- **MS Gore** and **SC Dubey** supported Singh's view.
- **TN Madan** writes that people who accepted modernity have closed minds as compared to those who don't go for modernity and have open minds as they question modernity.
- **Hilferding Rudolf**- selective modernity- GR as a symbol of modernity. But beneficiaries of modernity are going for political domination without forgetting tradition and caste. Therefore Indian modernity is Indian in character. **Andre Beteille** tells that "caste old is replaced by caste new".
- **BR Ambedkar** indicated that modernity should be universalistic in character. Its benefit should not be pocketed by few people therefore reservation is essential for unprotected people for a long period of time. To make modernity influential in India one should be allowed to choose his own caste.

- Gandhiji wanted Hinduism and Ambedkar wanted Buddhism. They both wanted tradition and modernity juxtaposition but how, it differed.
- Feminist view on modernity points out that women are twisted between official and domestic demands. Sexual harassment and exploitation at place of work, unequal pay for equal work etc.

(c) Protests and movements during the colonial period

(d) Social Reforms

- Phases of Social Change: Dissent -> protest -> movement
- **Dissent**: ideas and activities which are different from those prevailing in a society at a given point of time. Differences of opinion and disagreement on certain issues are basis of dissent.
- Protest: when dissent is expressed openly. Formal declaration of dissent and a more crystallised state of opposition and conflict.
- **Ramchandra Guha**: protest is manifested in different forms like Pradarshan, RastaRoko, Jal Samadhi, Fast unto Death (recent Anna Hazares protest), Gherao etc.
- **Social Movement: MSA RAO**: involves collective mobilisation through either informal or formal organisation and is generally oriented towards bringing about social change. Ideology is an important component of a social movement.

SOCIAL REFORMS:

- **Reform movement**: aims to improve condition w/o an existing social system w/o changing the fundamental structure of the society. Often linked with belief systems, rituals and life styles.
- **KL SHARMA**: necessity of socio religious reforms during British period due to 3 reasons:
 - 1.
 - Selection of texts and laws such as Manusmriti weren't always enlightened.
 - 2.
 - Reliance on law courts for interpretation resulted in more conservatism.
 - 3.
 - Combination of ancient Hindu and Victorian conservatism especially in matters concerning women.
- **AR Desai**: reform movements were an expression of national awakening due to contradiction of old value system and new socio-economic realities. Aim of these movements was to revive old religion in the context of democracy and nationalism as cardinal principles.

Reformative movements:

- 2 aims:
 - 1.
 - Hindu unity
 - 2.
 - To prove that equality and inclusiveness exists in hindu culture
- **Arya Samaj movement:**
 -

Infallibility of Vedas

- Unity of faith among all Hindus, abandon caste system, pilgrims visit, untouchability.
- Glorify idea of purity of soul and promote fraternity- eliminate attributes of polytheism, ritualism, Brahminic supremacy, sectarian division.
- "Go back to Vedas"
- Quest for past where Varna was based upon its qualities and capabilities than on the basis of birth. This movement fascinated a large body of Shudras in North India to go for Sanskritisation and challenge Brahminic monopoly.
- Rise of Jats in North India can be attributed to the impact of Arya Samaj movement supported by Lala Lajpat Rai.
- Arya Samajists accelerated Suddhi movement - encouraged the converts to revert back into the fold of Hindu community.
- Both Gurukul school and Anglo Vedic Schools promoted.

- **Theosophical society:** driven by ideology of Max Muller perceived that Hindu cultural tradition is both unique and ancient. Glorified the teachings of Bhagwat Gita, Vedas, Upanishads and indicated Hindu theological doctrine are analytical & logical and could offer a solution to all the problems of the world.
- **Brahmo Samaj Movement:** Liberal cultural movement. More dynamic and inclusive than aryasamaj movement. Emphasised on women empowerment, liberal education, secular values & challenged caste system, Brahminic orthodoxy & Hindu religion in totality - ideas from Upanishads .
- Strong link between Brahmo Samaj and Ramkrishna mission: as they talk about secular values, unity of God, Universality of truth, fraternity among people belonging to different religious faith. No political agenda like fighting war against British. It emphasised on creation of missionaries and provided a platform for glorification of religious tolerance, missionaries activities. It opened up schools and colleges - salvation only through knowledge.
- All the three: Arya Samaj, Brahmo Samaj, Ramkrishna Mission were initiated by upper-class, upper caste Indians to bring reforms in Hindu society preaching that there shouldn't be hierarchical social order and that society can be transformed into egalitarian system. Critics: all these started by upper caste and class people - no influence on the masses as their ideas were not understood by masses.
- **GHANASHYAM SHAH:** distinction between culture and class movement. reform movements wanted changes in the system whereas peasant movement wanted change of the system.
- **YOGENDRA SINGH:** reforms movements indications for quest for modernity. They were driven by high caste and class people, so modernity in india primarily entered through upper caste and upper class.

Subaltern Reform movements:

- **Satya Sodhak Samaj:** Jyotiba Phule, MH. Glorified the ideology that indigenous rulers of India belong to Shudra community. With the advent of Aryans into North India and subsequently their conquest over the other parts of the country injected caste systems into traditional egalitarian society. Caste identity, variation in occupations based upon caste divided the Shudras who were historically equal. The Shudras in their own soil, forgetting their own culture started fighting war with each other and people started evaluating their status with reference to Brahminic ideas, practices and the concept of Paap-Punya. Phule wanted all the non-Brahmins of West India to develop a new found identity of Bahujan and stand unified together against Hindu culture, Brahminic orthodoxy. He gave new identity to all the non-Brahmins of Maharashtra as Marathas - rise of Maratha consciousness as against Brahminic consciousness is manifestation of subaltern cultural protest.
- **Self Respect movement:** E V Ramasamy Naicker, Tamil Nadu. Encouraged unity among all the non-Brahmins of South India indicating that South Indian culture is ancient, unique and endogenous. Caste is pathological element introduced into egalitarian Indian society. Encouraged the non-Brahmins to go for education, small family names, stay away from spiritual activities, commit oneself to intensive economic activities. He asked people to glorify their self-identity rather than to be tempted by Sanskritisation and added reservation in provincial assemblies on the basis of caste. With the effect of SRM, from 1920, people forgetting intercaste differences, took the state power.
- **Dravidian movement:** Anti-Brahminic, anti Sanskritic, anti Hindu and anti-North Indian sentiments got momentum. This movement cannot be considered as secessionist movement because it was a Protest against an alien culture enforced upon the indigenous community. When **GS Ghurye** considers this movement as secessionist **MS RAO** call this movement as reactionary reflexive movement.
- **SNDP Movement:** Narayan Guru, Kerala. Protest against Brahminism in Kerala. Asking the non Brahmins and non Nair caste to stand unified. Parallel schools and temples for lower caste in which priests and teachers were belonging to lower caste origin - indicated that Brahminic supremacy is a product of the access to education. If non-Brahmins follow this secular standard then they will be never subdued to Brahmins.
- The subaltern movement offered foundation to Dr **Ambedkar** to search for justice and equality for the Dalits in India. Ambedkar rejected Manu Smriti. He instituted Jat Pat Todak Mandal - believed that one cannot get justice and equality staying within the framework of caste and Hinduism. Hence he encouraged conversion into the fold of Buddhism. He believed that historic discrimination associated with them cannot be addressed by social reforms alone. Hence he suggested constitutional guarantee for freedom, liberty and equality for the Dalit community in India.

Peasant movements:

- 1857 to 1920: series of peasant movements. Sense of integration cutting across their religious caste and language.
- Reasons: absentee landlordism, unauthorised zamindars forced eviction of peasants from the land on non-payment of land revenus, land tenure system introduced by British, high interest rates for seasonal peasant loans, no improvements in conditions of agriculture, brutality of police and private army of land lords, no effective measures to protect peasants from natural calamities.

- Eka movement, Moplah rebellion, Champaran, Kheda Satyagraha - protest against the exploitative colonial polices.
- By 1930s - All India Kisan Sabha. Burning tax records, attacked police, engaged in war against private army of landlords, gave a platform for the coalition for different groups of Indian population. Resulted coordination between landlords, peasants, intelligentia and indian masses - > contributed to Nationalist movement in India.
- Peasant movement was not restricted in the heartlands - Birsa Munda movement, Santhal rebellion, Khol uprising got momentum in central part of India.
- **AR Desai:** Peasant movement broke down the linguistic, regional, tribal-caste division among the people of India injecting into them a common class consciousness. Colonial land revenue policy of capitalist interest affected indian peasants more than proletriat class of Capitalist Britain. Class consciousness in India glorified nationalism.

Themes of Social Reform in India:

1. Fight for Better Position of Women: Child marriage, no inheritance, polygamy, sati
2. Abolition of Sati: Regulation Act, 1929
3. Female infanticide: The practice of murdering female infants immediately after birth was common among upper class Bengalis and Rajputs who considered females to be an economic burden.
4. Widow remarriage:
 - Vishnu Shastri Pandit founded the Widow Remarriage Association in the 1850s
 - Similar efforts were made by Professor D.K. Karve in western India and by Veerasalingam Pantulu in Madras. Karve himself married a widow in 1893.
 - Due to the efforts of Pandit Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar (1820-91), the principal of Sanskrit College, Calcutta that the Hindu Widows' Remarriage Act, 1856 was passed.
5. Child Marriage:
 - The relentless efforts of a **Parsi reformer, B.M. Malabari**, were rewarded by the enactment of the Age of Consent Act (1891) which forbade the marriage of girls below the age of 12.
 - The Sarda Act (1930) further pushed up the marriage age to 18 and 14 for boys and girls respectively.
 - In free India, the Child Marriage Restraint (Amendment) Act, 1978 raised the age of marriage for girls from 15 to 18 years and for boys from 18 to 21.
6. Education of Women:
 - Christian missionaries were the first to set up the Calcutta Female Juvenile Society in 1819
 - Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar was associated with no less than 35 girls' schools in Bengal
7. Legislative Measures in Free India:
 -

The Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961

-

Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1986

-

Factories Am Act, 1976 provided for establishment of creches where 30 women are employed

-

Equal Remuneration Act, 1976

-

The Hindu Succession Act, 1956 made the daughter equal co-heir with son

Social reform institutions:

1. The Gujarat Vernacular Society: established in 1848. The aim of this institute was to decrease the large-scale illiteracy and superstitious beliefs that was a feature of the Gujarati society
2. The Deccan Education Society: This society was formed in 1884. The society started girls' schools and encouraged education of women in Maharashtra.
3. The Ramakrishna Mission: estb 1897. It set up homes for widows and schools for girls.
4. The Seva Sadan: started in 1908, with a view to bringing together enlightened women of different communities who desired to work for the upliftment of backward women.

Colonial hangover:

- Refers to rules and standards of behaviour peculiar only to the old colonial system
- **Yogendra Singh** (1986) observes that even the debate - whether sociology has universal concepts and techniques or it refers to culturally cognitive styles and structures could be seen in the context of the hangover of colonialism in independent India today.
- **MEGHNADE DESAI**: India has a feudal attitude to its ruling class. The idea of a governor general/viceroy at the apex was to reproduce the British monarchy in the colonies. There were governors in each Presidency to reproduce the monarchical illusion. Independent India slavishly adopted this practice as part of its Constitution.
- Lutyens bungalows, red beacons, section 144, mineral rights, RTI displaced official secrecy act
- Take, for example, the Indian obsession with fairness of skin. Far too often have I heard it described as a manifestation of the colonial hangover. It cannot be denied that the powerless, at any point in time, give undue importance to the attributes of people in power and wish to emulate them. The preference for fair skin, however, probably started with the Aryan-Dravidian conflicts which the former won handily. The far later incursion of the British may only have reinforced the inclination.
- The fact that English is the lingua franca of any pan-Indian operation is another of those things that seems to be the influence of a colonial hangover. To an extent this is true. The colonial period is what truly welded a nation of multiple languages together as a modern nation .
- **Paranjoy Guha Thakurta**, a political commentator said: described English as a "colonial hangover".
- The Indian Police Act of 1861, a colonial relic, needs to be replaced with a law that befits a free country. Behind the rot is the Police Act of 1861 legislated by the British after the Indian Mutiny of

- 1857 to impose a police force upon their subjects, which could be used solely to consolidate and perpetuate their rule
- Opposite view - England is not laden with such inefficiencies.

Buddhism and impact on Indian society:

- These range from simple individual acts of charity, teaching and training, organized kinds of service, "Right Livelihood" in and outside the helping professions, - working for a better society.
- Buddhism is a pragmatic teaching which starts from certain fundamental propositions about how we experience the world and how we act in it.
- Instead, it uses ethics and meditation philosophy and science, art and poetry to point a Way to this Wisdom.
- In the East, Buddhism developed different schools of "traditions," serving the experiences of different cultures, ranging from Sri Lanka through Tibet and Mongolia to Japan.
- An outstanding example of this, in later times, is the remarkable "welfare state" created by the Buddhist emperor, Asoka (B.C. 274-236). Buddhism arose in India as a spiritual force against social injustices, against degrading superstitious rites, ceremonies and sacrifices;
- The Buddhist scriptures do indicate the general direction of Buddhist social thinking, and to that extent they are suggestive for our own times.
- Buddhism, is humanism in that it rejoices in the possibility of a true freedom as something inherent in human nature
- Several causes account for the decline of Buddhism. The period between the 400 BCE and 1000 CE saw gains by Hinduism at the expense of Buddhism. Some Hindu rulers resorted to military means in an effort to suppress Buddhism. However it is seen that the evolution of Hindu ideology influenced by Buddhism was more important factor for the growth of Hinduism.
- Literary evidences point towards an absorption of Buddhist elements by Hindu culture over a period of centuries. Anti-Buddhist propaganda was also reaching its peak during the 8th century when Shankara modeled his monastic order after the Buddhist Sangha.
- Ambedkar example: **Neo-Buddhist Movement** in India: Buddhism is against the Brahmanic social order. It is against the caste based social inequality. As it emerged as a response against the Brahmanic cult in the ancient India, in contemporary India. Buddhism has been used as the instrument of eradication of ascribed social inequality. Hence the most significant Buddhist mass revival of the new age was led by Dr. B.R. Ambedkar in India. He found in Buddhism the message for the uplift of the oppressed in India. He used and interpreted Buddhism as the ideology to bring social equality and justice for the oppressed mass, especially for the Scheduled Castes.

Jainism and impact on Indian society:

- Jainism's impact on Indian society can be seen in a couple of ways. The first is that Jainism stresses a strong notion of secularism in its relationship between political orders and religion.
- Jains' profound impact on Indian society is It is an individualistic relationship, one that the individual has with the divine realm. It is highly subjective, one in which the priest does not play an essential role and there is little presence of mediator.
- They share a common belief in the triratna (three jewels): right faith, knowledge & conduct.

- Stupas were among the first monuments to be erected by the Jain community. Soon the Buddhists alone continued this tradition, so that in effect, the Jains have two main types of architectural masterpieces: rock-cut and structural temples. It is probably in western India that the Jain temples are the most numerous and impressive.
- Their culture is both original and influenced by the Brahmanic society surrounding them. Conversely, their presence has probably encouraged certain tendencies of Hinduism, perhaps most outstanding of which are high value set on asceticism and the faith in ahimsa.

+ve of reforms:

- rationality, humanism and modernity
- made worship a personal experience
- gave rising MC cultural roots to cling on to
- aimed at modernisation rather than bind westernisation
- revival of native cultural personality which was distorted by colonial domination
- creation of national awakening and consciousness
- attack on hierarchy and rigidities of caste system

-ve fallouts:

- sectarian and obscurantist outlook - due to divergent duality of cultural and political struggles leading to cultural backwardness yet political advancement.
- critics: "denationalised and hyper westernised"
- localised, narrow social base
- encouraged mysticism in new garbs of pseudo scientific thinking
- overemphasis on philosophical aspects -> insufficient focus on art, literature, music, science and technology.
- arrested process of evolution of composite culture -> communal consciousness
- glorification of ancient India by Hindus and medieval India by Muslims
- uncritical praise of past wasn't acceptable to lower castes

Conclu: Social reforms were a necessity of the time to address the change in cultural and ritual practices with time. The trend and need for change continues till date as seen in Triple Talak abolition movement and temple entry movement etc.
