OPEN PEER REVIEW

Socio-Economic Transformations in Iran and India (1857–1904) in Alignment with the Modernization Project

Vahid. Farshbaf Rashidi¹, Malek. Zolghadr^{2*}, Abolfazl. Lotfizadeh²

¹ PhD student, Department of Political Science, Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Zanjan, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Zanjan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: malek.zolgadr@yahoo.com

Received: 2024-10-07	Revised: 2024-12-08	Accepted: 2024-12-29	Published: 2025-01-01
EDITOR:			
Tahereh Ebrahimifar 💿			
Head of Sociology Departme	ent, Faculty of Arts, Helwan Uni	versity,Cairo, Egypt. Email: Tah.E	brahimifar@iauctb.ac.ir
REVIEWER 1:			
Nabeel Bani-Hani🕩			
Faculty of Education Specia	lization, Wasit University, Wasi	t, Iraq. Email: nabeelhani@uowas	sit.edu.iq
REVIEWER 2:			
Mrinalini Puranik 🕩			
National Health Mission, Mi	nistry of Health and Family Wel	lfare, India. Email: MriPuranik@g	gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction discusses modernization in Western societies, mentioning "modern national state, the emergence of social classes, and the rise of instrumental and calculative rationality." It would strengthen the argument to reference key modernization theorists (e.g., Rostow, Huntington) to anchor the analysis within a broader theoretical framework.

The article asserts, "While military industries were first established during Abbas Mirza and Qaem Maqam Farahani's time and later expanded under Amir Kabir, they failed due to their inability to compete with imported goods." This requires quantitative support, such as trade figures or GDP estimates, to illustrate the scale of industrial failure.

The sentence, "In contrast, modernization efforts in Iran remained unstable and were largely confined to the establishment of newspapers and schools." lacks a clear causal explanation. Was this due to state resistance, lack of capital, foreign intervention, or another factor? Providing an explicit linkage between cause and effect is necessary.

The article claims that "India experienced significantly greater progress compared to Iran and is now considered one of the world's leading economies and scientific powerhouses." While this is broadly true, comparing India's colonial experience with Iran's semi-colonial status requires a direct comparison of industrialization rates, literacy levels, or infrastructure investments to validate the claim.

The text states, "These nations are now familiar with democracy and have achieved industrial progress, yet they have implemented a modernization project rather than adopting modernity itself." This distinction between modernization and modernity should be clarified, possibly referencing Eisenstadt's theory of multiple modernities.

The citation style fluctuates, with some references appearing in APA format while others are not fully formatted. For example, "(Tohidfam, 2003)" should be consistently presented in APA style, including page numbers where necessary.

The article states, "India witnessed substantial infrastructure development, including the construction of railways, nationwide irrigation canals, and universities, aligning with global modernization trends." However, British infrastructure in India was often extractive, primarily serving colonial economic interests. This nuance should be acknowledged.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The statement, "The long reign of Naser al-Din Shah was characterized by numerous political and social events, including intense colonial rivalries between European powers, particularly Britain and Russia." needs clarification regarding how these rivalries directly influenced Iran's modernization trajectory. It would be useful to delineate specific policies or agreements (e.g., Reuter Concession of 1872) that affected Iran's development.

The section on the concept of transformation defines "development (Develop) literally means 'emerging from the envelope' (envelope)." This definition is unclear and needs revision for precision. Instead, the explanation should align with mainstream sociological or economic definitions of development, referencing sources such as Sen (1999) or Sachs (2005).

In the discussion on modernization theory, the article states, "Eurocentric assumptions that all countries should follow the development path of the Global North." This point is important but underdeveloped. The authors should engage with critiques from dependency theory (e.g., Wallerstein, Frank) to provide a more nuanced discussion of how modernization processes were shaped by colonial influences.

The discussion of India's modernization efforts mentions that "Many intellectuals supported the civilizational policies of the British viceroyalty." This claim requires evidence, as many Indian intellectuals (e.g., Gandhi, Nehru) were highly critical of British policies.

The article does not address the role of unequal trade relations in shaping modernization efforts. For instance, Britain's economic policies in India led to deindustrialization in certain sectors. Discussing this would provide a more comprehensive picture.

The text does not sufficiently engage with resistance movements. The statement, "Despite opposition to colonial rule, many intellectuals supported the civilizational policies of the British viceroyalty." should acknowledge the role of movements like the Swadeshi Movement in shaping modernization debates.

The statement, "The major obstacles to the establishment of democracy and public participation in governance included the weakness of the landowning class." simplifies complex political structures. Many Iranian landlords had significant power in local governance. A discussion on land tenure systems (e.g., feudal vs. capitalist structures) would be beneficial.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted. Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

