All the sociological and social anthropological theorization about socio-cultural change distinguishes between change within the socio-cultural system and change of the socio-cultural system. The present thesis is of course not an exception to this. The preceding discussion regarding the innovation and socio-cultural change aimed at explaining the aspect of changes within the system. Innovations in this perspective are viewed as a change introducing element. But the discussion was not aimed at a diachronic explanation of innovative influence upon the socio-cultural change—the task which involves explanation of changes of the system. The Epilogue therefore is reserved for the explanation of what is the role of innovation in the transition from complementarity to symmetry and of what are the mechanisms, processes, outcome and goal of socio-cultural evolution.

It is evident about the sociological and social anthropological theory of socio-cultural evolution that the model of organic evolution was widely used in order to explain the mechanisms and processes of change in the various aspects of human life. It was also reported how and why the early evolutionism was criticised for its apparent rigidity, biological reductionism, similarity with Marxism, inherent ambiguity, overtones of Western superiority, unilinearity, deterministic exclusivity, notion of progress and so on. But as Wertheim has reported, there recently has been a "go-back" to evolutionism (Wertheim: 1974). With this encouragement and with the
discussions accomplished hitherto, we can replenish the possibility of a new comparison of the socio-cultural evolution with the organic evolution.

The last chapter aimed at explaining the synchronic analysis of the relationship between socio-cultural formation and human innovativeness and concluded with the remark that the diachronic analysis of this relationship may be done in terms of socio-cultural evolution. Implicit in that remark was a suggestion for the study of how human innovations in the techno-ecological, social-structural and individual-psychological contexts contribute to the transition from complementarity to symmetry and what is the role of synchronic aspect of the relationship between socio-cultural stimulation and innovation in the diachronic aspect of the processes, outcome and goals of social evolution. Let us therefore begin with the analogy between organic evolution and socio-cultural evolution.

1) The first point of the analogy between these two grand processes of biological and socio-cultural change is the "mechanisms" which are responsible for them.

The organic evolutionary process is believed to have rested on two great mechanisms of mutations and natural selection.

Mutation is the process by which different forms of genetic structures are produced. It is often defined as the sudden change in a particular gene which produces a new structural form of an old character. The new structural form
multiplies from one generation to another and becomes a distinctive character of the particular species, in favourable natural conditions. The second complementary mechanism, responsible for the permanentization of a new structure, is natural selection. The new structure only if it is "selected" by the environmental conditions has a possibility of persistence. The new structure, if it is new by the "advantageous" gene will multiply and if it consists of the "disadvantageous" gene, it will be eliminated by the environment.

Similarly, socio-cultural evolution identifies the mechanisms of innovations and cultural selection-analogous to the mechanisms of mutations and natural selection. Innovation is also a new structure arising from the old one. Only in case of innovations, the cause is the humans themselves. Innovations also are unpredictable with respect to their capacity to bring about changes in all the other social institutions. Innovations can also be classified into three broad types: transformative, conservative and ritualized. The transformative innovations actually transform the context in which they occur. Since the contexts of techno-ecological, social-structural and individual-psychological are in a cybernetic relationship with each other, occurrence of a transformative innovation in any one of the three contexts, causes, to a lesser or greater extent, changes in other two contexts also. The response of other two contexts would again be complicated by the efficacy of adaptive and compensatory stimulation deployed over in them.
The second mechanism of socio-cultural evolution is the "cultural selection". A diachronic study of socio-cultural change has to deal with the consequences of selection upon human innovations. As environmental conditions differ from one geographical region to the next, the socio-cultural conditions also show a great variation from one group to another. As it was discussed in the last chapter that different socio-cultural settings may exert innovative stimulation of three types : primary, adaptive and compensatory in different contexts, and the illustration about technocratic society considered that in the ideal-typical technocratic society primary stimulation is deployed in a techno-ecological context, it is now possible to explain, although briefly, the multilinearity of socio-cultural evolution. Cultural selection caused by the prevailing cultural themes may favour any of the three contexts of human activity, that is the contexts of relationship to nature or relationship to others or relationship to oneself, for the deployment of primary stimulation. All human societies in their historical course have done so. This has caused the socio-cultural variation. This is, of course, not to deny the influence of environmental conditions upon the societies. The environmental conditions have also contributed to the variation in their own way. We can therefore observe the differences among societies valuing different interactional contexts and also differences among societies favouring the same context due to variation in the environmental conditions.
To sum up, as the process of organic evolution is caused by the mechanisms of mutations and natural selection, the process of socio-cultural evolution is caused by the mechanisms of innovations and cultural selection with the following differences:

a) In socio-cultural evolution, the mechanism of innovation does not represent so sudden and abrupt process of change in the socio-cultural constitution as does the mechanism of mutation in organic evolution.

b) The factors responsible for innovation, that is, the socio-cultural stimulation and innovative personalities form a part of the evolving system itself, whereas it may not be so in case of mutations.

c) Multilinearity of socio-cultural evolution as caused by cultural selection presupposes two environments - natural as well as cultural in a complex relationship.

This is, in short, what the analogy between mutation - natural selection and innovation - cultural selection leads us to. Let us now turn to the next point of the analogy: Processes of organic and socio-cultural evolution - the exploration of dynamic elements involved in them.

II. The organic evolution is characterized by the transformation of simple life structures into the complex ones. The transformation from unicellular to multicellular and from relatively simple (structurally and functionally) organisms to relatively complex (structurally and functionally) organisms
constitutes the processual or dynamic aspect of the organic evolution.

Similarly, the process of socio-cultural evolution is characterized by a transition from complementarity to symmetry in the constituent structures (of relationship to oneself, to others and to nature) of human socio-cultural life. The mechanisms of innovation and cultural selection are therefore aimed at this transformation. We had earlier studied the synchronic aspect of innovations, that is, what innovations do or in what way do they characterize the socio-cultural settings they occur in. The dynamic aspect of the role of innovations in the process of socio-cultural change, on the other hand, seeks to explain what innovations do in the "change of the system". In other words, innovations cause the transformation of the structures of human relationships and the transformation has a specific direction - from complementarity to symmetry.

Here again it is a must to distinguish between "specific evolution" and "general evolution", as Sahlins stated it long ago: "It appears almost obvious upon stating it that in both its biological and cultural spheres evolution moves simultaneously in two directions. On one side, it creates diversity through adaptive modifications: new forms differentiate from old. On the other side, evolution generates progress: higher forms arise from and surpass, lower. The first of these directions is Specific Evolution, and the second, General Evolution. But note that specific and general evolution are not two
different concrete realities; they are rather aspects of the same total process....." (Sahlins 1968 : 229). What Sahlins wanted to stress is that specific evolution is the aspect of evolution which explains change within the system while the general evolution explains change of the system. In case of specific and general evolution in the biological sphere we have an ample of evidence and more can be collected through further research (ibid. : 229-241). The socio-cultural evolution also may be distinguished into its specific and general aspects. The specific evolution of societies and cultures is determined by the deployment of socio-cultural stimulation of primary kind and the innovative responses to it which transform that particular context while other two contexts move along with it. This is to say that the three broad types of societies spread primary stimulation in different contexts of human life: technocratic—techno-ecological; communitarian—social-structural; anarchic—individual-psychological, and transformative innovations occurring in each one of the types societies constitute for the specific evolution or change within the system. Diachronically viewed with the presupposition that the techno-ecological, social-structural and individual-psychological contexts are cybernetically interrelated, transformative changes in each one of them ultimately reflect in other two contexts also. Therefore primary transition from complementarity to symmetry in any one of the three contexts account for the specific evolution of that particular type of society while the trend of general evolution is the transition from complementarily
to symmetry in all the three contexts of human relationship: to oneself, to others and to nature.

III. The above discussion leads us to the third point of analogy between the organic and the socio-cultural evolution: "outcome of evolution". Although it is not possible to point out exactly, both in the biological and cultural spheres, the net outcome of the lengthy span of evolutionary process, it is at least possible to make a certain general comment about it.

As in the organic evolutionary process the result of mutation and natural selection mechanisms can be seen in the generation of distinct and novel types of species with a very wide range of intra-species variation, the process of socio-cultural evolution also comes out with various types of social formations. We had earlier pointed out that all the societies can be classified into three broad types of technocratic, communitarian and anarchic with the criterion of the context of transformative innovations. But these are only ideal and broad types. Actuality would show that there can be various sub-types distinguishable under these three types and also coexistence of two or even three contexts as contexts of primary stimulation and occurrence of transformative innovations is possible. Therefore similar to the organic evolution can be conceptualized the outcome of socio-cultural evolution as creation of diversity within the coordinated integrity.

IV. The final and the most important point of a general analogy between the organic and socio-cultural spheres of evolution is the "goal of evolution". Here we shall be brief about the goals
of organic evolution since they are already widely discussed in the already available literature. A general statement therefore can be made that the goal of organic evolution is to equip the "selected species" with the character necessary for their survival in particular and diverse environmental conditions. On the other hand, the goals of socio-cultural evolution are, as can be conceptualized on the basis of the previous discussions, to provide a social form in which all the three objectives of efficiency (power), justice (function) and personality fulfilment (meaning) can be realized. Let us try to elaborate this point to a certain length.

It was earlier suggested that the process of socio-cultural evolution is characterized by the transition from complementarity to symmetry in the structures of individual's relationship to oneself, to others and to nature. The complementary structures in relationship to oneself were characterized by the domination either of the social component (the "me") or of the individual component (the "I"). It was also pointed out that at both of these two sub-stages of the evolution of relationship to oneself, a proper "fulfilment of personality" is impossible. On the contrary, the symmetrical pattern of relationship to oneself, where both the "I" and the "me" are related to each other on the grounds of equality and mutuality, is the condition necessary for the fulfilment of individual personality. The context of relationship to others refers to the objective of socio-economic and political "justice". The earlier social formations, where complementarity was a rule, justice was
possible only as a ritual - as an attempt to maintain the dynamic equilibrium in the social relations. The symmetrical social formation towards which the socio-cultural evolution is directed would make it possible to establish the necessary as well as sufficient conditions for justice. The third and the all pervading objective is of "efficiency" in relationship to nature. The techno-ecological context of human collective action in the earlier social formations of complementary type was characterized by the domination of nature or the domination of humans. The objective of efficiency was therefore attained only partially, either by subordination to the forces of nature or by uncontrolled and exponential exploitation of nature in the mirage of emancipation of humans from the forces of nature. But the truly symmetrical social formation would suggest an altogether different kind of emancipation of both the nature and the humans from the forces being exerted by each other through establishing a mature dependence relationship with nature. Here the second party, that is, nature is to be acknowledged for the essential dependence of the society upon it and the objective of efficiency is to be achieved by exploitation to the optimum level on the one hand and by efforts to replenish the resources on the other.

Thus we can conclude in a summary fashion that the goal of socio-cultural evolution is to create that social formation where the objectives of efficiency, justice and fulfilment of personality will be attained. This suggests that the perpetual identification of societies with the contexts of primary stimulation
and transformative innovations would endanger the formation of a truly symmetrical society. In other words, a true symmetry in all the three contexts of human interaction can be achieved only by breaking the laws of primary, adaptive and compensatory socio-cultural stimulation as restricted to separate contexts. That is the horizontal deployment of socio-cultural stimulation and types of innovation would not allow the symmetrical social formation. The earlier types of technocratic, communitarian and anarchic will perpetuate and the goal of symmetrical social formation will remain distant. The key to this problem is verticalization of horizontal deployment of types of stimulation in each context as against hierarchical deployment across the contexts. To simplify the argument, all the societies instead of holding one of the three contexts of techno-ecological, social-structural and individual-psychological as the contexts of primary, adaptive and compensatory stimulation, should consider all the three context on an equal and horizontal ground and a supply to them of stimulation of primary type should be equalized. The innovative competence of all the three types channelized through the innovative personalities of technocratic, communitarian and expressive types will be actualized in the techno-ecological, social-structural and individual-psychological contexts now regarded as contexts of primary stimulation, through transformative innovations, and only then is possible the true emancipation of individuals and groups from the forces of nature, forces of others and forces within the self.
This is a point where the analogy between the organic and the socio-cultural evolution breaks up. The goal of organic evolution is to create diversity in order to enable the species to survive whereas the goal of socio-cultural evolution is to create diversity at the individual level but within a integrated symmetrical social formation of the global type. Also the goal of socio-cultural evolution is largely constituted of normative component and in this respect it is teleological as against the factual component in the goal of organic evolution. But in so far as the in built normative component is situated within the teleologically oriented model, it remains harmoniously integrated within the body of a general theory of socio-cultural evolution.