Since then there has been a tremendous expansion in primary, middle and high school education. The total number of teachers in lower primary schools during 1950-51 was 537,918 of whom 82,281 were women. During the same year the number of teachers in higher primary schools was 85,494, about 12,887 of these being women. The estimated number of lower primary school teachers by 1965-66 is about 1,050,000; out of this 200,000 would be women. For the same year the number of higher primary school teachers is estimated to be 520,000, about 140,000 being women. Although the rate of growth in the number of teachers has been low, through this profession an organized pattern for cultural diffusion in the country has emerged which contributes to the Great tradition of modernization in India.[70]

The expansion of primary and secondary levels of education has been followed by growth in higher education. To the three universities, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras which were established in 1857, fifteen more were added till the end of the British rule in India. After Independence, however, the number of universities has more than doubled. Between 1947–66, forty-six new universities have been established and nine Institutes have been deemed to be universities.[71] About 2,565 colleges are being controlled by the sixtyfour universities which are functioning in India, with a total enrolment of 15,28,227 students. Comparing it with the figures in 1911, when there were only 186 colleges and about 13,551 students (in graduate and post-graduate courses), the progress is phenomenal. Percentage increase in the output of post-graduate students in basic sciences has been of 120.6 per cent during 1950–51, of 83.6 per cent during 1955–60, and of 48.2 per cent during 1961–63.[72] The number of engineering students, which during 1889–94 totalled only 1,104 (an average of about 221 students per annum) was recorded in 1964–65 alone to be 78,114. However, it may be added that as compared to the total number of students pursuing higher education, this number constitutes only 5.4 per cent, which is fairly small. However, the balance of enrolment between science and humanities (arts) has been considerably made even if we compare the 42.0 per cent of total enrolment of students for arts courses with 31.3 per cent enrolled for science degrees and additional 12.4 per cent enrolled for degrees in engineering, medicine, agriculture and veterinary science.[73]

Progress has also been made in other spheres of educational planning and modernization of its organization. Percentage of girls going to schools and colleges has increased. In many States schooling of children has been made free and compulsory. New vocational and polytechnical institutions have been started for better utilization of educated manpower for the economic and social growth of the country. The working conditions and salaries of teachers at all levels have been improved to a considerable extent, although some imbalances still remain. But all this growth appears phenomenal only in temporal sense. In magnitude the growth rate of education does not seem to be very impressive or phenomenal.

Also the expansion of education has not led to a sociologically meaningful

degree of social mobility and change in stratification system. Higher education is still primarily confined to the upper classes, is a scarce good and reflects the advantages of wealth and social origin.[74] More than seventy-five per cent of people are still illiterate.[75] "The proportion of national income devoted to education in India is small in comparison with educationally advanced countries of the world. The absolute amount per capita spent on education in India is about one-hundredth of that spent by a highly industrialized country like USA."[76] India spends about 2.4 per cent of national income on education compared to 6.5 per cent by Japan, 6.2 per cent by USA and 4.5 per cent by Ceylon.[77]

In spite of these limitations, education has been one of the most influential instruments of modernization in India. It has led to the mobilization of people's aspirations for nationalism, liberalism and freedom. It alone has been responsible for the growth of an enlightened intelligentsia which carried forward not only a movement for Independence but also a relentless struggle for social and cultural reforms. It has created a sub-culture of students in India which though not fully modern, contains elements of transition from tradition to modernity.[78] The persistent strains that we find in the internal system of this sub-culture partly reflects the stresses of transition from one constellation of values to another and partly results from the structural maladjustment of this culture with that of the larger society. Yet, its modernizing significance is self-evident. Finally, the educational system has contributed to modernization by growth of new forms of rationally organized structures in the shape of schools, colleges and universities, which serve as cultural networks for the diffusion of knowledge and cultural categories which are modern in ethos. However, some elements of conflict between tradition and modernity can persistently be discerned in the functioning and administration of the educational system in India at all levels. Whereas modernization has in some forms been welcomed there has also been a conscious effort to preserve the traditional values.

This has a very logical explanation. Modernization in all traditional cultures goes along with the process of a new identity consciousness. Since the former is outer-directed process, the latter must necessarily be inner-directed. Hence identity consciousness finds its basic symbolic structure in the past tradition. Nationalism, as a modernizing process in such societies emerges as a queer blend of modern psychology of outer-directedness and the commitment to tradition as revealed by inner-directed search for national symbols. In the field of education a good example is the following statement in the Report of the Education Commission, 1964–66, appointed by the Government of India:

The most powerful tool in the process of modernization is education based on science and technology. The one great lesson of the present age of science is that with determination and willingness to put in hard work prosperity is within the reach of any nation which has a stable and

progressive government. There is no doubt that in the years to come India's trade and commerce will grow; there will be more food for all; more education, better health and a reasonable standard of living will be available. But India's contribution can, and should be far more than these material gains. She should learn to harness science but she must also learn not to be dominated by science.[79]

Urbanization and Industrialization

In sociological literature, a relationship between cultural modernization and urbanization and industrialization is assumed as a matter of logical necessity. All classical works in sociology are replete with construction of neat dichotomies such as rural-urban,[79a] community-society,[80] mechanical solidarity-organic solidarity,[81] sacred-secualr,[82] etc., which not only suggest that a transition from one stage to the other would mark the growth of new forms of social structure but also of new levels of moral and cultural patterns. Willy-nilly, in each formulation the first part is associated with traditional, social and cultural patterns and the latter part with modernization, which, of course, is evaluated differently by different sociologists.[83]

However, as we move away from the above world of logico-deductive formulations to that of reality, we are confronted with more complex phenomena which elude neat compartmentalizations. This is specially true about the extent to which urbanization or industrialization led to the modernization of culture. Modernization is a relative phenomenon and an open-ended process. The role of urbanization and industrialization is necessarily modernizing although variations in its extent and pattern may be there. In such pattern-variations historical factors play a crucial role. This is specially true for India.

Urban culture in India is centuries old. Handicraft and commerce-based industries are also as old as the cities. Hindu tradition provides elaborate guides for the planning and construction of various types of cities;[84] from this literature it is evident that traditional cities in India were planned in accordance with the principle of hierarchy; the caste and social rank determined the extent to which more or less favourable sites or neighbourhood could be allotted to a family. The king's or chief's fort must be located on the most favourable site, followed by those of priests (Brahmins) and merchants. The lower and the untouchable castes must live at the outer fringes of the city away from the higher castes. Each city must be built keeping into consideration its sacred-hierarchical geography and need for security from invasions. Hence, traditionally "at the ideal level the city is the centre of caste as at the political level it is the centre of the king whose prime duty, one need scarcely stress, was the maintenance of the caste order."[85]

Traditional form of urbanization, thus, only reinforced the established cultural pattern which was hierarchical, caste-oriented and pre-industrial.[86] Historically, in India, therefore, no straight equation between urbanization and modernization might be possible to establish. Often modernization

may lie in the breakdown of the hierarchical or traditional form of urbani-
zation, which is as old as the Indian tradition. Is such a process taking place?
Is industrialization in India contributing to the growth of modernizing
processes in urbanization? Answers to these questions are important.

The focus in various urban studies and surveys conducted in India is not
always uniform or directed to the issues we have raised. Nevertheless, in these
studies there is much relevant information on this theme. Many urban
studies show that cities in India continue to be dominated by cultural and
structural attributes which are far different from those which are considered
to be typical for a city, e.g. formalization, atomization, lack of familism
and kin-bound groupings and predominance of secular ideologies, etc.
Studies reveal, on the other hand, that in the Indian context a rural-urban
dichotomy is untidy if not irrelevant;[87] comparatively larger number of
persons are found engaged in primary industries even in metropolitan cities,
not to say of others;[88] contrary to the sociological stereotype, familistic
norms and joint family structures have been found to be predominant in
many urban centres;[89] the neighbourhood pattern of some cities studied
is organized on caste and kinship lines similar to the villages[90]. The migratory
pattern in the city is also closely related with ties of kinship and acquain-
tance;[91] it has been categorized as "family-centred associational migration"
by Lambert.[91] Migration to cities is often caused by social and economic
stresses in the rural habitat rather than by the pull of the city-life,[92] which
operates only in exceptional situations.[93]

Cities in India do not constitute a cultural isolate; the centre and network
of culture and communication in many cities expands to not only the hinter-
land but a whole region and in some cases to the country as a whole.[94]
There is a continuity of interaction between the city and the villages and
in many realms of cultural activities the distinction between the two as
separate complexes is blurred by the unity of the regional cultural pattern.
In some areas the cultural contacts between the villages and the cities are
parts of a very old tradition and the culture of cities in such cases is
reported to be bereft of novelty for the urban dwelling villagers, who either
look at it with indifference[95] or with a kind of "intra-rural"[96] outlook.
Bert Hoselitz concludes "that Indian cities .... even some of the largest
ones ....show sizable quarters which have preserved their rural character
and in which life is carried on under general conditions only little different
from those of the villages."[97] Urbanization in India according to him
follows a pattern which exists in Latin America; even urban growth rate
of India is similar-to that of Latin America.[98] Uniformity in the cultural
patterns of urbanization in some Indian cities is comparable to that in the
Mexico city, studied by Oscar Lewis. Caste and community neighbourhoods
of the Indian cities find its parallel in the *compadrazqo* and vacindades of the
Mexico city, which also represent neighbourhood unit based on face-to-face
relations and kinship ties. It is a process of 'urbanization without breakdown
in the traditional patterns.[99]

Persistence of the traditional cultural patterns in the cities or often an invigoration of the traditional ways have been reported in many urban studies. Prof. G.R. Gadgil's study of the Poona city revealed an increased strengthening of caste and communal associations for management of educational and other cultural resources and opportunities offerd by the contemporary changes in outlook and communal identities.[100] Milton Singer has found a process of resilience in the cultural structures of the Little and Great traditions of the cities that he investigated. In these cities, modern media of communication are being used for the spread of the traditional culture.[101] Urbanization is, therefore, not only having a modernizing impact on culture in India, but also tends to reinforce tradition.

The rate of urbanization in India is rather slow. "The rapidly urbanizing nation is involved in a huge and troublesome geographic shift of its population. To put it succinctly, about 60 per cent of its population must move from the countryside to the cities."[102] Compared to this, only about 20 per cent of the population of India was living in cities in 1951.[103] There was no substantial change in this figure during the Census of 1961. The estimate of Kingsley Davis was that as against 1951 when 7.8 per cent of the people were living in places of 100,000 population and 11.9 per cent were living in towns with 20,000 population, in 1961, there would be 8.9 per cent in the former category and 13.3 per cent in the latter category of urban centres. His projection of urban proportion based on logistic extrapolation shows that only by 1975 will India have an urban population as high as 50 percent of the total. This calculation is somewhat biased due to the steep rise in towns and cities in India during 1931–51 and shows much higher rate of urban growth than may be realistic.[104] Considering this, Davis has also projected the urban population of India for the year 1975 taking the United States as a model where the rate of urban growth has been slower than in Japan and faster than in Britain and France, which renders it a middle-of-the-road' model.[105] On this basis he finds that by 1975 only 32.4 per cent of the total population in India will be living in cities; to reach a proportion of above 50 per cent urban population India will have to wait till A.D. 2000.[106]

In spite of the comparative slow rate of urbanization, there has been a steady growth in this respect since 1881, when only 9.3 per cent of India's total population was living in cities. Davis writes: "During the entire period from 1881 to 1941 the percentage of the Indian population in urban places increased only 41 per cent, whereas in the United States it increased 111 per cent. Urbanization in India between these dates resembles urbanization in the United States during an earlier period between 1790 and 1850. Only in the last decade, 1931–41, did the pace of urbanization in India exceed that in the United States during a contemporary period. The gain was 18.3 per cent in India, as against a gain of only 0.7 per cent in the United States. It appears that India is just beginning a period of rapid urbanization, comparable perhaps to the 1820–30 period in the United States."[107]

The slow rate of urbanization in India which no doubt has retarded the