Introduction

Right from Heraclitus down to the modern times the study of social change has been one of constant endeavour, speculation, ideological controversy, philosophical quarrels and finally relating it to a vital principle rather than as a consequence of human social action. The unending speculation and presentation of theories may be likened to Penelope's web which is equally unending. There were attempts of explanations of part for the whole or vice versa or sometimes even relating and explaining it in terms of the models borrowed from the physical and natural sciences.

Thus we find an impressive array of theories presented in the name of the society and consequently a condition for the study of social change. The Mechanistic school was full of social atoms, repulsions, attractions and astronomical systems. The Le Play's school took part for the whole and made the family as a central configuration of social life. The Geographical school emphasized the geographical factors in determining the social customs, manners and consequently the society. Under the influence of biological explanations of organisms, several schools, one way or the other, tried to
explain human beings as individual organisms with biological drives as the cause of the entire web of social life. The Darwinian influences spread into the analysis of society and there came to the fore theories explaining the nature of struggle for existence among the human beings. Finally the sociologicist school explained society in terms of interaction and interrelations as the entire crux of the problem of society. As a branch of this school, there grew a great school which explained everything in terms of correlations notwithstanding the partial nature of such correlations\(^1\).

The latter exponents of social factors for the theory of social change divided culture into material culture and non-material culture. They gave explanation that material culture changes quickly rather than the non-material culture which includes the web of social relationships. This theory is called as culture-lag theory which explains a partial association of factors in the social relationships\(^2\).

\(^1\)For the entire range of theories mentioned above, see Pitirim A. Sorokin, *Contemporary Sociological Theories* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1928), pp.xxiii - 785. See especially under the different schools.

\(^2\)Ibid.
What is lacking in all these theories is the lack of interest in the lack of interest in the analysis of change as suggested by theoretical formulations and consistent observations. The models were borrowed hapazardly and explanations were given equally in an hapazard manner. In contrast to this the modern sociological theory emphasizes the nature of the web of social relationships as a system and attempts to explain the nature of change in terms of that system or model.

What has been missing from the above is supplied by the modern sociological theory in terms of its comprehensiveness, extent, theoretical rigour and a sustained interest in the study of social change in a truly scientific spirit, bereft of ideological overtones or philosophical vested interests.

Although Sorokin's approach is highly abstract in terms of changes from one system to the other, i.e., ideational, idealistic and sensate supersystems, a sort of cyclical view of change is presented by delineating the distinct modes of historical stages. These stand as principles without really giving out any type of systematic approach except in broad historical perspectives.
Likewise the single factor theories of social change of linear growth were also not suitable for the study of social change. As contrast to this, the current sociological theory postulates that social change may begin in any sector of the society and cannot be confined to a particular direction alone.

In the sections that follow, an attempt is made to analyse social change in terms of modern sociological theory, particularly, with the help of theoretical framework.

As a point of departure from the above approaches for the study of social change, action theory has been adopted for the purpose of study of social change in India. Action is the basic unit of social behaviour. It assumes a unit act, an actor, a situation and normative order, as building blocks. Above all, the action of an actor is described in terms of the subjective expectations.

---

which serves the scientific canons of validity\(^4\).

For Parsons the minimal social system "consists of in a plurality of individual actors interacting with each other in a situation which has at least a physical or environmental aspects," and these actors are motivated in "optimization of gratification" in a situation of "culturally structured and shared symbols\(^5\)." The entire analysis, for Parsons, is based on social system as delineated from personality and cultural systems. The social system analysis could be utilized at different levels, i.e., at microscopic and macroscopic levels. The crux of Parsons approach towards social system is that individual actor is motivated toward social system goals by the internalization of norms and values in the form of role-expectations. As such it constitutes a "motivational problem of order" for the entire social system\(^6\). This implies an adequate motivation of


individual actors for participation in the social system, positively to get reward and negatively to get punished which are "relative and gradual." Thus the actor is motivated to fulfill role-expectations by internalization of values of the social systems, in the form of norms and acts out as "need-dispositions" of the personality system. The role-expectations are institutionalized. A social system would not be possible without cultural integration of communication pattern through language. These are known as functional pre-requisites of social system. The motivational orientations are generated in the four functional pre-requisites of empirical social systems such as kinship system, instrumental achievement structures and stratification; territoriality, force and integration of the power system; and religion and value-integration. The same are given, slightly in a modified form as, functional imperatives in the form of four-fold table, L, I, G, A representing pattern-maintenance, integration, goal-attainment and adaptation.

---

7 Ibid., pp. 29-36.
8 Ibid., pp. 151-167.
The very basis of social change theory rests upon the structural imperatives of the social system and the motivational processes of the individual actors. As long as there is constancy of pattern in each of the structural imperatives "the stable state of equilibrium" continues in a given state. But there are also possibilities for the development of stresses and strains. The basis of such strains are

"For example, the statements to the effect that strain, defined as some combination of one or more of the factors of withdrawal of support, interference with permissiveness, contravention of internalized norms and refusal of approval for valued performance, results in such reactions as anxiety, phantasm, hostile impulses and resort to the defensive-adjustive mechanisms, are definitely statements of laws of motivational process."

From the analysis of social system as a boundary-maintaining and equilibrating system, it is apparent that social change encounters the problem of "vested interests" which are the central feature of equilibrating system. So any change has to encounter this phenomenon by successfully altering the pattern "by overcoming of resistance" of the vested interests.

\[10^{}\text{SOCIAL SYSTEM, p.434.}\]
\[11^{\text{Ibid., p.435.}}\]
\[12^{\text{Ibid., p.491.}}\]
Any inconsistencies in the patterns of interaction, structural constraints, and consequently the disturbances in the orientations of motivations may also cause disequilibrium in the social system. This may also occasion for change.

Thus a pattern of change in the form of strain may begin in any aspect of the structural imperatives of the social system. By virtue of the interdependence of the subsystems, strain may rapidly gain ascendancy in other subsystems also. As mentioned above change is always "alteration of pattern\textsuperscript{13}.''

As for the directions of social change Parsons argues that directionality is inherent in the theory of action, because of orientation of action toward "gratification." But gratification as such, or deprivation, cannot be transmitted unlike cultural tradition. Therefore the directionality of social change lies in value-orientations and cultural tradition\textsuperscript{14}. Here the countervailing

\textsuperscript{13}For an understanding stresses and strains, see, Ibid., pp. 485, 491, 493, 496, 504, 505, 508, 510-515 passim; also see THEORIES OF SOCIETY, Op.Cit., pp. 70-79.

\textsuperscript{14}SOCIAL SYSTEM, pp. 497-498.
elements in the processes of social are directed in one direction is shown through the description of the process of socialization\textsuperscript{15}. In a later work Parsons explains the process of "boundary exchanges," between G cell and the A cell of the structural imperatives of the social system\textsuperscript{16}. He shows the interchange between the power structure and economy, in their respective subsystems.

The development of charismatic movement is related to the presence of "alienative subgroups" in the social system, and if the countervailing mechanisms of social control fail, then the charismatic movement "rapidly gains ascendancy," in the social system to bring about change. But there is every likelihood of its being "routinized," in the process of its spread\textsuperscript{17}.

Mention must be made of deviance and its relation

\textsuperscript{15}Parsons describes the process of socialization in terms of four sequential phases, the permissive phase, the phase of support, the phase of denial of reciprocity, and the phase of manipulation of rewards, \textit{Ibid.}, pp.215-226.
\textsuperscript{17}\textit{SOCIAL SYSTEM}, pp.520-533.
to social change before closing this section. As far as deviance is within limits and does not upset the stability of the system, it is not problematic, but if it threatens the system it should bring about social change. Thus deviance enhances the degree of strain on the social system beyond certain limit which may occasion the cause of change in role-content of the role-players. Likewise technological changes may render obsolete one type of roles and may create another type of new roles.\(^\text{13}\)

Thus stability and interchange within boundaries of the subsystems of the social system forms the core of the theory of social change.\(^\text{19}\) The differentiation of roles in terms of functional imperatives also can occasion for change.

As for the directionality of change, the pattern-variables as depicted by Parsons, supply a mode of direction for the study of social change. As such they have been extensively used in the analysis of social change in the present thesis.

\(^{13}\text{Ibid.}, pp.512-513.}\)

\(^{19}\text{See Talcott Parsons, "Some Considerations on the Theory of Social Change," Rural Sociology, XXVI(3), September 1961, pp.219-239. The analysis of boundary exchanges is treated in terms of input and output analysis. For strain to develop there must be some shortage of input or output.}\)
Less committed than Parsons in terms of scope of analysis is Merton who is more interested in the "middle range theories," and hence his contribution toward social change theory is that of conceptual frames which are well tested empirically. His chief concern being that of functional analysis, his point of departure is with function and dysfunction in a social system. By function is meant that which helps toward the maintenance or the integration of the social system and dysfunction is that one which contributes to the unbalance of the system, hence it is the cause for the beginning of social change. For Merton culture and social structure form the core of his analysis, because interaction is guided by normative orientations and this interaction is conditioned by the behaviour of the interacting actors. His analysis always bears its weight on culture and social structure. Thus in order to study change the factors of manifest and latent functions of the pattern must be taken into consideration.

"To seek social change, without due recognition of the manifest and latent functions performed by the social organization undergoing change, is to indulge in social ritual rather than social engineering."

In terms of functional analysis, for Merton, the analysis of social change begins with

"The key concept bridging the gap between statics and dynamics in functional theory is that of strain, tension, contradiction, or discrepancy between the component between the component elements of social and cultural structure."  

Thus nonconformity with a particular social institution may be "the beginning of a new alternative pattern, with its distinctive claim to moral validity."

Merton identifies four directional types of social change of individual adaptations to strain as i) innovation, ii) ritualism, iii) retreatism, iv) rebellion, and v) conformity which is a stable pattern.

Merton's impressive array of concepts which are relevant to the study of social change are i) relative deprivation which leads to potential conflict, ii) status-role concept wherein the conflict or non-conformism forms a problem in role-sets and their disruption, iii) the self-fulfilling prophecy which may bring about change, iv) anomie

---

21 Ibid., p.122. For an extensive analysis of functional analysis, see pp.19-34. The analysis of social change in Merton is related to functional analysis.

22 Ibid.,

23 Ibid., pp.140-157.
which is defined as breakdown in the normative structure of the society, v) reference groups in the formation of adaptation to non-membership groups, and finally the vi) non-conformity amongst individuals during social mobility.

There is a methodological unity between Parsons and Merton in their approach to the study of social structure and change. To illustrate one can bring the unity and convergence of theory between Parsons and Merton in the analysis of deviant behaviour in the analysis of social change. Although their system commitment is different, they converge on the level of analysis of deviance and the concept of strain.

Such being the unity of approach in methodological orientations of Merton and Parsons, the present study utilizes this approach of structural-functional method for the study of social change, in establishing and "changeful" qualities of the social system. Thus structure and function serve the twin purpose for the study of stability and change.

24 Ibid., pp.163-164
Due to the early anthropological interest and indo-logical overtones of the earlier attempts in the study of society in India there was an overly emphasis on the stability of social system in India. The spate of studies on tribe, caste, religion, cultural change, kinship and village-oriented studies completely neglected the study of social system. Where there is an inkling of social system reference, for example, in village studies, it is completely partial, lacking in theory and focus of analysis. Such village studies could not contribute anything to the study of social change in the vast and sprawling country like India.

The way the beginnings were made by way of an attempt to understanding Indian society, it continued late into the post-independent era engulfing the entire social research in socio-economic aspects. Added to this there is a overtone of specific viewpoints for creating an Indian Sociology from the inference that Indian society is unique by its own logic. Such overtone could not but have an unsalutary effect on the study of social change in India.

In this setup, all the attempts ended up in the study of cultural change, tribal change, leadership change, personality formation through village studies, taking a
very narrow view of change in a given particular setup
without reference to any systemic or other influences.25

25 "See for a Sociology of India," Contributions to Indian
Sociology, (No.1), April 1957, pp.7-22. There is a strong
plea for a Sociology of India in this article. (Hereafter
referred to Contributions). For a plea of comparative
method in terms of Sociological analysis in India, see
F.C. Bailey, "For a Sociology of India," Contributions,
(No.3), July 1959, pp.88-101. See the rejoinder to
Dr. Bailey in Contributions, (No.4), April 1960, pp.82-
89. Srinivas pioneered the trend for religious studies,
see, his famous work, M.N. Srinivas, RELIGION AND SOCIETY
AMONG THE COORGE OF SOUTH INDIA, (Oxford: Clarendon
Press, 1952), pp.xvi + 268. For an understanding of
kinship structure in India, see Irawati Karve, KINSHIP
ORGANIZATION IN INDIA, (Poona: Deccan College Research
Institute, 1953), pp.xiv + 304. See also the condensed
edition by McKim Marriott, mimeographed. For a criticism
of the book see Contributions, (No.1), April 1957, pp.
43-64. For a strong plea of village studies in India,
see M.N. Srinivas, "Village Studies and their Significance,
in CASTE IN MODERN INDIA, (Bombay: Asia Publishing House,
1962), pp.120-135. For a general understanding and
criticism of the method see Contributions (No.1), pp.23-41.
For changing social structures of Indian villages, see
McKim Marriott, (Ed.), VILLAGE INDIA: STUDIES IN THE
LITTLE COMMUNITY, (American Anthropological Association,
Memoir No.23, 1955), xviii + 269; also see West Bengal
Government Press, INDIA'S VILLAGES, (1955), pp.193, a
collection of articles on different aspects of Indian
villages. For an interpretation of caste, see Irawati
Karve, HINDU SOCIETY, AN INTERPRETATION, (Poona: Deccan
College, 1961), pp.xi + 171. Piecing together all the
sociological interest in a volume, R.N. Saksena compiles
an edition with current interests in Sociology. See
R.N. Saksena, (Ed.), SOCIOLOGY, SOCIAL RESEARCH, AND
SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN INDIA, (Bombay: Asia Publishing House,
1961), pp.192. Mukerji calls for a balanced outlook in
the study of social change studies in India, see D.P.
Mukerji, "Indian Tradition and Social Change," DIVERSITIES,
Saksena too urges for the study of traditions for under-
standing social change in India, Op.Cit.
From the theoretical orientations and methodological postures, the study of stability and change has been treated equally well to show the resistances for change and to acceptance of change. As a point of departure for the study of social change, the systematic description of traditional social structure is posited for accounting the social change or resistance to it.

Scope of the Thesis

An attempt is made in the pages that follow to study planned social change during the planned period, i.e., after the institution of planning as a method and process for planned economic development. For this purpose, the period covered by two five year plans has been taken into consideration, i.e., from 1951 to 1961 being the first two five year plans. As such the analysis does not focus on social change per se, but only on the planned institutionalised social change.

In order to explain this planned social change, the fundamental social structural features of Indian social system have been described immediately prior to the institutionalization of planning in India. From
these moorings, the methods of planning, the ideological and value orientations, the spread and extent of its ramifications are given. Then the effects of such a process on the differential aspects of the social system are laid bare by systematic analysis. The central core of vested interests which oppose change has been analysed from the perspective of planning and its effects or directions to disband vested interests in bringing about change have been delineated. In this process of encounter with the vested interests, i.e., trying to overcome them successfully, the problem of creation of new vested interests also has been mentioned.

The place of charismatic movements in the large scale social change is given its proper place by virtue of pattern-maintenance in the social system but also its latent functions for the rest of the social system in bringing about social change have also been given. The milieu of changing old structures, values, the incoming new structures and new values has been designated as a process of transitional anomie. The question of change of role-structure has also been taken up with reference to social change, i.e., an attempt is made to study the new role-structure of village level worker with reference to the changing village social structure.
All through, in the study of institutionalized social change during the planning period, the entire interest has been focused on theory and its ramifications. The directions of social change are delineated by the pattern-variable schema which show the directions of the patterns that planned social change is attempting to bring about. Thus the social system emphasis is maintained all through the gamut of the thesis, in contradiction to the earlier works on the studies of social change in India. Whereas the earlier works have emphasized the cultural change, village social structure, kinship, thus showing bias toward stability and no-change, the present work places both the aspects of change and stability in their proper perspectives. That is how the resistance to change and acceptance of changes are described.

By focusing at the analysis of social change with a theoretical framework, this study mainly shows the possibility and utility of a theoretical framework which is fruitful in such analysis. As a logical corollary to the attempt, the changes described are sufficiently at a broader level i.e., the macroscopic level, which is understandable. By this method it has been possible to rank
the proper emplacement of the factors of social
change with regard to the social structure under study.
The purpose of the thesis will have been served if it
had sufficiently focused the interest on the importance
of theory for the study of social change in India.