KELLOGG INSTITUTE
THE HELEN KELLOGG INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

MODERNIZATION AND POSTMODERNIZATION:
THEORETICAL COMMENTS ON INDIA

Fred Dallmayr

Working Paper #195 - June 1993

Fred Dallmayr is Packey Dee Professor of Political Theory at the University of Notre Dame. A native of Germany, he holds a Doctor of Law degree from the University of Munich and a Ph.D. degree in political science from Duke University. Before joining the University of Notre Dame in 1978, he taught at the Universities of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Georgia, and Purdue where he also served as department chair for five years. He has also been a visiting professor at Hamburg University in Germany and at the New School for Social Research in New York; in addition he has been a research fellow at Nuffield College in Oxford and a senior Fulbright scholar in India. Among his publications are: *Beyond Dogma and Despair* (1981); *Twilight of Subjectivity* (1981); *Polis and Praxis* (1984); *Language and Politics* (1984); *Critical Encounters: Between Philosophy and Politics* (1987); *Margins of Political Discourse* (1989); and *Life-World, Modernity, and Critique* (1991).

ABSTRACT

This paper offers a discussion of development theory, with special attention to its relevance in the context of India. Three successive models of development are distinguished in the paper: empirical (structural-functional) development theory; philosophical modernization theory (deriving from Enlightenment teachings); and 'postmodernization' theory, emphasizing cultural resistance to global standardization. In its first section, the paper reviews (once again) the developmental model articulated during the postwar years by social scientists under the aegis of the SSRC. As the author shows, this model gave rise to numerous challenges and rejoinders on both theoretical and political grounds, rejoinders that often, however, bypassed one of the model's central features: its narrowly empiricist outlook. It was chiefly this feature that motivated a new wave of (postempiricist) theorizing which—under the banners of phenomenology, hermeneutics, and critical theory—raised the developmental debate to a philosophical and quasi-transcendental level. This move intensified existing controversies by making modernization and modernity itself central topics of critical inquiry, thus triggering a confrontation between defenders of modernity and of 'postmodernity.' Throughout the presentation, room is given to arguments of Indian philosophers and social theorists, to counteract the conceit of a Western monopoly of the development debate. This focus on Indian thinkers forms the heart of the paper's concluding section which illustrates a loosely postmodern view of development by referring to a strand of argumentation stretching from Gandhi to Ashis Nandy and others.

RESUMEN

Este trabajo presenta una discusión sobre la teoría del desarrollo, poniendo especial atención a su relevancia en el caso de la India. En el trabajo se distinguen tres modelos de desarrollo: la teoría empírica (estructural-funcionalista) del desarrollo; la teoría filosófica de la modernización (que proviene de las enseñanzas de la Ilustración); y la teoría de la 'postmodernización', que enfatiza la resistencia cultural a la normalización global. En la primera sección del trabajo se revisa (una vez más) el modelo desarrollista elaborado durante los años de la posguerra por científicos sociales bajo la égida de la SSRC. Como lo muestra el autor, este modelo dió origen a numerosos desafíos y réplicas, tanto en el terreno teórico como en el político. Sin embargo, dichas réplicas muchas veces pasaban por alto una de las características centrales del modelo: su estrecha perspectiva empírica. Fue principalmente esta característica la que originó una nueva corriente de teorías (postempíricas) las cuales—bajo las banderas de la fenomenología, de la hermenéutica, y de la teoría crítica—elevaron el debate sobre el desarrollo a un nivel filosófico y cuasitrascendental. Este movimiento intensificó las controversias existentes convirtiendo a la modernización y a la modernidad misma en temas centrales de la investigación crítica, provocando, así, una confrontación entre los defensores de la modernidad y de la 'postmodernidad'. A lo largo de la presentación, se da cabida a los argumentos de filósofos y teóricos sociales de la India, para contrarrestar la presunción de un monopolio occidental del debate sobre el desarrollo. La atención dada a los pensadores de la India constituye el núcleo de las conclusiones del trabajo, las cuales presentan una visión vagamente postmoderna del desarrollo al referirse a un tipo de argumentación que se extiende de Gandhi a Ashis Nandy y otros.

We hear much talk these days about the emergence of a new 'world order,' an order (presumably) ushering in an era of global peace and prosperity, terminating the arms race among superpowers and the nuclear balance of terror. Seen as an antidote to global anarchy, this vision of order surely has an appealing ring: feuds among states are to give way to a unified structure of humankind; narrow national self-interest to shared concern for our 'global village.'[1] Unfortunately, on closer inspection, the brightness of the vision quickly begins to dim—especially when attention is drawn to the motivating forces behind global unity. In large measure, global unification seems to be propelled by the dictates of the global market or world economy, a market that, in turn, is governed by the interests of leading industrial or postindustrial nations. On a more general (and more theoretical) plane, one may ask in which language or idiom the global vision tends to be articulated. Unsurprisingly, this language is typically of Western origin, reflecting specifically the aspirations of Western modernity with its bent toward rational universalism.[2] From its inception, modern Western thought carried a teleological imprint marked by a dialectical twist: the opposition between advancement and regression, between development and non- or underdevelopment. Confronted with the Western model, non-Western countries or cultures were expected to catch up sooner or later with the postulated *telos*—or else to suffer defeat and obsolescence. In this developmental schema, material and 'ideal' factors were inextricably linked: disparities of material or economic progress were matched with asymmetries of culture, language, and human worth.

In the following, I shall explore the issue of development and modernization in a particular context—though, I believe, broader comparative conclusions can readily be drawn from the inquiry. My focus shall be on India as one of the most prominent 'developing' countries today. My choice of focus is prompted by several considerations. There is, first of all, a biographical motive having to do with repeated visits to India during the past decade. A more important impulse is the political weight of India as the most populous functioning democracy in the present world. Finally, there is a cultural consideration: claims to superiority on the part of Western modernity appear in a particularly wistful light when viewed against the backdrop of one of the oldest living civilizations (whose culture has radiated powerfully throughout much of Asia and the Orient).

---

[1] Some decades ago, the philosopher Karl Jaspers foresaw the prospect of a new 'axial age' in which the diversity of human cultures would merge in a comprehensive global discourse; see Jaspers, *The Origin and Goal of History*, trans. M. Bullock (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953) and his *The Future of Mankind*, trans. E. B. Ashton (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).

[2] Regarding Western universalism, compare my "Polis and Cosmopolis" in *Margins of Political Discourse* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1989), pp. 2-8.

The accent in the following will not be placed on the analysis of empirical indices of development but on the theoretical understanding of the meaning of development and modernization as such. My discussion will concentrate primarily (though not exclusively) on theoretical formulations or conceptions that have gained prominence and perhaps notoriety during the last half century. The first section of the paper will review—once again—the developmental model articulated by modernization theorists during the period after the Second World War. As will be shown, this model gave rise to numerous challenges and rejoinders—which, however, often bypassed one of its central features: its narrowly empiricist or positivist outlook. It was chiefly this feature that became the target of a new wave of (postempiricist) theorizing that—under the banners of phenomenology, hermeneutics, and critical theory—raised the developmental debate to a quasi-'transcendental' level. Curiously and perhaps unexpectedly, this move further fueled and intensified existing controversies by lending them philosophical depth: closely linked with a turn to language, postempiricism called into question crucial premises of Western modernity, thus triggering a confrontation between 'modernity vs. postmodernity' projected onto a global scale. Throughout my presentation I give room, wherever possible, to arguments of Indian philosophers and social theorists—to counteract the conceit of a Western monopoly of the development debate. This attention to Indian thinkers forms the heart of the concluding section which adumbrates a loosely postmodern view of modernization (or a vantage of 'post-modernization').

1. The Development Syndrome

In the decade after World War II, a major effort was launched by the Social Science Research Council to formulate a broadly comparative and global model of social analysis concentrated on the parameters of economic, social-political, and cultural development. In many respects, this model is today of only historical interest; yet, in the eyes of many observers, recent dramatic events in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union seem to lend it renewed saliency. At the time of its initial formulation, the model was spawned not solely by academic concerns—although the influence of the positivist 'unified science' movement can hardly be discounted. Undergirding and buttressing academic initiatives were the political constellations of the postwar period. In the words of the eminent Indian philosopher Daya Krishna:

> The imperial responsibilities of the United States after the Second World War, coupled with its competitive role on a global scale against a country with a different political system, led American political scientists almost inevitably to view their field in a comparative perspective. And once things begin to be viewed in that way, specially from the vantage point of a superpower with global responsibilities for client and protégé states, the distinction between the

'developed' *we* and the 'underdeveloped' *they* gets built into the way issues are seen, questions are asked, and theories formulated.[3]

With greater attention to economic motives, this assessment is seconded by the Indian political theorist Thomas Pantham who notes that, during the immediate postwar era,

> it was widely recognized that the economic development of the less developed countries (LDCs) and their participation in international free trade would facilitate the rebuilding of the war-shattered economies of the industrial nations. Such economic development of the LDCs, it was further realized, depended on their social, cultural, and political modernization; the LDCs, in other words, were required to follow the footsteps of the advanced industrial nations.[4]

The central features of the modernization model have frequently been recapitulated; I restrict myself here to a brief sketch. In large measure, the model was heir to theories of social evolution formulated by prominent sociological thinkers during the preceding century. Following in the footsteps of neo-Darwinian concepts of natural selection, human societies were seen as quasi-organic structures seeking to increase their survival chances through the enhancement of internal complexity and external-environmental adaptability. Taking a leaf from both Spencer and Durkheim, modernization theorists viewed social evolution as a process of differentiation evident in the division of labor and growing 'subsystem' autonomy—a differentiation requiring ever renewed efforts of system integration to ensure effective environmental control. On the cultural level, Comte and strands in Marxism furnished the formula of a steady 'demythologization' of worldviews, that is, of the progressive rationalization and secularization of society and thus of the ascendancy of science and technology over traditional beliefs.

In the years immediately following World War II, the diverse ingredients of evolutionary thought were pulled together and systematically elaborated by a leading American sociologist or social theorist: Talcott Parsons. Blending evolutionary principles with Weberian notions of social action, Parsons presented society as a holistic though differentiated structure whose diverse elements or 'subsystems' were designed to perform distinct functions for system maintenance,

---

[3] Daya Krishna, *Political Development: A Critical Perspective* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. 1.

[4] Thomas Pantham, "Changing Conceptions of Development" (unpublished manuscript), p. 6. The political context of modernization theory was admitted even by one of its pioneers, Gabriel Almond, when he pointed to the "missionary and Peace Corps model" animating American intellectuals and social scientists during the postwar period; see his *Political Development: Essays in Heuristic Theory* (Boston: Little Brown, 1970), p. 21. Compare also Denis Goulet's comment: "After World War II, with the spectacular success of the Marshall plans, development became a shibboleth for progress. It was assumed that rapid industrialization and generalized improvement in material conditions of life could be won quickly by following the formula that had worked in reconstructing war-damaged Europe, namely injecting massive foreign aid in the form of capital for investment in infrastructure in order to restore or create a modern productive economy." See his "Development: Creator and Destroyer of Values," *World Development,* vol. 20 (1992), p. 468.

thus securing societal survival. In the field of social evolution, his work portrayed society as moving along a trajectory of 'evolutionary universals,' that is, along a path leading from the ideal-typical patterns of early or primitive society to patterns characteristic of modernity. Foremost among these typical processes were these: the abandonment of social 'diffuseness' in favor of the increasing differentiation and specialization of structures and functions; the change from ascriptive assignments of status to individual-personal achievement; the movement from 'affectivity' to affective neutrality (that is, from mythic-religious engagement to secularism and science); and finally, the advancement from particularism to universalism (or from local-parochial bends of kinship to general or global rule systems).[5]

Although formulated on a high level of abstraction, Parsonian systems theory exerted a profound influence on social and political scientists at the time. Most of the comparative political scientists heeding the call of the Social Science Research Council were in some form adepts of 'structural functionalism'—although the latter was suitably modified to meet specialized research needs. As articulated in successive SSRC volumes, social change around the globe followed basically the trajectory of Parsons' evolutionary universals, that is, the path leading from primitive kinship groups to modern, Western-style complexity. To be sure, members of the comparative research team differed in their precise use of vocabulary. Sometimes, the terms 'evolution,' 'development', and 'modernization' were used interchangeably as designations of the Parsonian movement; sometimes the terms were differentiated—often along the lines that 'evolution' referred to material-biological underpinnings, 'development' to economic and political stages of growth, and 'modernization' to changes in sociocultural beliefs. Typically, however, the various levels were treated as complementary; with material and economic advances seen as the primary requisites for political, social, and cultural innovation.

A good example of a differentiated vocabulary linked with an overarching developmental formula is Lucian Pye's *Aspects of Political Development*, a study that in many ways summarized the outlook of comparative research sponsored by SSRC. According to Pye, political progress had to be viewed as "one aspect of a multi-dimensional process of social change" and as "intimately associated with other aspects of social and economic change"—all of which could be termed "development syndrome." Modernization, in this context, referred to a profound transformation of traditional ways of life: namely, to the process "in which tradition-bound villages or tribal-based societies are compelled to react to the pressures and demands of the modern, industrialized and urban-centered world." As Pye added, quite candidly;

---

5 See Talcott Parsons, *The Social System* (New York: Free Press, 1951), pp. 45-67; also his "Pattern Variables Revisited," *American Sociological Review*, vol. 25 (1960), pp. 467-483, and "Some Considerations on the Theory of Social Change," *Rural Sociology,* vol. 26 (1961), pp. 219-239.

This process might also be called Westernization, or simply advancement and progress; it might, however, be more accurately termed the diffusion of a world culture—a world culture based on advanced technology and the spirit of science, on a rational view of life, a secular approach to social relations… At an ever-accelerating rate, the direction and the volume of cross-cultural influences has become nearly a uniform pattern of the Western industrial world imposing its practices, standards, techniques, and values upon the non-Western world.[6]

Regarding the historical trajectory of political development, SSRC-related studies were united in the assumption of a movement from primitive diffuseness to modern complexity. Instructive in this respect is Almond and Brigham Powell's study titled *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach* which encapsulated in concise fashion the basic political components of the modernization model. Adopting a streamlined version of Parsonian functionalism, the study portrayed political development as occurring along two main tracks or dimensions: a structural-systemic and a normative-cultural track. Viewed from the systemic angle, development pointed in the direction of a growing differentiation of subsystems and their concomitant re-integration for purposes of system maintenance and adaptation; on the normative-cultural level, on the other hand, social change involved progressive cultural secularization and the adoption of anonymous-universal rule systems. Properly joined together, the two perspective supported the distinction of at least three main stages of political evolution: the stages of 'primitive,' 'traditional,' and 'modern' systems, with the latter type further subdivided into liberal-democratic and authoritarian or totalitarian variants.

In the presentation of Almond and Powell, primitive systems were characterized by the submergence of politics in kinship relations or by the presence of at best "intermittent political structures" displaying a "minimum of structural differentiation" and sustained by a "diffuse, parochial culture." Structural differentiation was further advanced in traditional societies which witnessed the emergence of specialized governmental or 'output' structures to which members of society were uniformly subjected (giving rise to what the authors called a 'subject culture'). Modern systems finally were distinguished by the full panoply of differentiated subsystems, including both output and political 'input' or 'infrastructures' (comprising interest groups, parties,

---

6 Lucian W. Pye, *Aspects of Political Development* (Boston: Little Brown, 1966), pp. 8-9, 44-45. A few years earlier, Seymour Martin Lipset had analyzed the "syndrome of conditions" buttressing modern or Western democratic politics, in an effort to "help men to develop it where it does not now exist"; see his *Political Man* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1960), p. 417. Roughly at the time of Pye's study, S. N. Eisenstadt defined modernization as "the process of change towards those types of social, economic, and political systems that have developed in Western Europe and North America from the seventeenth century to the nineteenth and then have spread to other European countries and in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to the South American, Asian and African continents." See his *Modernization: Protest and Change* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 1. Compare also Daniel Lerner's comment: "What America is…the modernizing Middle East seeks to become"; *The Passing of Traditional Society* (New York: Free Press, 1965), p. 79.

and communication media), a process undergirded by the flourishing of 'participant' modes of political culture. Echoing themes struck by both Parsons and Pye, the study extolled the universalizing thrust of political modernization and Westernization. "It is through the secularization of political culture," we read,

> that these rigid, ascribed, and diffuse customs of social interaction [i.e. of parochial culture] come to be overridden by a set of codified, specifically political, and universalistic rules. By the same token, it is in the secularization process that bargaining and accommodative political action become a common feature of the society, and that the development of special structures such as interest groups and parties becomes meaningful.[7]

The implicit optimism permeating the early modernization model sponsored by SSRC was not borne out by real-life experiences in developing or Third World countries. Barely two decades after the war, it became increasingly evident that political development around the globe did not follow the smooth path of a simple Westernization or a 'diffusion' of (Western) world culture. The political regimes of developing countries were increasingly rent by turmoil and profound tensions, especially the tension between the 'revolution of rising expectations' and the inability of modernizing elites to meet them. Under the impact of these experiences, the assumption of steady progress and cultural dissemination gave way to a harsher emphasis on regime stability, output capabilities, and crisis management. In the words of Thomas Pantham:

> The actual trend of socio-economic and political changes in the 'new states' did not bear out the optimistic, evolutionary assumptions of diffusionist modernization. Economic development lagged behind peoples' expectations and there was no mistaking of the signs of the limits of growth… [The] 'dislocations' of social mobilization and the explosion of political participation were seen as dangerous 'crises', the containment of which became the preoccupation of the revisionist school of political developmentalists.[8]

Among the chief spokesmen of the revisionist outlook were Samuel Huntington, Ithiel de Sola Pool, and (to some extent) David Apter. According to Huntington, the primary need in postcolonial, developing societies was "the accumulation and concentration of power, not its dispersion—and it is in Moscow and Peking, and not in Washington, that this lesson is to be learned." This view was seconded by Pool when he noted that, in developing countries, order and stability depend "on somehow compelling newly mobilized strata to return to a measure of passivity and defeatism from which they have recently been aroused by the process of

---

[7] Gabriel A. Almond and G. Bingham Powell, *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1966), pp. 60, 215-216. For more detailed treatments of cultural development, see Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba, eds., *Political Culture and Political Development* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965); and Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1965).

[8] Pantham, "Changing Conceptions of Development," p. 13.

modernization." Pushing this point a bit further, Apter questioned the feasibility of cultural diffusion and the application of Western standards to the non-West. Although the departure from diffusionism has sometimes been described as a radical change or 'normative reversal,' revisionist arguments can still be reconciled without difficulty with the prevailing functionalist or systems paradigm: without abandoning functional-empirical premises, revisionists shifted the accent from systemic processes to output performance and from feedback mechanisms to efficient policy-making (where efficiency was measured by utility calculations).[9]

Given its global or universalist ambitions, the sketched modernization model—in both its diffusionist and revisionist variants—was also applied to the Indian subcontinent by Western social scientists, most prominently by Myron Weiner. While initially highlighting a gradual-cumulative process of 'nation-building,' Weiner detected in postindependence India tendencies of fragmentation that required a shift to political integration and output efficiency. There is also evidence that aspects of the model were attractive to segments of the modernizing elite in India wedded to the rapid diffusion of Western ways of life—foremost among them the first prime minister of the newly emerging country, Jawaharlal Nehru.[10] On the whole, however, the modernization model quickly encountered a barrage of criticisms articulated by intellectuals in developing countries (supported by some Western scholars). Critical attacks concentrated chiefly on two main defects of the model: first, its built-in asymmetry and political-economic inequity; and secondly, flaws pertaining to internal-theoretical consistency or coherence.

The first attack was at the heart of so-called 'dependency' theory which charged Western modernizers with obfuscating the gulf separating development and underdevelopment, a gulf deriving from the structural dependency of 'peripheral' countries on Western 'center' nations in control of the world market. By restricting developing countries to the production and export of

---

[9] That the shift to policy analysis did not basically disrupt the prevailing "behavioral" framework was recognized by David Easten, one of the initial proponents of systems theory; see his "The New Revolution in Political Science," *American Political Science Review*, vol. 63 (1969), pp. 1051, 1057. Regarding the revisionist approach, see Samuel P. Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), p. 138; Ithiel de Sola Pool, "The Public and the Polity" in Pool, ed., *Contemporary Political Science* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 26; David Apter, *The Politics of Modernization* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965); also R. A. Higgott, *Political Development Theory* (London: Croom Helm, 1983); and A. H. Somjee, *Political Capacity in Developing Societies* (London: Macmillan, 1982). Regarding crisis management, see Leonard Binder et al., *Crises and Sequences of Political Development* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971); and regarding the shift to policy analysis, Gabriel Almond and G. Bingham Powell, *Comparative Politics: System, Process and Policy* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1978).

[10] Compare Myron Weiner, *Party Politics in India* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957); *Politics of Scarcity: Public Pressure and Political Response in India* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962); *Political Change in South Asia* (Calcutta: Makhopadhyay, 1963); *Modernization: The Dynamics of Growth* (2nd ed.; New York: Basic Books, 1966). Regarding Nehru, see his *The Discovery of India* (Calcutta: Signet Press, 1946); also D. E. Smith, *Nehru and Democracy: The Political Thought of an Asian Democrat* (Calcutta: Orient Longman, 1958).

primary goods and materials, Western industrial nations slanted the world market in favor of the rich against the poor, in favor of advanced capital-intensive economies against labor-intensive economies in the Third World. As formulated chiefly by Latin American intellectuals, dependency theory carried strong Marxist (or rather Marxist-Leninist) overtones—a feature that, apart from properly accentuating power differentials, also engendered intrinsic problems or drawbacks. Chief among these drawbacks was the curious 'dependency' of the theory on the modernization model it opposed: together with that model, the theory often presented development as an empirical-predictable sequence of stages predicated on economic requisites (modes of production)—although this sequence was now seen not as a smooth transition but as punctuated by revolution or a global class struggle.[11]

Despite its Latin American moorings, arguments akin to '*dependencia*' were also sometimes advanced by Indian intellectuals—though typically with some priority given to equity considerations over economic determinism. Exemplary in this category were early writings by Rajni Kothari who advocated an alternative to the 'West-dominated world system' that would more equitably balance relations between center and periphery.[12]   Regarding internal consistency or coherence, the modernization model was subjected to searching scrutiny by numerous critics—including Daya Krishna who launched a radical philosophical assault. Broadly sympathetic to the analytical school of thought, Daya Krishna found the propositions of the model both empirically unfounded and logically untenable. One defect of the model apparent at a first glance was its haphazard and confusing use of terminology. Notions like 'modernization' and 'social development' were often used indiscriminately, although both terms were "neither clearly defined nor demarcated from what is usually regarded as economic or political development"; hence one was never quite clear whether the two notions carried the same meaning nor how they were related to political and economic processes of change. Turning to the so-called 'requisites' of political development sometimes stipulated by defenders of the model, Daya Krishna examined a number of such preconditions—including participation, conversion functions (i.e., interest articulation, interest aggregation and the like), and output capabilities—and judged all these criteria to be marred by logical incongruity and lack of empirical warrant. Taking up a question

---

[11]   The nexus of dependency and modernization theory was all the greater the more closely the former adhered to orthodox or positivist versions of Marxism. Regarding leading formulations of dependency theory, compare Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto, *Dependency and Development in Latin America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979); Andre Gunder Frank, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967); Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System* (New York: Academic Press, 1974).

[12]   Compare Rajni Kothari, *Footsteps into the Future* (New Delhi: Orient, Longman, 1975); also his "Towards a Just World," *Alternatives*, vol. 5 (1979), pp. 1-42. For a critique of an orthodox Marxist approach to development see V. R. Mehta, *Beyond Marxism* (New Delhi: Manohar, 1978); also his *Ideology, Modernization and Politics in India* (New Delhi: Manohar, 1983).

raised by Charles Tilly (in one of the SSRC studies) as to whether the difficulties of the model were ultimately surmountable, Daya Krishna answered (with Tilly):

> 'For my part, I do not think the difficulties are surmountable.' But if the difficulties are not surmountable, it can only be so because in principle it is impossible to do so. But if it is impossible in principle, then the whole enterprise is doomed to failure from the start, and it is no wonder that we have not been able to find any sure footing amongst any of the criteria that have been offered by many thinkers.[13]

In probing the concept of development itself, Daya Krishna perceived serious barriers obstructing its application to human and political life and also to the humanities and social sciences. The barriers were clearly evident in the field of art. For how could one meaningfully compare the artworks of modernity with those of Greek antiquity and (even more so) with the masterpieces of India and China? More specifically: "How shall we determine which is greater or more developed, and in terms of what?" The same barriers were noticeable in the fields of religion and philosophy; for in neither case was it possible to speak properly of "cumulative growth or development." If anywhere, the notion of cumulative growth was germane only to the natural sciences as they have developed in the modern era (and there only on the level of cognitive analysis, not the level of the examined objects). Growth patterns pertaining to the natural sciences, however, could not be transferred—even by analogy—to the field of the human sciences (the latter term comprising the spectrum from history to politics). Quoting a phrase from Robert Nisbet's reflections on history and historical knowledge, Daya Krishna noted that "there is no historical evidence that macro-changes in time are the cumulative result of small-scale, linear micro-changes." A similar absence of a linear or cumulative process characterized the arena of political life—the field specifically chosen as target by modernization theory. According to Daya Krishna, not only was politics recalcitrant to the stipulated developmental syndrome; it was actually governed by criteria that were foreign to mainstream modernization literature:

> The crucial question which therefore remains to be answered is whether the realm dealt with by the science of politics is of such a nature as to permit the application of the concept of 'development' to itself. And our answer to this question is in the negative, for the simple reason that the only relevant distinction here is between 'good government' and 'bad government,' and not between a 'developed polity' and an 'undeveloped polity,' as many contemporary political scientists seem to think… Perhaps the 'body politic' is really like 'the body' which has a thousand ways of being ill, but only one way of being healthy.[14]

---

13   Daya Krishna, *Political Development*, pp. 6, 179. Compare also Charles Tilly, ed., *The Formation of National States in Western Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), pp. 219-260.

14   Daya Krishna, *Political Development,* pp. 187, 190, 197, 201. Compare Robert Nisbet, *Social Change and History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 288; also Daya Krishna, *Considerations Toward a Theory of Social Change* (Bombay: Manaktalas, 1965).

2. Modernity and Postmodernity

Although perhaps overstated, Daya Krishna's critique pointed up serious shortcomings in the dominant modernization model—especially the weakness of its philosophical premises. Empirical or positivist in orientation and inspired by evolutionary paradigms of the last century, the model was theoretically vulnerable and unable to withstand rigorous philosophical scrutiny. As it happens, at the time of the sketched debate, positivist empiricism was under siege from a number of quarters—a siege that highlighted both its internal inadequacies (illustrated by the problem of paradigm shifts) and its general inability to account for its own premises (which could not themselves be empirically derived). In the field of human and social sciences, this siege manifested itself in the ascendancy of various postempiricist or 'postbehavioral' modes of theorizing, modes that owed their allegiance chiefly to the philosophical perspectives of phenomenology, hermeneutics, and critical theory. In critiquing positivism, these perspectives jointly (though in different ways) drew attention to the implicit underpinnings of human knowledge and action, thus shifting the level of analysis from contingent occurrences to the transcendental or quasi-transcendental 'conditions of possibility' (to use a Kantian phrase).

With respect to historical development, this shift dramatically raised the stakes of ongoing discussions: namely, by making modern science or knowledge itself a target of inquiry in need of philosophical grounding; while previously modernity had functioned simply as an unquestioned yardstick for developing societies, this yardstick now became itself a focus of critical attention. In seeking to ground this yardstick, most spokespeople of postbehavioral perspectives were drawn to the trajectory of the Enlightenment legacy, that is, to the notion of a progressive 'awakening' of humankind from immaturity and from the constraints imposed by intellectual and political tutelage. In line with this legacy, the accent was placed not on contingent-empirical variables but on the movement of human emancipation or the growth of autonomy and self-determination—which politically translates into a process of democratization.[15]

---

[15] The notion of an 'awakening' from immaturity stems from Kant's definition of enlightenment. The absence of sufficient attention to emancipation and human freedom in the modernization model was noted by Daya Krishna when he wrote: "Surprising as it may seem, the concept of 'political liberty' plays hardly any role in discussions about political development. Lucian Pye, who has made a supposedly exhaustive survey of all the definitions offered for political development in his well-known work *Aspects of Political Development,* barely mentions it. The closest that he comes to it is perhaps in the definition of political development as the building of democracy. But that democracy in this context is hardly concerned directly with the issue of 'political liberty' is revealed by the fact that neither the words 'freedom' or 'liberty' nor the phrases 'political freedom' or 'political liberty' are to be found in the index to this book." See *Political Development,* p. 16.

In a trenchant manner, arguments of postbehavioral spokespeople were prefigured in a text written by the founder of contemporary phenomenology, Edmund Husserl, half a century ago. In his *Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, Husserl attacked modern empirical science for forgetting its transcendental underpinnings in human intentionality, an intentionality that ultimately had its moorings in the experiential matrix of the life-world. While critically challenging modern science, the text did not dismiss modernity itself but rather salvaged it on a deeper level: namely, as a stage in the progressive unfolding of rational reflection and moral autonomy. For Husserl, rational reflection had its beginnings in classical Greek philosophy, a moment in history when humankind first stirred from its dogmatic or mythological slumber. According to the text, Greek philosophy signaled the "breakthrough and developmental beginning of a new human epoch, seen from the standpoint of universal humanity": namely, the epoch of a humankind that "seeks to live, and is only able to live, by freely determining its existence and its historical life on the basis of rational insight in the pursuit of infinite tasks" and by seeking a "deeper and comprehensive grasp of the world unfettered by myth and the whole tradition."

In Husserl's presentation, this breakthrough characterized Western civilization—it was the "*telos* inborn in European culture"—but ultimately it implied a universal calling, by revealing an "essential dimension of humanity as such, its *entelechy*." Although an inborn *telos*, rational reflection was not an instant achievement but required a long process of historical maturation. With the advent of the Cartesian *cogito* and Kant's critical philosophy, classical and medieval ontology could no longer be maintained in its taken-for-granted form; likewise, with the onset of phenomenology, Enlightenment views of reason had to undergo further refinement. Geographically, rational analysis was at first the trademark of European or Western culture; but its critical momentum was bound to radiate from the center to non-Western cultures through a steady contagion. As Husserl noted (in a somewhat harsh passage), the rational bent of Europe on the West "is recognized in us by all other human groups too"; it is this bent that,

> quite irrespective of considerations of utility and despite their unbroken commitment to cultural self-preservation, becomes for them a motivation steadily to Europeanize themselves, whereas we (if we understand ourselves properly) would never Indianize ourselves, for example.[16]

---

16   Edmund Husserl, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology,* trans. David Carr (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970), pp. 8, 15, 274, 288 (translation slightly altered). As should be noted, historical evolution for Husserl was a transcendental trajectory and by no means reducible to biological or organicist models. Most importantly, the trajectory was not a predetermined or predictable process but required steadily renewed dedication. Only through such ongoing renewal, he wrote (p. 16), can it be decided "whether European culture bears within itself an absolute idea, rather than being merely an empirical-anthropological type like 'China' or 'India'—whether the spectacle of the Europeanization of all other civilizations testifies to the unfolding of an absolute meaning, one which pertains to the sense of the world, rather than to a historical non-sense."

Despite a deepened attention to the life-world, phenomenology as a variant of later postbehavioralism never quite abandoned Husserl's transcendental élan; devoted to the analysis of 'essential' meaning structures in social and political life, phenomenological social science was bound to present itself as an inquiry geared to the pursuit of 'infinite tasks.' To this extent, Schutzian phenomenology shared some common ground with the program of 'critical theory' as articulated by the Frankfurt School (despite the latter's relative distance from Husserl's legacy). This commonality is particularly evident in the case of Jürgen Habermas whose writings pushed the critical theory program deliberately into both a quasi-transcendental and a historical-evolutionary direction. Quasi-transcendental leanings surfaced early on in Habermas's work and became a mainstay of his conception of communicative reason. In a manner harkening back to Husserl's *Crisis* volume, Habermas's *Knowledge and Human Interests* chastised positivism for its neglect of cognitive underpinnings in the matrix of human intentionality—a matrix that now was redefined in terms of three knowledge-guiding 'interests' (undergirding respectively the endeavors of science, hermeneutics, and emancipatory critique).

Reformulated in a steadily refined and universalist idiom, the same quasi-transcendental leanings serve as a pillar of Habermas's subsequent writings on language and communication. In the field of language theory, these writings extended Chomsky's notion of a deep-seated 'linguistic competence' into the domain of speech performance and communicative interaction—a move undergirding the framework of a quasi-transcendental or 'universal pragmatics.' In terms of this framework, every native speaker must be intuitively endowed with a basic 'communicative competence' (as condition of possibility of speech), a faculty that supports not only the performance of diverse utterances but also, in these utterances, the articulation of crucial 'validity claims' universally present in speech as such: the claims to truth, to normative rightness, to truthfulness, and comprehensibility. In Habermas's words:

> The meaning of the validity [of utterances] consists in their worthiness to be recognized, that is, in the guarantee that intersubjective recognition can be brought about under suitable conditions. I have proposed the name *universal pragmatics* for the research program aimed at reconstructing the universal validity basis of speech.[17]

As in the case of Husserlian phenomenology, Habermas's reconstruction of universal requisites was not meant to support a static essentialism. Paralleling arguments in the *Crisis* volume, rational faculties for Habermas denoted both necessary preconditions *and* teleological guideposts for the growth of human knowledge and insight. Simultaneously with the analysis of

---

17   Jürgen Habermas, "What Is Universal Pragmatics?" in *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, trans. Thomas McCarthy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1979), p. 5. Compare also Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interests*, trans. Jeremy J. Shapiro (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971).

universal rule structures, Habermas embarked on studies of developmental processes both on the individual and the collective-social levels, studies that perceived rationality as moving basically along the trajectory from latency to manifestness. Given his postbehavioral yet (emphatically) social-scientific ambitions, Habermas's approach in this domain was indebted both to evolutionary and neo-evolutionary theories (from Spencer to Parsons) and to phenomenological and hermeneutical concepts of culture and normative purpose. This combination emerged clearly in his *Legitimation Crisis*, a work that—while focusing on crisis potentials in 'late-capitalist' societies—offered also a theoretical scheme of social-political development as such. According to this scheme, development occurs typically along two tracks: the tracks of 'system integration' and 'social integration'—the former referring to advances in systemic differentiation and steering (or output) capacities, and the latter to the cultural domain of the 'life-world.'

Regarding sequential patterns, the scheme replicates the modernization model on the systems level, while supplementing it with cultural considerations. Thus, we encounter again the three stages of political development familiar from Almond and Powell: the stages of primitive, traditional, and modern systems (the latter now subdivided into early-modern and late-modern phases). While in primitive societies system and life-world were still diffusely blended in kinship relations, traditional societies witnessed the emergence of political steering systems, coupled with a weakening of mythic beliefs; modern society, finally, heralds the differentiated autonomy of the economic market as well as the ascendancy of universalist cultural norms (with a potential clash between system and norms—as manifest in late capitalism). In a theoretically refined manner, the two-track scheme was resumed in Habermas's *Theory of Communicative Action* which depicted modernization as a tension-laden movement occurring simultaneously in the fields of instrumental-technical and communicative-cultural rationality. As in the previous study, the motor of development was located in the process of 'rationalization' seen as the advancement of rational reflection or 'reflective learning.' Elevated to a normative principle, such reflective learning constitutes for Habermas the hallmark of 'modernity'—a stage of human maturation permitting the autonomous cultivation of science, ethics, and art.[18]

Although couched in a distinctly Western idiom, Habermasian critical theory has been attractive to many Third World intellectuals for a number of reasons. The chief reason

[18] See Habermas, *Legitimation Crisis,* trans. Thomas McCarthy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1975); *The Theory of Communicative Action*, vol. 1: *Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, trans. Thomas McCarthy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984); *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*, trans. Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987). Regarding individual development, see especially Habermas's essays on "Moral Development and Ego Identity" and "Historical Materialism and the Development of Normative Structures" in *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, pp. 69-94, 95-129. For a more detailed discussion of Habermas's view of development, compare my *Twilight of Subjectivity* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1981), pp. 179-211.

undoubtedly is Habermas's strong commitment to emancipation and liberating critique—an aspect that resonates with persistent struggles against colonial and postcolonial elites as well as against entrenched forms of stratification. Another motive is Habermas's (relative) attention to culture and to the legacy of human or cultural sciences—a feature that seems amenable to cross-cultural comparisons. In India, the Habermasian framework has been greeted by a number of intellectuals, including Thomas Pantham and the philosopher Sundara Rajan. In an essay titled "Habermas' Practical Discourse and Gandhi's *Satyagraha*," Pantham found "interesting parallels" between Habermas's notion of communicative action and Gandhi's engagement in *satyagraha* in the pursuit of moral-political goals. Both Habermas and Gandhi sought to recover the 'public sphere,' seen as an arena of practical involvement in opposition to the usurpation of politics by technocratic or managerial elites; both also aimed at a consensual resolution of conflicts which would reintegrate ethics and politics. The chief parallel, however, resides in their shared emancipatory élan. "The goal of Habermas' critical theory," we read, "is human emancipation from ideological deceptions or self-deceptions (i.e., from systematically distorted communication) as well as from technocratic domination and the scientization of politics." From Habermas's vantage, contemporary society fosters increasingly the conversion of 'practico-political' issues into issues of 'technical manipulation and control,' which entails a growing divorce of politics from morality and ethics. To counteract this tendency, Habermas advocates the revitalization of cultural-normative concerns, and especially the strengthening of practical discourses through which prevailing interests can be screened, rendered transparent, and perhaps even transformed—a goal that is not too far removed from Gandhi's accent on nonviolent struggle and *satyagraha*. While acknowledging some important divergences, Pantham summarized the similarities between the two positions in these terms:

> A critical-emancipatory concern is common to both Gandhi and Habermas. They are concerned with the legitimacy crisis of the socio-political structure of exploitation and violence as well as our ideological self-deceptions and the tyranny of dogmatic beliefs. Habermas objects to the reduction of practico-political questions into the technical or technocratic model of politics, which eschews ethics and morality. Gandhi also condemns the divorce of politics and economics from ethical standards and moral principles. Both Gandhi and Habermas seek to reclaim the freedom or autonomy of the individual from the technocrats of social power.[19]

---

[19] Thomas Pantham, "Habermas' Practical Discourse and Gandhi's *Satyagraha*" in Bhikhu Parekh and Thomas Pantham, eds., *Political Discourse: Explorations in Indian and Western Political Thought* (New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1987), pp. 292-293, 306. Among divergences, Pantham stressed primarily these (p. 292): "The main difference between Habermas and Gandhi is that while the former's practico-political discourse centers around communicative rationality and the force of better arguments, the latter's *satyagraha* is based not only on reason but also on love and self-suffering. Moreover, Habermas' practical discourse is largely a thought experiment, while Gandhi's *satyagraha* is a mode of direct action that ruptures the theory-practice dichotomy." A more stringent critique of Habermasian critical theory, attacking the very notion of 'language'

On a more abstractly theoretical level, Habermasian arguments have been adopted and further pursued by Sundara Rajan, in a string of publications starting with *Innovative Competence and Social Change*. As the author acknowledged, the notion of 'innovative competence' was indebted to the 'communication-theoretical model' of Habermas and especially to the latter's concept of communicative competence. In addition to the Habermasian framework, the study also invoked Schutzian phenomenology as a cognate (postbehavioral) approach to the analysis of the cultural life-world. "If this alignment between the theory of communicative competence and [Schutzian] social theory could be defended," Sundara Rajan observed, "then I suggest that we may have a possibility of carrying over a transcendental point of view into the domain of social theory." Regarding social and political development, the study relied in part on evolutionary models from Spencer to Parsons (though stripped of their positivist determinism), and in part on the Habermasian scheme of a double or multiple trajectory of modernization. In line with Habermas's tripartition of cognitive interests (corresponding to the validity claims of empirical truth, rightness, and truthfulness), Sundara Rajan portrayed development as moving along the three axes of growing steering efficiency, cultural communication, and self-reflection or self-expression. In terms of the study, every society, no matter how simple or complex, "has to face, and in a measure successfully solve, three basic types of tasks: (1) task of survival; (2) task of maintaining the structure and normative order of the group; (3) task of making possible for individual members a tolerable degree of personal fulfillment and happiness." Accordingly, innovative competence could be differentiated into the three strands of adaptive, interactive, and expressive innovation—strands that reflected the central goals of every society, namely, efficiency, justice, and happiness. Approximation of these goals involved a process of progressive differentiation coupled with reciprocal integration and ultimately with universalization:

> If at all we can speak of the goal or ultimate objective of socio-cultural evolution, as a terminus of the process, it may be described as an optimal balance of these three [dimensions]—an order of balance which may be said to be a 'cultural climax'... [Hence,] the omega point of cultural evolution is a single universal culture in which there would be perfect balance of efficiency, justice and happiness. It is not merely different social types but the universalization of these types in the form of a single culture that may be said to be the ultimate goal of cultural evolution.[20]

---

operative in its discourse model, was voiced by another Indian contributor to the same volume; see Raghuveer Singh, "Traditional Wisdom and Modern Science as Paradigms of Political Discourse," pp. 221-237, esp. pp. 234-236.

[20] R. Sundara Rajan, *Innovative Competence and Social Change* (Ganeshkind: Poona University Press, 1986), pp. x-xi, 87-89, 107-108. The study (p. 103) also distinguished between 'residual' and 'dormant' competences, the former correlated with reform and the second with revolution.

The notion of innovative social change was carried forward in Sundara Rajan's subsequent study titled *Towards a Critique of Cultural Reason,* a work that blended Habermasian motifs with arguments derived from Ricoeur's transcendental hermeneutics. Adopting the Habermasian distinction between life-world and discourse or between ordinary interaction and communicative reason, the study postulated a differentiation between two basic levels of social practices: the levels of situation-bound context and of decontextualized or transcendental universality. Blending this distinction with vocabulary drawn from Ricoeur's hermeneutical theory, Sundara Rajan juxtaposed the two semiotic dimensions of 'signification' and 'symbolization'—where signification means the "expression of contextualized and situation-specific meanings," while symbolization denotes the "transcendence of such contextuality" within the communicative process itself. As he recognized, articulation of this distinction implied a departure from orthodox Marxism which tended to equate culture with ideology and, more specifically, to reduce universal symbolization to modes of distorted signification or communication (to be unmasked through a 'hermeneutics of suspicion').

Countering such a reductive approach, Sundara Rajan stressed the genuine quality of symbols and their possibly liberating or transformative efforts. In terms of the study, 'culture' was not simply a contingent or restrictive life-form but a synonym for essential features of social life as such; to this extent, culture could be described as "the architectonic of the symbolic," where the latter points to "general or universal meanings." Where such meanings are evoked, the study observed, we are in the presence of

> symbols of transcendence. I am noting that from this point of view, culture is the domain of symbols of transcendence. In so far as such symbols operate in discourse, i.e., in so far as culture is active in the experience of individuals, the finite individual is able to transcend the contextuality and existential boundedness of his life. In traditional formulation, in culture life is *aufgehoben*—that is, transcended and preserved in a higher form. If this is so, it is in the domain of the symbolic that finite transcendence takes place.

As one should note, symbolization for Sundara Rajan was not only potentially liberating but also a 'condition of possibility' of cultural understanding in the Kantian sense. Pursuing this line of argument (beyond the confines of Kant's own critical inquiry), the study projected the outline of a "critique of cultural reason" which alone could serve as "the foundation of historical knowledge."[21]

Elaborating on the implications of this approach, the study made a distinction between two levels or dimensions of communicative practices: the dimensions of semantic meanings and intentional actions; in both cases, the bifurcation of contingent context and universality was said

---

21   R. Sundara Rajan, *Towards a Critique of Cultural Reason* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987), pp. ix-x, 20, 22-24.

to be operative. In the domain of semantic meanings, Sundara Rajan—following Ricoeur—differentiated between ordinary speech and written text (a variant of the Habermasian correlation of speech and discourse). While everyday speech was said to be contextual or context-bound and to reflect the semantic process of signification, written texts were seen as relatively context-free in the sense that ordinary expressions are elevated or 'sublated' into universal meanings through a process of semantic transformation whereby 'symbolization transcends signification.' A similar movement of transcendence was detected in the field of intentional action where the process of sublation points from ordinary modes of interaction to the level of 'exemplary' or 'epochal acts'—the latter seen as the hallmark of politics in the strong sense.

Just as texts—the term taken as stand-in for a broad cultural field (from art and literature to ethics)—are able to thematize essential meanings and address universal human needs, so epochal acts are capable of disclosing universal political longings shrouded or obscured by limited historical settings. In Sundara Rajan's words, by virtue of exemplary deeds a community

> comes to self-consciousness in terms of what it aspires to be. The exemplary act reveals a vision of the good life as the community in its historical and contextualized vicissitudes, in its moments of humiliation and defeat has nevertheless obscurely felt within, as a vague and unnamed aspiration and hope. The exemplar clarifies this longing, responding to the hope in bringing to consciousness the demands that it entails; he, as it were, de-contextualizes the meanings of its historical experiences and thus anticipates the form of the world that an obscure and confused longing was intending in the depth of its misery and defeat.

Both modes of transcendence, the semantic and the practical, could be summarized under the heading of 'tradition' construed as a process of cultural transformation. Seen from a critical-transcendental vantage, tradition is said to represent a "repository of generalized meanings and themes" available in a society; it denotes "the universal dimension of the communal experiences standing, as it were, as the charter of the group or community."[22]

At the time of the publication of Sundara Rajan's study, some premises of his approach were already under close scrutiny in the West. Despite its appealing emancipatory élan, Habermasian critical theory at that juncture was under severe attack from a number of quarters and for several reasons. One prominent reason was the partial complicity of his framework with earlier modernization theory, as manifest in his endorsement of growing system differentiation and capability and his overall teleological or stage-model of social development. In the eyes of many critics, Habermas's evolutionary outlook dovetailed too neatly with the progressive

---

[22] *Towards a Critique of Cultural Reason*, pp. 27, 31, 33-34, 39, 43-46. For a further development of these views, see R. Sundara Rajan, *The Primacy of the Political* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1991).

ascendancy and domination of Western science and technology around the globe. This complicity was not (or not sufficiently) offset by his attention to the life-world and to normative-cultural concerns. Although constituting a clear advance over the positivist focus on psychological attitudes, 'culture' in Habermas's scheme was still an intentional domain attached as a supplement to empirical science (and following like the latter a teleological trajectory).

As it happens, the 'transcendental turn' undergirding this scheme has been paralleled in recent decades by another trend: the so-called 'linguistic turn' or turn to language—where language is assigned a more emphatic, contextualized meaning than it is accorded in rational 'discourse.' The resurgence of language has been accompanied by a more pronounced accent placed on 'culture' seen as a reservoir of mostly latent, only partially articulate or intentional meanings—a conception that had been favored and promoted for some time by cultural anthropologists. As a close corollary, this accent entailed a reassessment of the notion of 'tradition' and its status in the process of social change. In opposition to universal or transcendental formulas, both culture and tradition came to be seen as historical phenomena necessarily couched in local, vernacular idioms.[23]

Together with its universalist bent, Habermasian critical theory was also suspect for its relentless modernism. In line with his teleological schema, Habermas was led to champion with growing vigor the accomplishments of Western modernity or of the 'philosophical discourse of modernity'—a discourse that he sees as marked by commitment to rational enlightenment and by the growing differentiation of cultural 'value spheres' (science, ethics, and art). To this extent, his outlook seemed to downplay or bypass the intrinsic tension or 'dialectic of enlightenment' characterizing the modern age—an aspect that had been powerfully propounded by some of the early spokespeople of the Frankfurt School program.[24] Building in part on such earlier initiatives, recent intellectual trends in the West have mounted a concerted assault on the modernist trajectory, assailing Western rationalism and universalism as synonyms for 'logocentrism' and as smokescreens for 'Eurocentric' designs of global domination. Prominent among these trends are the perspectives of poststructuralism and deconstruction—whose proponents are sometimes grouped together as 'postmodernists' or advocates of an incipient 'postmodernity.'

---

[23] The so-called 'linguistic turn' has been associated chiefly with the works of Ludwig Wittgenstein, John Austin, and the later Martin Heidegger. Regarding the anthropological conception of culture, compare Alfred L. Kroeber, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions* (New York: Vintage Books, 1963); Robert Redfield, *Peasant Society and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956); and Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973). Regarding the reassessment of tradition, see Edward Shils, *Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981); and Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue* (2nd ed.; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984).

[24] See Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment,* trans. John Cumming (New York: Seabury, 1972).

In his *The Postmodern Condition,* Jean-François Lyotard denounced all the trajectories of modernization—that is, the teleological accounts of modern history, including the account of human emancipation—as high-flown 'metanarratives' out of touch with the basically circumscribed, historically contingent character of language. As he observed, modernity as a process (that is, modernization) invariably presented itself in terms of "some grand narrative such as the dialectics of spirit, the hermeneutics of meaning, the emancipation of the rational or working subject, or the creation of wealth." By contrast, the chief trademark of the postmodern outlook is its 'incredulity' toward such accounts, its skepsis toward all continuous or progressive teleologies of history. Relinquishing universal schemes, postmodernity—in Lyotard's view—insists on the dispersed and heterogeneous character of historical episodes and cultural 'language games,' thus lending support not to holistic theories but only to a "pragmatics of language particles" and to political activity only "in patches—local determinism." In explicit opposition to Habermasian communication, the study privileged the role of 'dissension,' coupled with "sensitivity to differences" and an "ability to tolerate the incommensurable." Accordingly, the basic 'principle' underlying the study was struggle or contestation: for, "to speak is to fight" and speech acts "fall within the domain of general agonistics."[25]

Theoretical accents of this kind are pervasive in contemporary literature—from Derrida's celebration of '*différance*' to Deleuze's stress on heterogeneity and Foucault's notion of 'micropowers.' Rejection of historical teleology was particularly pronounced in the latter's *Archaeology of Knowledge* which shifted the focus from historical evolution to paradigmatic ruptures, discontinuities, and epistemic breaks. As Foucault observed, the notion of discontinuity "assumes a major role" in contemporary historical inquiry; while previously seen as a "stigma of temporal dislocation that it was the historian's task to remove from history," discontinuity now surges forth as a central issue blocking holistic overviews. The political implications of antiholism were spelled out by Foucault in a subsequent interview that underscored the role of decentralized practices and local resistances; political analysis, he noted there, should be concerned not with total systems but with "power at its extremities," with "those points where it becomes capillary, that is, in its more regional and local forms and institutions."[26] In the American context, antiholism surfaces frequently in the guise of a neopragmatic particularism or of a postmodern

---

[25]   Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), pp. xxiii-xxv, 4-5, 9-10.

[26]   Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge,* trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 8; *Power/Knowledge*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), p. 98. Compare also Jacques Derrida, "Différance" in *Margins of Philosophy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), pp. 3-27; Gilles Deleuze, *Différence et Répétition* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968). For a more detailed discussion of these points, see my "Democracy and Post-Modernism," *Human Studies*, vol. 10 (1986), pp. 143-170.

cultivation of (counter-) cultural diversity. Adopting a pragmatic stance, Richard Rorty tends to privilege local narratives over Habermasian quasi-transcendentalism; in lieu of the global trajectories of modernization, he commented at one point, it would be preferable to endorse "those untheoretical sorts of narrative discourse which make up the political speech of the Western democracies" and hence to be "frankly ethnocentric." In the cultural (or countercultural) domain, the characteristic preferences of postmodernity have been eloquently stated by Cornel West in an essay titled "The New Cultural Politics of Difference," where we read:

> Distinctive features of the new cultural politics of difference are to trash the monolithic and homogeneous in the name of diversity, multiplicity and heterogeneity; to reject the abstract, general and universal in light of the concrete, specific and particular; and to historicize, contextualize and pluralize by highlighting the contingent, provisional, variable, tentative, shifting and changing.[27]

As briefly sketched here, postmodern trends carry important—and largely salutary—implications for the issue of development. In opposition to universal categories derived from Western modes of discourse, postmodern antiholism seeks to give voice to local or vernacular idioms and thus to empower the marginalized—in particular the poor masses in Third World countries trying to resist Western global control. The former president of Senegal, Leopold Senghor, captured this emancipatory thrust when he said that "We Africans do not wish to be mere consumers of civilization." This saying resonates deeply with a formulation that Deleuze used to characterize Foucault's contribution to contemporary social theory: "You have taught us something absolutely fundamental: the indignity of speaking on someone else's behalf."[28] To avoid this indignity, ethnic and other (sub)national groups in the Third World must have the opportunity to articulate their hopes and grievances in their own vocabulary—which implies a valorization of indigenous cultural and linguistic traditions and ways of life.

---

[27] Cornel West, "The New Cultural Politics of Difference" in Russell Ferguson et al., eds., *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991), p. 19. As Cornel West adds, however, the new cultural politics "shuns narrow particularisms, parochialisms and separatisms, just as it rejects false universalisms and homogeneous totalisms"; thus, it simultaneously seeks to "avoid ethnic chauvinism and faceless universalism" (pp. 35, 37). Compare also Richard Rorty, "Habermas and Lyotard on Postmodernity" in Richard J. Bernstein, ed., *Habermas and Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985), pp. 165-166.

[28] For Deleuze's comments, see A. Sheridan, *Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth* (London: Tavistock, 1980), p. 114. The statement by Leopold Senghor is cited by Denis Goulet in "Development: Creator and Destroyer of Values," *World Development,* vol. 20 (1992), p. 468. Goulet also refers to the Intercultural Institute of Montreal (and its journal *Interculture*) which views development mainly in critical or negative terms, namely, as "the instrument which destroys the political, juridical, economic, and symbolic meaning systems of native cultures" (p. 469). A similar outlook is sponsored by the Cultural Survival Movement founded by David Maybury-Lewis and headquartered at Harvard University.

To be sure, such valorization can also give rise to narrow self-enclosure or to ethnic parochialism; under socially and economically stressful conditions, Rorty's benign ethnocentrism can readily give way to virulent forms of chauvinism and ethnic-religious 'communalism.' This is the dark or perilous side of postmodernity—an aspect rendering it vulnerable to modernist attacks. To counter this danger and the lure of cultural narcissism, postmodern localism or particularism must be construed in a radically porous and open-ended manner, one that encourages multiple types of engagement and interaction—both among marginalized groups and ethnic communities and between traditional culture(s) and the modern West (whose presence cannot simply be exorcised). Seen from this angle, Lyotard's 'agonistics' loses some of its militant and atomistic quality, making room instead for a struggle for mutual recognition or a process of 'agonal dialogue' —a process that seems to concur with Seyla Benhabib's notion of 'interactive universalism' (and with Merleau-Ponty's earlier conception of a 'lateral universalism'). Under these auspices, tradition and modernity are no longer binary opposites or poles of a historical trajectory, but rather ways of life intimately entwined with each other—a correlation finding expression in diverse forms of critical traditionalism and naturalized (or traditionalized) modernism.[29] Instead of pursuing these matters on an improperly abstract level, I want to devote the final part of this essay to theoretical initiatives on the Indian subcontinent that illustrate the potential of a non-Western approach to development or to (what one may call) "postmodernization."

3. Postmodernization in India

Among contemporary Indian theorists concerned with development issues, Foucauldian and postmodern influences are particularly evident in the writings of Tarig Banuri. In an essay titled "Modernization and Its Discontents," Banuri has zeroed in on a crucial feature of modernization models: their glorification of 'modernity' based on the assumption that modern culture is inherently superior to other life-forms or 'ways of seeing the world.' In Banuri's view, there is a deep-seated crisis of development or modernization theory, a crisis that derives not

---

[29] For significant early attempts to break down the opposition between tradition and modernity, compare Lloyd I. Rudolph and Susanne H. Rudolph, *The Modernity of Tradition: Political Development in India* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967); and Milton Singer, *When a Great Tradition Modernizes: An Anthropological Approach to Indian Civilization* (New York: Praeger Publ., 1972). Apart from outright traditionalism and modernism, the options of critical traditionalism and critical modernism are discussed by Bhikhu Parekh, *Colonialism, Tradition and Reform* (New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1989), pp. 34-70. Regarding 'interactive universalism,' compare Seyla Benhabib, *Situating the Self* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), p. 3-6; and regarding 'lateral universalism,' Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Signs*, trans. Richard C. McCleary (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964), pp. 119-120. For the notion of agonal dialogue see my "Postmodernism and Political Order" in *Margins of Political Discourse* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1989), pp. 95-115.

simply from errors in detail but from basic inadequacies of a philosophical, epistemological, and ontological sort. Differentiating between 'personal' and 'impersonal' maps or world-views, the essay finds modernization models attached to Western modernity which, in turn, is addicted to a hierarchical postulate: namely, the 'impersonality postulate' whereby impersonal relations are intrinsically privileged over personal relations. In this formulation, impersonality characterizes a culture where everyone maintains anonymous relations "with other people, with the natural environment, and with knowledge," while concrete experiential bends in all three dimensions are the hallmark of a 'personal map'; differently phrased: the latter map is 'context-specific' while the impersonal stance is abstract, decontextualized or 'universal.'

While most actual cultures reveal a blend of the two dimensions, the distinctive trait of Western modernity is its attempt to bifurcate the two and place them in an asymmetrical hierarchy. Seen from this angle, the trajectory of modernization theory globalizes this hierarchy: "It has the confessed task of 'rationalizing' the whole world, of placing the world in a conceptual grid"; its primary objective is "not pedagogy but control; not helping to understand the world, but rather helping to maintain existing (often oppressive) structures of power." Appealing to Foucauldian vocabulary, Banuri's essay castigated the 'hegemonic panopticism' inherent in "Western liberalism's method of binary opposition," that is, in its hierarchical rather than dialectical correlation of modernity and tradition, of universality and contextuality. Offering a summary diagnosis of the malaise of modernization, Banuri argued

> that many of the seemingly insoluble problems of today's world stem precisely from the implicit assumption of a dichotomy and a hierarchy between the impersonal and the personal spheres of culture, and that in our search for solutions we need to replace this hierarchy with the notion of a tension or a dialectic between the two.[30]

In moving from diagnosis to prescription, Banuri did not advocate a radical, antimodern separatism but rather something like an agonal or tensional dialogue. Such a tensional approach, in his view, was liable to show that concrete social systems always reflect "an admixture of the personal and impersonal perspectives, notwithstanding the overemphasis of the modernization approach on the latter" and also that "a perfectly coherent and logical argument could be based on the 'personal' map just as easily as on the modernizers' exclusive reliance on impersonal arguments." The basic moral-political upshot of this approach was the correction of cultural asymmetry: namely, the replacement of the modernizers' assumption of the superiority of

---

[30]   Tarig Banuri, "Modernization and Its Discontents: A Cultural Perspective on the Theories of Development" in Frédérique Apffel Margin and Stephen A. Margin, eds., *Dominating Knowledge: Development, Culture, and Resistance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 73-74, 78-79, 82-83, 88. Under postmodern auspices, the terms 'personal' and 'impersonal' are somewhat suspect (because of the possible association of the former with modern individualism). For these and other reasons I prefer the distinction between context-specific and decontextualized dimensions.

the modern life-style with "the earlier notion of the moral as well as socio-economic worth of different cultures and value systems." To accomplish this correction or redress, however, a basic shift of focus was necessary: namely, a shift from the universal discourse of 'impersonal' (Western) experts to the indigenous or vernacular idiom of Third World societies. Both theoretically and practically, such a turn was designed "to deny the validity and legitimacy of universal and objective definitions" and thus "to transfer the power of defining the problems and goals of a society from the hands of outside experts into those of the members of the society itself."

Foucault's stress on local resistance was relevant here. In Banuri's account, the resistance of 'traditional' cultures to modern values and practices could be understood as an attempt "to retain control over their own actions and their own environments"; from this angle, whatever 'development' or social change takes place, will occur "as the result of resistance, protest, and challenges from below, rather than from an imposition from above." Banuri in this context formulated a "vision of the future in the Third World" couched in terms of a "decentralized polity, economy, and society"; decentralization here implied a strengthening of local government "whether at the level of the village, a group of villages, small towns, or possible subdivisions of large cities." Such a decentralization, in Banuri's view, was able to link up with the Gandhian legacies of self-reliance and nonviolence. In contrast to the wantonly aggressive character of instrumental modernism,

> the shift in perception away from this universal and impersonal perspective towards one based on direct human connections can help create the notion of sustainable development as a fundamental human value, and therefore also the basis for popular resistance against violence.[31]

A similar outlook (though with slightly more polemical accents) has been articulated by Ashis Nandy in several of his writings. In frontal opposition to modernization seen as progressive adaptation to Western hegemonic culture, Nandy at one point defined progress or development as "expansion of the awareness of oppression in society." The concrete implications of this definition were spelled out in a manifesto or Third World 'credo' titled "Cultural Frames for Social Transformation." According to Nandy, emphasis on indigenous culture or cultural traditions was urgent in the face of the relentless Westernization and uniformization of the world. As in Banuri's work, resort to native culture implied for Nandy "a defiance of the modern idea of expertise," an idea that demands "that even resistance be uncontaminated by the 'inferior' cognition or 'unripe'

---

31   Banuri, "Modernization and Its Discontents," pp. 76, 89, 95-99. Compare also Banuri's essay "Development and the Politics of Knowledge: A Critical Interpretation of the Social Role of Modernization Theories in the Development of the Third World" in the same volume, *Dominating Knowledge,* pp. 29-72.

revolutionary consciousness of the oppressed." Given the hegemonic status of Western modernity, the manifesto added, resistance to oppression has to involve "in our part of the world, some resistance to modernity" itself; in particular, resistance must challenge "the connotative meanings of concepts such as development, growth, history, science and technology," concepts that have become in the Third World "not only new 'reasons of state' but mystifications for new forms of violence and injustice."

The stance toward social transformation outlined in the manifesto was termed 'critical traditionalism,' a phrase that appealed to the liberating potential present in 'living traditions'—and that was meant as counterpoise to all forms of complicity with modernization (including a 'critical modernism' loyal to Western hegemony). In Nandy's view, such a liberating potential was not a monopoly of Western modernity but could also be found in Indian culture; for many features of traditional Indian thought—including "many of its *puranic* and folk elements—can be and have been used as a critical base." According to the essay, a chief representative of critical traditionalism was Gandhi who, in many of his writings and speeches, was "by far the most consistent and savage critic of modernity"—while refusing to retreat into a nostalgic archaism. Gandhi, we are told, rejected "modern innovations such as the nation-state system, modern science and technology, urban industrialism and evolutionism," yet without abandoning traditional notions of "the state, science and technology, civic living and social transformation." The central feature in Gandhi's outlook was his opposition to oppression, in the past as well as in the present. In Nandy's words:

> Gandhi's movement against the tradition of untouchability [was] the other side of his struggle against modern imperialism… Unlike Coomaraswamy, Gandhi did not want to defend traditions; he lived with them. Nor did he, like Nehru, want to mesmerize cultures within a modern frame. Gandhi's frame was traditional, but he was willing to criticize some traditions violently. He was even willing to include in his frame elements of modernity as critical vectors.[32]

With some concessions to liberal humanism, a stance congenial to Nandy's has been propounded in recent writings by Rajni Kothari (who like the former works at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies in Delhi). Together with Nandy and Banuri, Kothari in these writings links the search for political alternatives and a properly 'humane world order' with resistance to Western global hegemony; secular modernization or development, in his view, has

---

[32] Ashis Nandy, "Cultural Frames for Social Transformation: A Credo," *Alternatives*, vol. 12 (1987), pp. 113-117; the essay appeared also in Parekh and Pantham, eds., *Political Discourse,* pp. 238-248. See also his "Towards a Third World Utopia" in *Traditions, Tyrannies, and Utopias: Essays in the Politics of Awareness* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987), pp. 20-55. For some of his more recent works see Nandy, ed., *Science, Hegemony and Violence* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1988); and his *Alternative Sciences: Creativity and Authenticity in Two Indian Scientists* (New Delhi: Allied, 1980).

produced a basic asymmetry both in global and domestic society, a split that divides North against South, urban against rural populations, and Westernized elites against indigenous masses. As he wrote in a book titled *Transformation and Survival*, the contemporary crisis of development results from a steadily "sharpening dualism (a) between the imperial centers and peripheral societies and (b) between the rich and the poor of the world." Like Nandy, Kothari locates the core of genuine development not in an expansion of technocratic or managerial controls but in liberating transformation; such transformation, he emphasizes, has to do with "the problem of freedom in human affairs and of democracy and the institutions that sustain it." To unleash this liberating potential, Kothari's prescription urges a strengthening of local self-government and an invigoration of indigenous cultures and grassroots movements, especially among marginalized groups. As his book *Rethinking Development* observed, the focus on ethnicity and native cultures

> is a response—including reaction—to the excesses of the modern project of shaping the whole of humanity (and its natural resource base) around three pivots of world capitalism, the state system and a 'world culture' based on modern technology, a pervasive communications and information order and a 'universalizing' educational system.

While supporting ethnicity and local cultures, however, the study did not endorse any kind of ethnocentrism or self-enclosed chauvinism—an enclosure that is at the heart of contemporary 'communalism' and the upsurge of intercommunal violence. Honoring liberal-humanist impulses, Kothari's work instead subscribes to open-ended engagement among cultures and to an agonal 'dialogue among people' (*lokayan*), an engagement that alone can pave the way to equal respect among religious and cultural groups and to an alternative world order.[33]

As in the case of Nandy, Kothari's outlook resonates with aspects of Gandhi's legacy, especially with the themes of self-reliance and nonviolence; according to *Rethinking Development*, it was Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj* that best articulated "the moral imperative of treating people as a source in the recovery of a humane order." Gandhian affinities are pervasive among Indian writers working in this field—although there surely is not (and cannot be) anything like a Gandhian orthodoxy.[34] What is typically invoked in contemporary writings is an image of Gandhi

---

[33] See Rajni Kothari, *Transformation and Survival: In Search of a Humane World Order* (Delhi: Ajanta, 1988), pp. 16-17; *Rethinking Development: In Search of Humane Alternatives* (Delhi: Ajanta, 1989), pp. 185, 192. Together with some colleagues at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Kothari has been instrumental in setting up and maintaining "Lokayan," a forum of dialogue among social activists, scholars, and policy-makers. For an instructive discussion of Kothari's perspective, see Manoranjan Mohanti, "On Democratic Humanism: A Review of Rajni Kothari's Recent Works," *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (n.s.), vol. 25 (1991), pp. 151-160.

[34] See Kothari, *Rethinking Development*, p. 2. Nandy refuses to label himself a Gandhian; and there are clearly also differences between Gandhi and Kothari. In the words of Mohanti: "Gandhi worked for a total replacement of the prevailing political-economic order, namely, the capitalist

not as a modernizing nation-builder but rather as a critical traditionalist—that is, as a figure able to combine reliance on indigenous Indian traditions with the aspiration for liberating transformation. In this respect, Gandhi is clearly an unparalleled political and intellectual figure in our century, someone who has lessons to teach not only to India but to the world at large. Wherever possible, Gandhi sought to articulate his views in the vernacular idiom of Indian language(s) and through appeal to indigenous traditions. Thus, the notion of *swaraj* (self-rule) was borrowed from the tradition of *arthashastras* but, in the context of our century, acquired the connotations of resistance to colonial hegemony and of local governance recalcitrant to centralized managerial control. Similarly, the concept of *ahimsa* (nonviolence) paid tribute to ancient Buddhist and Jain teachings but now gained strategic significance in the political process of liberative-transformative struggle. As is well known, one of Gandhi's favorite classical texts was the *Bhagavad Gita*; in line with the teachings of the text, he perceived himself as a '*Karmayogin*,' one pursuing the path of right action. While often applauding his political struggle, Western observers are likely to be perplexed by the yardstick of this struggle—which Gandhi described in terms of '*satyagraha*' (practice of truth), a notion far removed from Western-style 'interest-articulation' or 'interest-aggregation' (to borrow terms from modernization theory). Western writers also tend to praise his commitment to interethnic and inter-religious peace, but they fail to detect the source of this commitment: far from reflecting a secularist indifference or 'tolerance,' his search for ecumenical peace was itself part of his striving for '*moksha*' (liberation) whose sparks he saw present in every genuine religious experience.[35]

    In the modern Indian context, Gandhi was not alone in exemplifying a religiously grounded ecumenicism. In many respects, a cognate outlook was shared by leading figures of the 'Indian renaissance'—foremost among them Sri Aurobindo and Vivekananda—whose life-work exhibited an alluring blend of rootedness in Indian traditions and cross-cultural or global generosity.[36] By way of conclusion, I want to draw attention to still earlier sources of critical

parliamentary system. Kothari seeks transformation by working through the existing political-economic order… Thus, despite traces in Kothari of Rousseau's celebration of the civil society and M. N. Roy's new humanism and Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj* outlook, elements of liberalism permeate his thinking." See "On Democratic Humanism," p. 159. Closer attachment to Gandhi—and a deemphasis on Habermasian motifs—also characterize recent publications of Thomas Pantham; see, e.g., his "Beyond Liberal Democracy: Thinking With Mahatma Gandhi" in Pantham and Kenneth L. Deutsch, eds., *Political Thought in Modern India* (New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1986), pp. 325-346.

35   For a more detailed discussion of Gandhi as a critical traditionalist, see my "Gandhi as Mediator between East and West" in *Margins of Political Discourse,* pp. 22-38. Regarding the sources of Gandhian *ahimsa* compare William Borman, *Gandhi and Non-Violence* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1986); and Unto Tähtinen, *Ahimsa: Nonviolence in Indian Tradition* (Delhi: Navajivan Publ., 1976). For a defense of inter-religious tolerance based not on secularism but on faith itself, see Ashis Nandy, "The Politics of Secularism and the Recovery of Religious Tolerance," *Alternatives*, vol. 13 (1988), pp. 177-194.

36   Regarding Sri Aurobindo see D. P. Chattopadhyaya, *History, Society and Polity: Integral Sociology of Sri Aurobindo* (New Delhi: Macmillan, 1976); V. P. Varma, *The Political Philosophy*

traditionalism or a nonexclusionary reading of native legacies; specifically, I want to alert to the liberating-transformative spirit evident in *bhakti* poetry and some of the *puranic* literature.

During my last visit to India I was fortunate enough to watch an evening performance by an Odissi dance group (a performance held in celebration of the annual "Shreeya Chandaluni"). The dance drama was based on an Orissa poem called "Lakshmi Purana," written by the sixteenth-century *bhakti* poet Balaram Das. The story of the drama centered on the worship of goddess Lakshmi performed by housewives in Puri annually during the month of November. One year, Lakshmi decided to go into the city disguised as an old woman, in order to observe the level of devotion. Going from house to house, she was increasingly discouraged and dismayed noticing the prevailing religious superficiality and even apathy among the women. Finally, she came upon the house of an untouchable family, finding the woman prostrated on the ground praying fervently "Mahalakshmi." Overjoyed, the goddess entered the house and shared a meal with the woman. This event was reported to Lord Jagannath (another name for Vishnu or Krishna) who is the presiding deity in Puri. Denouncing her ritual impurity, Jagannath ordered the goddess out of the temple. As it happened, however, Lakshmi fully rose to the occasion. With the help of divine architects, she had a new palace constructed for her near the sea; at the same time, she had the temple in Puri cleared of all contents, including every morsel of food. Faced with this desolation and deprived of sustenance, Jagannath and his brother were eventually forced to go into town begging for food. Having been ignored or shunted aside at every house, the gods finally and nearly starved came to the palace of Lakshmi—whom they entreated to return but who proved obstinate. In the end, Lakshmi consented to come back to Puri, but only on one condition: that in the temple there would be no distinction of caste and that everyone would be allowed to enter freely. Couched in a traditional idiom, this poem (I believe) tells a story that concurs with the Gandhian legacy and, more importantly, with the ecumenical aspirations of humankind.

---

of Sri Aurobindo, 2nd. ed. (New Delhi: Motilal Barnarsidass, 1976); and regarding Swami Vivekananda H. Mukherjee, *Vivekananda and Indian Freedom* (Calcutta: Orient, Longman, 1986); Tapan Raychauduri, *Europe Reconsidered* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 219-331.