

## B.A.(Hons.), Part - III

### Sociology, Paper-VII

#### CONTENTS

Sl.	Topics	Unit No.	Page No.
1.	Social Change	1	2
2.	Social Evaluation and Social Progress		
3.	Revolution and Innovation		
4.	Evolutionary Theory of Social Change	2	19
5.	Cyclical Theory of Social Change		
6.	Conflict Theory of Social Change		
7.	Planned Change in India : Indian Plans a Mixed Model and Their Socio-economic objective	3	30
8.	Tradition and Modernity in India : Concept and Indices	4	37
9.	Change in Little and Great Traditions	5	43
10.	Industrialization	6	48
11.	Urbanization		
12.	Law and Social Changes, Social Changes Through Legislative Measures in India	7	56



## Social Change

Social Change is the Change in society. Society is a web of social relationships. Hence, social change is a change in social relationships. Mac Iver and Page said in this context, have observed correctly, "It is the change in these which alone we shall regard as social change." What are social relationship ? Social relationships include social processes and social interactions. These include the mutual activities of relations of the various parts of society. In the words of Jones, social change is a term used to describe variation or modification of any aspects of social processes, social patterns, social interactions, or social organisations. Thus social change is a change in the social organisation. It is in the sense that Davis has written that "by social change is meant only social alternations as secure in social organisation, that is, the structures and functions of society." Social change can be observed in every society. Describing social change in detail, Merrill and Elderedge have said, "Social change means that large number of persons are engaging in activities that differ from those which they or their immediate forefathers engaged sometimes before. Society is composed of a vast and complex network of patterned human relationships in which all men participate. When human behaviour is in the process of modification, this is the only another way of indicating that social change is occurring. Human society is constituted of human beings.

Mazumdar, H.T. said, "social change may be defined as a new fashion or mode, either modifying or replacing the old, in the life of people— or in the operation of a society."

Gilliu and Gllin has written that "social changes are variation from the accepted modes of life; whether due to alteration in geographical conditions, in brought about ny diffusion or inventions within the group.

Grisberg, M has said that, "by social change, I understand a change in social structure and, the size of society, the composition or balance of its parts or the type of its organisations.

On the basis of these definitions it may be concluded that social change refers to bte modifications which take place in the life patterns of people. It does not rerer to all the charges going on in the society. The changes in our, language, technology, philosophy etc. may not be included in the term. Social change which should be interpreted in a narrow sense to mean alternation in social relationships are social processes, social patterns and social interrelations. Thus social change will mean variations or social organisations. It is a change in the institutional and normative structure of society.

### NATURE OF SOCIAL CHANGE

The main characteristics of the nature of social change as are follows :

**1. Social change is a universal phenomenon :** Social change occurs in all societies. No society remains completely static. This is true of all societies, primitive as will as civilized.



Society exists in a universe of dynamic influences. The population change, technologies expand, material equipments change, ideologies and institutional structures and functions undergo re-shaping. The speed and extent of changes may differ from society to society. Some change rapidly, others change slowly.

**2. Social change is community change :** Social change does not refer to the change in the life of an individual or the life patterns of several individuals. It is a change which occurs in the life of the entire community. In other words only that change can be called social change whose influence can be felt in a community form. Social change is social and not individual.

**3. Speed of social change is not uniform :** While social change occurs in all societies, its speed is not uniform in every society. In most societies it occurs so slowly that it is often not noticed by those who live in them. Even in modern societies there seems to be little or no change in many areas. Social change in urban areas is faster than the rural areas.

**4. Nature and speed of social change is affected by and related to time factor :** The speed of social change is not uniform in each age or period in the same society. In modern times the speed of social change is faster today than before 1947. Thus, the speed of social change differs from age to age. The reason is that the factors which cause social change do not remain uniform with the change in times. Before 1947 there was less industrialization. Therefore, the speed of social change after 1947 has been faster than before 1947.

**5. Social change occurs as an essential law :** Change is the law of nature. Social change also is natural. It may occur either in the natural course or as a result of planned efforts. By nature we desire change. Our needs keep on changing to satisfy our desire for change and our changing needs social change and becomes a necessity. The truth is that we are anxiously waiting for a change. According to Green, "the enthusiastic response of change has become almost a way of life.

**6. Definite prediction of social change is not possible :** It is difficult to make any prediction about the exact forms of social change. There is no inherent law of social change according to which it would assume definite forms. We may say that on account of the social reform movement untouchability will be abolished from the Indian society; that the basis and ideals of marriage will change due to the marriage laws passed by the government that industrialization will increase the speed of urbanisation but we can not predict the exact forms which social relationships will assume in future. Like wise it cannot be predicted as to what shall be our attitudes, ideas, norms and values in future.

**7. Social change shows chain relation sequence :** A society's pattern of living is a dynamic system of interrelated part. Therefore, change in one of these parts usually reacts on others and those an additional ones until they bring a change in the whole mode of life of many people. For example, industrialization has destroyed the domestic system of production. The destruction of domestic system of production brought women from the home to the



factory and the office. The employment of women meant their independence from the bondage of man. It brought a change in their attitudes and ideas. It meant a new social life for women. It consequently affected every part of the family life.

**8. Social change results from the interaction of a number of factors :** Generally, it is brought that a particular factor like changes in technology, economic development or climate conditions causes social change. This is called movistic theory which seeks to interpret. Social change in terms of one single factor. But the movistic theory does not provide an adequate explanation of the complex phenomenon of social change. As a matter of fact, social change is the consequence of factors. A special factor may trigger a change but it is always associated with other factors that make the triggering possible. The reason is that social phenomena are mutually interdependent. None stands out as isolated forces that bring about change of themselves. Rather each is an element in a system. Modification of one parts influences the other parts and these influence the rest, until the whole is involved.

**9. Social changes are chiefly those of modification or of replacement :** Social changes may be broadly categorised as modifications or replacements. It may be modification of physical goods or social relationships. For example, the form of our breakfast food had changed. Though we eat the same basic materials which we ate earlier, wheat, eggs, corn, but their form is changed. Ready to eat- cornflakes, breads, omlettes are substituted for the form in which these same materials were consumed in yester year. These may also be modifications of social relationships. The old authoritarian family has become the small equalitarian family, the one room school has become a centralized school. Our ideas about women's rights, religion, government and co-education stand modified today.

Change also takes the form of replacements. A new material or non-material form supplants an old one. Horses have been replaced by automobiles. Similarly, old ideas have been replaced by new ideas. Democracy has replaced aristocracy.

#### **KINDS OF SOCIAL CHANGE**

In the most concrete of 'Change', every social system is changing all the time. This followed from the fact that at the very least its members are growing older and are, therefore, undergoing physiological transformations, some of which affect their role performance. Changes due to aging may not be very important in the short run, but there are other short-run changes going on continuously. For example, in the very process of interacting with one another, the members of a social system subtly affects one another's attitudes, including their mutual expectations, If the social system is a sub-system of a larger one, then its members are also being subtly changed in their abilities and attitudes by their participation in social system other than the system of reference.

Despite the existence of such continuous change, we often speak of a social system as being relatively stable, and we may even speak of it as unchanging. Such judgements imply that some kinds of change are regarded as more important than others and that for certain



purposes some changes may be ignored. It will be the purpose of this section to specify the various kinds of social change and the contexts in which each may be important.

### **CHANGE IN SOCIAL VALUES**

The most important kind of structural change is change in the comprehensive standards that we have called values. It will be recalled that values are a kind of norm but that we use the term 'Value' when we wish to imply that the norm in question affects or is expressed in more specific norms. 'Fair play' is a value. The rule that a Judge should disqualify himself in certain cases is a norm. The values we have in mind here are, of course, values that directly affect the content of social roles and social interaction, not purely cultural values such as classification in art. It is the relatively comprehensive character of change in social values that leads us to regard this kind of change as the most important. It is likely to have far-reaching consequences for the more detailed aspect of social structure and for the over-all functioning of social systems.

On a more analytical level, this change in values may be viewed as a change in the relative emphasis upon different system problems, or different functional subsystems of society. In a feudal society, the highest social positions, those that manifest the chief values, are in the goal attainment and integrative sub-systems predominantly. Economic functions, while important because they are necessary, are not valued so highly as the others. In the industrial-commercial type of society, however, economic production is more highly valued and leaders in this field of activity have greater prestige.

### **INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE**

Under "Institutional Change" we mean to include change in all more definite structures, such as forms of organization roles, and role content. A change from a polygamous to a monogamous system, from an absolute monarchy to a democracy, from private enterprise to socialism—these are examples of society-wide institutional changes. With respect to smaller social systems, comparable changes occur.

As with changes in values, so with changes in particular patterns such as norms and roles, a change may consist in the introduction of something new or in a shift in the relative importance of patterns already existing. The change from a dictatorship to parliamentary government in a particular society is the introduction of something new, accompanied, of course, by the disappearance of an older form. Changes that affect many groups within a society may involve some innovation that at first is not important so far as the structure of the whole society is concerned but becomes important as it gradually spreads and establishes itself as the normal pattern for groups of the relevant type.

### **CHANGE IN PERSONNEL**

Independent of any changes in the value pattern, institutional pattern, and quantitative distribution of possessions and rewards, changes may occur in the particular persons occupying the roles of a social system. Over a long period of time, such changes are of course inevitable since people grow old and retire or die.



The importance of these change varies. At a very concrete level of analysis, it is always important who occupies a particular social position. At this level, every one is unique in his capacities and developed abilities. In a subtle way, the normative system itself—the detailed expectations with regard to quality and kind of role performance—is affected by the unique personality of the role occupant. However, taking all the roles of a large social system as a whole, the change effected by a turnover in personal along is ordinarily not great, and not great enough to be regarded as structural change. It is usually regarded as an aspect of the endlessly varied flow of interaction within a given social structure.

### QUESTIONS

1. What is social change ? Discuss its characteristics.
2. Define social change. Discuss its main kinds.

### Books Recommended

- |                    |   |                    |
|--------------------|---|--------------------|
| 1. Mac Iver & Page | — | Society.           |
| 2. Gilliu & Gilliu | — | Cultural Sociology |
| 3. Kingsly Davis   | — | Human Society.     |
| 4. Lichter         | — | Sociology.         |





## Social Evolution and Social Progress

The term 'evolution' comes from the Latin word 'evoloere' which means to develop or to 'unfold'. It is equivalent to the Sanskrit word 'Vikas; It means more than growth. The word, growth' connotes a direction of change but only of a quantitative character, eg, we say population grow. Evolution involves something more intrinsic. Change not merely in size but atleast in structure also, for example, when we speak of biological evolution, we refer to the emergence of certain organisms from others in a kind of succession. Evolution describes a series of related changes in a system of some kind. It is process in which hidden or latent characters of a thing reveal themselves. It is an order of change which unfolds the variety of aspects belonging to the nature of the changing object. We can not speak of evolution when an object or system is changed by forces acting it from without. The change must occur within the changing unity as the manifestation of forces operative within it. But since nothing is independent of the universe, evolution also involves a changing adaptation of the object to its environment, and after adaptation a further manifestation of its own nature. Thus evolution is a continuous process of differentiation –cum–integration.

The concept of evolution as a process of differentiation cum integration was first developed by the German sociologist Von Baer and subsequently by Darwin, Spencer and many others. Spencer writes : societies show integration, both by simple increase of mass and by coalescence and recoalescence of masses. The changes from homogeneous to heterogeneous is multitudinously exemplified, up from the simple tribe, also in all parts, to the civilized nation full of structural and functional unlikeness. With progressive integration and heterogeneously goes increasing coherence– simultaneously comes increasing definiteness. Social organization is at first vague; advance brings settled arrangements which grow slowly more precise; Customs pass into laws, which while gaining fixity, also become more specific in their applications to variety of actions, and all institutions at first confusedly intemingled, slowly separated at the same time that each within itself marks off more distinctly its components structures. Thus in all respects is fulfilled the formula of evolution. There is process towards greater size, coherence, multiformity and definiteness.”

### **Characteristics of Social Evolution :**

Herbert Spencer has prescribed four important principles of evolution. These principles are :

1. Social evolution is one cultural or human aspect of the law of change, of cosmic evolution.
2. Hence social evolution takes place in the same way at all places and processes through some definite and inevitable stages.
3. Social evolution is gradual.
4. Social evolution is progressive.



In addition to these four characteristics, three other features of social evolution are clearly evident from its foregoing definition :

1. Social evolution takes place through the process of differentiation. In order to understand this, do study the history of a society over a long period of time and you will find that its association, institutions, etc. are constantly evolving or developing. In social evolution new and ever newer circumstances and problems are constantly appearing. In order to cope with them new associations and institutions are evolved. Take community in a town. Previously, when the town had been a small community its management was the responsibility of a Panchayat or a Town Area Committee. Now that the town has become a big commercial centre. Its management is in the hands of a dozen different committees. One of them looks after the educational facilities, another looks after the sanitation, a third is deputed to look after the octroi while a fourth manages the market, and so on. In this way, this differentiation increases with the evolution of the town.

2. But without integration this differentiation can not take one anywhere. Hence synthesis, alongwith differentiation, is necessary. In cities while you will find sectarian association such as kayastha society, Maharashtrian samiti etc., you also find institution which synthesize and compromise associations based on various caste and class distinctions. Today, while new nations are coming into being in the human society, equally strong efforts are being made to create a world society by compromising these nations.

3. By virtue of this double process of differentiation and integration the efficiency of the society is being constantly increased. Division of labour is the magic world of modern economic evolution. By an increase in the number of associations and institutions in society, work in various sphere is performed more successfully and because of the process of synthesis various spheres take advantage of each others efficiency also.

In the theory of social evolution Herbert Spencer applies the biological principles of survival of the fittest and struggle for survival to society. Many scientists have found this theory tenable and have offered their explanations of it. Hobhouse has written, "By evolution I mean any sort of growth, by social progress the growth of social life in respect of those qualities to which human beings can attach or can reasonably attach values. The principle of social evolution maintains that there is linear progress in society, but all scientists do not accept social evolution as a linear evolution. Some scholars believe it to be unilineal while others considers it to be cyclical. According to Morgan, Haddon and Eugels, the evolution of every society passes through the three following stages— (i) Savagery, (ii) Barbarism, and (iii) Civilization. In the same way these scholars have held that there are four stages in the economic development of every society— (i) Hunting, (ii) Pastoral, (iii) Agricultural, and (iv) Industrial stages. According to the evolutionistic principle, there are three recognized stages in the development of technology— (i) Stone Age, (ii) Bronze Age and (ii) Iron Age. In the same way, the evolutionists have attempted to show that there are stages of development in the various institutions of human society, such as marriage, family, religion, property, law, government, etc.



But some scholars have indulged in the bitter criticism of this evolutionist opinion. A goldenweiser, writing in *The History and Prospects of the Social Science* has staunchly advocates this viewpoint. According to these scholars it is fallacious to conceive of evolution in the social sphere. The description of the states of the development of society is no more than a fit of imagination. There is no historical evidence supporting the description of these stages of technological, economic and cultural development. And it is entirely wrong to believe that there occurs orderly progress, of the same type in every society because each society has its own peculiar circumstances, and any changes that occur in it concur with its conditions. These conditions are always changing and this change also is not orderly and uniform.

### **Reality of Social Evolution :**

In his famous book 'Society' Maciver supports the principle of social evolution. According to Maciver, social evolution is the process where by all that is implicit is made manifest successively or showly. Direct increase is not called evolution. In evolution the structure of an object changes alongwith an increase in its size. It is that increasant and unwavering process of quantitative and qualitative change by which the internal characters of an object appear and become distinct and clear. Thus the fundamental characteristic of evolution is differentiation (which comprehends the sense of unification).

What is the reality behind social evolution? In order to reach some definite conclusion in this connection, it would be useful to acquaint one-self with the arguments given by Maciver and Page in favour of the reality of social evolution. Roughly speaking, these arguments are as follows :

1. The variety and difference to be seen between primitive and civilized societies is also to be seen between the different kinds of animals in the animal society. Hence, from the variety in human society it can not be occluded that there is no reality in the principle of evolution.

2. The existence in social life, of the process of differntiation is the proof of there being evolution in society. Maciver holds that if evolution in the form of unilineal evolution, is to be so interpreted as to mean that some of the specific institutions of society after passing through many stages in a definite order, become the social circumstances of developed societies, then the reality of evolution can not be accepted. The reality of evolution is in the process of differentiation. It is only due to this process that in every society, as time passes new association, systems, groups and institutions develop to perform different functions. In this way, all the various groups political, economic, religious, religious, cultural are continuously developed.

3. The reality of social evolution is even better evinced in the revealing composition of modern societies with primitive societies. In primitive societies every family or at the most one kin group collectively performs all the activities such as farming, hunting, fighting, etc.



Neither were there any classes as there are in modern societies, nor any specific associations for the performance of particular functions. Even the religious, cultural and educational institutions were not distinct. On the contrary, in modern societies one finds differentiation in the religious, economic, cultural, veriey all spheues. It is evidence that this difference between primitive and modern societies is due to the reality of social evolution.

### **Social Progress :**

The literal meaning of the word 'progress' is moving forward towards some objective or simply 'moving forward'; But moving forward or backward, progress or regress are relative terms. If it be remarked, that such and such a country has progressed no meaningful information can be extracted from such a statement unless the direction towards which progress has been made be known. In this way, progress is not mere change. It is change in a particular direction. The word progress can not be appended to change in every direction. For example, if the condition of agriculture in a particular country worsens and a famine results, it is underiably a change, but it will not be called progress. Progress means moving forward in the direction and achievement of some aim. In this way, its connotation is less comprehensive than that of evolution. As a general statement the definition by Burgess can suffice. According to it, any change or adaptation to an existent environment that makes it easier for a person or a group of persons or other organised form of life to live may be said to represent progress. In this way progress can roughly be descriptive of any change that assistants in the life of individual, group or institution because even though not an ultimate value, 'to live' is certainly a primary and indispensable value. Thus, any change desirous of being dignified by the name of social progress should at least be life-giving.

### **Characteristics of Social Progress :**

The concept of progress will be clarified by a knowledge of its characteristics. The following are its main general characteristics :

**1. There is change in progress :** Progress is change or motion in some direction. Hence, change is its first essential characteristics.

**2. In progress, the desired aim is achieved, but mere change can not be called progress.** It can be called progress only when it fulfils the desired aim. Whatever this desired objective may be it must be beneficial and pertain to welfare since no one desirous of his own ill being.

**3. Progress is Communal :** Progress, in its ethical and certain other meanings is also personal but in sociology this meaning of 'progress is not accepted since sociology is the science of society and in it, the individual is taken into consideration only as a part of society. Thus progress, according to sociology, is communal or in other words, in progress the entire group moves ahead in some desired direction.

**4. Both harm and gain are possible in progress :** It is not that there is only gain and no loss in progress, although ultimately, ofcourse, there is more gain than loss. In case the



loss is greater than gain, the social change involved cannot be called progress. In every progress the community has to suffer hardship and make sacrifices. In gaining its independence what hardships did India not suffer and what sacrifices was it not compelled to make? But nevertheless every struggle in the history of independence was a step towards progress.

**5. Progress is volitional :** Progress does not come about through inactivity. Desire and volition are needed for progress. It is an uphill task. Efforts have to be made and when these efforts are successful it is called progress. It must be remembered that every effort is not progress since efforts are also wasted and despite the most desperate endeavour we make no headway whatsoever.

**6. Concept of progress is variable :** The concept of progress does not remain constant in all times and all places. That which is today considered the symbol of progress may tomorrow be considered and treated as a sign of regress.

### **Criteria of Progress :**

As in the case of conditions for progress, it is difficult to explain or describe the criteria of progress, which also are relative to their temporal context. Social values are the criteria of progress, and social values change with time and place. Hence it is difficult to formulate a universally acceptable criterion of progress. But nevertheless, the following can be tentatively suggested.

**1. Health and longevity of life :** Average length of life is the one sure index of whether the world is growing better. But it does not necessarily follow from this that a longer life must also be more pleasurable and better. Hence this criterion is inadequate.

**2. Wealth :** In the opinion of some persons, wealth or economic progress is a criterion of progress. But what does wealth avail when an individual lacks in health? In a country like India, religion has always been valued more highly than wealth.

**3. Population :** Some people hold that an increase in population is a sign of progress. But if this is so, then it is India and China and not England and America, which should be considered the most progressive countries.

**4. Moral Conduct :** According to some thinkers, including then Mahatma Gandhi, it is moral conduct that is the criterion of progress. This view is generally correct and tenable but its difficulty arises from the fact that moral basis is undefined.

### **Differentiation Between Evolution and Progress :**

What, in fact do we mean by progress, if evolution is not progress? Ginsberg defines progress as a development or evolution in a direction which satisfies rational criteria of value. According to Ogburn, progress is a movement towards an objective, thought to be desirable by the general group, for the visible future. According to Maciver, "By progress we imply not merely direction, but direction towards some final goal, some destination determined ideally not simply by the objective consideration at work". According to Pourgess, "Any change of adaptation to an existent environment that makes it easier for a person or group of persons or other organised form of life to live may be said to represent progress."



According to Lumely, Progress is change, but it is change in a desired or approved direction not any other direction. The nature of progress depends on two factors : the nature of the end and the distance at which we are from it. Thus when we say that we are progressing we mean that society is flourishing both materially and morally. Evolution is merely change, the change may be for the better or the worse. When we speak of social evolution we refer to the emergence of certain institution. The emergence of the institution may or may not be welcomed by the people. The reference is to an objective condition which is not evaluated as good or bad. But when we speak of progress we imply not merely direction, but direction towards some final goal, some destination determined ideally. Progress means change for the better, and hence implies a value judgement. It is not possible to speak of progress without reference to standards. Hobhouse writes, by evolution I mean any sort of growth by social progress the growth of social life in respect of those qualities to which human being can attach or can rationally attach values." According to Mazumdar, H.T. Progress must atleast contain six ingredients : (1) enhancement of the dignity of man (2) respect for each human personality, (3) ever increasing freedom for spiritual quest and for investigation of truth, (4) freedom for creativity and for aesthetic enjoyment of the works of nature as well as of man, (5) a social order that promotes the first four values and (6) promotes life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, with justice and equity to all.

Thus it is clear that evolution cannot be progress. It is not logically necessary that evolutionar process should always move in the direction of Progress. That society has evolved, all agree, all agree. That society has progressed all would not agree because we can not speak of progress without reference to standards and standards, as we know, are eminently subjective. If the process of evolution satisfies also our sense of values and if it brings a fuller realization of the values we cherish them for us it is also progress.

In short, no single criterion can be used as a test of progress. Societies are complexes made up of many important elements. Progress is achieved if, in a society, all respects of social life move in a coordinated manner towards desired ends.

### QUESTIONS

1. What is social evolution ? Discuss its characteristics.
2. Define social evolution. Discuss its real nature.
3. What is social progress. Discuss the characteristics of social progress.
4. Define social progress. Discuss the criteria, of social progress.
5. What is the difference between social evolution and social Progress ? Define.

### Books Recommended

1. Gillin & Gillin
2. Fichter.





## Revolution and Innovation

### REVOLUTION :

The word “revolution, like the term, evolution,” entered into the general vocabulary of social sciences by way of natural sciences. By definition, revolution is a fundamental, rapid, and violent change in political organization, power relationship, stratification, economic property control, and the predominant myth of a social order within society. Revolution is thus the most radical form of social change. Before we proceed further with the patterns of revolutionary change, it should be noted that not all such change can be equated with force or violence, nor does it always entail initiation by anti-establishment forces or radical alteration in social structure or political organization. For example, many of the revolutions in Latin America prior to world war II Considered of overthrowing Colonel. A by General Y and his followers, but nothing after the overthrow change in the basic structure of society. Similarly, Max Gluckman studied what he calls ‘rebellion cycles, in a number of pre-colonial African Kingdoms. He found that periodic rebellions and replacement by one calan over another served to strengthen rather than weaken the established political and economic structure. Their social systems peristed for generations with minor modifications until truly radical changes were introduced by Western colonial powers.

Similarly, there have been what may be designated as “revolutionary changes in science. A change in the though system, or world view, is revolutionary in the extreme and has wide ramifications in technological, economic, political, and religious spheres of life, this is according to Gerlach and Hine. For example, when Nicholas copernicus, the Polish astronomer described the sun as the centre of a great system with earth revolving around it, revolutionary changes in astronomy resulted. Johann Gutenberg invented the printing press in 1937, thus revollutionizing the technique of disseminating knowledge. The name of Isaac Newton and Albert Einstein do not require to commentaries in terms of their revolutionary contribution to science. In medicine, we need only consider some examples such as Louis Pasteur, Conard Wileim Roentgen, who discovered the X-ray machine, or Ignaz Philip Semmelueis, who through the use of antiseptic methods in obstetrics significantly reduced deaths from presperal fever. These are just a few illustrations to show that revolutionary and radical forms of social change need not always be violent or involve the basic structures in society.

### THEORIES OF REVOLUTION :

Crane Brinton : Brinton, Drawing on information from American, French and Russian Revolution and the English Revolution of the 17th century, finds that in none of the cases were conditions growing steadily worse. Our American ancestors were making economic progress at the time of the Revolutionary war. It is true that France was undergoing crop shortages at the time of her revolution, but she had experienced a century of rather rapid progress in total output before then. In all cases, however, there was cristis at the Governmental level. A need for new taxes, combined with governmental ineptitude, at a time when there



was a rising class of able and determined people demanding more rights, played a part in each of the revolutions. With each revolution there was middle-class leadership and an abandonment of the old order by the leading intellectuals.

**James C. Davies** :— Davies, using a slightly different group of revolutions for illustrative purpose, adds an important factor. Although there is usually a general increase in the well-being and hopes of the revolutionary elements involved, something occurs that seems to shatter their hopes. There is a downturn in prosperity or employment or a serious threat of such a downturn. In neither the Brinton nor the Davis analysis is there the implication that misery alone will lead to revolution. Many societies have existed in a state of misery too long to make this seem to be the single ingredient of revolution.

**Talwit Parsons** :— In Parson's analysis of the revolutionary movement, it is pointed out that a revolutionary movement demands a complex of circumstances. The rise of a revolutionary movement demands large widely distributed alienative element," who are able to pull together, united by a vision of the future. The vision might be of a religious nature in which case it will result in a religious rather than a revolutionary movement. Under the right circumstances, however, these elements can be united behind a charismatic leader with an exciting ideology of change. Even at this point there must be a weakness in the power structure or a revolution is impossible.

Persons carried his analysis of revolution a step further, showing that there is an adaptive transformation so that the new order retain some elements of the old. It is not surprising that Communist Russia should have retained a secret police force such as had existed in the days of the Czars, nor that in foreign policy. They should again cast hungry glances as Eastern Europe and the Dardanells, nor that a military elite would again be very prominent in the system. This is not to deny that revolutions make great and sweeping changes, but it does remind us that there is a certain persistence to a social system and a culture.

#### **Pattern of Revolution :**

The patterns of revolution according to Johnson, can be analyzed in term of (i) the targets selected for attack— government personal, political regime, the community as a social unit (ii) the nature of the carriers of the revolution— mass or an elite ; and (iii) its goals and ideologies— reformist, nostalgic, nation— forming elitist, or nationalist. On the basis of these he identified six patterns :

**1. The jacquerie** : A spontaneous mass peasant rising, generally carried out in the name of the traditional authorities, Church and King, and with the limited objectives of purging local or national elites. Examples would include the peasant revolt of 1381, Ket's Rebellion of 1549, and the Pugachev Rebellion in Russia from 1773-1775.

**2. The Millerarian Rebellion** : Similar to the first one but with the extra feature of a utopian dream fostered by a living messiah. This pattern is rather widespread and found in all parts of the world. Illustrations of this would include the Florentine Revolution led by Savonarrola in 1494, the Taj Ping Rebellion, and the Mau Mau Rebellion. In more recent



times, Hitler offered overwhelming proof of the significance of a living messiah and a charismatic leader.

**3. The Anarchistic Rebellion :** A nostalgic reaction to progressive change involving a romantic idealization of the previous order. Illustrations of this would include the Vendee, the Boxer Revolt, and the Pilgrimage of Greece.

**4. The Jacobin Communist Revolution :** A rather rare phenomenon, which has been defined as a sweeping fundamental change in political organization, social structure, economic property control and the predominate myth of a social order, thus indicating a major break in the continuity of development. The pattern of revolution can occur only in a highly centralized state with good communications and a large capital city and its target is the government or the regime. Revolutions of this nature serve to increase national consciousness and to create a more rational and stranger state and social structure. Such revolutionary patterns occurred in France, Turkey, Russia and China.

**5. The Conspirational Coup'd'etat :** The planned work of a small elite fired by an oligarchic sectarian ideology. It is considered a revolutionary pattern only if it in fact anticipates a social movement and inaugurates social change. Examples include the Nassar revolution in Egypt or the castro revolution in Cuba. Johnson contends that this pattern of revolution must be distinguished from palace revolts, bandity, assassinations, strike, dynastic successions— conflict, and other forms of violence, none of which could entail social change.

**6. The Militanized Mass Insurrection :** A deliberately planned mass revolutionary war guided by a dedicated elite. The outcome of guerrilla warfare is determined by political altitudes, not by military strategy or material and the rebels are wholly dependent on broad popular support. In the example, found in Yugoslavia, Algeria, Vietnam and China, the ideology that attracted mass following has been a combination of Levophobic nationalism and Marxism, with a some what heavier emphasis on the former.

Like any categorization of historical processes, Johnson's typology of patterns of revolution is concerned with ideal types. In reality, individual revolutions may at times, display characteristics of several different patterns conditioned by the targets, carries, and ideologies of the revolution of difficulty with Johnson's scheme is his distinction between rebellion and revolution. The former tends to concentrate on individuals, rather than institutions, with a retrospective out look, whereas the latter seeks to change institutions and social structures and are innovative. To simplify the distinction between rebellion and revolution. Smith proposed fourfold typology :

- (i) Simple rebellion, such as the Jacquerie, which is nonideological and attempts changes only in the personnel.
- (ii) Ideological rebellion— Such as anarchism, which attempts to restore the old order as well as change to present elite.
- (iii) Simple revolution, such as the early American Revolution, where the ideology attempts alterations in some values, such as governmental or economic, which leaving others intact.



- (iv) Total revolution, such as in France or China, which attempts to structure the entire society.

For each revolutionary pattern, it is possible also to establish quantitative changes in several domains. Basically, all revolutionary patterns deal with the class, status, and power systems.

Although revolution is seen as affecting all three components of the satisfaction system (class, status and power), the transfer of power from one social group to another is usually considered the most crucial. Various significant factors have been considered to precede such transfer of power on a wide scale, but there seems to be a substantial disagreement in the literature about which of these are of paramount importance. Marx, Crane Brinton, and others see economic fluctuations and the increasing non legitimacy for revolution. Even among these theorists, however, there is some disagreement. The marxist agree that economic conflict between classes plays the primary usual role in revolution. Briniten advocates the arguments of relative deprivation' or rising expectations.

In combining the various causal arguments, Hagopian distinguished between 'long-term' and 'middle-term' causes of revolution. The former would include such considerations as economic growth, technological innovations, the growth of science, democratizations, secularizations, growth of the modern state, and the growth of modern nationalism. Middle-term causes of revolution would include economic depression alienation of the intellectual, division and ineptitude in the ruling class, war and government financial crises.

In U.S. patterns of revolution have been manifested in recent years in attempts of "devising the alternate society." The alternatives include food, co-operations, free schools, communal living, run away houses, drugs, free clinics, occult and mystic beliefs, legal defence funds, repressions, break clothing; underground press and switch board information exchanges. The object seems to be to discard capitalism, organized religion, the necessity for wedlock, and the social unit of the family. As one advocator suggested, the bomb is at one end of it, organic food at the other end, and in between is everything from alternate schools to disorganized religious services— for every institution now existing there is an alternate one developing.

In sum, revolutions are best studied in retrospect. Although the objectives of revolutions are always clearly stated and concluded in emotional and ideological terms, it is very difficult to predict their outcomes accurately. There will always be a discrepancy between ideals and reality. In Mao Tse Tung's words. 'Any thing can grow out of the barrel of a gun.

**Innovation** :— An innovation is an idea for accomplishing some recognized social end in a new way or for a means of accomplishing some new social end. The idea or pattern of ideas may become manifest as a new kind of tool or mechanical device, as a new process or technical procedure, as a new material or substance, as a place or terrain previously unknown to man, as a new mode of human action, or as a new concept or belief. Whatever the manifestation the innovating consists of the creation of a unique and to significant degree



unprecedented mental construct, the idea that makes possible the 'thing'. An idea of how to construct a new tool, how to live a tribal or other form of life, how to pacify Gods, or how to make music on a violin is not, of course, socially significant apart from its actual manifestation. Nevertheless, it is invariably antecedent to the latter antecedent both in the sense that the manifestation originates in the idea and that in operation it is the idea that makes the manifestation Possible. Thus his possessing a set of modern carpenter's tools would not make a carpenter out of a primitive India, nor would the fact that he played the part of a man of finance make an actor a financier. The tools of a carpenter are only the material manifestations of the skills and knowledge that in use make the tools effective. Should a qualified carpenter be deprived of his tools, he could, presumably, make do with makeshift devices. Should a society be stripped of its capital plant and even of a majority of its members, the social system could be reconstructed in all physical and operational manifestations as long as there were some survivors with knowledge of the mental heritage of the society.

It is mainly from the history of technology that what knowledge there is of the innovative process is derived. Antifacts of one sort and another, plus in some instances pictorial representations, provide some evidence, however crude and fragmentary, of the technology of prehistoric peoples, while there is nothing at all to indicate anything of their social life, their religious beliefs, and their knowledge and understanding of the universe. As the modern period is approached, the record of technological development is always clearer and more detailed than that of development in other aspects of life, even the ideological, which by its nature tends to be embodied in writing. Thus there are fairly detailed accounts of the invention and developments of the steam engine, whereas knowledge concerning the invention and development of the joint-stock company as a form of economic organisation must in the main be inferred. R.J. Forbes said that "whereas the analysis of the innovative process that follows is derived mainly from the history of mechanics, the fine arts, medicine, world exploration, and the physical and biological sciences, there is no reason to believe that innovation in social organization or ideology follows a different course." Wherever there is detailed evidence on innovation in these realms, the conditions and procedures seem very much the same, some exceptions are to be noted in the case of innovation in organization. For one thing, innovations in organization are often very crude to begin with and must go through a longer period of developmental refinement than is necessary with most innovations in technology and ideology.

#### **Necessity is the Mother of Innovation :**

Innovation has often been described as a synthesis of existing social elements into a unique pattern, not the elements. Some writers prefer to speak of innovation as "creative synthesis" a reference to the well known fact that by definition a synthesis is more than a sum of its separate parts. Thus a modern watch, it might be said, is a creative synthesis of cogwheels, shafts, and springs which together have the valuable faculty of running at a constant speed and thus of measuring time. This way of putting the matter conveys, or may convey, the entirely false impression that a modern watch was an invention achieved in a



single creative synthesis; where as it was in fact a synthesis of a long series of specific innovation, each prerequisite to those that followed.

Even the remarkably predictive ideas of Jules Verne were innovative only as fictions. Verne projected into fantasy some of the then-current trends in mechanics and engineering, much as modern science fiction writers do with current knowledge and hypothesis regarding the universe. He did not invent the submarine, the base invention had long since been made. What he did was to imagine, unrestrained by realities. What the submarine might be when it was fully developed. The actual development of the submarine came through a series of specific innovations, no one of which was even suggested by Verne's functional protection.

Under the stimulation of group interaction, an individual may be aroused from his normal mental torpidity to the end that he recalls facts and ideas that he otherwise might not, at that moment, recall; and when numbers of individuals are so aroused, the total of what they mobilize to pool may be more than they could otherwise muster. Evidently, it was this possibility that gave rise to the much-touted brain storming sessions among advertising copywriters a few years ago. Creative thinking, as distinct from simple recalling is not, however; facilitated by stimulation of this sort; on the contrary it is more likely to be inhibited under stress, social or circumstantial, an individual may solve a routine problem in a routine manner more quickly than he otherwise would; this is what happens when a motorist successfully extricates himself from a traffic crisis. Routine problem solving does not however, require the repetitive and exhaustive trial and error that is involved in creative thinking and that is only interrupted and disrupted by external stimulation.

The idea that numbers of people assembled can be more innovative than can any one of them alone, that a decision produced by a group is somehow superior to one arrived at by a single individual, and that the great virtue of what is known as the democratic process is that it has been an individual mind, not some synthetic mind produced through the interaction of the various members of a group, that has upon occasion come to a social perceptum of a problem, proceeded through laborious and inherently discouraging trial and error to solve it in an unconventional way, and ultimately—upon a trial that was judged worthy of list.

### QUESTIONS

1. What is revolution, ? Discuss the social change due to revolution ?
2. What is the importance of innovation in social change ?
3. Write short note on :—
  - (i) Innovation
  - (ii) Revolution

### Books Recommended

1. T. Parson — Social System
2. P. Vague — Social Organization.





**Evolutionary Theory of Social Change**

In the latter half of the 19th century, the concept of evolution assumed a central place in explanations of all forms of human development in both the social and biological sciences. The most influential among the biological evolutionists was Charles Darwin, whose theory of natural selection provided a solid base for the explanation of biological evolution. Just as biologists traced a stages in the development of the organisms, Sociologists envisioned society as proceeding inevitably through a fixed set of stages— for example, from savagery through barbarism to civilization. This evolution was believed to occur in response to a set of natural laws' that explained each stages in the organisation of society in terms of the stage that preceded it. More over, the idea of evolution was tied with ideas of progress, development and advancement; each stage represented 'higher' stage than the one before it, with the finl stage in the series approximating societal perfection.

It is a popular misconception, however; to assume that 19th century social evolutionism, as advocated by Darwin, to the investigation of social institutions. Many of the major works on social evolution appeared before the publication of Darwin's book, notably those of Comte and Spencer. Moreover, the difference between the theory of biological evolution and the theory of social evolution is substantial, it was substantial in the 19th century, especially after Darwins and Wallace's researches appeared and the difference increased after the long, ignored results of Mendel's remarkable studies in genetics became synthesized with Darwinian theory of natural selection. This too, is a point well worth emphasis, for too often we in the social sciences leave the impression that own studies of social evolution or development, even of social change generally proceed from a theory or method common to biological and social sciences but they do not, according to Nigbet.

In evolutionary theories, typologies are dominant. The object of inquiry in any theory of social evolution seems to be invariably social class, kinship, culture, law, society as a whole, or one of the dozens of the other types and structures into which the normative and institutionalized behaviour of human beings are classified. The early sociologists all believed in social evolution, the progressive development of social patterns over long periods of time. Among others Augusts Comte particularly concerned with the identification of the type of stage through which they assumed all societies must pass.

The theories of progress, that developed broadly and loosely in the 18th century, particularly by Cendorcet, and advanced in the early 19th centure, particularly by Saint Simon, formed the starting point for Comte's thinking, which centered in the explicit search for a law of progress. Comte, like many of the philosophers of his period in France, believed in progress towards a perfect society. He insisted, however, that it would come to about not by political revolution, but by the proper application of the new moral science, which he



named 'Sociology' in 1939. The highest of all sciences, it would use the 'positivist' Scientific method of observation, experimentation, and comparison to understand order and promote progress.

The road to perfect society involved the human intellect passing through three historical phases of sophistication : the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive. The progress of knowledge, which is the underlying basis for his theory of evolution through the law of the three stages, is not only inevitable but also irreversible. It is, in addition, symptomatic, that is we always approach, but never attain, perfect positive knowledge.

Comte's description of each of the three stages is as follows. In the theological stage, people think that inanimate objects are alive. This general view itself goes through phases; animism or fetishism, which views each object as having its own will; polytheism, which believes that many divine wills impose themselves on objects; and monotheism, which conceives the will of one God as imposing itself on objects. The second, or metaphysical, stage is a period when causality is explained in terms of abstract forces; causes and forces replace deities, and one great entity, nature prevails. The third, or positive, stage is the scientific period when persons develop explanations in terms of natural processes and scientific law. At this point in a society's development it becomes possible to control human events. Comte contended that Western civilization had already reached the positive stage in control of the physical environment and was on the verge of the positive stage with respect to social relations.

Each stage not only exhibits a particular form of mental development but also has a corresponding material development. In the theological state, military life predominates, in the metaphysical state, legal forms achieve dominance; and the positive stage is the stage of industrial society. Thus, Comte held that historical development shows a matching movement of ideas and institutions.

Lewis Henry Morgan, an early American, anthropologist also saw societies as evolving through a number of stages. His principal attention was focussed on technological factors, kinship system, and property system and their relations to social and political institutions. On the basis of historical and anthropological data, he concluded that the societies could be ordered along an evolutionary continuum through which human must pass everywhere. He argued that the experience of people has run in nearly uniform channels. Human necessities under similar conditions have been essentially the same, and the operation of human mentality is uniform throughout the various human societies. He described the progress of human kind through three main stages of evolution; savagery; barbarism, and civilization. The stages of savagery and barbarism were further subdivided into lower, middle, and upper, such that the entire scheme had altogether seven gradations of evolution. They are as follows :

1. Lower status of Savagery— From the Infancy of Human Race to the commencement of the next period.



2. Middle Status of savagery— From the acquisition of a fish subsistence and a knowledge of the use of fire, to etc.
3. Upper status of savagery— From the invention of the Bow and Arrow, to etc.
4. Lower status of barbarism— From the invention of the art of pottery, to etc.
5. Middle status of barbarism— From the domestication of animals on the eastern hemisphere, and in the western from the cultivation of maize and plants by irrigation, with the use of adobe-brick and stone, to etc.
6. Upper status of the barbarism—From the invention of the process of smelting iron ore, with the use of iron tools, to etc.
7. Status of civilization— From the invention of a phonetic alphabet, with the use of writing, to the present time.

Each stage and substage was assumed to have been initiated by a major technological invention. Thus, the second stage of savagery was brought into being by the art of making fire and catching fish, and the third by how and arrow. Barbarism began with the invention of pottery making. Its second stage was characterised by the domestication of animals, and its third by the technology of melting iron. Civilization was heralded by the invention of the phonetic alphabet. Each of these stages of technological evolution according to Morgans was correlated with characteristic developments in religion, the family, political organization and property arrangement.

According to Spencer, evolution can be seen as one in which matter passes from indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent, heterogeneity. He saw evolution as an unilinear development, that is, as a steadily continuing accumulative process by which every thing in the cosmos was continually being synthesized at even higher levels of complexity. He maintained that human society had followed as course of natural development, from relatively simple patterns of organization to more complex structures, characterized by an increasing specialization of parts.

Spencer held that the process of social evolution followed inexorable laws of nature in that it led inevitably toward progress, toward progress, toward the development of increasingly desirable and just forms of society. But Spencer also posited that there is an equilibrium between population and food supply. Should the population growth exceed the needed resources for survival, a struggle for existence will occur. Those individuals who are best able to adopt to the new conditions will manage to survive. Central to an understanding of Spencer's evolutionary model is the basic analogy between change in both biological and social organisms. He suggested that an increase in mass or size in either of these organism corresponds to an "increase in structure from a few like parts to numerous interrelated parts.

William Graham Sumner argued that state ways could not change folkways. That is, social improvement could only come about through natural evolution of society and not by legislation. His arguments are still echoed today by those who oppose laws providing for more equitable treatment of minorities on the ground that morality can not be legislated."

---



Lester Frank Ward believed that both human beings and human society had developed through course of evolution, but they maintained that once intellect has evolved in human being, they gained the ability to help shape the subsequent evolution of social forms. Through the application of intelligence, people could effect desired changes in society.

Robert Redfield put the transition as being from folk to urban. He described folk society as :

— Small, isolated and homogenous with a strong sense of group solidarity. The way of living are conventionalized into that coherent system which we call a culture. Behaviour is traditional, spontaneous uncritical and personal. There is no legislation or habit of experiment and reflection for intellectual ends. Kinship, its relationships and institutions are the type categories of experience and the familial group is the unit of action, the sacred prevails over the secular, the economy is one of status rather than of market.

In sum, we may turn to the main assumptions to which, according to Smith, evolutionists subscribed :

- (i) Holism—Studying the whole unit rather than its parts.
- (ii) Universalism— Change is natural, universal, perpetual and ubiquitous, and requires no explanation.
- (iii) Potentiality— Change is inherent and endogenous in the unit undergoing change.
- (iv) Directionality— Change is progressive.
- (v) Determinism— Change is inevitable and irreversible for all units.
- (vi) Gradualism— Change is continuous, cumulative growth.
- (vii) Reductionism— ‘:aws of successions are uniform and the basic topic of change is everywhere the same.

### QUESTIONS

1. What is evolutionary theory of social change ? Explain.
2. Discuss the evolutionary theory of social change.

### Related Books

1. Fichter — Sociology.
2. Maciver & Page — Society.
3. Gillin & Gillin — Cultural Sociology.





## Cyclical Theory of Social Change

Perhaps the oldest motives of social change is that which views society as following a cyclical course. This generalizations 'essentially argues that all main's experience has half and before—a kind of sense of devience on the grand scale, the distributing sensation that we have been along this way before—does not deny change, but it does not deny that it is leading any where over the long term. Rhythmic regularity is the underlying factor in life. It is exhibited in human physiology as heart beat, breathing, hunger, and satiation, and finally as a process of organic growth and decline. The life of every species is a closed cycle of birth and death, forever repeated unit 1 the extinction of the species. Among Homo-Sapiens, one of the most universal observations concerning history is that in many respects, it often repeats itself, speculations have ranged from depictions of history as exactly reproducing itself in tim, through ideas of statistical, regular recurrences of phenomena, to notions of random recurrences.

The German historian Oswald Spenger suggested that societies were like people, each with it choldhood, youth, adulthood and old age. They were born, grow up rapidly, reached full maturity—which he called the “golden age— decline, and died. Spengler's suggestion that Western Civilization was in the process of declining and that nothing could be done to half the inevitable process is still being referred to in certain pessimistic circles as the inevitable fate of the decadent and hedonistic Western Civilization.

The British historian Arnold Toynbee saw the development of society as a cyclical process. He proposed tht each cycle begins with some sort of 'challenge'—initially to make a living from the land, later to make social adjustments. Each challenge is met by a “response.” If the response is successful, the society survives and the process continues on to the next challange; if the response is not successful, the society is destroyed by the unmet challenge. At a certain time and in a certain place a civilization emerges. Under particular conditions, the civilization grows if it is not arrested orif it is not of the abortive type, such as the Spartan civilization. This growth ultimately brings with it a “breakdown”, followed by a decline. Unlike Spengler, Toynbee dos not use the rather potetic images of the four ages of man to depict the cycle.

The sociologist most widely associated with the cyclical view of social change is Pitirim of-Sonokin although he has nver explicitly referred to his complex theory as 'cyclic'. His theory is based on a classification of 'socio-cultural systems'. His most provocative and most neglected book, *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, is a detailed study of the Greek, Roman and Western cultures from about 600 B.C. to 190, with sporadic references to Egyptian, Hindu and Chinese cultures. He describes three main types of socio-cultural super-systems with distinct patterns, each capable of surviving of several centuries. These are the ideational' systems, the “sensate” system, and an intermediate or mixed system, referred to as 'idealistic'.



The ideational system is characterized as one in which the elements are based on faith (sacred). The sensate system is composed of elements based on empirical science and rationally (secular). The idealistic system is a combination of these two forms is characterized by more emphasis on the creative activity of the human mind, in art, literature and thought.

Serokin draws upon the fields of music, literature, painting, science, technology and invention, philosophy and law, deriving from them a series of statistics that provided the basis for a number of graphs. Using these graphs, he demonstrates that cyclical fluctuations have occurred in the creative achievements of Western man from the dawn of history. He then relates these cultural activities to the ideational, idealistic and sensate systems and charts growth and decline. This leads him to the question : Does the total culture of a given area change altogether as one system or do its various elements change independently from one another ?

He asserts the cycles of total culture and the various elements of culture are interrelated and directed by a sort logical principle residing in the total culture. In his words : "From the moment of its emergence, any empirical, socio-cultural system is a self-changing and self-directing unit that hears in itself unfolding, and the essential of its destiny. As such, it has always a margin of autonomy from all the force external to it."

Serokin considers the direction of these systems as "variable recurrence". Cultural change may initially conform to a linear form and then, due to internal changes, alter its directions, and a new form appears. The new form may be again linear, cyclical, or perhaps Oscillatory. In the process of several irregular fluctuations, culture may partially return to a condition approaching, but never identical with, a former state. Thus the culture completes the nearest approximation to a cycle that is possible in the history of human society.

F. Stuart Chapin, in cultural change, posits that cycles of national growth and decay may be established. The cycles belong in three orders : the order of material culture, the order of non-material culture, and the order of larger cultural composites. Each cycle is to be understood as the product of a complex of forces, consisting of individual phases of culture, such as the economic, political, religious and intellectual. These individual components of culture are themselves characterized by a cycle of growth and decline. When the cycles of several cultural forms are chronologically correlated, when they grow together and reach a high point of development at the same time, the result is an era of maturity of the nation or group.

From this, Chapin proposes the following hypothesis :

1. Every cultural form has its own law of change with the qualification that for certain groups of social phenomena there may be some basic and common law of change.
2. The law of each cultural form is more likely cyclical in nature and may be rhythmic.



3. It is possible to describe quantitatively the law of its cycle of periodic function.
4. When the cycles of periods of a number of cultural forms of the first and second order are synchronous, there is an era of maturity of nation or groups in which the culture traits are found.

In brief, his idea is that certain categories of cultural and social phenomena fluctuate together and that a cyclical form emerges.

The question of synchronous fluctuation has been also investigated by Anthropologist A.L. Kroeber who analyzed a number of cultural fields such as philosophy, science, sculpture, painting, drama, literature and music. He noted that men who were evaluated by subsequent periods as being great tended to appear in clusters. He assumed that such clusters indicated periods of the cultural creativity and quality. Using a panel of judges to identify the 'great' men in the diverse cultural areas, Kroeber noted the periods when they appeared to cluster and then attempted to ascertain the importance of the cultural phenomena they expressed. His analysis covered a period ranging from the early Greek Civilization to the 1940 and included all European nations and many Asiatic countries. He found that clusters of 'great' men did indicate the flourishing of some culture patterns and that intervals without such men occur. He posited that these periods of culture defined certain directions of cultural activity or 'opportunity.'

In opposition to the views of Spengler and Toynbee, Kroeber argues that the same culture may flourish many times. He finds no strict correlation between the growth of different aspects of a culture, although he concedes that periods of a high level of cultural creativity may be established in which several cultural stages show mature development at the same time. Furthermore, he argues that the determination of cultural growth or decline cannot be attributed to any specific single factor or set of factors except perhaps to the general tendency of movements to exhaust themselves.

### QUESTIONS

1. What is the cyclical theory of Social Change ? Explain.
2. Critically examine the cyclical theory of social change.

### Related Books

1. P.A. Sorokin — Social and Cultural Dynamics.
2. Mead & Page — Society.
3. F.S. Chapin — Cultural Change.





## Conflict Theory of Social Change

Conflict theory assumes that social behaviour can best be understood in terms of tension and conflict between groups and individuals. It suggests that society is an arena in which struggle over scarce commodities take place. Conflict theorists consider change, rather than order, as the essential element of social life. Change is viewed as an intrinsic process in society, not merely the outcome of some improperly functioning or imbalanced part of the social system. Structural differentiation is felt to be the source of conflict, and social change occurs only through this conflict. A number of social theorist have epoused this approach.

Marx postulated that every society, whatever its stage of historical development, rests on an economic foundation. He called this the 'mode of production' of commodities. The mode of production in turn has two elements. The first is "the forces of production" or the physical or technological arrangement of economic activity. The second is the social relations of production" or the indispensable human attachments that people must form with one another in carrying out this economic activity. In this word :

The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society the real foundation, on which rise legal and political super-structures and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development the material forces of production in society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or what is ut a legal expression for the same thing- with the property relations within which they had been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into the letters. Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.

The determinant or independent variable for Marx is the mode of production. Changes in this produce changes in the relations of production that is, changes in the way in which groups of men are attached to this production technology. To ilustrate this point, he divided history into five mayjor stages, each characterised by a type of economic production. These stages are : (i) Tribal ownership, a type of primitive communism; (ii) ancient communal and state ownership accompanied by slavery, (iii) feudalism; (iv) Capitalism; and (v) Communism, which is devided into a dictatorship of the proletariat and 'pure' communism. With the exception of pure communism, each stage is characterized by economic and other conflicts between two or more opposing economic groups with the separate and opposing economic interests. The economic conflict between these groups inevitably leads to further social and



political conflicts as each group seeks to further its own interests at the expense of other groups.

For Marx, conflict is a normal condition of social life whose nature and variations are some of the most important things to be described and analysed by social science. Conflict and change for him are inseparable. The economic production is the substructure upon which the rest of society, the superstructure, is built. Social institution— such as the government, the family, education and religion—are dependent upon the mode of economic production in a given society, variations and changes in economic production give rise to variations and change in other social institutions with their associated values, attitudes, and norms.

In a capitalistic society all individuals will move from intermediate groups to become either proletarians (worker) or bourgeoisie (property owners). The struggle is inevitable between these two classes and will result, as class consciousness and militant class action develop, in the overthrow of the existing system. It will culminate in the establishment of a new form of economic production— communistic production— and the new historical stages, communism. The proletariat, having won the revolution will become the dominant group in this final historical stage.

In brief, the series of events leading to an ultimate proletariat revolution is as follow : “(i) the need for production; (ii) the expansion of the division of labour ; (iii) the development of private property; (iv) increasing social inequality; (v) class struggle; (vi) creation of political structures to represent each class’s interests, and finally; (vii) revolution. Each event leads inevitably to the next event. And, according to Marx, no man or group of men can stop the revolution from occurring.

The Marxian approach to social change has been attacked on a number of grounds. One group of criticisms deals with the fact that it overemphasized economic determination and ignored idea tological, political, and other factors that influence social change. Otherws maintain that it insisted upon the dialectical model of change through thesis, antithesis, and synthesis (action, reaction, and combination) and did not allow for regressive change or for change to occur in other ways. Some sociologists have criticized Marx as placing too much emphasis on conflict and economically based power and rank. They argue, instead, that conflict is often integrative, as we shall set in the writings of Coser, and that consensus, integration, and co-operation are much more frequently in evidence than conflict. These critics argue that shared values are common to normative systems, and functional and economic interdependence all tend to gloss over or reduce class conflict to a minimum. Finally, many critics have challenged his formulations regarding revolutions. They have stressed that most revolutions, especially those in the twentieth century, have been middle-class revolutions. They argue that, aside from Marx’s inadequate predictions of the place of revolution, he misjudged the depth of alienations and frustration of the average worker. Marx also failed to see the tendency of workers to identify with national, community, religious, racial, sexual, and occupational groups.



Notwithstanding these limitations, scholars felt compelled to develop and expand his ideas and, in doing so, often produced some of their most important work. Each succeeding generation has had sociologists working directly in the marxian tradition. Consequently, his approach remains an important and influential one in contemporary sociology.

The conflict approach to social change gained additional momentum during the middle of the 20th century, prompted by race conflicts, class struggles, and the warring of interests. Undoubtedly, the best known conflict theorist among contemporary American Sociologists is Lewis A. Coser. In his widely read book, "The Functions of Social Conflict", Coser holds that conflict has both positive and negative effects. He explains conflict is part of the socialisation process and that no social group can be completely harmonious. Conflict in society is inevitable since individuals have a predisposition for hate as well as love. Thus conflict is part of the human condition. But conflict can be constructive as well as destructive because it frequently resolves disagreements and leads eventually to unity. He believes that conflict makes for an increase in adjustment and adaptation as groups learn to live side by side. Moreover, conflict encourages 'in-group' cohesion become the members of the group have a common enemy and a common course.

Coser view conflict as a means of promoting social change. People we feel that their society satisfies their needs are not likely to want to alter anything in it. Those whose needs are not satisfied will attempt to change the situation by confronting the dominant group that has suppressed their goals. But Coser maintains that conflict can lead to change in a number of way, including the establishment of new group boundaries, the drawing off of hostility and tension, the development of more complex group structures to deal with conflict and its accompaniments, and the creation of alliances with other parts. Each of these can result in a new distribution of social values, with the concomitant formation of a new social order. Therefore, conflict is seen as a creative force that stimulates change in society.

Another influential contemporary conflict theorist is Ralf Dahreudorf. He rejects the marxian notion of social class as determined by the relations to the means of production and define if in the terms of the unequal distribution of authority. All groups in society are seen or divided into those who have authority and those who do not. He maintains that social conflict has a structural origin and is to be 'understood as a conflict about the legitimacy of relations of authority. He said that in any organisation, roles and positions can be dichotomised into two "quasi groups" whose members have opposed 'latent interests'. The group in position of power or authority is interested in preserving the status quo whereas the subordinated group is interested in change. These two 'quasi-groups' are potential antagonists in that their members share common experiences, roles, and interests, whether or not they are aware of them.

Under proper 'conditions of organizations', interest groups emerge out of quasi-groups as the members developed a leadership cadre, effective intragroup communication, a consistent ideology, and an awareness of their common interests. Dahrendorb suggests that



the more the subordinate interest groups become organized, the more likely they will be in conflict with the dominant group. The 'condition of conflict', such as opportunities for social mobility and the response of the agents of social control, will determine the intensity and violence of conflict. By intensity he refers to the emotional involvement, and animosity felt by the participants. He proposes that the more organized the interest groups and the more regulated their conflict, the less violent the conflict will be. Conflict in turn leads to structural change as a result of a change in dominance relations. The type, speed, and magnitude of change depends on the 'conditions of structure change'. These conditions include the capacity of those in power to stay in power and the pressure potential of the dominated interest group. Conflict between workers and management, the unionization process, and the changes brought about by the unions are used by Dahrendorf to illustrate his theory.

He concluded that "the great creative force" that leads to change in society is social conflict. The notion that wherever there is social life there is conflict may be unpleasant and disturbing. "But" ..... societies and social organizations are held together not by consensus but by constraint not by universal agreement but by the coercion of some by others.... and as conflict generates change, so constraint may be thought of as generating conflict.

The past decade or so witnessed the rise of a series of conflict theories that are variously referred to in the sociological literature as 'radical', 'activist', 'critical', 'humanist', and the like.

### QUESTIONS

1. What is conflict theory of social change ? Explain.
2. What is the contribution of Karl Marx in conflict theory of social change? justify.

### Related Books

1. Macluers & Page — Society
2. L. Coser — Functions of social conflict.





**Planned Change in India : Indian Plans a Mixed Model and Their Socio-economic objectives.**

India's socio-economic system was made handicapped under the British rule. Its economic style of life was quite disrupted. In spite of availability of social and economic resources in abundance poverty was widespread through out the country. Income of an average Indian remained lower to the people of almost all civilized countries. No effective effort was made for economic development of the country during the British rule. Infact colonial-cum-feudal path of development has generated two mutually opposite processes— enrichment of minority and impoverishment of majority.

For removal of Indian poverty and enrichment of the majority different individuals and institutions considered that planning might be the best recourse and then socio-economic changes might be planned in proper direction, even during the British India. It was commonly viewed when the country would get the independence people should not be left for adequate economic development. Rather for goining the group of developed countries of the world planned social change is the only alternative so that limited economic and human resources could adequately be utilised and rate of desired change could be speeded up. First of all M. Vishveshwariya wrote a book entitled 'Planned Economy for India' in 1934 which was considered as an outline of planning for economic development of India. In 1938 the Congress Party formed a 'National Planning Committee' under the chairmanship of Jawaharhal Nehru. The Committee published an outline of planned economic change in 1948. Besides, three other frame works of planning for economic changes in the country were prepared. In 1941 eight businessmen prepared a planning proposal named as 'Bombay Planning'. At the same time M.N. Rai presented a 'People's Planning' while Srimannarayan's proposal was known as 'Gandhian Planning'.

The above mentioned efforts attempted in the British India indicate the felt urgency for planned social change of India's economy and society and also indicate the serious concern for solving the problems of the people like poverty and backwardness. As a result independent India efforts were started to reconstruct the economy and society with the help of available limited resources. A 'National Planning Commission' was established under the chairmanship of Jawaharlal Nehru in 1950 for the purpose— development of the country.

India had three options for its development at the time of Independence.

- Capitalist path/Model of development
- Socialist path/Model of development
- Mixed path/Model of development

The capitalist model of development is generally liberal and democratic in nature.



Here government is considered not an absolute but limited by the laws and conventions constitute the fundamental law of the land. Emphasis is one according proper recognition to the personality of various groups and professional associations. The bulk of the economic decisions, say in planning for development is not taken by the government, but by a multitude of private firms and their associations through the play of the market mechanism.

Contradistinguished from the capitalist model a Socialist model is one where the authority of government is total and absolute claiming justification over the whole of a man's life. All aspects, of individuals activities including economic ones are always supervised and controlled by the state. This model stands for the monopolistic and hierarchical organisation of a single group or junta (party) having both de facto and de jure authority to control and run the machinery of administration (also of economic development through planning). This model of development is the antithesis of the capitalist model of development.

Independent India adopted third path/model of development i.e. model of mixed development, Theoretically it embraces the virtuous aspects of both capitalist and socialist models of development. It borrows the idea of liberty from the laissez faire school and of welfare from the socialist model and then blends the two in such a peculiar way that it becomes a half-way house. While, on the one hand, it guarantees essential liberties (as of speech, expression, worship, profession, property, etc.) to its people : on the other side, it adopts a policy of abolishing gigantic evils that sap the blood of the people. It guarantees a minimum standard of subsistence without removing incentive to personal enterprise, and it brings about a limited redistribution of income by means of gradual high taxation yet does not pretend to establish economic equality among its citizens. All are assured of adequate help in case of, whether the need is due to illness, old age, unemployment, famine, flood and others, when the ordinary citizen loses his source of income. Here state performs the function of order, protection, conservation and development of the country and its people, views R.M. MacIver.

In India the Mixed Model of Development for planned socio-economic changes adopted has combined the features of capital path development with Gandhain path of development and socialist path of development. It sought to transform colonial and feudal India into a democratic, secular and socialist India. No Indian was to starve, to be exploited and to remain unemployed. This model as a working ideal has been accomplished through Five Year Plans, till the seventh five year plan. Since 1951 plan much has been done in the field of socio-economic welfare and striking improvement has taken place in the directions of agriculture, irrigation, education, public health and social welfare.

#### **Socio-economic Objectives of the Plans :**

The proposal of Five Year Plan was presented in July 1951 by Planning Commission. However, First Five Year Plan from 1 April 1951 to 31 March 1956 was finalised in December 1952. Based on mixed model of development it contained the following main socio-economic objectives :



1. Correcting disequilibrium emerged in India economy because of second world War and Partition of the country ;
2. Enabling economic development in such a way that development might be speeded up in future ;
3. Increasing productivity and reduction in economic inequalities ;
4. Decreasing incidence of inflation;
5. Increasing means of transport for maximum facilities for transporting food grains and other materials;
6. Increasing social services like education, health, and others ; and
7. Provision for efficient bureaucracy in states.

Second Five Year Plan's (1 April 1956 to 31 March 1961) main Objective— based on the ideal of Socialistic Pattern of Society adopted by the Government of India during the period of the first plan—

1. Rapid increase in the national income— 5 percent in a year (25 percent in five years) ;
2. Rapid industrialisation of the country emphasizing the developing basic and heavy industries ;
3. Vast expansion of employment opportunities; and
4. Reduction in economic inequalities.

Third Five Year Plan's (1 April 1961 to 31 March 1966) Objectives—

1. To secure an increase in the national income of over 5 per cent per annum and at the same time ensure a pattern of investment so as to sustain this rate of growth during subsequent plan periods;
2. To achieve self-sufficiency in foodgrains and increase agricultural production to meet the requirements of industry and trade;
3. To increase steel, chemical, oil, electricity, fuel and other basic industries and to establish machine making factories ensuring availability of machines for industrial development within 10 years ;
4. To utilise to the fullest possible extent the man power of the country and to increase employment opportunity adequately; and
5. To establish equality of opportunity and to reduce inequitable distribution of income and wealth for equal distribution of opportunity and economic resources.

After the completion of the third plan the fourth plan was to start from 1 April 1966. But due to certain reasons like Chinese war in 1962, Pakistani war in 1964, famine in 1964-66 and famine in big areas of the country three annual plans for 1966-67, 1967-68 and



1968-69 were formulated and implemented. Thus Fourth Five Year Plan for 1 April 1969 to 31 March 1974 was prepared. The main objectives were the following for planned social change :

1. Attaining a growth rate of 4.4 percent per annum in the National Income;
2. To achieve self-reliance, priority in the fields of agricultural and industrial production at the earliest;
3. To bring about economic stability for rapid economic development— by promoting export and restricting import and others;
4. To increase production of consumption goods;
5. To control population growth;
6. To increase employment opportunities, emphasis on labour intensive schemes in rural areas.
7. To bring social justice and equality by reducing income disparity and other measures;
8. To correct regional imbalances in matter of development;
9. To provide greater role of public sector;
10. To extend social services like family planning for development of human resources.

Fifth Five Year Plan was started on 1st April 1974 and was to be completed on 21 March 1979 but it was stopped a year ago on 31 March 1978 by Janata Party Government which implemented Six Five Year Plan from 1 April 1978. However, the main objectives of Fifth Five Year Plan are given below :

1. Removal of poverty;
2. Attainment of economic self-reliance;
3. Reduction of economic inequality;
4. Provision of basic minimum needs by providing
  - (a) elementary education to the children of upto 14 years of age,
  - (b) minimum facilities of public health integrating family planning and nutrition for children,
  - (c) house site for landless labourers,
  - (d) roads and electricity in rural areas,
  - (e) slum improvement in larger towns;
5. Increase in employment opportunities;
6. Other objectives which include;
  - (a) emphasis on basic industries producing agricultural and consumable goods,
  - (b) Increase in export and export substitution.
  - (c) effective distribution system for availability of consumption goods,



- (d) Strict restriction on unnecessary consumption, and
- (e) institutional, fiscal and other measures for reducing social and regional inequalities.

#### **Sixth Five Year Plan—**

Janata Party Government started sixth five year plan known as “Rolling Plan” from 1 April 1978 and it was to be completed on 31 March 1983 (1978-1983). But in January 1980 Congress Party under the leadership of Indira Gandhi came in power by winning the parliamentary election with thumping majority and the ‘Rolling plan’ was stopped in the way in 1980. The new sixth plan was started from 1980 for five years.

The main objectives of Sixth Five Year Plan under Janata Government (1978-83) was.

1. Removal of unemployment and under employment;
2. Significant improvement in standard of living of the poorest section of the population;
3. Provision of basic needs to low income group by the state e.g. clean drinking water, adult literacy, primary education, health facilities, rural roads, rural housing and minimum services to urban slums;
4. Higher rate of growth;
5. Reduction of economic disparity;
6. Continuous progress for self-reliance;

The Main objectives of new Sixth Five Year Plan under Congress Party Government (1980-85) :

1. Remoral of poverty, the foremost goal of the plan;
2. Adequate growth rate increase;
3. Strengthening the impulses of modernisation for achievement of economic and technological self-reliance;
4. Adequate increase in means of employment;
5. Speedy development of indigenous sources of energy;
6. Improvement in standard of living of general people by Minimum Needs Programme;
7. Checking population growth through family planning;
8. Reduction of inequalities in distribution of income and wealth;
9. Promoting the active involvement of all sections of the people in the process of development through appropriate education, Communication and institutional strategies.



10. Progressive reduction in regional inequalities in the pace of development and in the diffusion of technological benefits.

**Main objectives of Seventh Five Year Plan (1985-90) :**

1. Greater emphasis on productive employment;
2. Full public participation in decentralisation of planning and development;
3. Poverty alleviation and reduction of inter-class, inter-regional and rural-urban disparities;
4. Achievement of self-reliance in food grains of higher stage of consumption;
5. Higher stage achievement of social consumption particularly education, health, nutrition, sanitation and housing;
6. Increasing the extent of self-reliance through export promotion and import substitution;
7. Enhancing voluntary interest in adoption of small family norm;
8. Promoting efficiency, modernisation and competition in industries;
9. Reducing infrastructural bottlenecks and shortages and improving capacity and productivity in economies;
10. Developing conservation of energy and non-conventional sources of energy;
11. Co-ordinating science and technology in developmental planning;
12. Conservation of environment and climate;

**Eighth Five Year Plan (1992-97) :—**

Eighth Plan was to begin in April 1990 but due to certain reasons planned social change took place through annual plans during 1990-91 and 1991-92. And the eighth five year plan was started from 1 April 1992. This plan was launched at a time of momentous changes in the world and in India, The international political and economic order is being restructured everyday and as the 20th Century draws to a close, many of its distinguishing philosophies and features have been swept away. In other words, all over the world centralised economics are disintegrating. On the other hand, economics or several regions are getting integrated under a common philosophy of growth, guided by the market forces and liberal policies. The emphasis is on autonomy and efficiency induced by competition. India cannot remain untouched. Lessons from the rich empirical and development experiences of other nations and also own experience, gained during the last four decades have been instrumental in formulation of the eighth plan. The lesson have indicated re-examination and reorientation of the role of the Government as well as the process of planning. It would need to work out the ways and means of involving people in the developmental task and social evolution. It would have to strengthen the people's participatory institutions. Planning has to be re-oriented so as to make planning largely indicative. This, in turn, would employ a somewhat changed role for the Planning Commission. Instead of its usual role of resource allocation the Planning



Commission would have to concentrate on optimal utilization of the limited available resources and it would have to play the role of a change agent gradually moving towards indicative planning.

The Eighth Plan is indicative in nature. It concentrates on building a long term strategic vision of the future and sets forth the priorities of the nation. While for the public sector, the Plan goes into the details examining the alternatives and identifying the details projects in various sectors. For the rest of the economy it works out sectoral targets and tends to provide promotional stimulus to the economy to grow in the desired direction. The Plan recognises "human development" as the core of all developmental effort and it also attempts to correct the fiscal imbalances, prevalent earlier.

Under the above mentioned background the following objectives are accorded priority for planned socio-economic changes through the Eighth Five Year Plan—

1. Generation of adequate employment to achieve near full employment level by the turn of century;

2. Containment of population growth through active people's cooperation and an effective scheme of incentive and disincentives;

3. Universalisation of elementary education and complete eradication of illiteracy among the people in the age group of 15 to 35 years;

4. Provision of safe drinking water and primary health care facilities, including immunisation, accessible to all the villages and the entire population, and complete elimination of scavenging;

5. Growth and diversification of agriculture to achieve self-sufficiency in food and generate surpluses for exports :

6. Strengthening the infrastructure (energy, transport, communication, in order to support the growth process on a sustainable basis.

On the basis of foregoing discussion one may conclude that the launching of the First Five Year Plan in April 1951 initiated a process of planned socio-economic changes through the mixed model of planning of development aimed not only at raising the standard of living of the people but also opening out to them new opportunities for a richer and more varied life. This was sought to be achieved (under various Plans) by planning for growth, modernisation, self-reliance and social justice. A largely agrarian feudal economy at the time of independence has been transformed into one based on a well developed and a highly diversified infrastructure with immense potential for industrialisation. Income and consumption levels have significantly risen. Consumption basket has diversified. Incidence of poverty has visibly declined. The average life expectancy has gone up. The death and the birth rates have declined. Literacy has improved and the educational base has widened. It is expected that more rapid socio-economic changes might take place after the successful completion of the Eighth Five Year Plan.



## Tradition and Modernity in India : Concept and Indices

In recent years, tradition and modernity have loomed large in the conceptual baggage of sociologists. The process from tradition to modernity— Modernization is not so new but earlier it was subsumed under the terms social change or development, whereby less developed societies tend to acquire characteristics associated with the more developed societies. The socio-economic changes were initiated with the growth and development of science and technology especially after the industrial revolution in England (1760-1830) and subsequent political revolution in France (1789-1794), first in the West Europe and later diffused to rest of the world. This came to be conceptualised as Europeanisation, Westernisation and Americanisation. The concept synthesising all these aforesaid trends in society is recently termed as 'Modernization'. But studies have revealed that an endless variety of meanings have been put on this term. Each meaning depends upon the professional training and discipline of the social scientist concerned. The different meanings lack logical consistency, Drawing upon the studies of Almond and Coleman. Mc Clelland, Lerner, Ithiel de Solo Pool and Wilbert Moore the great sociologist S.C. Dube present a twelve point model of modernisation. As the frames of reference of these source theorists do not belong to the same logical family, the model projected by Dube is not an integrated one. I. L. Horowitz goes to the extent of refusing modernisation as a concept of social science.

However, it is properly viewed that tradition and modernity as feuristic concepts are easy to formulate but to separate them at substantive level is rather difficult. As Joseph R. Gusfield has said, "We can not easily separate modernity and tradition from some specific modernity, some version which functions ideologically as a directive. The modern comes to the traditional society as a particular culture with its own traditions." But it seldom comes in the same form or brings about identical culture consequences in every society that it comes in contact with.

The totality of the process of modernisation in different sphere of life has been stressed by many modern scholars. The changes involved are said to be specific and peculiar, not only in economic functioning but also in value system, social stratification, family organisation, religion and government pattern, quite different from traditional society. The conception of such change is implicit in the dichotomous typological terms it seems inevitably to invoke, such as folk vs. urban, traditional vs. modern, community vs. society, sacred vs. secular, mechanical solidarity vs. organic solidarity and so on. These indicate that tradition and modernity are bi-polar opposites. But the fact is that no society is completely modern or completely traditional. It is through tradition that the process of modernization is thrown into bold relief. Tradition and modernisation represent a continuous process in modern times. None of them at the same time can be regarded as a static phenomenon. Modernity can not



by completely identified with the present or tradition with the past. Some elements of present day modernity may be the elements of tradition tomorrow. So noth are different moments of a continuous social process. So a concept of tradition-modern continuum has been evolved by Inkeles and Smith.

In the light of the theoretical discussions made above it is now proper to have some understanding of the definitions of the concepts in brief. In modernisation denotes both types of changes— economic and social. Some scholars, define modernization hinges on the use of inanimate source of power and the use of tools to multiply the effect of such efforts.” On the other hand S.C. Dube views, modernisation is a process denoting movement from a traditional or a quasi traditional order to certain desired types of technology and associated forms of social structure, value-orientations, motivations and norms.”

According to Yogendra Singh, “in the concept of modernisation no evolutionary universalism is implied. Modernisation. in its specific context and form is treated as a historical rather than a universal evolutionary reality”. This implies that modernization in the cultural traditions of India might not be identical to or just a replica of modernization in other parts of the world.

The basic foundations of the defnintion are provided by Mark G. Field and T. Anthony Jones elaborately. To them modernization denotes the process of development in the three mutually related aspects of social reality— culture, personality and social structure, in such a way that advancement in the realm of thought, that is the development of scientific knowledge, bring about changes leading to universal, rational and positivistic values, structure and role differentiation and creation of secular instutitions, and development of scientific secular attitude and modern personality.

Thus like science (the basic source of modernisation) modernisation also global and not a parochial phenomenon. It is like science, neither western, nor Indian or Russian or Chinese. It is not an exclusive possession of any one ethnic or culturl group, but belongs to the humanity as a whole. The existential adaptions to modernisation in every society, as evidences suggest, take a historical and distinctive forces.

The ‘tradition’ word is derived from ‘trader’ which means ‘to transmit’. In this way tradition is transmitted value and behaviour patterns of a community. It is recalled, quoted, esteemed. The age long succession of traditions becomes an assurance of value which has already accrued in the process of its instrumental functioning as a constituent of social cohesion or social solidarity. Old traditions die and new traditions continually emerge as they are not static. Personal experiences of may people, in course of time, became the collective experience of the community and was then enshrined as a tradition. Social reformers had modified the existing traditions while their teachings were added to tradition in due course of time.

V.K. V. Rao has defined tradition in this way, “Tradition means habits, customs, attitudes,



ways of life which get embodied in institutions and then tend to get frozen because of the staility and autonomous existence of these institutions. Thus tradition implies age and with it, a fairly long period of continuity.”

Some traditional society is characterised as series of agrarian villages in a setting of relatively unchanging technique, limited economic opportunity and age old conventional understanding, attachment to authority, respect for the pastness of things, dependence upon routine and an exaggerated respect for precedent.”

The primary structure of Indian tradition might itself have been a product synthesis of a number of indigenous or even alien cultural patterns. It means it would be wrong to view that Indian society has always existed in its present form. Invasions and a number of socio-religious movement have affected the life ways and thoughtways of the people. Indian society has the impact of islamic culture especially more in medieval period. For example, the institution of caste, basic to the Hindu Social system, has faced constant change in its structure and norms through the age; Changes have also been taking place in villages, usually regarded as a sink of slagnation and ignorance, since long. Once Indian village were flourishing little republics with an efficient panchayat system and more or less self sufficient economy. But they began to present a dismal look towards the end of 19th century.

It has, at the outset, been pointed out that socio-economic changes after the industrial revolution of England and political revolution of France were characterised as modernisation, a 19th century phenomenon. As far India is concerned, here modernisation started mainly with the Western contact, especially through establishment of the British rule.

This had a special historicity which brought about many far reaching changes in social structure and culture of the Indian society. But all of them were not modernising but the basic direction of the contact was towards modernisation. However, modern cultural institutions and forms of social structure were introduced after the establishment of British rule. But the growth of this process of modernisation was selective and segmental. The British by and large followed a policy of least interference in matter of family, caste and village community, especially after the rebellion of 1857. But some legislative measures were taken against customs violating the norms of human dignity, personal security and freedom e.g., widow burning custom was abolished in 1829. Caste Disabilities Removal Act was passed in 1850, and others. However, basic characteristics of Indian tradition continued to exist but the process of modernization has got momentum after the independence of India. But before discussing that it would be proper to have some understanding of Indices of modernization.

Modernization many a time is used as a synonym or defined in terms of economic development which has been the continues to be the cherished goal of almost all developing or under developed countries. However, it is generally equated with various types of social and cultural change. As a result various studies have been conducted in such countries.



While studying modernization in the Muslim countries Middle East D. Lerner finds out the indices that modernization comes through the rise of urbanisation, leading to literary, to greater success to media of information (newspaper, books and other mass media) and this in turn mobilises the people to greater political and economic participation.

Studying modernization among peasants of Columbia Everett M. Rogers has found the following indicators of modernization—

1. Political Knowledgeability,
2. Occupational aspiration,
3. Educational aspiration,
4. Education,
5. Achievement motivation,
6. Functional literacy,
7. Empathy,
8. Agricultural innovativeness,
9. Home innovativeness, and
10. Fatalism.

Observing modernization in contemporary India, S.C. Dube considers the modern society as rational and scientific and talks about three basic assumptions—

1. Substituting traditional sources of animal power with new sources of inanimate power to produce a variety of goods and to operate a range of services.
2. This can be done best by collective rather than individual effort, associational capability to operate through increasingly complex organisations and
3. Such complex organisation cannot be created and run without radical personality change and attendant changes in the social structure and in the cultural fabric.

Drawing from the workws of Lerner, Almond and Coleman, Mc Clelland, their de Solo Pool and Wilbert Moore Dube presents twelve indices of moderation, importance of the study of Indian modernization also and they are the following—

1. Empathy,
2. Mobility,
3. High participation,
4. Interest articulation,
5. Interest aggregation,
6. Institutionalised political competition,
7. Achievement orientation,



8. Rational end means calculation,
9. New attitude to wealth, work, saving and risk taking,
10. Faith in the desirability and possibility of change,
11. Social economic and political discipline, and
12. Capacity to put off immediate and short-run satisfactions for higher satisfactions in longer run.

It means that in modernising society like India people have sense of more empathy for higher status or more modern role cosmopolitaness, more mobility liberating the newer generations of both sexes and undermining the foundations of traditional society having alertness for a group of interests. In such society new attitude is developed for economic, social, political gains influencing the behaviours and activities accordingly. Deeper and greater acceptance of change in organisations and elsewhere is found. In the process of rapid socio-economic changes, individuals are likely to aspire for various positions and are supposed to perform different roles.

So far tradition and modernity in independent India is concerned it may be said that the very freedom movement ushered in a new political culture of modernisation. The personality of Mahatama Gandhi was at the centre of the movement. His one foot was always deeply embedded in tradition. He successfully mobilised Indian people for the attainment of freedom.

Modernization in free India has undergone a basic change from its British pattern. It has been considered as constituent strategy of development for all levels of cultural and structural systems, without discontinuity between macro and micro structures and between the little and great traditions. Introduction of adult suffrage and a federal parliamentary form of political structure have carried politicization to every sector of social organization. Conscious legal reforms in Hindu marriage and inheritance laws have affected traditional Hindu family structure. Community Development Projects and other development programmes including anti-poverty have carried the cultural norms and orle structures of modernity to each village. Land reforms and elective village panchayats have brought modern bureacratic forms to villages. No doubt, the process of modernization has generated inter-structural tensions and conflicts between traditions, past and contemporary. Patterns of resolving these tensions would decide future course of modernization.

Caste has been viewed as a representation of tradition in modern India and is said to arrest mobility. However, castes like the Chettiar, the Marwari and the Bania have developed long standing tradition of business. Outside the fold Hinduism, the Parsees and Jains are carries of economic innovation and promoters of large scale industrial production. Caste associations have been formed for social uplift and political bargain. In fact has politicised in today India and also politics is characterised by caste, sometimes ppromotig economic growth. Similarly it has been shown that traditional forms of families— joint families are compatible with large industrial organisations. Such families provide capital for technical



and specialised education of their members, for expanding the existing industrial units and starting new ones. The big Indian industrial houses, Tata, Birla, Dalmia etc. are supported by traditional family units.

Similarly magic and science have been co-existing. Even in highly educated families recourse is taken to religion and magic especially when medicine fail. The little tradition of the rural area is not replaced by the great tradition of the urban areas. In other words, the modernising processes and traditional form do not necessarily clash. For politicization of the people, as part of the modernization ample use is made of such traditional institutions as village, caste, and religion. It is through those that the individuals and the family are drawn into the vortex of modern political organization. In 1994-95 more than a dozen rallies of individual backward castes organised mainly at the instance of the party in power took place and in 1995 assembly election the then ruling party got thumping majority in the Bihar assembly. In the same election also political parties in their appeals, electoral support and candidate selection tended to be dependent on the major ascriptive communities. It is not uncommon to hear that constituency 'A' is a Muslim constituency 'B' has a 'Yadav' constituency or 'C' is predominantly scheduled caste. The politician operates at two levels—

(i) for gaining support, he appeals the supra-caste level;

(ii) but in the disbursal of benefits he confines himself to the close kin group.

Growth of literacy promoting a common cultural identity has encouraged languages and cultures. It has strengthened regionalism and parochialism and imperilled national unity. Thus a move in the direction of modernization may foster a traditional element. It is thus difficult to disentangle tradition from modernity in India. Ample scope is thus found for both tradition and modernity surviving together. In fact, both the concepts are continually changing. What is modern today may not be so tomorrow.





### Change in Little and Great Traditions

It is generally held that unity in diversity is found in India society. The society consists of various small and big communities having different traditions, religious faiths, rituals and thoughts but they differ from one another. However, they depend on each other for their survival, various scholars have tried to have some understanding of Indian society with the help of traditional bases like Varna, Ashram, Dharma, Purushartha, Karma and some others on the basis of rural social and economic structures. Through these studies it is found that same forces/force which keeps the Indian society unified and integrated. In fact, rural community has some parochial and little traditions through which its cultural self-dependency continues to exist. On the other hand all communities are embedded to various great traditions and consequently all communities appear related and integrated to each other. In other words it may be said that traditions play a very significant role in the emergence of culture/civilization. In this connection contribution of Robert Redfield can be well mentioned. The credit goes to Redfield who has first tried to analyse social change with the help of Little and Great traditions, the concepts emerged in his studies of the Mexican communities. In fact, he has classified traditions into categories—

(i) the traditions related to the folks or unlettered peasants and

(ii) the other traditions related to the elite or the 'reflective few'. The first category of traditions is called 'little tradition and the second is Great tradition. To him these two traditions occupy special relationship in any society. In other words there is constant interaction between the two traditions having their own social organization. Unity of a civilization is maintained through these traditions which perpetuate a unity of world-view.

Now it would be proper to have some understanding of little tradition and Great tradition separately.

#### **Little Tradition : The concept**

The concept of little tradition as propounded by Robert Redfield can be described broadly in this way— Little tradition is that which is not related to basic or classical religions texts, that which is prevalent in a small region and most of the people virtually do not understand its real meaning. It means the little tradition is parochial. In a small region beliefs gradually emerge and after some time that takes the form of religious ritual. As a result such belief and religious rituals take the shape of Little tradition. To Redfield generally tradition of illiterate peasants is thought as Little tradition. It is developed in the community of unlettered peasants/little people and there it gets permanency. It is an oral tradition transmitted from one generation to another. These Gods and Goddesses religions rituals, folkways, fairs, folksongs, folk dances, magical performances and other cultural elements which have



not been described in classical religious texts and other texts or not written therein are included in Little tradition. In other words it is also said that the social structure of the Little tradition consists of its own role-inclumbents such as the folk artists, medicinemen, tellers of riddles, proverbs and stories, poets and dancers, etc. M.M. Underbill has enlisted 270 festivals of the Hindu religious years and many of them are related to local rituals which may be put under the category of the Little traditions. Different meanings are attached to the most of village rituals in different regions and sometimes in the same region.

### **The Great Tradition : The Consent**

According Robert Redfield architecture depicted in temples, mansions, refined arts, astronomy, calendar (panchang) epigraphic, literature, good and natural forces and religion based state administration are known as Great tradition. This is the tradition of philosophers, theologians and literatures and that is rationally propagated and transmitted.

Mekin Mariott has found that the great tradition is understood to be literate religious tradition, embodied in or derived from Sanskrit works which have a universal spread in all parts of India. Elaborately the Great tradition is defined by S.C. Dube "as the corpus of beliefs, rituals and social patterns embodied in the sacred conoical literature." Thus both definitions indicate that Gods and Goddesses, religious rituals, festivals, fairs and cultural elements mentioned in classical religious texts of India are examples of the Great tradition. Redfield has evidently pointed out that the Great traditions are protected and developed by some rational individuals of the elite group and gradually they are adopted by other groups and spread in many other regions.

While studying a Rajasthan village B.R. Chauhan has presented the distinctive features of the Great and Little traditions in this way :

The Great Tradition	The Little Tradition
1. National	1. Local
2. Written	2. Unwritten
3. Subject matter classical and cultural	3. non-classical
4. More systematic	4. Less systematic
5. More rational	5. Less rational

The above distinction presented by Chauhan indicates—

(i) The spread of the Great tradition is comprehensive and there is found a national frame. It is prevalent, in some form or the other, among almost all classes, castes and religions. On the other prevalence of the Little tradition is local, is limited to specific regions. Consequently different little traditions may be found in different regions.

(ii) All religious texts like Vedas, Puranas, Ramayan, Mahabharat and others are written and there the great traditions are described. They are accepted all over India. They are



transmitted from one generation to the others. The Little traditions are not written, not mentioned in sacred texts. So they are orally transmitted from one generation to the other.

(iii) The Great traditions are very old and classical. For example, such traditions are mentioned in the Vedas and Puranas which are thousand years old. On the other hand the Little traditions are not so old and traditional and thus they are not classical.

(iv) In Sacred texts the great traditions are described with certain norms, virtuals for their observance and also taboos and thus they are very systematic. Their structures are definite and evident. But the little traditions are easy as their norms are not definite and evident. People may observe them with certain modification here and there with ease. Their structures are not so elaborate and systematic.

(v) Emergence and development of the Great traditions depend on some rational individuals of the elite group and so they are more systematic and clear. The Little traditions are made and developed by illiterate villagers and so rationality lacks there. And so they are nto so elaborate or systematic.

(vi) The Great traditions being written are transmitted from one generation to the other in written forms while oral transmission takes place in case of the little traditions.

Thus it appears that nature of these two traditions is different from each other. However, there is close relation between the two as interactions take place between them.

#### **Change in the Great and the Little Traditions**

It has already been made clear that the Little tradition is mainly related to illiterate peasants and the Great tradition to the chosen few— the elite who are supposed to be rational. Changes have been taking place in the both categories of tradition. It has been said that both are inter related and are dependent on each other. Redfield has viewed that the both are supplementary to each other. It means changes in one tradition is caused by the other and vice versa. In rural areas the Little traditions are quite prevalent and the people have great faith in them. There the Great traditions are brought through saints, religious thinkers and preachers. Consequently, one can notice the impact of the Great traditions on the Little traditions. Redfield has provided the example of the great Hindu religions text. Ramayan written imitially by Valmiki in Sanskrit, a great source of the Great tradition when Sanskrit was not understood easily, it was Tulsidas who wrote Ramayan in Avadhi for the understanding by many. And tater on Tulsidas' Ramayan become the basis for writing Ramayan in several local languages. Thus the cultural and religions elements of the Great traditions have been brought to the general people. Gradually the Great traditions become the parts of the Little traditions and alos there emerge new Little traditions. Thus changes take place in prevailing Little tradition. But it is not a one way phenomenon. The Little traditions also become instrumental for changes in the Great traditions and help in understanding, cultural changes taking place therein (the Great traditions).



For examples, folk-songs, folk-dance, folk-entertainment, and other folk phenomena belong to the Little traditions. In modern India one may observe that folk-dance and others are demonstrated at all India level appreciated and adopted by the urban elite who have been considered as belonging to the Great tradition. Consequently the cultural elements of the Great traditions are embedded to the Little traditions and thus interaction takes place between the two traditions. The elite are thought to be rational and educated and many of them are found to have internalised the beliefs and behaviours related to the Little tradition. They and other urban people are found observing bad or good women while starting a journey, consulting astrologers for starting a work like house construction, consulting a shaman for physical recovery, and wearing amulets and believing in exorcism as per the direction of a priest who is supposed to be powerful to free one from disease, ghost or panic. In other words the Great traditional elements are influenced by the Little traditions. Thus the both interact and influence each other. But it is a fact in India where the Great traditions are causing more changes in the Little traditions. One can easily notice changes folk dress, food habits, rituals, vocabulary, materials culture, mode of travel and type of conveyance and customs. The factory produced clothes now have replaced the home-spun clothes and one might occasionally come across modern synthetic fabrics like nylon, telelyne etc., even in remoter parts of the country. The tuft has given way to cropped hair and the traditional dress has at least partially, given place to western type dress and shoes. The change of dress has marked a gradual weakening of ideas regarding ritual purity. Now eating is not a ritual act for many. People particularly the elite sit at dinner with dress on. And so on. Changes have been taking place in other respects due to the impact of the Great traditions.

C. Von Grunnebaum has discussed the ways conflict, co-existence and interaction take place between Islamic Great culture and local cultures. One's life style is considered superior to that of the other because the elite are related to that symbolising the Great tradition. It has usually wide acceptance while the folk life style is the feature of the Little tradition and so its extension is in limited region. To him both traditions are related to belief. Hypothesis of the Great tradition is said to be 'belief' while hypothesis of the Little tradition may be said, 'superstitions'. And social position of an individual depends on the situation as to which of the two traditions internalises on one's life. Grunnebaum believes that commentators of the Great traditions of the Islam religion can evaluate it in a new way and adjustment of local thought and customs with Islam as a great religion can be arrived at. In fact, both are supplementary and each influence the other.

Following the analysis frame proposed by Robert Redfield, Milton Singer, Mekim Marriott and others have tried to understand social change in Indian. Marriott has found the importance and relevance of the Little tradition when he says. ".....Great tradition originates by a carrying forward of materials which are already present in the Little traditions which it encompasses." While studying Modernization of Indian Tradition Yogendra Singh has presented a paradigm for an intergrated approach. There he talks about two sources of



changes in cultural structure and social structure namely heterogenetic changes and orthogenetic changes. There are two broad substantive areas of social realities to which most studies of change are oriented..... the culture and the social structure. Following Redifield, Singh has divided cultural structure into the categories of the Little tradition and Great tradition. He observes that constant changes in the Great tradition are going on from the vedic time down to the 20th century and also in the Little tradition. In the cultural structure of India significance of Islamic impact can be seen at the levels of both of the Little and Great traditions. These traditions have the impact of westernisation. Primary westernization is the changes induced by western impact on Indian Little tradition. The other form of westernization of Indian cultural structural modernization— contributing to the emergence of a new Great tradition of modernization, Parallel to the classical Great tradition cultural. Modernization of India society is going on and it has been affecting both the tradition— the Little and the Great. They are interacting to each other. No doubt the Great tradition of Indian cultural structure is more effective influencing the Little traditions which however, affect the Great traditions to some extent.





## Industrialization

Industrialization refers to the actual course of transition from the preceding agricultural or commercial society towards the industrial society at the result of the development of factory systems under mechanical power. According to Kerretel the most commonly used index of industrializations is the proportion of a nation's labour force engaged in agriculture. As the proportion declines, a nation can be considered as becoming more industrial. It should be noted, however, that this is an index and not a measure of industrialization, The reduction in the agricultural labour force can be seen more appropriately as a consequence of technological, economic and organizational changes accompanying industrialization. As indicated in the preceding section, the concept of modernizations is a comprehensive term that subumes industrialization and other concepts such as econoic growth or development and the political, social, religious, educational and other institutional changes that accompany industrialization.

Great Britain is considered the first and classic case of industrialization By 1830 it saw the development of workers who were acclimalazed to factory conditions and were able to move from place, from employment to employment, as required. Prior to World War-I industrialization spread widely from England to the Western World and to Japan. It spread largely by diffursion rather than by independent social inventions, Now a days, much of the interest in industrialization is focussed on the changes taking place in economically under developed areas.

Industrialization is accompanied by a growing degree of complexity in the division of labour and the cocomittant distribution of the labour force among occupations. At the most general level, industrialization involves a shift from labour force concentration in agricultural employment to manufacturing employment and eventually to employment in service industries. Wilbert Moore describes some of the factors that result in increased division of labour. One of these considerations is the growth in size of economic organizations, transition; first occured and proceeded to the greatest degree during the industrialization of Europe. The essence of the demographic transition is a more from a situations where both birth and death rates are highly to a situation where both of these are law. Thus many of the first European countries to industrialise have been characterized by low population growth for a number of years, where replacement through fertility equals populations losses through deaths. Contemporary developing socities however, present a different picture. Demographic changes are taking a very different— and highly problematic— form. This is due to the fact that death control have been brought about relatively rapidly, whereas a corresponding drop in birth rates lags for behind.



Rapid reduction in death rates can be achieved through such relatively simple procedures as using insecticides to control mosquitoes, flies, and other disease-transmitting insects. For example, dramatic reductions in world deaths from malaria have been achieved in this fashion, Widespread which encourages the efficiencies that result from occupational specialization. Another is technological change, which brings about new occupational specialties, such as computer programmer, and can also result in the further subdivision of skills as is the case of specialized machine operators who replaced the skilled dress maker. A third consideration is the development of new products and services, resulting in occupations that previously did not exist. The changes in the size and complexity of the labour force engaged in manufacturing and service are usually accompanied by a growth of unions and management power and a growth of class consciousness among workers. The division of labour is also related to occupational and geographic mobility as well as to highest levels of educational attainment that is more closely related to industrial functions.

Change in population patterns (birth, death, marriages, migration) is also closely linked with industrialization. The sequence of events, often referred to as the 'demographic immunization programmes and the greater availability of antibiotic drugs also contributed to the lowering of mortality rates. Birth control, however, is a different matter. In many societies, high fertility is a source of social prestige. In the industrializing context, traditional attitudes may remain a strong positive sanction for bearing children, possibly in keeping with religious values, possibly for practical considerations, such as the economic value of children or for other complex inter related reasons. Such societies are generally characterized by a high fertility rate and low or rapidly falling mortality rates, resulting in a rapid population growth and subsequent changes in the economically dependent or non productive segments in the population, such as the very young or the old.

Industrialization is also accompanied by change in family form. Traditional societies are typically characterized by an extended family system. But the more industrialized society becomes, the more likely it is to move toward the nuclear family form presents numerous advantages from the perspective of geographical mobility and increased urbanization, which are associated with industrialization. Traditional patterns in mate selection and parent-child relationships have been replaced by contemporary forms; and, as the family ceases to be an economically productive unit the social position of woman has changed. There is also some evidence to indicate that the role of divorce and other indicators of family break down increase with industrialization. However, it would be erroneous to talk about "family disorganization" as a concomitant of industrialization. Instead, at least in the United States, the modern family has undergone major changes— changes associated with urbanization and industrialization; however, it would be inaccurate to regard these as signs of deterioration. Parson argues that the family has been become a more specialised structures although it has lost some of its functions such as producing economic goods and services and educating the children; it has also become a more exclusive guardian of other functions, such a socializing the very young



and providing a setting for emotional tension management for adults. Further more the roles of the husband's father and wife's mother have become more specialized relative to one another. Parson contends that these new features of the family signify the opposite of disintegration and concludes that the nuclear family is more effective than its predecessor is specializing children for adult roles in industrial society.

Industrialization is related to the increased need for literacy since education is a determining factor in labour force participation and for social mobility. There is a greater reliance on mass communication channels both as a source of information and as a means for breaking down the previous forms of isolation. It also results in the development of a popular culture, replacing some of the traditional forms of recreation. There is also a sharp division between "work" and 'leisure' a distinction that did not exist in agrarian or tribal societies. Time becomes a scarce commodity. There is an increased participation in voluntary associations, an increase in secular attitude, and the rise of clearly differentiated political and administrative structures.

In sum, industrialization is an important pattern of change. In analysing it, we often find it difficult to determine where best to "draw the line". An examination of this pattern of change can be almost indefinitely extended in continuing to discover ways in which its presence makes itself known.

### QUESTIONS

1. What is industrialization ? What is its importance in Indian society ?
2. Define industrialization. What changes in society is being observed due to industrialisation ? Explain.

### Books Recommended

1. Yogendra Singh — Modernization of Indian tradition.
2. M.V. Srinivas — Industrialization and urbanization of Rural Areas..
3. Krugsley Davis — Urbanization in India





## Urbanization

A city has a physical form, with geographic limits and a compactness of physical structure. The population is relatively dense, compact, heterogeneous, and mobile; yet the area is fairly permanently settled. Occupationally, the people are highly differentiated and diversified. The commercial and industrial establishments perform business, manufacturing, financial, transportations agencies, and special interest groups. Legally, a city is a subsidiary political corporation, with its classification and status determined by state charter. As a political unit, a city has a municipal form of government, with powers to make laws to levy taxes, and to carry on other government functions. An urban centre tends to develop characteristic attitudes and values, customs and traditions, and cultural forms that give it the appearance of having a state of mind. Cities vary in size, location, chief characteristics, and functions.

**Urbanism** : Urbanization refers to the proportion of the total populations in the urban settlements or to the rise of the proportion. At times, the terms population implosion, is used to describe this increased concentration of world's peoples in urban or metropolitan areas. Urbanization also refers to show people live, their patterns of behaviour and social relationships. There are two aspects— where people live and how they live— are interrelated. The world's earliest cities appeared some 5000 to 6000 years ago in Sumer, the southern part of Mesopotamia, and various types of commercial cities such as Mecca existed long before the advent of modernization and industrialization.

Historically it seems that the urbanization of homos sapiens occurred almost yesterday. As back as in 1850 no country in the world was as urbanized (39%) as the world as a whole is now. Only about 2 percent of the world's population lived in the cities of more than 40 years ago, Louis Wirth answered affirmatively. He started by assuming that the larger, the more densely populated, the more heterogeneous a community, the more accentuated the characteristics associated with urbanism will be. For him, a city is permanent settlement, characterized by large size, density, and heterogeneity leading to correspondingly more transitory, anonymous, formalized, and specialized interrelationships— that is, to a more urbanized way of life. He reasoned that the greater the number of people interacting, the potential for differentiation, bringing about lesser dependence on particular persons, less intimate relations more freedom from the personal and emotional control of intimate groups, and no individual alliance to a single— group. Density results in further differentiation and specialization, a separation of residence from the work place, and the functional specialization of areas in the city. The city thus becomes a mosaic of social worlds. Because of a high degree of heterogeneity, there is no common set of values in the city, and money tends to become the measures of all things. Formal controls replaces informal controls, and it becomes necessary to adhere to predictable routines.



As a consequence of these factors, the urban dweller develops characteristics personality attributes and attitudes. Due to the many life strikes and kinds of people, there develops a relativistic perspective. He becomes secularized and free of intimate ties; he lacks a strong sense of integration and participation. Thus, the city is characterized by anomie. In the middle of the crowd the individual feels lonely, senses friction and irritation, personal frustration, and nervous tension. Because of the mobility and diversity in the city, he accepts instability and insecurity in the world at large as a norm because of his segmental roles and alliances. The personal integrity is constantly threatened, and he is vulnerable to manipulation by the mass media. For these reasons Wirth suggested that the incidence of personal disorganization, mental break down, suicide, delinquency, crime, corruptions, and disorder tend to be higher in cities than in rural communities.

Robert Redfield argues that all occasions of urbanization repeat a particular series of events— that there is a unilinear centiceum from folk to an urban form of organization. He describes folk societies as small, isolated, and homogenous, with no division of labour except according to sex and age roles. Face to face communications prevail and these societies are marked by a high degree of solidarity. Religion is important and social control is exercised through the sacred, cultural patterns are based upon sentiment and tradition. There is no writing, no complex technology, status is ascribed at birth; and members of the society follows folkways uncritically and spontaneously. The family is the central social group. Redfield maintains that the transformation of an isolated folk community into an urban society occurs through a transmission of influences from the latter, resulting in cultural heterogeneity, disorganization, secularization, and individuation in the former.

Currently urbanization is more highly visible in the under developed nations. In fact, many of these nations have a quite large proportion of the world's urban population, although only a small percentage of the societies are predominantly urban. The cities of the underdeveloped nations have grown by the transfer of underemployed to the cities, which have offered little more than the country side in the way of economic opportunities. The European experience was more a phenomenon of urban growth reflecting a general pattern of industrialization, with the cities characterized by expanding economic opportunities.

Lambert says that many urban studies show that cities in India continue to be dominated by cultural and structural attributes which are far different from those which are considered to be typical for a city e.g., formalization, atomization, lack of familism and kinbound groupings and predominance of secular ideologies, etc. Studies reveal, on the other hand, that in the Indian context a rural-urban dichotomy is untidy if not irrelevant; comparatively larger number of persons are found engaged in primary industries even in metropolitan cities, not to say of others; contrary to the sociological stereotype, familistic norms and joint family structures have been found to be predominant in many urban centres; the neighbourhood pattern of some cities studied is organized on caste and kinship lines similar, to the villages. The migratory pattern in the city is also closely related with ties of kinship and acquaintance ; it has been categorized as “family— centred associational migration.



The rapid rate of urbanization in developing countries gave rise to the concept of "over urbanization". It implies the belief that a particular developing country has too high a proportion of its population residing in cities where high densities are considered detrimental to health and general wellbeing. More important over urbanization is often indicative of the fact that the urban population of a nation is too large in relation to the extent of its economic development. Egypt for example, is far more urbanized than its degree of economic development would warrant. It is more urbanized than France and Sweden, both industrial nations, according to Davis and Golden. Over urbanization is usually the result of migration from rural areas at a rate higher than the expansion of employment opportunities in the city. This migration is prompted by high rural densities and lack of economic opportunities for peasants. Life seems difficult in the city, and for many of the migrants, it is not better than the countryside; at least in the city, however, there is always hope and possibility of something better. All over the world, peasants are voting with their feet in favour of city life. It may be argued that in so far as urbanisation is associated with the development of a modernized mode of life and general economic progress, the problem in much of the developing world is not over urbanization, but possibly under urbanization.

### **Urbanization in India :**

Though there were cities in ancient civilizations, it is only in the last two centuries that urbanization has become a characteristic form of human life. For thousands of years of recorded history human society has been rural in a predominant way because rural life is the characteristic feature of all agricultural societies. Even today, in spite of the efforts of the seven five years plans in India is predominantly rural since 75% of the population live in the rural areas.

But Indian people had built up a city civilization nearly 5,000 years back. Archaeological discoveries have shown that the Indian cities were in existence for a thousand years from 2500 B.C. to 1500 B.C. The Indus valley civilizations extended over nearly a thousand miles from Rupa in Haryana in north to Rangpur in Kathiwar in the south and up to Baluchistan in the west. The chief cities were Harappa and Mahanjo-daro which are now in Pakistan.

Indus valley civilization is one of the three ancient civilizations which developed nearly simultaneously in the river valleys of Nile, Euphrates, and Indus in the early part of third millennium B.C. Much is known of the Egyptian and Mesopotamian civilizations as they have left rock inscriptions which have been satisfactorily deciphered. The Indus valley people did not engrave long inscriptions on stone but the archaeological remains show that the pattern of civilization was so uniform that even bricks were usually of the same size and shape from one end to the other. Each city had a well fortified citadel which was probably used for both religious and governmental purposes. The layout of the cities, the regular planning of the streets, the uniformity in weights and measures, all indicate that there must have been a strong centralized state.



There were wide streets with large blocks of houses two or more storeys high. Each house had a square courtyard with a number of rooms around like traditional Indian buildings upto the recent times. But the houses had bathrooms, the design of which indicate the ancient Indians like the modern Indians preferred to take bath standing pouring water over their heads. The drainage and swerage of there cities is one of the most unique features of the Indus valley civilization.

The historians now believe that for about a thousand years after the Aryan invasion there were no cities in India. But even at the time of Budha 2,500 years ago, Kasi (Varanasi) and Kausambi were famous cities. In the time of the Mauryas, pataliputra (Patna) was a big city. According to magasthanese, the Greek traveller, Patliputra was a long narrow city stretching nine miles along the banks of the Ganges. Takshashila, where the modern capital of pakistan, Islamabad, is built, had a broad main street with large houses with central courtyards in the manner of traditional India from the days of Harappa. Kautilya in his Arthashastra give detailed instructions for the establishment of a new city with six main roads, three running from north to south and three from east to west. The great temple cities of Ayodhya, Mathura, Haridwar, Dwaraka, Kasi, Prayag, Puri, Kanchi and Madurai are very ancient.

Magasthanese as well as Kautilya mention the large spinning and weaving workshops and those established by the state to manufacture weapons and other military supplies. Thus, even in the Mauryan period there was a public sector and a private sector. Prices were being regulated by the market officials, In order to maintain just prices, Government officials were asked to buy staple grains in the open market when they were cheap and plentiful and release the stocks when they were in short supply in order to bring down the prices and also to secure profit to the state.

Thus, though India has been a land of villages it has also had an urban tradition from times immemorial. The muslim rulers built the great cities of Agra, Delhi and Lahore in the north, and Golkunda, Hyderabad, Bijapur and Srirangapatnam in the south. The British built the metropolitan port cities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. Since independence new cities have been built like Chandigarh, Bhubaneshwar, Bhillai, Durgapur, Neyveli etc.

### **Urbanization in Modern India :**

But according to the census figures in 1901 and 1911 only 10.5 percent of the people were living in urban areas. It went up to 12 percent in 1931. Since then there has been a significant increase in the urban population. It went up to 14 percent in 1941, 17 percent in 1951 and 18 percent in 1961. There were nearly millions people living in the urban areas in 1991 nearly one half of whom lived in cities of over 100,000 while the other half lived in the smaller towns. About 20 million or a grater of the urban people lived in the eleven metropolitan cities with over half million population— in Calcutta, Bombay, Delhi, Madras, Hadarabad, Ahmadabad, Bangalore, Kanpur, Poona, Lucknow and Nagpur.



The United Nations survey had identified five main criteria in defining the urban areas, namely, (i) administrative function, (ii) population size, (iii) Local self-government, (iv) certain urban characteristics like sewerage, public water supply, electricity, police station, Hospital, market, educational institution, courts of law, local means of transport etc., and (v) predominant economic activity; over two thirds of the people in the area should be engaged in industry, commerce, transportation and other non-agricultural occupations. The United Nations Population Commission further recommended that for international purpose places with more than 20,000 population could be considered urban because an agglomeration of this size is not likely to retain rural characteristics.

### QUESTIONS

1. What is urbanization. What is being changes in societies due to urbanization explains.
2. Write a historical account of the growth of cities in India.

### Books Recommended

1. E.E. Burged — Urban sociology
2. Fairchild, H.P. "Dictionary of sociology
3. Thomson, L.S. "Encyclopaedia of social sciences.

□□□



## **Law and Social Change, Social Changes Through Legislative Measures in India**

Law is closely related to society, the subject matter of sociology. George Gurvitch has rightly said, "a little law leads away from sociology but much law leads back to it." If one looks at the history of western sociology, it is clear that 'much sociology' did indeed lead its founders back to law. The structural significance of law, in the broadest perspective, was most clearly recognized by the founders of modern sociology like Durkheim, Max Weber and K. Marx. Their conceptual elaboration gave some kind of primacy to law as a social variable. But unfortunately, since the early 1920s, a gradual dissociation between sociology and law began, leaving criminology as the only meeting ground between lawyers and sociologists. In many parts of the world, but especially in the U.S.A. and Europe, we now witness the emergence of an autonomous discipline called the 'sociology of law'.

Western experiences also indicate that much law led back to sociology. It is viewed that understanding of lawyers' law (that is legal processes as relevant to decision-makers or law-men-judges, lawyers, law reformers and jurists) is almost impossible without a sensitive grasp of the implications of law as a social process. In fact, there has been much talk of LAW and SOCIAL CHANGE all around. Here first of all the concept of law and social change should be made clear in brief and the attempt would be made to have same understanding of the relationship between the two.

The concept of law has been defined in several ways. Some of them are given below—

According to Woodrow Wilson—Law is that portion of the established thought and habit which has gained distinct and formed recognition in the shape of uniform rules backed by the authority and power of government. "To Holland, 'A law is a general rule of external action enforced by a sovereign political authority.'" It shows that external actions formed by people are controlled and regulated by law. Highlighting the close relationship between law and value (internalised by individuals in their group) Krabbe views. 'Law is the expression of many judgments of value which we human beings make by virtue of our disposition and nature'. R.M. MacIver and C.H. Page have pointed out that law is not an ethical rule prescribing the right and forbidding the wrong deeds and it is not a rule that society compels individuals to obey. To them Law is the body of rules which are recognised, interpreted and applied to particular situations by the courts of the state." Further it is stated that a customs may become law when the state, which means in the last resort the court, is prepared to enforce it as a rule binding on citizens and residents within its jurisdiction. Thus through law, people's lives are regulated, their right and duties defined, the offences against individuals and society determined and punishments for the violaters provided.



### **Social Change—**

The concept of social change has been a very difficult and fascinating in sociology. Modern sociology began with attempts by Auguste Comte and other nineteenth century writers to explain the causes and the course of social change which was dramatically expressed in the French political and the English industrial revolutions. Social change is usually considered a universal, inevitable, natural, unequal and comparative, complex and unpredictable phenomenon. It has been defined differently. Some of the definitions are given below—

According to K.Davis, 'By social change is meant only such alterations as occur in social organisation, that the structure and functions of society.'

Samuel Koenig views, 'Social change refers to the modifications occur which in the life patterns of a people'. M.D. Jenson has elaborated it in this way, 'Social change may be defined as modification in way of doing and thinking of people.' Ginsberg considers social change, as a change in social structure and Harry M. Johnson has also defined in similar word.

Elaborately Jones defined in this way. "Social change is a word used to describe variations in or modification of any aspect of social process, social patterns, social interactions or social organization." Thus changes in the basic elements of social system or its social structure may be characterised as social change.

Now here it may be discussed that laws are responsible for social changes in society and the nature, characteristics, speed and direction of social change might necessitate the emergence of new laws or reformulation or removal of certain laws in a society as both are interrelated especially in modern world. There may be differences in the intensity of their relationship depending upon the quality of development' or 'modernisation' of the society concerned and the law.

In traditional society the sanctity of tradition matters most. There is more reliance on the wisdom and sanctity of the past. The laws are relatively concrete and may or may not provide adequate guide for new situations. These unspecified sphere of whim or 'grace' or discretion to the holders of authoritative positions and their traditional sphere of discretion happens to be the source of new legislation. In such society laws fails to bring expected change in the social structure of a social system. But if that society is being exposed to outside world and is anxious to change then changes might be effective to some extent. As in case of developing countries like India one may notice. There the enlightened individuals and social reformers may try to change some old norms, values, customs or traditions harmful for the society and for the purpose they might influence the government to formulate the relevant laws for social change. For realising the smooth and expected or desired social change laws are framed. On the other hand effectiveness of law depend on the intensity and direction of changes taking place in a society. Say, if population is fast increasing and becoming a problem, than new laws might be made for checking the population explosion. In others



words laws and social change are closely related, influencing each other. But unlike modern societies laws are not so effective and social change is not so fast and smooth in tradition dominated developing societies.

### **Social Changes through Legislative Measures in India—**

In ancient India social orders (in society) was attained by means of two mechanisms—Dharma and Achar or Custom. The state never issued any edicts or statutes. The King had no power to promulgate a law. The duty of a king was to administer justice according to the Dharmasastras.

During the colonial period the relation between Dharma and custom, between people's law and state law, underwent fundamental change. While the colonial government had generally adopted a non interference policy in the area of personal law, it made some impressive attempt to deal with some of the intrasigent features of the Hindu societylike female infanticide, the sati and child marriage. The Regulation No. 111 of 1801, the legislative measure of the government made female infanticide punishable. It was a measure of gigantic proportions, which touched directly the private lives of individuals'. It engaged a programme of social regeneration and incidently it helped in laying the foundations of a newer and healthier Hindu society in some parts of the North-Western provinces. For the blend of positive and negative sanctions (transportation of life and ten years jail), coupled with vigilant administration, led to a substantial decline in the practice of female infanticide.

Sati or the burying of the widow on the funeral pyre of the husband was the custom practiced extensively in Rajsthan, among Rajput princes and also among the Brahmins in Bengal and to some extent in Uttar Pradesh and other northern states. Raja Ram Mohan Roy began the active campaign against the custom of Sati. He showed that sati was approved by Dharmasastras and Vedas. It was opposed. But after due efforts the Governor General promulgated 'Bengal Sati Regulation, 17' in 1829. The number of cases of sati the barbarous custom began reducing significantly.

Another revolutionary legislative measure was Hindu Widow Remarriage Act of 1856, an outcome of great efforts of Ishwarchandra Vidyasagar. As a result of this Act, social reformers started widow's homes and widow remarriage associations. Young widows were provided education and enabled them to remarry. Thus it causes changes in improvement of women-condition.

Civil Marriage Act, 1872 provided for marriage irrespective of differences in religion, first of its kind making marriage a civil affair and not a sacrament. Age of Consent Act of 1881 raised the age of consent to 12 years for marriage. For this social reforms spared no effort in persuading the administration as well as in creating and mobilizing favourable public opinion. Similarly through various legislative measures efforts had been made for removing the obstacles in the proper functioning of children, women and men and also for removing the age old harmful customs. Here it may be concluded that in the pre-constitution



period-colonial period-two broad trends appear to be noticeable in the court's approach. Continuing the policy of the English rulers of not interfering with caste practices and decisions particularly where there was evidence to show usage and custom in this regard, and in the case of any practice that appeared to them to be secular and non-religious but emerged out of caste discrimination, they upheld the principle of the dignity of the individual and the equality principle.

### **Legislative Measures Since Independence—**

The constitution of free India contains provisions of revolutionary and far reaching consequences. Adult franchise has been made available to all men and women. It provides for equality of status and principle of social, economic and political justice to all citizens irrespective of caste, religion, sex etc. After 1950 it has been the policy of the Government to bring legislations in line with the fundamental rights and other provisions enunciated in the constitution. Consequently these are various legislative measures since the affecting society, economy and polity of the nation.

Hindu Marriage and Divorce Act of 1955 provided, for the first time, that the Hindu (Buddhists, Jains, Sikhs, Aryasamajis's and others included) of all castes have the same rights with respect to marriage, inter-caste marriages are now valid, no castes restriction in marriage. The Act enforces monogamy thus bringing equality between the two sexes. It also provides for judicial separation and divorce or dissolution of marriage, so that rights of men and women are the same. Hindu Succession Act, 1956 confers, for the first time absolute rights over the property possessed by a Hindu women. Female members of the family now have property right as wife, mother and daughters. Economic interest of Hindu minor children is protected properly under Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act of 1956. Status of women is enhanced through the provision of Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act, 1956 as consent of the wife is made necessary for the adoption of a child— male or female. Finally the widow has got the right to adopt. Suppression of Immoral Traffic in Women and Girls Act of 1956 and Dowry Prohibition Act of 1961 are also attempts in direction of improving the status of women and making the society more civilized but these have not been so effective.

Another very important Act of the time is the Untouchability (Offence) Act of 1955 which make the practice of untouchability cognizable and compoundable. Its impact has been noticed more in urban India. The Act was made more stringent in 1976 through a fresh Act.

Labour laws of free India have brought marked changes in the socio-economic conditions of labourers and their working conditions, though Factory Act 1948, Motor Transport Workers Act 1961, Maternity Benefits Act of 1961, Gratuity Payment Act, 1972 and others.

At first sight, modern India offers sharp contrasts and discontinuities in the agrarian realm to the conditions in the colonial India. Economic development and just redistribution of wealth and community resources are avowed and conscious goals pursued. The Planning



Commissions of India and of its constituent states vigorously formulate development goods as per constitutional objectives and prevailing laws. Many live in rural areas and are engaged in agriculture. Thus considering the importance of land in rural life zamindari Abolitions Acts were enacted in all states in India. In Bihar the Act was first promulgated in 1949 and when opposed in courts by zamindars it was amended in 1950. The Act was implemented in phases. It relieved of various problems. Various land reform legislative measures have been taken related to tenancy reform, ceiling on land holdings, consolidation of holding, restriction on subdivision and fragmentation of holdings, co-operative farmings and others. However all these legal efforts could not succeed in their object but changes have taken place in the socio-economic and political scene in rural India. But Zamindari Abolition Act was fully implemented. Modernization of agriculture has been started for making the country self sufficient in food. But various studies indicate that poverty and inequality has increased in spite of such and other measures (say related to industries) undertaken in free India. But no doubt, changes have taken place in socio-economic, educational, demographic, political characteristics of the Indian society and people. Very many changes have started taking place in social institutions (like family, caste, kinship), political, economic and other institutions. For example, small family norms has been emerging and quality of social change have also provided incentive or lead formulation of laws from time to time. In a way it is because of the socio-economic changes taken at world level that the Indian government have adopted the policy of economic liberalisation and accordingly laws have been amended and also now legislative measures have been taken. Earlier public sector was considered very relevant and meaningful but now private sector prestige is on increase and individually or collectively initiative (say through voluntary or non-government organisations, more importance in the 8th five year plan) are encouraged. In other words not only the changes taking place within a country but also in other countries became instrumental in formulation of law. But it has already been made clear that laws have been affecting the Indian society, economy and polity. It is also a fact that those laws which were implemented with greater determination (like infanticide law and zamindari abolition law) and preparedness were successfully implemented. But if prevailing social norms and values are not inconsistent with the legal norms. Then there arise many difficulties in the implementation of law. Above all, in a democratic countries like India traditional, age-old customs, values, attitude, interaction patterns of the people, government personnels have to be modified and political parties should also be ideologically and in action conducive to welcome laws so that adequate expected changes could be achieved.

□□□