CHAPTER I

TOWARD A COMPETENCE THEORY: PSYCHODYNAMIC FOUNDATIONS
1. BACKGROUND

The subject matter of social sciences is the systematization of knowledge about human behaviour in its various aspects. Since there are various disciplines specializing in different aspects of behaviour of the same human beings, and the craving for specialization has led them to fragmentation of knowledge to such an extent where there is none or very limited exchange between and among these various disciplines, the thought of an attempt to understand human social life in its totality - though on an abstract level of understanding and explanation - seems to have gone far away from the vicinity of possibility. Another reason behind the still-birth of such a thought of an endeavour to grasp social reality in its static as well as dynamic forms seems to be the lack of a holistic theoretical framework. This is not to mean that the sciences of society and of culture have altogether neglected the development of theories; but the theories they constructed have never been adequately broad based so as to accommodate the varied interdependent aspects of social life. The obvious reason behind the parochiality of social science theories is the boundary - maintenance mechanism, already present in the minds of the theorists which encouraged only intra-boundary creativity in their respective disciplines - while retarding the interdisciplinary acculturation.

As a reaction to this state of affairs, there have been efforts to create interdisciplinary understanding of man. Such empirical attempts were not feasible in the absence of a
parallel theoretical development. The most vulnerable discipline, in these conditions, seems to be anthropology - for it claims to be what it wants to be - the study of man in totality.

Cultural anthropology has always been interested in two major areas of truly interdisciplinary nature.

1. The relationship between cultural and psychological processes:

   The area of interaction between the individual and his culture became of prominent importance especially since the exchange between the Freudian psychoanalytic theories and the anthropological theories of historical particularism and cultural relativism. The exchange had resulted into the theoretical refinement the product of which was the American version of synchronic functionalism - the "culture and personality school", which produced a number of studies in this area.

2. The relationship between cultural patterns and patterns of exploitation of natural resources:

   Anthropological studies in this field have expressed two extreme and various intermediate positions. The extreme positions are - the environmental bias and the cultural bias. The major ecological approaches could be enumerated as follows: (Bennett 1976).

   a - Deterministic anthropogeography
   b - Possibilism
   c - Stewardian cultural ecology
   d - Cultural ecosystemism
   e - Adaptive dynamics.
However, the two areas of urgent interdisciplinary attention have grown independent of each other. Anthropologists engaged in the culture-personality studies felt a need of basic understanding of the mental processes at work within the individual psyche to explain the nature of institutionalized behaviour and the variation in it, coupled with the understanding of institutional influences on the process of the formation of individual personality. Ralph Linton, Clyde Kluckhohn and other psychologically oriented anthropologists such as Franz Boas, Abram Kardiner, Anthony Wallace have acknowledged and tried to fulfil, successfully or otherwise, the epistemological and methodological necessity of the incorporation of 'emic categories' in their theoretical exercises aimed at the understanding and explanation of psychocultural phenomena.

The other group of anthropologists who interested themselves in the studies of man's organized ecological activities also felt the need of understanding of what men do to themselves in their dealings with environment; that how culture itself undergoes changes while it "...comes to embrace more and more of Nature" (ibid. : 4), and how and why it responds to these changes.

Thus cultural anthropology has already taken the notice of the need to attend psychocultural and cultural-ecological problems. But the attendance of psychocultural phenomena in the absence of their ecological dimension would result into incomplete and distorted understanding as would happen to the studies in cultural ecology in the absence of the adequate
attention paid to the psychological dimension of the actors involved. Therefore, it appears as if these two fields have divided three important aspects of social life and both these fields have remained incomplete for the aspects they respectively have neglected.

Another important methodological consequence of the theoretical division of the three aspects of social life mentioned above, is expressed in the emic-etic discrepancy. The essence of these approaches could be presented as under: Anthropologists want their concepts to be useful in the construction of more and more inclusive and successful theoretical systems. The success of both concepts and broader theoretical structures is measured in terms of their efficacy in explaining human behaviour and the failure in it is traced back, among other factors, to the anthropological method or the strategy of conceptualization used in ethnographic descriptions. The anthropological methodology is mainly divided into two fundamental approaches - the "emic" and the "etic".

The terms emic and etic were coined by the linguist Kenneth Pike on the analogy with 'phonemic and phonetic'. Pike stated the idea as follows: "In contrast to the etic approach, an emic one is in essence valid for only one language (or one culture) at a time...... It is an attempt to discover and to describe the pattern of that particular language or culture in reference to the way in which the various elements of that culture are related to each other in the functioning of the particular pattern, rather than an attempt to describe them
in reference to a generalized classification derived in advance of the study of that culture.....

"An etic analytical standpoint......might be called "external" or alien, since for etic purposes the analyst stands "far enough away" from or "outside" of a particular culture to see its separate events, primarily in relation to their similarities and their differences, as compared to events in other cultures, rather than in reference to the sequences of classes of events within that one particular culture". (Pike 1954 : 8-10).

Marvin Harris gave somewhat different definitions of the terms 'emic' and 'etic' in relation to their use in anthropological methodology.

"......Emic statements refer to logico - empirical systems whose phenomenal distinctions or "things" are built up out of contrasts and discriminations significant, meaningful, real, accurate, or in some other fashion regarded as appropriate by the actors themselves. An emic statement can be falsified if it can be shown that it contradicts the cognitive calculus by which relevant actors judge that entities are similar or different, real, meaningful, significant or in some other sense "appropriate" or "acceptable"......

"......Etic statements depend upon phenomenal distinctions judged appropriate by the community of scientific observers. Etic statements cannot be falsified if they do not conform to the actor's notion of what is significant, real,
meaningful or appropriate. Etic statements are verified when independent observers using similar operations agree that a given event has occurred...." (Harris 1968: 571-75).

The development of an emic approach to anthropological method owes its origin to the Boasian school. Since Franz Boas's initiation of the emic approach, there have been a very wide use of emic techniques of data collection and the approach itself dominated creation of a distinct theoretical mosaic. The most prominent critic of the emicists has been Marvin Harris who developed etic approach and sophisticated tools of investigation. The point being stressed here is that the tradition of psychocultural studies in anthropology is dominated by the use of emic approach while the cultural ecological studies made more and more use of the etic approach and its tools of research.

Actually what is needed is the proper combination of emic and etic approaches to the study of man and his society. The three aspects of human social life - individual psychological, social-structural and techno-environmental are to be placed on same level of analysis and seen in their interdependence. This theoretical abridgement of the psychocultural and cultural-ecological fields would automatically solve the emic - etic dilemma in the anthropological methodology. Such a task of building a theoretical framework does require the basis that could make the constructs used plausible and tenable. Kardiner reports that "Efforts have recently been made by Lynd, Mannheim, and many others to create a synthesis of the social sciences,
and in all these proposals the need for a psychology suitable for such ends was commonly conceded. Many techniques were proposed and tried, and their success varied. The most unsatisfactory conclusion of these endeavours was that much of this psychological material had to be labelled irrational...." (Kardiner 1945: 1).

If we are to take psychology as a basis of the theoretical synthesis of social sciences to understand man in his relationship to oneself, to others and to nature, what aid is it ready to give us in this attempt? Kardiner asked the same question and answered that "......we have no psychological technique today that satisfies all requirements, either because its techniques or conclusions are not ready for adoption by the social sciences on any large scale or because the relevancy to these problems is dubious......" (ibid: 15).

But it does not mean that the original proposal of the use of psychology as a basis for elaborating a comprehensive approach to socio-cultural theory was useless. We must therefore, critically evaluate this line of thought originated with Mill and indirectly developed by Freud to refine the structure of interdisciplinary researches in social sciences. Kardiner was the first to attempt the synthesis of psychology and cultural sciences, says - "......that the requirements of a psychology suitable to the needs of sociology are of specific character. Such a psychology must be holistic......it must be able to follow change and motion, it must be dynamic......" (ibid: 21).
There have been mainly two lines of thought in psychology which have a direct bearing on the sociological implications of the intra-individual or personality dynamics. The first is Freudian psychobiology, 'essentially a nineteenth century leftover'. The second is psychology which began with Adler and was later developed into an elaborate alternative to Freudian orthodoxy by Karen Horney, Erich Fromm and H.S. Sullivan which is known as culture-pattern school.
2. THE EMPTY CABINET AND FREUD

Locke in his "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding" provided the foundation upon which the modern behavioural disciplines, including sociology, cultural anthropology and psychology based themselves in their stress on the relationship between the society and individual. What Locke had attempted to prove was that the human mind at birth was an empty cabinet. The knowledge or the ideas with which the mind later comes to be filled are all acquired during the process of what we would call today enculturation. In other words all of man's knowledge comes through the perceptions conveyed by 'sense impressions', i.e. experience.

"Let us then suppose the mind to be, as we say, white paper, void of all characters, without any ideas: How comes it to be furnished? Whence comes it by that vast store which the busy and boundless fancy of man has painted on it with an almost endless variety? Whence has it all the materials of reason and knowledge? To this I answer, in one word, from EXPERIENCE. In that all our knowledge is founded; and from that it ultimately derives itself" (Locke 1690 : 122).

Freud also started with a similar presumption. Hart J. writes that "Locke......stood in relation to the eighteenth century much as Freud and Marx stand to ours"......(Hart 1964 : 6)

Ludwig Binswanger thinks of Freud as the first thinker to propound the idea of man as "homo natura". Then he draws necessary parallel between Locke and Freud. "Where Locke asks how far man's capacity for knowledge expands, Freud asks
how far man's capacity for civilization extends. Where Locke seeks the method of current knowledge, Freud seeks the method of living correctly with respect to civilization. Where Locke proceeds from the doubt as to whether the goal of all-embracing knowledge is attainable, Freud proceeds from the doubt as to whether the goal of a complete capacity for culture is attainable in man.

"For both, the psychic life is a "movement" according to laws of its simpler elements, in Locke images and in Freud instincts. Both are strictly psychological empiricists and are rooted as far back as Descartes. Both reject metaphysical hypotheses as prejudicial. Both are oriented predominantly, sensualistically, and nominalistically, and so on......

"......applying to Freud a rephrasing of the Lockean "nihil est in intellectu, quod non feurit in sense" as:
"nihil est in homine culture, quod non feurit in homine natura".

"Binswanger draws the parallel most decisively when he speaks of the Freudian "tabula rasa". The important qualification that Freud gives to the notion of tabula rasa, however, lies in the fact that for Freud 'in the newly born infant there is a certain biological etching on this tabler, a blueprint according to which subsequent cultural development takes place. This "Zeichnung" (blueprint) is, of course, sketched by the instincts, the notion of which forms the basic substructural presupposition of psychoanalysis......" (Binswanger : 1969 : 54-55).
Let us now take a brief account of the causes why both psychobiology and psychosociology or culture pattern theory could not be used for our task. Our frame of reference is 'that psychology which is useful in the analysis of the human relationship - relationship to oneself, relationship to others and relationship to environment.'

Freudian image of personality is constituted of impulses and drives. The core of personality, therefore, in Freudian conception, is biological. This biological foundation which Freud assumes in order to discuss psychic and social phenomena makes Freudian theories psychobiological.
3. A CRITIQUE OF FREUDIAN PSYCHOBIOLOGY

Though the theories of Sigmund Freud remain as the inevitable starting point for the modern culture and personality movement, "Quoting Freud ...... is beginning at last to be like quoting Newton in physics. Both men are assured of that permanent place in the history of thought that belongs to the genuine pioneer. It is not the function of the pioneer to say the last word but to say the first word" (Guntrip 1971 : 3). Freudian first word regarding the psychology of man which ran throughout his career is "homo naturalis" - it is around this conception of man that - psychoanalysis was oriented. Psychoanalysis began as a clinical procedure aimed at the therapy of neuroses. Freud had attempted to explain all human thought and action in reference to sex and aggression instincts. Freudian system sought to analyze human action by evaluating the life history of the individual. And "The reason why Freud ranks with Darwin and Marx is that....he was the greatest single influence in bringing the phenomena of the human mind within the compass of historical determinism" (Harris 1968 : 457). But this particular method of character analysis which was a part of a wider psychobiological theoretical assumptions pulled Freud far away from the understanding of human individuals as "persons". Hartmann writes, "Many schools of psychology have completely disregarded the individual's social relationships. They speak of laws governing thought processes without taking into account the world to which thought refers: they speak of laws of affectivity, neglecting the objects of the
emotions and the situations which provoked them. In other words, they do not take into account the concrete object in relation to which the behaviour occurred, nor the roots of the behaviour in concrete life situations. This is due to their studying the individual as if he were completely isolated from the world of social phenomena.... Such a separation of the individual from the world in which he lives is completely artificial" (Hartmann 1948: 326-27).

Freud's attempt to understand the psychological phenomena, primarily in terms of the physiological processes as associated with mental states might have been proved to be successful as far as the aim of therapy was concerned. But overestimation of the narrow biological ground of his psychoanalytical theory led him to underestimate cultural influences shaping and controlling the individual's thoughts and actions and to the undue generalizations such as that of the Oedipus Complex. Freud's later psychological theories indicate his major shift in the emphasis, from instinct to the ego. But these developments also did not take him to the psychology of the "person" from his earlier psychology of the organism. Harris writes - "when Freud turned his attention from the analysis of the individual psyche to psychocultural phenomena, it was to identify the causal processes in cultural evolution. This was the avowed objective of "Totem and Taboo" (1913), his first sustained foray into the domain of culture. In every respect "Totem and Taboo" may be taken as representative of what the Boasians considered to be the worst form of evolutionary speculation. In the grandiosity of its compass, the
flimsiness of its evidence, and the generality of its conclusions, it was scarcely approached by anything Morgan had conceived. A direct clash between Freud and the Boasians was thus inevitable". (Harris 1968 : 425).

Boas writes of Freudian abracadabra as "While, therefore, we may welcome the application of every advance in the method of psychological investigation, we cannot accept as an advance in ethnological method the crude transfer of a novel, one-sided method of psychological investigation of the individual to social phenomena the origin of which can be shown to be historically determined and to be subject to influences that are not at all comparable to those that control the psychology of the individual" (Boas 1948 : 289).

Thus Freud was criticised by anthropologists for his neglect of the crucial cultural forces also responsible for the patterning of individual personality and by sociologically oriented psychologists for his theory was biological rather than personal, sociological and properly psychological. The most important point of criticism is that Freudian theory makes the character dependent on the organic maturing of sexual instincts while neglecting sexual functioning as also controlled by the extent to which character has matured in human relationships - the ones which have a direct effect on the formation of the self. Freud's assumption regarding the subordination of objects to the role of mere means of gratification of instinct is unsatisfactory from sociological and human point of view, since he treats personal relationships on a sub-personal level.
A truly psychological theory must be a "self" theory and not an instinct theory. Thus "Freudian psychoanalysis threatened to come to a dead end if it remained tied to the instinct theory......" (Guntrip 1971: 13). And R. Phillips suggests an alternative that "only the study of psychology can save us from this: that psychological psychology in which the proper study of mankind is subjects". (Phillips 1968: 83).

Finally it is almost irresistible to quote Harris who has very aptly written about the need for enculturation of anthropology after the accommodation of psychobiological theories has been proved to be useless. He writes that "The meeting of anthropology and psychoanalysis has produced a rich harvest of ingenious functional hypotheses in which psychological mechanisms can be seen as intermediating the connection between disparate parts of culture. Psychoanalysis, however, had little to offer cultural anthropology by way of scientific methodology. In this respect the meeting of the two disciplines tended to reinforce the inherent tendencies toward uncontrolled, speculative, and historinic generalizations which in its own sphere had cultivated as part of its professional license. The anthropologist carrying out a psychocultural analysis resembled a psychoanalyst whose attempt to identify the basic personality structure of his patient remains largely interpretative and immune to normal verification procedures. In a sense, what the great figures in the formative phases of the culture and personality movement were asking us to do was to trust them as we would trust an analyst, not for the demonstrated truth of any particular item, but for the accumulating
evidence of coherence in a believable pattern. Although such faith is essential to psychoanalytic therapy in which it scarcely matters whether childhood events of particular kinds did or did not take place as long as both analyst and patient are convinced that they did, the separation of myth from concrete event is the highest goal of all disciplines which concern themselves with human history". (Harris 1968 : 448).
4. A CRITIQUE OF PSYCHOSOCIOLOGY

If Freudian psychobiological conception of man presents one extreme, the Neo-Freudian movement which represents new anthropologically biased approaches to the study of individual psychology marks another extreme. Karen Horney, Erich Fromm, Abram Kardiner, Erik Erikson, H.S. Sullivan interested themselves in the eradication of psychobiological overtones predominant in the earlier wave by accepting and elaborating sociological standpoint. The culture-pattern school or psychosociology concentrates upon the processes of socialization and enculturation as the first step towards the study of the individual's personality configuration. Early childhood experiences, especially such matters as toilet training, nursing experience, weaning, body contact that contribute to the human socialization process were held to be important for this study. It would require a separate volume to comment upon the success and failure of the psychosociological approach of the figures mentioned above. This section therefore, would encompass the most salient general points of criticism of the neo-Freudian culture-pattern school in general and, wherever possible and essential of the particular theorists in a summary fashion. As it will be pointed out, the theory that the culture-pattern school produced, was constituted mainly by the criticism of Freudianism and its neglect of social-cultural factors.

Erich Fromm, who is recognized as one of the most influential theorists of the psychosociological orientation states
in his 'culture-pattern and social pressure' theory that human problems arise not out of the need to satisfy instincts but out of the relationships the individual is involved in - the relationship to the world and to himself - which are largely patterned by society. Human beings are related to the environment only through culture and not through instincts. He writes - "The most beautiful as well as the most ugly inclinations of man are not a part of a fixed and biologically given human nature but result from the social process which creates man" (Fromm 1942 : 12). Being a social psychologist Fromm perceived the role played by the influence of society and culture on man's neurotic suffering. His attempt to substitute Freudian concept of the biological nature of the essence of being human by the sociologistic conception of man resulted into one-sided theory. He says - "We believe that man is primarily a social being and not, as Freud assumes, primarily self-sufficient and only secondarily in need of others........ In this sense, we believe that individual psychology is fundamentally social psychology or in Sullivan's terms, the psychology of interpersonal relationships; the key problem of psychology is that of the particular kind of relatedness of the individual towards the world, not that of satisfaction or frustration of single instinctual desires" (ibid : 290).

Karen Horney began as the disciple of Freud but was influenced by Fromm's sociological approach formally rejected Freud's instinct - theory but she could not elaborate equally profound theoretical substitute for the same. For Horney, the
present day social relationships are affected by the individual's past experiences, the remnants of the early childhood relationships especially with the parents. To found her theory on the critical evaluation of Freud she writes - "The reverse side of (Freud's) biological orientation is a lack of social orientation, and thus he tends to attribute social phenomena primarily to psychic factors and these primarily to biological (libido theory)......Freud sees a culture not as the result of a complex social process but primarily as the result of biological drives which are repressed or sublimated, with the result that reaction formations are built up against them......We have to take a definite step beyond Freud......

He has assumed that the instinctual drives or object-relationships that are frequent in our culture are biologically determined 'human nature' (Horney 1937 : 20-21, 282-83).

Thus, in order to reject physiological basis of human personality, Horney seems to allow sociology to influence her psychological thought. But since she discards the truly psychological factors such as the deep unconscious she is unable to build a satisfactory theory of personality.

Harry Stack Sullivan also has pulled the similar line of thought in his "interpersonal theory of psychiatry". Clara Thompson writes of him that "Sullivan calls his the theory of interpersonal relations. He holds that, given a biological substrate, the human is the product of interaction with other human beings, that it is out of the personal and social forces acting upon one from the day of birth that the personality
emerges. The human being is concerned with the pursuit of two inclusive goals, the pursuit of satisfaction and the pursuit of security" (Thompson 1952 : 211).

Thus Sullivan stresses the social pressures of the culture-pattern, exerted through the agents of socialization as responsible for the moulding of individual personality. The needs for satisfaction are the basic biological or appetitive needs in contrast with the needs for security which Sullivan prefers to call as 'cultural needs'.

Erik Erikson also contributed to the development of psychosociological theory. He states about the shift of orientation in the psychoanalytic theory: "Psychoanalysis today is implementing the study of the ego, a concept denoting man's capacity to unify his experience and his action in an adaptive manner......the study of the ego's roots in social organization" (Erikson 1950 : 64).

Thus all of Erikson's attempt is concentrated upon the exploration of role of social organization in the process of individual personality formation and the study of ego's adaptation in a social rather than a biological context. Thus Erikson also seems to have committed to the broadening of sociological range of psychology rather than to develop a truly psycho-dynamic theory.

The purpose of present section is not to give the exhaustive account of the psychosociological thinking and its drawbacks, but rather to point out the difficulties in conceptualization of human nature predominant in psychosociology. If
Freud attempted to develop one sided psychobiology which conceptualized man as "homo-naturalis", the psychosociologists ran to an opposite extreme to develop much more one sided culture - pattern theory where man was viewed as "homo-culturalis". Guntrip remarks that "Freud did not ignore cultural phenomena as completely as the 'Culture-Pattern' writers ignored the deep unconscious" (Guntrip 1961: 354).

Overemphasis on the social determination of the individual personality is pointed out by Dennis H. Wrong (Wrong: 1961). The implications of such a oversocialized conception of man for social sciences, especially sociology, found expression in Durkheimian sociologicist sociology.
5. THE INDIVIDUAL AND HIS CULTURE

The long tradition of culture and personality studies exhibits several fundamental assumptions regarding the relationship between the individual and his culture. Some of the theorists have found that this relationship is synthetic in nature - that the individuals in a given society are all alike in their basic personality structure while some others have found the culture to be the greatest enemy of the individual. A recent development in this area is the invention of the "organization of diversity" principle, which opposes the earlier dominant view which could be called as the "replication of uniformity" principle as the guideline to understand individuals and culture. A brief comparative picture of these two principles is given below -

- Replication of Uniformity vs. Organization of Diversity -

The oversocialized conception of man which was predominant in earlier anthropological studies of the relationship that the individuals bear with cultural institutions gave rise to the "replication of uniformity" principle. This standpoint assumes that the individual members of a society, through sharing of the same cultural identity, going through the same patterns of upbringing of children, behave in the same way under the same circumstances. Such a set of assumptions creates the image of a society as a closed and culturally homogeneous system. Likewise the relationship between the cultural structure and the individual member is to be regarded as non-problematical since all the individuals share a core of a given
set of culturally determined personality traits. Such researches which were directly or indirectly based on the assumption of the replication of uniformity principle sought to study the mechanisms of socialization in order to describe the shared personality traits of the individuals in a given society. An example could be given of Kardiner's study of the child rearing practices. Kardiner developed the concept of basic personality structure. The basic personality structure of the members of a given society is the reflection of the cultural structure and of the shared cultural themes. That is, all the members of a given society are tied together by the sharing of a common life experience for generations.

Linton writes in his forward to Kardiner's 'The Psychological Frontiers of Society': "The basic personality type for any society is that personality configuration which is shared by the bulk of society's members as a result of the early experiences which they have in common" (Linton 1945: viii) and which rests upon the following postulates:

"That the individual's early experiences exert a lasting affect upon his personality.... That similar experiences will tend to produce similar personality configurations in the individuals who are subjected to them. That the techniques which the members of any society employs in the care and rearing of children are culturally patterned and will tend to be similar, although never identical, for various families within the society. That the culturally patterned techniques for the care and rearing of children differ from one society to
Thus the theorists like Kardiner who had assumed that the individuals in a given society share the common personality type were led to generalize that the alikeness in the individual goals was functional from the points of view of both the individual and culture. Such a conception that all or most of the individual members of a given society are a replica of culture went to such an extent that the uniformitarians started to believe that the sharing of common goals was the functional prerequisite of a human society. Erich Fromm held that a nuclear personality structure must be shared by most members of the same culture if the culture is to continue and enculturation processes must make the individuals want to act as they have to act.

Durkheim, who attempted to develop the sociologistic theory of individual personality stressed that heterogeneity was responsible for disintegration of the individuals. Margaret Mead carried the argument to the point where heterogeneity was to be conceived as pathogenic: "......in a heterogeneous culture, individual life experiences differ so markedly from one another that almost every individual may find the existing cultural forms of expression inadequate to express his peculiar bent, and so be driven into more and more special forms of psychosomatic expression" (Mead 1947: 72).

Thus, the replication of uniformity principle indirectly suggests that all cultures are stable and if not, the source of cultural change is the culture itself as the individuals are
what they are given by the culture.

The development of the antithetical concept which I believe is original with A.F.C. Wallace is the "Organization of diversity" principle. The organization of diversity principle does not deny the influence of culture on the process of personality formation. Kaplan attempted to give shape to this conception when he wrote - "That great variability exists does not argue against the influence of culture on personality, it means merely that cultural influences do not necessarily create uniformity in a group. All individuals interact with their cultures. However human beings are not passive recipients of their culture. They accept, reject, or rebel against the cultural forces to which they are oriented......" (Kaplan 1954: 32).

Wallace in stressing the organization principle makes a similar remark: "The magnitude of individual psychological differences within cultural boundaries is recognized as being so large that the analytical problem would appear to be the elucidation of the processes of the organisation of diversity rather than the mechanisms of inducing a supposed uniformity" (Wallace 1962: 6-7).

The organization of diversity assumes the coexistence of diverse habits, motives, customs, personalities etc. within any culturally organized society. The process of socialization does not produce similar personalities but rather tends, to be different for all individuals. Culture, through child rearing institutions create diversity and novelty of individual
characters, of interests and goals. Wallace says: "An alternative (to the replication of uniformity theory) is the organizational theory. According to this theory, no population, within a stated cultural boundary, can be assumed to be uniform with respect to any variable or pattern...... Personality is not assumed to be an internalization of the culture, and culture is not conceptualized as a constant environment, or projection of all members of the society" (Wallace 1970 : 128).

Culture as viewed from this standpoint appears to be characterized internally by diversity of individuals and groups. It becomes not a superorganic entity as it appeared in the uniformitarian view, but a "policy, tacitly and gradually concocted by groups of people for the furtherance of their interests, and contract, established by practice, between and among individuals, to organize their strivings into mutually facilitating equivalence structures" (ibid : 24).

Thus the organization of diversity principle rejects the uniformitarian concept of man as 'homo culturalis.' How does it view, then an individual human being? We shall come back to answer this question in the following sections.

Wallace who elaborated this theoretical principle as a guide to the solution of methodological problems in the field of culture and personality also fathered the concept of mazeway.
6. THE CONCEPT OF MAZEWAY

In Wallace's theory of culture and personality the concept of mazeway is as essential as is the concept of basic personality structure in the theory of replication of uniformity of Kardiner's. For Wallace, mazeway formation is the product of cognition and thus, by resting the personality construction on the learning process he admits that experience is the only source of knowledge. Mazeway refers to the entire set of cognitive maps of an individual at a given time. The cognitive maps involve symbolic impressions of the internalized principles of behaviour, objects and cultural material and their possible dynamic interrelations. Wallace establishes an analogy between the mazeway and culture by stating that "Mazeway is to the individual what culture is to the group. Just as every group's history is unique, so every human individual's course of experience is unique. As a product of this experience, every human brain contains, at a given point of time, a unique mental image of a complex system of dynamically interrelated objects....."

(Wallace 1970 : 15).

On the mazeway are registered the simplified images of the experiences the individual encounters in his life-span. In other words, the mazeway is the "inner world" for an individual, which is responsible for initiation of action and reaction to the action of other individuals in the social context. Mazeway includes a large number of assemblages (or cognitive residues of perception) and for an individual - the mazeway-holder it is a true and complete representation of the operat-
ing characteristics of a "real" world.

Personality, in this context means the same as mazeway, covering the same territory, but on a higher level of obstruction in which mazeway components are classified and grouped under various sub-systems for the actor's use. However, Wallace defined the terms culture and personality as -

"Culture is those ways of behaviour or techniques of solving problems which, being more frequently and more closely approximated than other ways, can be said to have a high probability of use by individual members of society". Personality, in this context, would be simply:

*those ways of behaviour or techniques of solving problems which have a high probability of use by one individual* (Wallace 1952 : 750).

Therefore, viewed pragmatically, mazeway is the infrastructure or the implicit schema of the personality. It provides the brain with the already internalized and sifted knowledge, possible alternatives of the patterns of actions and action sequences and alternatives of patterns of reactions to the recurring stimuli. In mazeway are stored the principles of behaviour and techniques of problem-solving which are externalized by the actors - in action. In this way the knowledge gained through sense-impressions is accumulated, sifted and used by the individual.

Wallace has given the account of the various components
of the normal human mazeway (1970). Another method of the classification of mazeway contents, for heuristic purposes would reveal that it contains values and techniques associated with the following contexts of human relationship or objects of relationship:

a) Self - relationship with oneself.

b) Human environment - particular persons and particular classes of persons, and sociocultural system as a whole.

c) Non-human environment.

Wallace implicitly considered that the dynamics of individual personality is constituted of his self, others and environment. Another important point that he made by stating that every human individual carries a mazeway that is distinctive of himself was that non-sharing of the cultural core by the individual members of a society is still functional and explicable than the sharing of it. However, the most important point I want to stress here is about the psychological framework of Wallace's personality theory. Since the human personality is rooted in the relationships - to oneself, to other social actors and to nature, the psychology explaining the genesis of personality has to deal with the experiences that the individual undergoes in these three contexts.

Any personality psychology has to explain the creation process of the self - whether it be replication of uniformity theory or organization of diversity theory. That is to say that every theoretical system aimed at the understanding of
human nature has to deal not only with the problem of synchronic explanation of personality but also with the problem of genesis and development of it. Then what theoretical grounds are prepared by Wallace to explain the personality structure of an individual which embeds the mazeway? It appears that Wallace's theory of culture and personality to which the mazeway construct is so central does not discuss seriously the problem of genesis of it. It merely assumes that the mazeway is formed out of the experiences that the individual undergoes during his life-time. But Wallace does not seek to strengthen this assumption by placing it to test within a broader theoretical framework.

Psychobiological and psychosociological orientations have been the two extremes available for such a task. But as we have seen, they would not help in so far as they do not consider human nature as constituted of the relationships. Therefore, we need a psychology that is oriented to the relational nature of man. In this respect, the object - relation theory - a synthesis of psychobiology and psychosociology, seems to present itself as an alternative. It seems to me that the coming together of the object-relations theory and the concept of mazeway is useful for both psychology and cultural sciences. Object-relations theory has to offer to anthropology the explanation of the innate psychic mechanisms which enable man to develop the capacity for culture, while in its turn, the concept of mazeway offers what it owes to psychology - the empirical instrumentalities to be utilised in the explorations
of cultural and material influences on the personality formation and on psychopathetic conditions. Hence, I think that such a interdisciplinary exchange of concepts and theories surpassing the limits of mere exchange of methodologies would certainly enrich both the disciplines involved in it.
7. THE OBJECT - RELATIONS THEORY

The object-relations theory owes its origin and development to the writings of Melanie Klein and Fairbairn. It gives substance to the suggestion made by Erich Fromm that "the fundamental approach to human personality is the understanding of man's relation to the world, to others, to nature, and to himself" (Fromm 1942: 290).

This section, therefore, is confined to the brief description of the evolution of object-relations theory and to the reasoning why it is the psychological psychology we need for our task of construction of a theory of social change.

A modest acquaintance to the history of personality psychology reveals how psychoanalysis, starting from the classical psychobiological orientation was contrasted by culture-pattern theory and the ground was prepared for Klein's incipient revolt within the ambiguous orthodoxy and later, her work was taken up by Fairbairn with whom "...psychoanalysis ceased to be a psychobiology of the organism with an ego-psychology tacked on, and became a psychodynamic theory of the person developing and fulfilling himself......" (Guntrip 1961: 278).

The works of Klein gave a decisive turn to the psychoanalytic movement. She developed a psychodynamic theory in which the concept of an internal psychic world was given a central place. She held that it was the dynamics of internal world created by ego-object relationships that is responsible for the child's failure to experience external real objects in any truly objective way. Life is viewed in the internal world
of fantasy and feeling, as a matter of ego-object relations.

Unfortunately Klein’s use of the Freudian terminology and her stress on the pathological dimension disabled her to develop the theory of personality development. Although some of the Kleinians are pleased with their identity with the classical school of thought, Hanna Segal, the best authority in this field holds that "......the technique as developed by Melanie Klein, in that the nature of the interpretations to the patients and the changes of emphasis in the analytical process show, in fact, a departure, or, as she saw it, an evolution from the classical (psychobiological) interpretations" (Segal 1967 : 199).

In Kleinian theory, instincts hold only a secondary position. They are transformed into the world of internal objects and thus the outside world is subordinated to the dynamics of internal one. Guntrip writes of her theory as - "Whereas Freud's theory was basically physiological and biological, I do not think that Klein's theory is in any genuine sense biological at all; it is philosophical, and more like a revealed religious belief than a scientific theory in its basic assumptions. Everything in life for Klein is dominated and overshadowed by the mighty and mysterious forces of life and death, creation and destruction, locked in perpetual struggle in the depths of our unconscious psychic experience, and constituting our very nature as persons" (Guntrip 1971 : 58). Although, Melanie Klein could not achieve a real synthesis of the impulse theory and the ego theory and thus could not come
out with any true theory of the personality of the human 'person', she certainly took a step towards it, which was sufficient to influence W.R.D. Fairbairn and stimulate his thought, who seems to have achieved what was being sought for: a complete object-relations theory. However, it is not the purpose of the present section to give the account of the whole complex of development of the theory. Thus, I would briefly describe the important contributions of Fairbairn.

Fairbairn held that the intellectual disciplines should not intermingle. There is no need of explaining psychic phenomena in terms of physiology or biology. But at the same time, he does not neglect the biological and social dimensions personality - its origin and development. Thus his theory takes the form of the psychodynamic theory of personality structure in terms of object relationships. It is certainly a theory of the ego development but the ego is conceptualized not as 'the superficial or adaptive ego of Freud'. Here the ego is a psychic self - a complete unit - which differentiates into various organizational structures resulting from its relationship to various objects. Thus there is a clear-cut difference between Freud and Fairbairn: while Freudian theory was that of an organism where he stressed psychophysiological processes, fairbairn's theory was that of a person where the personal relationships are held to be primary.

Fairbairn started from the assumptions that "The pristine personality of the child consists of a unitary dynamic ego". The child starts life as a whole psychic self with distinctively
human capacities for ego development. Fairbairn held that the preservation of the fundamental wholeness and its development according to the sociocultural conditions constitutes mental health. As the child grows, it comes across various good and bad objects to which the ego is intensely related. The process of internalization of objects results into the structural development and organization of the psyche. Here Fairbairn says that as far as the good-object relationships are attained by a child, good ego development occurs, but bad object relationships cause the endopsychic structure wherein infantile elements are registered and perpetuated in the later life. Although, it is not the purpose of the present section to criticise the psychopathology of Fairbairn, it should be enough to mention that not only the bad-objects are internalized by the infant but whatever objects it comes across during the most impressionable period of life, are registered, alongwith the values attached with them, in its mazeway. Fairbairn is right in saying that: "What are primarily repressed are neither intolerably guilty impulses nor intolerably unpleasant memories, but intolerably bad internalized objects. If memories are repressed, accordingly, this is only because the objects involved in such memories are identified with bad internalized objects; and, if impulses are repressed, this is only because the objects with which such impulses impel the individual to have a relationship are bad objects from the standpoint of the ego" (Fairbairn 1952 : 62-63). He viewed both normal as well as abnormal development of personality as a consequence of the ego-object relations. Guntrip writes of this as: "The entire process of
growth, disturbance, and restoration of wholeness as an ego or personal self depends upon the ego's relations with objects, primarily in infancy...... not just any objects, material things, toys, foods, but the all-important class of objects who are themselves egos, human objects beginning with the mother......" (Guntrip 1971 : 67). The very objects internalized by the individual human beings in early life, thus form a definite pattern. Here the term pattern refers to the complex of various objects, their interrelations and the values and techniques attached with them. This pattern of the psyche may be distinctive for every individual depending upon the encounters with different objects of a very large range, the very process of perception and so on. More importantly, this inner world of internalized objects and the outside world of real objects are in a constant interaction - each influencing the other.

This is the gist of Kleinian and Fairbairnian object-relations theory. In its complete form, the object relations theory seems to be the most plausible psychodynamic theory of human personality. It neither neglects nor overestimates the biological as well as social influences. It also prepares the psychodynamic ground for the explanation of cognitive make up of the human individual and makes feasible the understanding of genesis of the mazeway. I shall be utilizing the various sociological implications of both the object-relation theory and the concept of mazeway in the following sections.

A brief comparative and schematic analysis of the three lines of thought - psychobiological, psychosociological and
object-relational - is given below:

**PSYCHOBIOLOGY**

**SUPER STRUCTURE:**
Psychosocial Make up of the Individual

**BASE:**
Biological-Instinctual Nature of Man, i.e. *Homo Naturalis*

**Base = Underlying Conception of the Essence of Man.**

Super-structure = Personality structure.

(Determination by drives)

**PSYCHOSOCIOLOGY CULTURE-PATTERN THEORY**

**SUPER STRUCTURE:**
Reflective Individuality

**BASE:**
Internalized Cultural Material
i.e. *Homo Culturalis*

(Determination by affect)

**OBJECT-RELATIONS THEORY**

**SUPERSTRUCTURE:**
Concept of Relational and Meaningfully Interactive Character

**BASE:**
Organization of self, Society and Objective Reality, i.e., *Homo Communians*

(Determination by Cognitive Component (Mazeway))
The schematic comparison of the psychobiological, psychosociological and object-relational theories of human personality draws the following salient features of their relative compatibility -

1. Regarding the psychobiology, the underlying conception of man is the *homo naturalis* which forms the base of individual personality and upon which is built up the superstructure of the interactive man finding and reacting to the painful and pleasureful experiences arising out of his instinct-driven behaviour.

2. In regard with psychosociology, the base is formed of the conception of human nature as the *homo culturalis* for individual personality. Thus individual personality organization is the mere reflection of cultural structure, and the individual thinking, acting and experiencing is to be seen within the boundaries of his cultural heritage.

3. Unlike psychobiology and psychosociology where base is too narrow to enable a successful and all-embracing knowledge about the personality superstructure, the object-relational conception of man necessarily calls forth the term *homo communicans* and thereby builds up a superstructure of the personality, enabling the individual meaningfully perceive the biological and social phenomena and create the self. The term *homo communicans* necessarily presupposes the relationship to oneself, to others and to the objective reality and their interconnections form the basis of individual personality. The
notion of "communicans" therefore includes both "naturalis and culturalis" conceptions of man.
8. GUNTRIP'S FORMULATION OF THE BASIC FORMS OF HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS

Dr. Harry Guntrip believes that the object relations theory enables us to conceptualize the various fundamental ways in which the human individuals interact with each other. He thought that by using some of the important concepts developed by Klein and Fairbairn it was possible to construct the polar types of personality in terms of infantile dependence and mature dependence and to identify different stages or probable forms of relationships that the individual may adopt as and if he develops from the complete infantile dependence to the mature dependence. Thus his analysis is important also from the psychopathological viewpoint. Fairbairn's conception of the types of dependency - infantile and mature could be briefly outlined as follows:

Infantile Dependence - Infantile dependence is characterized by the ego's complete dependence upon the object. The relationship of complete dependence of the infant on the mother exists not only in the form of the infant being taken care of by mature mother but also in the form of all other relationships in the later life which are characterized by the dependence of the weak, immature or ill on the strong, mature or healthy.

Mature Dependence - In contrast with the infantile dependence, the mature dependence is characterized by full differentiation of ego and object. Here in the relationship of mature dependence between two persons are the elements of
mutuality and spontaneity.

Fairbairn had seen the process of personality development as starting from the original infantile dependence on the mother and slowly developing into the phase of mature dependence. It is physically expressed as a transition from the oral stage to the genital one. But there are, in between these two types of dependent relationships, as Guntrip has distinguished twelve transitional patterns which are available to the individual actors. As against the two polar types which are characterized by inherent stability, the transitional forms are unstable and reversible. According to Guntrip, the human individual tries to take up one after another of these twelve necessarily unequal, hostile and thus immature patterns of relationships in his transition towards the mature dependence. All these twelve patterns lead to competition, rivalry or withdrawal. All of these twelve patterns indicate perpetuated elements of infantile dependence in their structure and function. Individuals involved in all these patterns of relationships, according to Guntrip's formulation seem to play either of two dominant roles - the role of a supporting, mature mother and the role of the infant seeking for a mother figure. The original infantile dependence situation is a objective reality whereas the ideal type of mature dependence is only a theoretical construct because the process of individual development cannot prevent contamination as the perpetual elements of infantile dependence are already absorbed and internalized in the very structure of personality. But it is also true that
the more mature a relationship is, the less it is influenced by infantile elements.

Thus, Guntrip's formulation of the probable basic forms of human relationship, which is based on the object-relations theory, clearly demonstrates how the past experiences influence the very patterns of human behaviour in their day-to-day life. It is now easy to understand the implications of the changed emphasis within psychoanalysis. By emphasising the ego-object relationship, the object-relations theory emancipates the individual from extreme biological and social influences, which formed the core of psychobiological and psychosociological orientations respectively. The dynamics of interpersonal relations, then, is the best possible approach to the understanding and explanation of psychocultural phenomena.

Therefore, it is clear that the object-relational thinking considers two important and mutually decisive aspects of interhuman relationships - the intrapsychic as well as social. It elaborates the fact that internalized patterns of ego-object relations influence the individual's actual social relationships and being constantly fed back by the dynamic aspect of social interaction, in turn, they themselves undergo gradual changes. The implications of this hypothesis are very important especially for anthropology among other sciences of society. With consideration of the object-relational conception of human nature, it is now possible to suggest a new way of looking at the psychosocial change.
As it has already been mentioned above, the object-relations theory of personality although it assumes tacitly and at some junctures explicity the influences of both past experiences and present social relationships on the development of personality, it does not seem to have elaborated these findings - the reason of which owes to the same boundary maintenance tendency. It is apparent in Guntrip's formulation that although he attempts to elaborate a strong theory of psychological basis of human interaction, he does not take into consideration the dynamic aspect of the latter. It appears as if he takes the social statics as given in his formulation. This assumption not only hampers the possible progress of social research in the various important areas such as socialization but also retards further research in personality psychology. Therefore, it seems necessary to search for other bodies of relevant theories which have seriously pursued the sociological implications of object-relations theory. Here social psychology and social anthropology lend help. The intrapsychic aspect of social relations leads us to the distinction between "the I and the Me" - famous of George Herbert Mead while the dynamics of social relations to Gregory Bateson's formulation of "complementary and symmetrical" types of social relations.
The intra psychic aspect of interhuman relations is well expressed in Mead's various writings regarding the mind, self and society. Mead writes about the process which transforms the biological organism of the human individual into the "social self". He holds that interpersonal relationships as a part of social processes act upon the individual and a "self" is created: "self arises where the individual form has the ability to take the attitude of the group to which he belongs, then to come back upon himself, stimulate himself as he stimulates others, talk to himself in terms of his community and lay upon himself the responsibilities that go with the community life" (Mead 1936 : 366-35-75). Preconditions, that Mead assumes, of the evolution of self are certain physiological capacities and participation in social activity by means of language. Thus social experience is an essential condition for the making of a social self and social experience is possible only through participation and communication in social action. The individual's experience of himself, then, is possible only through enculturation and in social action for "......he enters his own experience as a self or individual, not directly or immediately, not by becoming a subject to himself, but only in so far as he first becomes an object to himself just as other individuals are objects to him or his experience; and he becomes an object to himself only by taking the attitudes of other individuals toward himself......" (Mead 1934 : 138).
Thus, for Mead, the self is not congenital and is not possible without social experience. The experience also must involve not only action, not even reaction but interaction. If social interaction is a precondition for the formation of self then what is the innate equipment which enables the human individual the social interaction? Here Mead distinguishes between the two indispensable and functionally disparate constituents of the self - the "I" and the "me".

The "me" is composed of the organized set or sets of attitudes of the group which the individual assumes or incorporates in his mazeway (here mazeway is used conveniently to mean its elaborate function by which various attitudes of different social actors in contact are organized according to their prominence and cumulative occurrence and are carefully though not consciously, used in the later life) while the "I" is the individual's response to the attitudes of others - a set of behavioural techniques, alternative modes of differential perception. In Mead's conception, the distinctively human psycho-physical assertive organism is the given or the "I" while the "me" is the introjected other. Then the self or personality as Mead conceives of it, is the given as socialized through the experiences and interplay of living in a group. While the "me" is conventional basic structure of the self, the "I" is to be viewed as the active, calculating consciousness which is responsible for novelty in the continuous change in the total self. The "I" is relatively free, unpredictable, self-initiating response of the organism to the attitudes of
others. Although, Mead maintained a "social theory of mind", he did not regard the self as being determined by society; for him, the selves were created by both, the society and organism's own capabilities. Therefore, both "I" as well as "me" are essential to the self in its full development. Considering that the relationship between the "I" and the "me" is generally that of a dialogue the individual shows the elements of both altruism and egoism. In living a social life, wherever the self is adapted to the outer social reality, it is through over-taking of the "I" by the "me" and thereby dominating the situation by altruistic tendencies. Contrastingly, wherever the self attempts to change the conditioning environment overtaken by the dominating "I", it exhibits egoistic tendencies. There, the "I" is as essential for development of the self as is the "me". One without the other gives an extreme and one sided self. The "me" plays a very important role of controlling of the "I" and provides for social control; while the "I" asserts itself within the social limits and is responsible for social change. Taken together, the "I" and the "me" constitute a personality.

This is a brief picture of Mead's conception of the individual personality. The point which is being stressed here is that the social relationships constitute the part of the very structure of a personality. This process starts right from the infancy and its presence is evident in each and every act of the individual.
But Mead has not explained how the interaction between the "I" and the "me" takes place. What are the probable patterns of this interaction? How the excesses of egoistic or altruistic tendencies come to govern the self? Although it is possible to generate certain explanatory hypotheses from within the Meadian formulation I would like to take a resort to Bateson's theory of schismogenesis which not only explains the cybernetics of social relationships, their patterns and so on but also given some clues regarding the intrapsychic differentiation inherent in the "I" - "me" dynamics.

Another point that seems to be important mentioning here is regarding the relative profitability of both psychology and anthropology as the Meadian and Batesonian formulations come together. While Mead is interested in the exploration of structural components of the self or personality by distinguishing between the "I" and the "me", Bateson is interested in the formulation for the understanding of the processes involved within the personality. Although Bateson starts with the distinction between two major types of human social relationships, he goes beyond the descriptive function of the typology and explores the grounds to analyse the patterns of conflict experiences. In this way, the synthesis of Meadian and Batesonian ideas help us in the understanding of content of social and intrapsychic aspects of human relationships and also the quality or charge of the relationships. It is very interesting to note down that while Mead emphasizes content part of the relationship with an insight in the structure, Bateson emphasizes the charge with
which the relationships persist, showing thereby a much deeper insight in the function.
10. THE RELATIONSHIP TO OTHERS - ACTUAL

According to Gregory Bateson all the interpersonal relationships and even intergroup relationships can be classified into two broad types - complementary and symmetrical. He defines them as follows:

"Complementary Relationship - A relationship between two individuals (or between two groups) is said to be chiefly complementary if most of the behaviour of the one individual is culturally regarded as of one sort (e.g. assertive) while most of the behaviour of the other, when he replies, is culturally regarded as of a sort complementary to this (e.g. submissive).

Symmetrical Relationship - A relationship between two individuals (or two groups) is said to be symmetrical if each responds to the other with the same kind of behaviour, e.g. if each meets the other with assertiveness" (Bateson 1958: 308-11).

Each of these two types of relationship carries in its functioning a tendency of progressive change and in the absence of stabilizing mechanisms arises a possibility of change in the cultural norms. Bateson holds that in both complementary and symmetrical social relationships, there are two types of mutually dialectical processes which are always at work. On one hand are the processes of differentiation tending towards increase of ethological contrast, and on the other hand are the ones which continually counteract this tendency towards differentiation. Thus in the presence of these two types of processes,
the social order has to be seen differently. The "Status quo" in the society is, in fact, a dynamic equilibrium, in which changes are continually taking place.

What exactly happens when the interpersonal relationships of the types mentioned above are carried on? In the absence of a strong configuration of equilibrating mechanisms of various types, the processes of differentiation give way to change in the very structure of personalities of the individuals concerned, in the relationship as such and if viewed from the cultural point of view, in the cultural norms also. Bateson calls the processes of differentiation as schismogenesis and defines the same as - "a process of differentiation in the norms of individual behaviour resulting from cumulative interaction between individuals" (ibid : 175). What he is claiming is that the relationship between two individuals - whether complementary or symmetrical - is liable to alter from time to time without any disturbance from outside. It could be demonstrated by giving a following example:

Persons A and B are in a social relationship. A behaves with B in what is culturally regarded as an assertive pattern to which B is expected to reply in what is culturally regarded as submission. B's submission encourages further assertion on the part of A which demands B to be more submissive. Such a progressive state of affairs in a complementary relationship is due to "complementary schigmogenesis" at work.
In another instance, persons A and B are in a social relationship. A behaves with B in cultural pattern of boasting to which B replies with boasting and causes A boast more. To this kind of progressive change the name given by Bateson is "symmetrical schigmogenesis".

Both in a complementary and in a symmetrical schigmogenic situations characterized by absence or very weak presence of other factors to restrain the excesses of assertion and submission what would ultimately occur is breakdown of the relationship. In this way, all social relationships are, potentially conflict generative. Schismogenesis, once started and not controlled is destined to create progressive changes in the various relationship structures. Bateson has at some length discussed the causes of the Schismogenesis being progressive.

Now, reflecting back upon the "I" and the "me" as the phases of the self or personality, it could be said that the potential conflict in the actual social relations also is internalized and registered on the mazeway. Therefore, the claim of the object-relation theory that the personality structure is object-relational is added with the various allied claims such as (i) the individual's relationship to oneself, i.e. his mode of perceiving, experiencing, acting and reacting back in the various relationships in the contexts of relationship to other, which is patterned by a configuration of the egoistic and altruistic tendencies peculiar to himself, is subject to undergo the schismogenic consequences. Therefore, the questions regarding the probable patterns of "I" to "me"
interaction which were raised at the end of the last topic could now be answered with the application of the concepts of complementarity, symmetry and schismogenesis; (ii) that relationship to others - since it is liable to change structurally from time to time has a profound effect on the individual's internalized organization of the "I" and the "me"; (iii) that the interrelations between the social objects as internalized by the individual, right from the infancy period is a source of the distinction between the "I" and the "me" and a complete organization of the patterned relationship between the various objects as internalized in the form of mazeway components is what is to be referred as personality structure.
11. DISCUSSION

The present chapter aimed at preparing the ground for the construction of model of social changes. As the various topics in the chapter have shown, the steady progression of the discussions of various concepts and theories have led us to the point where it is essential to spell out the implications of the arrangement of preceding discussions.

It is evident that the age-old alternatives of the psycho-biological and psychosociological theories available to sociology and anthropology are unagreeable in so far as they seem to threaten the autonomy of the individual. It is not to argue that the human individual is completely autonomous because the denial of social and biological dependence of man is superficial and untrue. But man is a reflective animal. He can and does act meaningfully and wherever fails psychopathology seeks to give meaning to mental suffering and thereby attempts to cure the illnesses. The object-relations theory offers a strong alternative to the extremes previously mentioned. The new conception of man is that of "homo communicans". The concept of mazeway is used instrumentally to establish the authenticity of the claim that the human nature is relational. The mazeway concept also enables us to reject the former uniformitarian view of the relationship between individual personality and culture.

Guntrip's formulation of the various forms of interhuman relationships demonstrates how different personality structures (composed of different types of organization of object-
relationships) influence actual social behaviour. In other words, Guntrip's formulation shows how the internalized object-experiences determine the modes of day-today social participation. But Guntrip's formulation was overloaded by the terminology of object-relations theory. The principal point which the object-relations theory sought to make was that the process of personality formation is influenced by relationship to others. This suggestion has been very well elaborated in Mead's conception of individual personality. The various important concepts from the object-relations theory, Wallace's analysis of culture and personality relationship and Mead's social interactionism when taken together and arranged in the above order help us elaborate the concept of being related to oneself. To be meaningfully related to oneself necessarily presupposes the social relationships. Therefore, an attempt is made to explore the connections between the patterns of social relationships and the patterns of relationship to oneself. Bateson's concepts of complementarity and symmetry as the patterns of social relationships remind of Guntrip's classification of interhuman relationships. There infantile dependence and mature dependence are the key concepts and they can be taken as analogous to what Bateson calls complementary and symmetrical patterns.

Complementary and symmetrical patterns are found not only in the social relationships but can also be distinguished between in relationship to oneself. Complementary relationship would mean the relationship between the "I" and the "me" is dominated either by the "I" or the "me". Therefore, both of
the probable patterns arising out of the organism's domination over or submission to the internalized attitudes of others are categorized as complementary relationship to oneself. Whereas the symmetrical relationship to oneself would mean that an individual experiences symmetrical tensions originating from both the aspects of his self - the "I" and the "me". The connection between the pattern of relationship to oneself and the pattern of relationship to others could be schematically represented as follows:

Relationship to Oneself: Complementary -

I - me (domination of the "I") ...... Egoistic pattern of action ...... Assertiveness in social relation.

I - me (domination of the "me") ...... Altruistic pattern of action ...... Submissiveness in social relations.

Relationship to Oneself: Symmetrical -

I - me (Equal and/or alternative pressure of both "I" and "me")

...... combination of both egoism and altruism

...... strong presence of both assertive and submissive behavioural traits in social relations.

As in the culturally structured social relationships, excesses of symmetry are equilibrated by ritualized complementarity and the excesses of complementarity are stabilized by ritualized symmetry, so also happens in the relationship to oneself. Excesses of assertion and submission of the "I" or the "me" in a complementary pattern are met with the stabilizing
symmetrical elements and symmetrical patterns are found in combination with the balancing complementarity.

What we find in the relationship contents of relation to oneself and relation to other social actors is also applicable to the third context of human relationship. The patterns of complementarity and symmetry can also be tranced out in man's ecological activity. Man not only experiences nature as a determinant of culture but also attempts to change it within his technological limits. The history of ecological thinking in anthropology gives ample evidence of the different conceptions of the man-nature relationship and among which different types of complementarity as well as symmetry can be found.

The complementarity - symmetry concepts can be generalized therefore, in all the three contexts of human relationship: relationship to oneself, relationship to others, and relationship to nature. Although the meaning and the mode of functioning of the complementary and symmetrical relationships would vary depending upon the context in which they are found, nevertheless they seem to be the only patterns of relationships that men can have in all the three contexts. A further discussion about the complementarity and symmetry types is proposed in the succeeding chapter. Another point which needs a brief mention here is that we can also distinguish between the primary and derived forms of the complementary and symmetrical relationships. The primary meaning of the terms 'complementary' and 'symmetrical lies in the second context - i.e. relationship to others while the derived forms of complementarity and symmetry may mean
differently when used in the contexts of relationship to oneself and relationship to nature.