deprivation, and Merton's own theory of role-set. These theories are quite different from those all-embracing total systems of sociological theory. Merton rallies to his cause an impressive array of figures in the history of thought, including Plato, Bacon and Mill, and such sociologists as Hankins, Ginsberg, Mannheim and Sorokin who favoured the theories of middle-range. However, in middle-range theory, there is summary and retrospect, an attempt to codify sociological theory, questioning of literary style in sociological writing, and a treatment of the function of paradigms in the development of science.

4.8.1 Manifest and Latent Functions

Like Parsons, Merton replaced structural functionalism with functional analysis and brought functional analysis to the fore and raised it to the level of theoretical orthodoxy. At the same time, he helped to bring about the demise of its canonical form, introducing a radically new and modified formula of functional analysis. Merton maintains that the assumptions of functional theory holds that social activities are common for an entire social system; that these social and cultural functions completes all sociological function; and that these functions cannot be done away with. While considering the first postulate, Merton faults Kingsley Davis and Wilbert E. Moose for overestimating the integrative function of religion in society. He also criticized them for ignoring the divisive effects that religion has had in the actual history of human societies. This error is attributed to the practice of carrying over, without modification, theories and conceptions derived from the study of non-literate societies. Thirdly, Merton suggests that the notion of functional indispensability of items be avoided in view of the number of functional alternatives that can be discerned in societies. According to Merton, sociologists often confuse conscious motivations and objective consequences of behaviour. In this context he brings out the distinctions between *manifest* and *latent* functions. Every specified unit, like a person, sub-group, social or cultural systems have a few objective consequences. These consequences help in the unit's adjustment or adaptation to their immediate environment. These consequences are known as *manifest functions*. On the other hand, *latent* functions are the unrecognized and unintended consequences. Merton contends that all sociologists know this difference but have not taken this up for a serious investigation.

4.9 THEORY OF ANOMIE

From a functionalist position, Merton in his article 'Social Structure and Anomie' in 1938 considers not only *conformity* but also *deviance* as a part of social structure. Instead of setting the individual in opposition to a social structure that constrains him in either a Durkheimian or Freudian sense, Merton wants to show that structure is an active factor, that it produces motivations that cannot be predicted from knowledge of native impulses or drives. It is not wayward personalities but ordinary social structure that motivate behaviour that is then labelled deviant. In this respect, Merton extends the theory of functional analysis from the study of

social structure, where it involves questions of order and maintenance, then to the study of order and maintenance, and ultimately to the study of social change. However, Merton's primary aim in the essay 'is to discover how some social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society to engage in non-conforming rather than conforming conduct'. In this regard, he distinguished between cultural goals in a society and institutional norms that arise to regulate their pursuit. There is a difference between technically effective means of achieving goals and culturally legitimate means of achieving them. When the two coincide, the society tends to be stable. When they draw apart or when technically efficiency is emphasized over cultural legitimacy, then the society becomes unstable and approaches a state of anomie, or a place with no norms.

Functionalist position of value, in the functional sociological theory, holds that all members of a society have the same value. However, since the positions of the actors in a social system are different, and actors positioned in different classes would differ in class positions. These actors positioned differently will definitely not have the chance to realize their values in a similar manner. He uses USA as a basis for his study and maintains that though every American shares the same value, their achievements are varied. Success in this society is mostly measured with the achievement of material possessions. America has accepted talent, hard work, drive, determination and success, coming through educational qualifications as standard means of achieving success. However, this is an unbalanced society and unlike other societies, there are no value-based means of achieving cultural goals. The people tend to bend the rules and attempt to achieve their goals. When people do not abide by rules, a state of 'anomie' flourishes. There are five ways that Americans respond to anomie. In this regard Merton provides his famous 'Typology of Modes of Individual Adaptation' as follows:

Modes of adaptation	Culture goals	Institutionalized means
Conformity	+	+
Innovation	+	−
Ritualism	−	+
Retreatism	−	−
Rebellion	+	+

These categories refer to *behaviour* and *not personality*. The same person may use different modes of adaptation in different circumstances. Conformity is the most widely diffused and the most common type of adaptation; otherwise society would be unstable. They strive for success by means of accepted channels. Secondly, innovation rejects normative means of achieving success and turn to deviant means, in particular, crime. Merton argues that members of the lower social strata are most likely to select this route to success. They are least likely to succeed through conventional channels, thus, there is greater pressure upon them to deviate. Merton uses the term *ritualism* to describe the third response. To him, ritualism occurs when an individual drops out of 'rat race' that monetary success requires but continues to go through the motions required by the norms of the

society. Merton suggests that it is the lower-middle class that exhibits a relatively high incidence of ritualism. The ritualist is a deviant because he has rejected the success goals held by most members of society. Merton terms the fourth and least common response as *retreatism*. This involves rejection of both goals and norms and the 'people who fit into this category are the true aliens'—psychotics, pariahs, outcasts, vagrants, vagabonds, tramps, drunkards and drug addicts. Merton does not relate retreatism to any social class position. *Rebellion* is a rejection of both the goals and the norms of the old structure and accept and actively work for the goals and norm of the new. People who wish to create a new society would take this alternative. The guerillas in Western Europe take up the deviant path of terrorism to achieve their goals. Merton maintains that only the lower classes take to deviant paths and the upper class that has legal means to achieve their aims and goals refrain from doing it. The rising class organizes the dejected population to bring about a revolution in order to wipe away the old order and usher in the new.

Thus Merton shows how culture and structure of society generate deviance. The overemphasis upon cultural goals in American society at the expense of institutionalized means creates a tendency towards anomie. This tendency exerts pressure for deviance; a pressure which varies depending on a person's position in the class structure. Merton thus explains deviance in terms of nature of society rather than nature of an individual.

4.10 REFERENCE GROUP THEORY

Rejecting Hyman's conception of reference groups, Merton formulated his own idea of reference group. What Merton and (earlier) Hyman studied is behaviour in terms of some subjectively selected frame of reference. Thus, 'Reference group behaviour means not so much the behaviour of reference groups but rather human behaviour in terms of particular frames of reference supplied by the groups but also by reference individuals, statures, role models, culture heroes, reference idols etc.' The idea of reference group rovers those processes of evaluation and self-appraisal is which the individual takes the values or standards of other individuals and groups as a comparative frame of reference. However, Merton's theory of reference group, one of the most developed theories of middle-range, attempts to explain why individuals select certain frames of reference and not others. It also attempts to trace the consequences of those choices for the wider society. Both the origins and consequences of the selection are referred to the social structure, and thus, in one sense, reference group theory is another example of Merton's structural orientation.

The concept of reference group arises essentially from the fact that any person acting in any situation may be influenced by the positions he occupies in one or more interaction or status group and by his conceptions and expectations of the group or groups by which he may be interacting. However, his conception of still other groups of which he is *not a member* and apart from any interaction he

may be having with them will also influence the individual. These groups—either interaction groups or status groups—exert their influence as reference groups in purely passive ways, simply by being *thought of*. Any group may be a reference group for a given person—a group to which he belongs or one to which he does not belong, an interaction group, a status group or a statistical category; a group whose members are aware of their influence or one whose members are not an actual group or even an imaginary group. According to Merton, reference groups are of three types: those with whom men are in actual association, those with whom they share the same status or social category. An example of the first would be the man who compares himself with friends and acquaintances; of the second, a captain who compares himself with other captains; and of the third enlisted men comparing themselves to officers. Men sometimes compare themselves with groups of which they are members and sometimes with groups of which they are not. Thus, both membership and non-membership groups are involved. For members of a particular group, another group is a reference group if any of the following circumstances prevail:

(i) Some or all of the members of the first group aspire to membership in the second group (the reference group).

(ii) The members of the first group strive to be like the members of the reference group in some respect, or to make their group like the reference group in some respect.

(iii) The members of the first group derives some satisfaction from being unlike the members of the reference group in some respect, and strive to maintain the difference between the group or between themselves and members of the reference group.

(iv) Without necessarily striving to be like or unlike the reference group or its members, the members of the first group appraise their own group or themselves using the reference group or its members as a standard for comparisons.

Merton's understanding of relative deprivation is closely tied to his treatment of reference groups or reference group behaviours. Merton speaks of relative deprivation by examining the findings of *The American Soldier* by Stouffer in 1949. It appeared that people in the Army were happy or unhappy with their situations depending upon the situations or persons or groups with whom they compared themselves. Those who might objectively be better off, nevertheless, often felt themselves to be deprived in relation to some other group to whom they made references. So, relative deprivation and reference groups came together as two sociological concepts.

4.10.1 Determinants of Reference Groups

The same individual may choose different reference groups for different purposes under the influence of various determinants. Individuals, other than referencing

groups, also reference people who influence then through their social status, glamour and charisma. Thus, we notice that referenced people are mostly considered role models.

On the other hand, for Merton, individuals belong to innumerable groups and it depends upon the individuals whether to take them seriously in shaping their behaviour or evaluating their achievements and role performance. Thus, short-term groups, for example, a postgraduate class that would move out in two years' time would normally not be taken as a reference group. Groups formed according to the same profession, kinship or caste may be taken as reference groups as these will last for many years. Individuals, however, choose groups of which they are not members, as their reference groups. The selection of some groups may be done on the basis that they 'confer some prestige in terms of the institutional structure of that society'. The members of a group who cannot relate with other members of the group generally reference other lucrative groups; for example, the 'disenchanted member of the elite who adopts the politician orientation of a class less powerful than his own'. Individuals in a social system that entails a high social mobility may like to reference groups of which he is not a member as his reference group, hoping to become a member of such a group in the near future. Merton classified reference groups into two types: the *normative* and *comparison* type. While the former lays out rules for the members, the latter provides a frame of comparison against which the member evaluates himself. Reference groups thus help us understand how lifestyle, behaviour and roles in a social setup get influenced. It also helps us understand the complexity of reference group behaviour and the conflict these might cause in a social system.

4.11 THE SOCIOLOGY OF SCIENCE

Merton's focus on the social aspects of science culminates in founding a separate scientific discipline—the sociology of science. His intellectual development leading him inevitably towards sociology of science may be conceived in terms of two stages. The first covers *rediscovery of sociology of knowledge* as founded by Marx, Mannheim and Scheler. The second covers his *drift away from sociology of knowledge towards sociology of science*. It began with his youthful doctoral dissertation, 'Science, Technology and Society in 17th century England'. Science is more a way of viewing the world rather than a source for contributing to the needs of man. His thesis on relationship between Puritanism and science attracted the attention of many scholars because it is closely related to the great work of Weber. Merton said that there was something about the Protestant ethic that served as an encouragement to the growth of science. He isolated several facts of Puritan thought and concluded that scientists of the 17th century functioned as *innovators*. The scientists adopted the posture of turning to nature rather than to theological inspiration or speculation as a means to attain their goals. Merton was also concerned with the influence of economic and military factors upon scientific

development. He considers the utility of science for developing technologies in mining, transportation, navigations, reforestation and the manufacture of weapons of war. However, science prospered because of its utility for the practical affairs of life. He claimed that Puritanism provided not exclusive, not indispensable but major support for science in that particular period of history.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

4. List a few examples of middle-range theories propounded by Merton.
5. What are reference groups?

4.12 SUMMARY

- Talcott Parsons was born in Colorado, USA on 13 December 1902 to Edward Smith and Mary Augusta. Parsons' father was an academician and the vice-president of the Colorado College.

- Parsons has emphasized the necessity of developing a systematic, general theory of human behaviour. He views the development of abstract theory as the principal index of maturity of a science. Such theory facilitates description, analysis and empirical research. And such pursuits require a general frame of reference and demand understanding of the structure of the theoretical system.

- Sociological theory, according to Parsons, is structural-functional. Being influenced by Marshall, Durkheim, Weber and Pareto, he provided a general theoretical scheme in his *The Structure of Social Action* (1973), *Towards a General Theory of Action* (1951) and *The Social System* (1951).

- Sociological theory, Parsons maintained is an action theory based on voluntaristic principle which means it should take into account goals, values, normative standards and action choices which actors make on the basis of alternative values and goals. Moreover, sociological theory must take into account the principle of emergence.

- Parsons' early contributions were based on the conviction that the appropriate subject matter of sociology is social action, a view reflecting the strong influence of Max Weber, and to some extent, Thomas. In *The Structure of Social Action* Parsons presents an extremely complicated theory of social action in which it is held to be *voluntaristic behaviour*. The analysis is largely based on the means-end scheme.

- Parsons' voluntaristic theory of action emerged from two different traditions—the tradition of *positivistic utilitarianism* on one hand and the tradition of *idealism* on the other.

- The three analytical systems, viz., the personality system, the social system and the cultural systems are all based on Parsons' schemes. Thus, behavioural and cultural aspects of role expectations are defined by the motivational and values orientations.

- Pattern variables first emerged as a conceptual scheme for classifying types of roles in social systems starting with the distinction between professional and business roles. Later, the scheme was revised and its relevance extended from role analysis in the social system to the analysis of all types of systems of action.

- Pattern variables, apart from being dilemmas of choice that every actor confronts are also characteristics of value standards and a scheme for the formulation of value standards. These pattern variables are also categories for description of value orientations, crucial components in the definition of role expectations, characterizations of differences of empirical structure of personalities or social systems. These are inherent patterns of cultural value orientation.

- A pattern variable in its cultural aspect is a normative pattern, in its personality aspect, a need, a disposition; and in its social system aspect a role expectation. Explaining the relationship between pattern variables, Parsons is of the opinion that the first three derive from the problems of primacy among the modes of orientation; the last two from indeterminate object situation.

- Parsons conceives of an actor who acts in terms of means and conditions and this actor has an object towards the act. Parsons maintained that individuals interact in conditions where the process becomes easy to investigate in a scientific sense. Then it is analysed using the same techniques that other sciences use to carry out their investigations. Parsons' notion of social system varies with different places.

- Social system, according to him, is defined as a plurality of individual actors interacting with one another. Again, the social system is described as a plurality of individuals who are motivated by a tendency to optimum gratification. Individuals also have relation to this situation that is defined in terms of a system of culturally structured and shared patterns. There are three types of motives. These are: (i) *cognitive* (ii) *cathective* and (iii) *evaluative*. There are three corresponding types of values: (i) *cognitive* (ii) *appreciative* and (iii) *moral*.

- Parsons became increasingly concerned with social change. He visualized that the energetic information exchanges among action systems provide the potential for change *within* or *between* the action systems as well. Parsons' views social change as a process of social evolution from simple to more complex forms of societies. He regards changes in adaptation as a major driving force of social evolution. Such change may be brought about by

excess energy or information during the process of exchange within action systems.

- These excesses modify the energy or information crossing over to the other action system. On the other hand, insufficient information or structure may also change or affect the action system in some way. Motivation, for example, would definitely change the way actors behave and eventually affect the cultural orientation of the social system.

- Robert Merton was born in Philadelphia, USA, on 4 July 1910. He was introduced to sociology by George E. Simpson of the Temple University, Philadelphia. His immediate community and his life in southern Philadelphia influenced his sociological theories.

- The sociological community perceives Merton as a devout academic, primarily a scholar involved in the disinterested search for truth, with reason as his major tool. Merton is conceived of as a functional analyst concerned with sociological understanding produced by research of objective, latent patterns inherent in social life. Merton, being a central figure in the theoretical development of American sociology, was influenced both by Parsons and Sorokin, though Parson's impact was more pronounced in his works.

- Merton developed the notion of middle-range theory as the theoretical goal suitable for the contemporary epoch of sociology. He conceives of sociological theory as logically interconnected sets of propositions from which empirical uniformities can be derived.

- To Merton, the theories of middle range are used primarily to guide empirical inquiry. Examples of middle-range theories are the theory of reference groups, the theory of relative deprivation, and Merton's own theory of role-set. These theories are quite different from those all-embracing total systems of sociological theory. Merton rallies to his cause an impressive array of figures in the history of thought, including Plato, Bacon and Mill, and such sociologists as Hankins, Ginsberg, Mannheim and Sorokin who favoured the theories of middle-range. However, in middle-range theory, there is summary and retrospect, an attempt to codify sociological theory, questioning of literary style in sociological writing, and a treatment of the function of paradigms in the development of science.

- Every specified unit, like a person, sub-group, social or cultural systems have a few objective consequences. These consequences help in the unit's adjustment or adaptation to their immediate environment. These consequences are known as *manifest functions*. On the other hand, *latent* functions are the unrecognized and unintended consequences. Merton contends that all sociologists know this difference but have not taken this up for a serious investigation.

- Merton distinguished between cultural goals in a society and institutional norms that arise to regulate their pursuit. There is a difference between

technically effective means of achieving goals and culturally legitimate means of achieving them. When the two coincide, the society tends to be stable. When they draw apart or when technically efficiency is emphasized over cultural legitimacy, then the society becomes unstable and approaches a state of anomie, or a place with no norms.

- The concept of reference group arises essentially from the fact that any person acting in any situation may be influenced by the positions he occupies in one or more interaction or status group and by his conceptions and expectations of the group or groups by which he may be interacting. However, his conception of still other groups of which he is *not a member* and apart from any interaction he may be having with them will also influence the individual.

- These reference groups—either interaction groups or status groups—exert their influence as reference groups in purely passive ways, simply by being *thought of*. Any group may be a reference group for a given person—a group to which he belongs or one to which he does not belong, an interaction group, a status group or a statistical category; a group whose members are aware of their influence or one whose members are not an actual group or even an imaginary group.

- Merton's focus on the social aspects of science culminates in founding a separate scientific discipline—the sociology of science. His intellectual development leading him inevitably towards sociology of science may be conceived in terms of two stages. The first covers *rediscovery of sociology of knowledge* as founded by Marx, Mannheim and Scheler. The second covers his *drift away from sociology of knowledge towards sociology of science*. It began with his youthful doctoral dissertation, 'Science, Technology and Society in 17th century England'.

- Science is more a way of viewing the world rather than a source for contributing to the needs of man. Merton's thesis on relationship between Puritanism and science attracted the attention of many scholars because it is closely related to the great work of Weber. Merton said that there was something about the Protestant ethic that served as an encouragement to the growth of science. He isolated several facts of Puritan thought and concluded that scientists of the 17th century functioned as *innovators*. Merton was also concerned with the influence of economic and military factors upon scientific development. He considered the utility of science for developing technologies in mining, transportation, navigations, reforestation and the manufacture of weapons of war.

- However, science prospered because of its utility for the practical affairs of life. He claimed that Puritanism provided not exclusive, not indispensable but major support for science in that particular period of history.

4.13 KEY TERMS

- **Cognitive orientation**: A process through which the actor perceives a situation in relation to his system of need-dispositions.

- **Cathective orientation**: A process through which an actor invests an object with affective or emotional significance.

- **Evaluative orientation**: A process through which an actor allocates his energy to various interests among which he must choose.

- **Affectivity–affective neutrality**: The amount of emotion or effect that is appropriate in a given interaction situation.

- **Self orientation–collective orientation:** The level or extent till which an action may be directed towards realizing individual or group goals.

- **Universalism–particularism:** The process to deal with the problem of whether evaluation and judgment of others in an interaction situation is to apply to all actors.

- **Ascription–achievement:** The process to deal with the issue of whether to assess an actor in terms of performance or on the basis of inborn qualities, such as sex, age, race and family status.

- **Specificity–diffuseness:** The process to deal with the issues of how far reaching obligation in an interaction situation should be.

4.14 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Talcott Parsons was a leading exponent of functionalism and had a considerable influence upon American sociological tradition of various scholars. Parsons took upon himself the responsibility to provide a general theoretical structure for the whole of sociology, which would serve, also, to integrate all the social sciences.

2. Any behaviour becomes action when:
   - It is oriented to attainment of ends or goals
   - It occurs in situations
   - It is regulated by norms and values of society and
   - It involves an investment of energy or motivation or effort

3. Stages of evolution, according to Parsons, bring about the formation of a new set of problems in the integration between society and culture. With every passing stage, these systems have been influenced and modified to become internally distinct as well as distinct from each other.

4. Examples of middle-range theories are the theory of reference groups, the theory of relative deprivation, and Merton's own theory of role-set. These

theories are quite different from those all-embracing total systems of sociological theory.

5. Reference groups—either interaction groups or status groups—exert their influence as reference groups in purely passive ways, simply by being *thought of*. Any group may be a reference group for a given person—a group to which he belongs or one to which he does not belong, an interaction group, a status group or a statistical category; a group whose members are aware of their influence or one whose members are not an actual group or even an imaginary group.

4.15 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Write a short note on Parsons' structural functionalism.
2. What are the determinants of pattern variables?
3. What do you understand by latent functions?
4. What are the three values propounded by Parsons?
5. What are normative and comparison types of reference groups?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Analyse Parsons' AGIL model.
2. Discuss Parson's theory of social system.
3. Critically analyse Parsons' theory of social change.
4. Discuss Merton's theory of functional analysis.
5. Analyse Merton's theory of Anomie with reference to the social structure in America.

4.16 FURTHER READING/REFERENCES

Abel, Theodore. 1980. *The Foundations of Sociological Theory*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Abraham, Francis M. and John Henry Morgan. 1985. *Sociological Thought*. Chennai: Macmillan India.

Aron, Raymond. 1965. *Main Currents in Sociological Thought*, Vol. I and II. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Boguardus, Emory S. *The Development of Social Theory*. 1969. Mumbai: Vakils, Feffa and Simons.

Ritzer, George. 1988. *Sociological Theory*, Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

References

Fararo, Thomas J. 2001. *Social Action Systems*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Parsons, Talcott and Neil J. Smelser. 1956. *Economy and Society*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Parsons, Talcott, Robert F. Bales, and Edward A. Shils. 1953. *Working Papers in the Theory of Action*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Parsons, Talcott. 1964. *Structure of Social Action*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Merton, Robert K. 1938–10. 'Social Structure and Anomie'. *American Sociological Review,* 3 (5), 1938–10, pp. 672–682.

Merton, Robert K. 1968. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New Delhi: Amerind Publication.

Merton, Robert K. 1973. *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Ritzer, George. 2000. *Sociological Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rocher, Guy. 1975. *Talcott Parsons and American Sociology*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

UNIT 5 RADHA KAMAL MUKERJEE AND M.N. SRINIVAS

Structure

5.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, we will study about the life and works of two stalwarts of Indian sociology, Radha Kamal Mukerjee and M.N. Srinivas. We will discuss and critique the general theory of society and the regional basis of values and symbols propounded by Mukerjee. We will also examine the theory of social change proposed by Srinivas.

5.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Learn about the lives of Indian sociologists Radha Kamal Mukerjee and M.N. Srinivas
- Discuss the general theory of society proposed by Mukerjee
- Critique the regional basis of values and symbol
- Examine the theory of social change introduced by Srinivas

5.2 RADHA KAMAL MUKERJEE AND THE GENERAL THEORY OF SOCIETY

Radha Kamal Mukerjee was born in a Bengali Brahmin family in Berhampur, West Benagal in 1889. He completed his education from Presidency College, Calcutta (now Kolkata). Radha Kamal Mukerjee is considered one of the pioneers of Indian sociological theories. He has contributed in areas of:

1. General theory of society
2. Developing interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary approach in studying society
3. Sociology of values/ social structure of values
4. Social ecology and regional sociology

Mukerjee considered the question of value as an important aspect of sociology. He also argued that social science gives us knowledge and if we employ this knowledge for the betterment of man, then definitely we must create a value. His basic sociological ambition was to work for a better social order. Mukerjee's basic sociological idea was to develop a *general theory of society*. He proposed a few measures so that a borderless society can be formed. He advised sociologists to break the obstructions between physical and social sciences; to avoid distinction between social and psychological aspects; to encourage continuous exchange of ideas among the social sciences and between the social and physical sciences. These measures will help human personality to better interact with the surrounding social environment. He discouraged specialization and compartmentalization within disciplines which provide a parochial view of man's social behaviour. Radha Kamal Mukerjee had emphasized on interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approach to study and comprehend human life. This was the fundamental reason for the development of this general theory of society. In a further analysis of the general theory of society, he explains the value of a universal civilization. He maintains that civilization is the bigger picture of which culture is a part. He argues that studying the development of human civilization through the study of biological evolution, spiritual and universal dimensions. Let us discuss his views on these details.

(i) Biological evolution

Evolution has helped man form better and complex societies, of which they decide and control the environment. Animals, on the other hand, have limitations in their ability to affect and change the environment. Humans are able to rise above conflicts and strife and attain coopeation to achieve higher goals in life and resultant social change.

(ii) Universalization

Within the realm of social psychology, people are classified according to their race, ethnicity and nation. Humans are treated as slaves to their egos with bias

attitudes. All their actions are meant to achieve their own selfish interests. However, Mukerjee maintained that human beings have the potential to achieve universalization and forget their petty interests for common good. This would help people to connect to others over a collective perspective; he may start looking at himself as a member of a nation. Ethical relativism, according to Mukerjee, does not have relevance in our present times. Ethical relevance is the difference of values among societies. Instead, human beings should venture for *ethical universalism* that helps maintain unity among the human beings. Under ethical universalism, people feel free to disregard rules and norms created for attainment of parochial individual interests.

(iii) Spiritual dimension

Mukerjee maintained that there is a spiritual angle to civilization. Human beings have always moved up the ladder of spirituality by overcoming material and physical limitations. He commended the Indian and Chinese civilizations as these have managed to become and remain stable since the 6th century BC. These civilizations have thrived in the face of adversity as their values help nurture their quest for spiritualism.

In his work *Community and Society in India*, published in 1979, he argued that the true place of values in human life and progress can be understood only when we consider the natural history of value. Thus, the psychological function of values in orienting and directing the behaviour and evolution of animals capable of mental construction and experience that value-creation and communication involve. Values as adaptive mechanisms play a significant evolutionary role in life, mind and cosmos. In his argument he asserts that social sciences, which are the proper study of mankind, cannot do without a consideration of values. This is, however, completely disregarded by the social sciences governed by subjectivism, phenomenalism and physicalist assumptions and procedures. The latter help bring about a complete separation of the social sciences from one another and an unwarranted neglect of the unity and wholeness of man and his value experience. The discredit of human values and value-scale, the divorce between human ideals and norms and social action and policy and rigid, watertight demarcation between the social sciences constitute together a crisis in the modern knowledge of man and society.

The theoretical framework for the study of mankind should be such that the nexus of valuation can restore the general unity of the social sciences now concerned with the various aspects of his impulses, behaviour and strivings. The present divided treatment of social phenomena by the different social sciences with their independent, non-interacting fields go against the human experience that human impulses and values interact and cannot be dealt with in isolation. Hopefully, there is a trend today towards the discovery of the unity of knowledge. The unity of the social sciences comprises a common core of meanings and values based on an interchange and coordination of the fundamental nations and methods of the

NOTES

various social studies dealing with man, his behaviour and culture. The interdisciplinary approach in social analysis affords the highest promise not only for the unification of the social sciences but also for the clarification of universal values for all mankind.

5.2.1 Social Science and Ethical Values

Rationality, Mukerjee argues, in individual behaviour or intelligence in the social world, selects and consciously strives for more enduring and harmonious universal values. In fact, mankind not only seeks various relatively stable or institutionalized values, but is always conscious of a universal scale or hierarchy of value. The *definition* or selection of institutionalized values and the *description* of social relations and behaviour pattern for their attainment are the concerns of the various social sciences. Each social science is concerned with an appraisal of the effectiveness of behaviour patterns in creating, maintain and developing values. So, family structure for the sociologist, governmental structure for the political scientist, economic organization for the economist and the structure of law for the jurist are treated by the social scientist as objective data. The social scientist does not pass judgment on institutionalized values, but must take them as given; he may then analyse their efforts on social behaviour, and thus treat these values as cause of social behaviour.

He also argued that social scientific inquiries must, obviously, be concerned with the social consequences of human behaviour which is the result of moral decisions made by individuals. According to Mukerjee, the social sciences are not only concerned with values as they are presented in established institutions of society, but also with human choice and evaluation of moral alternatives, i.e., with ethics. Ethics for man should be naturalistic, or based on scientific grounding itself and not on blind and rigid conformity to institutional values, but value-preferences, based on different social consequences of human behaviour, stemming from different alternative and complementary sets of institutional values regarded as social facts. Ethics implies intelligent and far-sighted appraisal of psychological and social facts that are enmeshed with values and value judgments. In a sense, judgments of social facts and institutions and moral judgments do not logically exclude each other. Ethics, in the second place, is universalist and transcendent, embodying universal values for all mankind. Human history reveals an overall trend of universality in social and moral development, realizing an unlimited, forward oriented unity and wholeness of mankind.

In his work *Institutional Theory of Economics*, he argued that Indian economy is following the model of Western Economics. This model does not take into account the prevalent caste system in banking, handicrafts and local businesses. Western economics stresses mostly on industrial centres and economic markets. Mukerjee's argument was that in an ancient civilization like India, ignoring caste frameworks within the social structure is actually not advisable. He also argued, in India the economic exchange are influenced by traditional networks. The various

castes and guilds in this country have been operating in an environment of mutual cooperation and harmony in the economic market. He argued that the economic values of India should be understood with reference to existing social norms.

While discussing social ecology, he maintained that this discipline needs to be studied along with various other social sciences. The ecological aspect is composed, primarily, of geographical, geological and biological factors that work hand-in-hand. The ecology of a society is also influenced by its political, social and economic perspectives. Thus, ecology may be defined as the study of the interactions of various aspects of man and his environment. According to Mukerji the scope of human ecology as explained in his book *Regional Sociology* are 'a synoptic study of the balance of plant, animal and human communities, which are systems of correlated working part in the organization of the region'. The ecological relations of the lower animals are very similar to that of the human beings. However, culture plays a vital role in case of man. While studying human ecology, examining of regional influence, varied social habits, traditions and values is important. The intricate interactions between man and the region he resides in is dealt with by social ecology. Growth in ecological regions depend on the residents' response to it and the challenges that environment pose.

5.3 REGIONAL BASIS OF VALUES AND SYMBOLS

R.K. Mukerjee maintained that society is 'the sum of structures and functions through which man orients himself to the three dimensions or levels of his environment'. These three levels are the moral, psycho-social and ecological. Thus, society 'fulfils the basic requirements of sustenance, status and value fulfillment.' Socially accepted goals or desires that are adopted by individuals through socialization and conditioning are known as *values*. Values create set standards, aspirations and preferences in a social system. The basic concept of value cuts across desires, goals, ideals and norms. Values help man to channel his desires and goals towards a specific direction. Man can thus fight his physical desires and inner conflicts and choose the correct path. By following the path of values, individual actors successfully achieve peaceful coexistence with his fellowmen. The fundamental issue in modern societies is to make and maintain values that would be followed by all members of the society. Values should have a two-fold object: to lead to holistic development of human individuality and nurture solidarity and harmony among the members. The West developed the ideology of metaphysical individualism. However, this ideology makes man isolated from his group and dissects only his needs and preferences. Social sciences have generally ignored the human values that are shared by human beings and have, instead, focused only on those that were competitive. These sciences have also ignored the integral nature of these values that accelerate development of social culture. These parochial divisions create an artificial divide between practical sociology and metaphysics and ethics. While values are the core subject of study of ethics, empirical/practical sociology examines social structure and function. The difference

between these two has been promoted by Western social sciences. He propounds the existence of a gradation of values while talking about theorization of sociology. This gradation is noticed on four levels of social integration A crowd exudes, against institutions, a brutal kind of expression of value. Certain economic values like integrity, reciprocity, consideration, fairness, etc., may be exhibited in the economic circle. Within society, justice and equity need to be shown among members. Solidarity, cooperation, unconditional and natural love and social responsibility are the basic social values that must be displayed within a social structure. These values are required if the world society needs to be reconstructed.

Mukerjee has pronounced the existence of *disvalues* to be associated with values. Both social shortcomings and individual lags are responsible for the expression of disvalues. Individuals as well as institutions can show these disvalues too; for example criminals or organized criminal activities. He contends that ethics have a global existence in his work *Dynamics of Moral and Dimensions of Human Evolution.* In order to attain universal brotherhood, man must rise above petty selfish interests. In this world of violence and discords, this is absolutely essential.

5.3.1 Conservation and Synthesis of Values and Ideals by Institution

In his work, difference between groups, traditions, and institutions have been portrayed as nuclei of the major values, He argued that man, as he is physically endowed and a social being, seeks values not singly but collectively. He forms groups and institutions that represent methods and mechanisms for the satisfaction, promotion, and transmission of values. Every basic interest and value of mankind constitutes the nucleus of formation of groups and institutions. Groups grow from individuals, cohere together for the satisfaction of the basic values; while the mass of institutions is called into being for standardizing, organizing, and directing group relationships and activities for the satisfaction and fostering of these values. Groups are episodes in man's adaptation emerging out of the ordering and fulfillment of specific human values that become the common ends or goals of the associated individuals. As the system of values becomes stable and continuous, groups crystallize into institutions by which we understand social relationships, attitudes, and habits that are more or less enduring and have obtained social approval. Institutions, accordingly, represent the more definite, formal, and sanctioned social relationships and behaviours; the more stable integrations of both values and adaptation techniques that provide the standardized ideas, attitudes, and purposive controls for the fulfillment and promotion of values. He also argues that institutions are embodiments of the major values of man and society. They give definition and meaning to values for the individual who can mature his self only insofar as he can reflect these in his social activities and relationships. It is in this manner that values become a part of the structure of man's developed and organized self. Groups may be temporary and group values may be shifting, but in so far as groups develop into institutions, group values are tested, renewed, and consolidated by the experience of generations. Institutions combine the results of deliberation, memory,

organization, and judgment on individual and social experience for generations and thus generate ideal values. Such ideal values of institutions outlast the lives of both individuals and groups; while at the same time may be infinitely enriched by the contributions of the latter. Values are defined by institutions in a broad and general manner leaving ample scope for the variety and flexibility of individual strivings and behaviour. The mind of the socially fashioned individual constantly recreates and modifies the pattern of social values in terms of the self. Institutional values are also systematically assisted in their fulfillment in daily life by the fixation and elaboration of means and programmes, conventions, habits, morals, and schemes of action for the individual involving specific rights and duties according to his role, position, and status. Man's interests, values, and ideals are made definite and permanent as his duties in life, and character stabilized by finding his role and position in institutional life. Man can enter into and fully participate in the totality of values, both concrete and ideal, of a society and culture only in and through institutions that are embodiments of social experience of generations guiding man in his evolutionary advance. This is the biological significance of institutions. Concretely, institutions are the agencies for the fulfillment of the essential and universal biological values, such as food, marriage, family, and protection, economic values such as wealth, property, standard of living and security, social values such as status, honour, and prestige, and spiritual values, such as aesthetic appreciation, knowledge, and security amidst the uncertain and the inexplicable. It is because man can fulfil and foster values mainly through the instrumentality of institutions that these possess authority and sanctity.

Radha Kamal Mukerjee and M.N. Srinivas

NOTES

He also emphasized that human values are derived social values. He argued that man is mentally so constituted that his major urges and desires blend with one another and with his social dispositions. Thus, most values integrate desires and interests at different levels with the social urge. Human values are essentially social products. These can be satisfied only in and through man's groups and institutions. The values that groups and institutions fulfil do not represent egocentric primary desires in the raw, such as food, sex, and aggression but are secondary or derived values. Institutions stand for a certain discipline and control of man's primitive impulses and desires, a certain degree of socialization that transforms his blind, explosive, and disruptive urges into large and stable interests and values. It is not the mere sexual values that create the institutions of family and marriage institutions. Sexual and parental desires, hunger and food, play and repose, all intermingle in the composite secondary values of the family that also extend into and overlap, due to the interplay of the social impulses, with the values of kinship. Similarly, economic values are secondary and derived values, not to be attributed to the operation of single primary drives like food-getting, appropriation and possession, curiosity or constructiveness. All these mingle together and also with the social impulses in combinations that vary and that are often difficult to trace, comprising the permanent derivative economic values of economic adequacy and standard of living, security, and power. Similarly, man's primary tendencies of aggression and sympathy, dominance and subordination merge together for fashioning the derivative

social values of status and prestige. Here also institutions embody large and universal derived values. Finally, in the case of the values connected with the aesthetic, religious, and ecclesiastical institutions, it is even more difficult to single out the threads which connect them with the elemental urges of human nature. Such institutions are integrations and ordered expressions of the impulses of play, creation, assertion, and gregariousness, but in the imaginative values arising out of the harmonies of sound, colour, matter, and movement as in art and in those arising out of man's ordered relationships with the unknown and the bewildering these elemental human nature satisfactions are very much in the background.

He also argues human values involve orderly relationships of persons and objects. All institutions, accordingly, give fulfillment to secondary or derived values in which some definite ordering or integration of the primary urges and interests is implied for the sake of their durable satisfaction in man's social setting. By blending, by ordering, satisfactions and values become relatively stable. On the other hand, the same process involves orderly relationships of persons and objects. Underlying the institution of the family are both the integration of sex with the food-getting, parental, and social urges and the idea of ordered relations of the sexes and the family groups. In wealth, property and other economic institutions, we have the pattern of fundamental human urges such as those of food-getting, appropriation, possession, aggression, and constructiveness mingled in different combinations, and with the notion of orderly economic relationships and transactions by the regulation of competition and cooperation and of ownership or control of material resources and implements of production and distribution and exchange. In status, there are similarly a definite integration and combination of the impulses of aggression and sympathy, dominance and submission as well as the notion of systematic distribution of social rank, power, and prestige relationships. Every institution, stereotypes values and sentiments and standardizes forms of social relationship and activity. In other words, the institutional values are the only values, the institutional relations the legitimate relations, and the institutional ways of action the moral ways in society. Thus arises what is called the institutional fallacy according to which man hides his conscience behind the institutional feeling, belief, and habit. The chief reasons why the institutional fallacy persists in all societies are the institutional determination of his attitudes and social actions and relations and his rationalization in respect to his own behaviour and institutional standards that saves him from psychic conflicts. Due to the chronic antagonism between individual wishes or scale of preferences and the institutional values, he sometimes adores and condemns, extols and decries the institution. For, there is no escape for the average man from the institution, since he finds reward, convenience, security and self-status in institutional conformity. On the other hand, the institution lays down norms and standards only in a general manner permitting some amount of divergence of individual behaviour and mode of fulfillment of values.

Institutions derive their stability from integration of biological, social, and ideal values. Man's values are concentrated and integrated in institutions, as these become his goals, lead him away from the mere physical values that are disapproved

and come under various taboos and prohibitions in life and society. The familial values standardize and stabilize the desires and satisfactions of sex that no longer run the tumultuous course of brutal lust. The biological, the economic, the social, and the ideal values fuse and interpenetrate. The result is that even such an explosive and disruptive impulse like sex which also constantly changes in its aim and direction develops into a deep, stable, and tender attachment that becomes the seat of realization of many ideal values.

Radha Kamal Mukerjee and M.N. Srinivas

In economic and social values which are ordered and guaranteed by economic and social institutions, the values that are fixed in the minds of people and determine their goals and activities grow out of primary and universal urges as well, but the biological urges and values are here hardly recognizable. Hunger, the desires for appropriation and possession, curiosity and constructiveness are hardly manifest in the vast complex economic apparatus providing for the production, acquisition, and distribution of food and other necessary economic goods and services that ensure economic sufficiency; yet these original impulses furnish the drives for the newly fashioned, derived economic values of standard of living, wealth, property, and economic power mingling as they do now with the social impulses and the interests of social order, security, and well-being.

Man's social values are even more varied and complex; woven as these are by threads of various kinds and grades of urges and satisfactions. Among the most important of these are gregariousness, sympathy, protection, dominance, and submission, which are, however, not found in the raw but blend and integrate with one another and with the various types of biological as well as ideal values. The process of valuation, then, is undoubtedly the work of man's groups and institutions that create derived or secondary values through: (i) the ordering and integration of the biological, the social, and the ideal satisfactions in each case, thereby giving values both intensity and stability; (ii) through the ordering and standardization of the activities and relationships of the persons and groups concerned.

Institutional values lose their stability and unity, and disintegrate, contributing also to the break-up of the solidarity of the group, as the biological, the social, and the ideal phases of satisfaction fail to cohere or dissociate. The familial values lapse and the family group sunders as a result of brutal lust and aggression unchecked by the social impulses or any ideal satisfactions. On the other hand, where the sex impulses, home-making, and other interests cannot obtain adequate fulfillment due to the dominance of economic values and the desire to maintain an artificial standard of living for the class as an economic goal, there is a similar dissociation of the familial values. Economic values lapse at the time of an extreme food crisis or famine due to the magnification of the hunger impulse among the famine-stricken mass that excitedly hunt for and seize food, unmindful of social and even familial relationships and obligations. These are extreme instances of the pursuit of mere biological values to the exclusion of the social and ideal values, spelling social unsettlement and disruption. The solidarity of society depends upon the network of institutional values surrounding human life and behaviour and fixing in human minds social habits or ways of living in which biological values no longer fulfil

themselves in brutal egocentric satisfactions but coalesce with the social and the ideal values. Man's social advance is possible only on the foundation of relatively fixed habits, attitudes and ways of living that make his choice of subordination of lower to higher values easy and automatic involving scarcely any mental effort.

The evolution of tertiary universalized values of institutions: *familism*, *economism*, and *nationalism*. Over and above the secondary or derived values that institutions embody and integrate; institutions foster tertiary values. There are several sets of values that institutions fulfil and promote. These are interdependent. Their synthesis generates a new tertiary value. Furthermore, the institution is becoming the necessary condition and requisite for the satisfaction of these various sets of values acquires a new tertiary value. Tertiary values are composite, emergent, and ideal values, and often grow out of a constellation of value-systems that are harmonized and merge in one another. The familial institutions of India and China like the joint household, the clan, the *gotra*, the kindred and the generations tied with one another to the hearth, the home, and the soil by ancestor-worship merge their values in the great tertiary values of *familism* centered round the peace, continuity, and solidarity of man in his generations. Such is the supremacy of the tertiary values of the family in the Orient that these embrace most of the values of life and direct the all-around complete unfolding of Oriental character and personality in the family setting. Similarly, in the modern industrial West *economism* comprises the tertiary values represented by the system of industry and business organization, property, and class. Here again the synthesis of economic values generates new tertiary values, centered around individualism, equality, and freedom of mobility that have represented abstract conditions, favourable for the development of a particular type of character and personality and their distinctive contribution to civilization.

The state that comprises the system of institutions, promoting and safeguarding the essential values of life and security, order and peace, freedom and justice, education, social welfare and culture becomes the pre-condition for the pursuit of most of the ends and values by other groups and institutions upon which it imposes regulatory measures. It thus embodies and fosters universal tertiary values that may for want of better terms be called state-ism and legalism and nationalism. These have elicited the devotion and adoration of citizens of vast continuous empires held together by a common ideal legacy of justice, liberty, equality, or an aggressive cultural mission. All through the ages, the religious organization, the monkhood, the church, and the ascetic order also have in different countries often developed great tertiary values centred round purity, wisdom and ministration of the poor that have given to the world some of its greatest and most lovable personalities. The quality of personalities developed in different civilizations is largely the outcome of tertiary values of characteristic institutions in different patterns of culture, stimulating and eliciting the noblest toil, devotion, and sacrifice of individuals. All tertiary values of institutions go back to certain peculiar conditions of social history and cumulative influences of region, race, and tradition embodied in some special phases of development of such institutions. Familism in the Orient

draws its character from the ancient cooperation of the large household and the kindred in rice agriculture, the unchequered, peaceful history of the autonomous village communities in the vast river basins, and the peculiar development of the worship of ancestors, household, clan and caste deities, and of local gods and goddesses in Indian and Chinese polytheism. The pecuniary tertiary values of the western industrial organizations can be easily traced to the peculiar social and geographical conditions in Western Europe, the expropriation of the village communities and rise of the big estates, the wholesale migration from the villages to the towns, the rise of Protestantism, and the series of scientific inventions and discoveries associated with the utilization of coal and steam.

Similarly, the significant tertiary values of stateism and legalism embodied in the political institutions of the Roman and the British Empires grew out of the peculiar history of Rome as one the Latin republics expanding in the Mediterranean region and of an island empire that obtained supremacy over the entire globe by its sudden increase of industry and commerce requiring liberal institutions for their expansion among different peoples obeying strange customs and laws. All peoples and cultures develop their familial, economic, religious or political institutions but under special conditions these have given rise to a special system of values in the Orient and in the West that have attained relative permanence and universality. As a matter of fact all the above sets of institutions, familial, economic or industrial, political and religious, have always tended to develop on the basis of larger and more abstract social relationships and universal values towards a universal social order. Familism moulded the entire Chinese empire into a functional pattern working out universal familial values and virtues and transforming the family code of ethics into a universal socio-political code.

The Chinese ideal is a social order founded on certain universal moral obligations that first emerge in the family but apply to every relation of life. Not only social organization, industry, and the state but also the religion and philosophy have their roots in the family ethos. The economic organization easily expands into an international society on the basis of an impersonal rational division of labour and abstract social relationship of exchange and freedom of competition and contract. In different countries, the state welding together different peoples through the power of the sword has developed universal ideals of a larger world community than an empire organized in terms of social and spiritual mission rather than of might. Similarly, religion through the ages has striven to establish an abstract universal human community or social order through the doctrine of the spiritual brotherhood of man or the worthlessness of all men before the divine will and power. It is in this manner that the major institutions under special social and historical conditions have attained in different countries universality and uniformity of interests and values knitting together masses of people into some kind of a rational or abstract universal society. This expansiveness or universality of institutions is of course due to the development of abstract philosophical notions and social relationships, gestures or symbols that attach themselves to institutions engendering and developing universal attitudes and values.

NOTES

5.4 M.N. SRINIVAS

Mysore Narasimhachar Srinivas was born on 16 November 1916 in Mysore. He was a well known Indian sociologist and social anthropologist. His contribution to the discipline of sociology is immense. He has done so many pioneering works in the field of caste and study of social change in India. He completed his honours degree in Social Philosophy from Mysore University followed by a postgraduation degree from Bombay University under G.S. Ghurey. He moved to Oxford University and did his D.Phil under A.R. Radcliffe-Brown and E.E. Evans-Pritchard.

According to T. N. Madan, Srinivas produced a fieldwork-based and richly documented Ph.D. dissertation on social organization among the Coorgs of Mysore in 1944, again at the University of Bombay (now Mumbai). In Oxford, he reworked on his dissertation, *Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India* that was published in 1952. The work has been considered a milestone in the world of social anthropology. The study was based on the structural-functionalism of Radcliffe-Brown. In this work, Srinivasan dissects the social and religious lives of the residents of Coorg and throws light on the interrelationships of the social actors and the basis of purity and pollution that become the foundation of social life. Religion has been sought to be understood by studying its contribution to maintenance of social order and has been reduced to seasonal rituals.

Srinivas was one of the first sociologists in India that took the actual village or a factory as a classroom for study and was not contented with only a theoretical analysis. He wanted to study man in relation with his environment and wanted to study the various facets of cultural roles. T.N. Madan, a noted sociologist and Srinivas' friend for over three decades states: 'He had the rare gift of conveying insightful observations in simple language. The term "vote bank", the notion of the "dominant caste", or the concept of "Sanskritization" have become part of common speech. His scholarship was remarkable for its accessibility.'[1] He was an institution builder, a creative researcher and a devoted teacher in a remarkable manner. He took up the challenge of building the department of Sociology at M.S. University, Baroda, in which he was involved starting from scratch in every respect. He joined the Institute of Social and Economic Change at Bangalore after leaving Delhi School of Economics. M.N. Srinivas was one of the few who preferred to be a professor and remained one all his life rather than accepting the offer of a powerful and prestigious post in the government. Srinivas is best known for having coined the concept of 'Sanskritization'. According to him, caste is undoubtedly an all India phenomenon in the sense that there are everywhere hereditary, endogamous group which from a hierarchy, and that each of these group has a traditional association which one or two occupations. Everywhere there are Brahmins, untouchables, and peasants artisan trading and service castes. Relations between castes are invariably expressed in terms pollution and purity.[2]

[1] *Frontline*. Vol. 16, Issue 26, Dec. 11– 24, 1999.
[2] Srinivasn,M.N.1972. Social Change in Modern India. *Orient Longman*. New Delhi:

Srinivas wanted to explore and understand his countrymen not on the basis of European or American textbooks, not from the point of view of sacred texts but from the field experience through observation. For this, he made extensive field work study of Coorg from 1940–42. In his study, he explained the concept of functional unity by analysing the interaction of ritual context of different caste among Coorgs, particularly, Brahmins (priests), kaniyas (astrologers and magicians) and bannas and panikas (low castes). In the context of the study of Rampura also, he describes that the various castes in a village are interdependent. Srinivas also explained the basic concepts to understand our society, firstly *book view* and *secondly field view.*

According to him *book view* meant bookish perspective; he argued that religion, *varna*, caste family, village, and geographical structure are the main elements, which are known as the bases of Indian society. The knowledge about such elements is gained through sacred texts or from books. Srinivas calls it book view or bookish perspective. Book view is also known as Indology, which is not acceptable to Srinivas and emphasized to the field view.

According to Srinivas, *field view* meant field work perspectives. He believed that knowledge about the different regions of Indian society can be attained through field work. This he called field view. Consequently, he prefers empirical study to understand our society. Srinivas took the path of small, regional studies rather than the construction of grand theories. In this context, field work plays an important role to understand the nativity of the rural Indian society. Srinivas also studies caste and religion (1952, 1959, 1962, and 1966) and highlighted not only their structural-functional aspects, but also the dynamics of the caste system in rural setting. He proposed concepts like 'dominant caste', 'Sanskritization', 'Westernization' and 'secularization' to understand the realities of inter-caste relations and also to explain their dynamics. The concept of 'dominant caste' has been used in the study of power relations at the village level. Srinivas presents the results of a number of studies on the structure and change in the village society.

5.5 THEORY OF SOCIAL CHANGE

Change is the unchangeable law of nature. Society as a part of the vast universe and is not an exception to this eternal law. The reality of social life is the reality of change. Change means alternation, modification, replacement, differentiation or integration within a phenomenon over a particular period of time, caused by a force. It refers to the amount of difference in condition of the object or phenomenon in any direction, between two points of time. Time factor is the measuring rod of the amount and direction of change. The primary concern of a sociologist is the social change and not the physical, environmental or natural changes. Of course, physical and environmental changes are not exclusively out of the sociological purview. These are studied so far as they are causally related with social change. In the light of such discussion, social change may precisely be put as any alternation,

NOTES