CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

Of all the living creatures on this world, man is unique. He is the sole living species that has a culture. By culture we mean an extrasomatic, temporal continuum of objects and events dependent upon symboling, specifically and concretely, culture consists of language, ideas, beliefs, customs, codes, institutions, tools, techniques, works of art, rituals, ceremonies and so on. The existence and use of cultura depends upon an ability possessed by man alone. The classic definition of culture was given many years ago by E. B. Tylor. According to him 'culture...is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society'. This definition comprises such products of group life as folk-ways, technicways and other group expectation. Besides, there are the material elements that comprise our contemporary culture and supplement the psychological elements at every point, there are the meaningful relationships between the various parts of culture and the symbolic interpretations placed upon them. Thus customs, material things and meaningful relationships make the principal aspects of culture. Culture includes both structure and function.

The symbolic aspects of culture have been emphasised by Leslie A. White. According to him, 'Culture is an organisation of phenomena—acts; objects; and sentiments—that is dependent upon the use of symbols. Culture began when man as an articulate, symbol-using primate, began.'
Because of its symbolic character...culture is easily and readily transmitted from one human organism to another.” In this way, culture is a continuous and growing whole. It acquires new elements as it is a handed down from one generation to another spreading to new groups and peoples. The history of culture is, in a real sense, the history of man as a human being. For hundreds of thousands of years, culture in some form has been continuously transmitted. In course of time, some elements have been lost, others have been changed and new ones have been added. But culture itself has gone on “Culture is, therefore,” concludes A. White, “a symbolic, continuous, cumulative and progressive process.”

All peoples in all times and places possessed culture. No other species had culture. In the course of the evolution of primates ‘man’ appeared when the ability to symbol had been developed and become capable of expression. Man, as an animal, possesses a number of characteristics which qualify him for culture. Among these erect posture; an opposable thumb, stereoscopic, chromatic vision; gregariousness are important traits. But the most important qualification of all is the ability to symbol. We call the ability freely and arbitrarily to originate and bestow meaning upon a thin; the ability to understand and appreciate such meaning, ‘the ability to symbol.’ Holy water provides us with a good example of this. Holy water is a liquid that exists in nature plus a value derived from man. This value cannot be grasped or appreciated with the senses. Symboling, therefore, consists of trafficking in meanings by nonsensory means. We may well regard articulate speech as the most characteristic and the most important form of expression of the
Darwin had observed long ago that dogs 'can understand words and sentences'. Even the laboratory rats can make the distinction of the food meaning of green circles from the electric shock meaning of red triangles. But this is not symboling. The animal is not able to originate and bestow the meaning in either case. It is man alone who does this. The difference between the mind of man and that of subman is one of kind, not one of degree; that man's mind is unique among all species of living beings. Man is capable of doing many things which other creatures can not do. Man alone can make the distinction between holy water and ordinary water. No dog, rat, ape or any other subhuman animal can appreciate the difference. Only man can classify their relatives, distinguishing cousin from sibling, uncle from grandfather, etc. No subhuman can do this. An age cannot toll an uncle from a cousin. No animal can distinguish the Sabbath from any other day. No animal other than man can group the meaning or value of fetishes. The lower animals can ascertain the intrinsic values of commodities but they can know nothing about their prices. Incest and adultery matter for man alone; all other animals are somewhat innocent. Only man has gods and demons, heavens and hills, and immortality. Only man knows death'. Thus on the basis of the instances given above, it is quite evident that no animals except man can have any comprehension whatever of holy water, fetishes, uncles, sins, prices, incest, adultery, etc. None of the lower animals are capable of being 'human' and sharing their lives. The fundamental, qualitative difference between the mind of man and that of lower species
It is hoped that man and culture came into being simultaneously. The time of man's and culture's origin cannot be fixed exactly, of course, but one million years ago is acknowledged by almost all authorities as the date of their beginning. Our assumption of the beginning of culture is based as follows: Neurological evolution culminated eventually in the ability to symbol the exercise of which brought culture into existence and then preserved it. This conception can be justified by showing that culture in all its parts and aspects is dependent upon symboling, or, more specifically, upon articulate speech. The components of culture can be divided into four categories: ideological, sociological, sentimental and technological.

The ideological sector of culture is composed of beliefs which are dependent upon symboling or, articulate speech for their origin as well as for their perpetuation. Without articulate speech, a belief that owls bring bad luck; that the world is round; that man has a soul or that all men are mortal cannot be possible.

The sociological components such as institutions, customs, rules and modes of interpersonal behaviour etc. of cultural systems are dependent upon articulate speech. It is through speech that one know that two mates are permissible if possessed one at a time but not if held simultaneously. Or that marriage with a cross-cousin is permissible, or even obligatory, but marriage with a parallel cousin is incestuous and, therefore, criminal. It is through speech that one can tell a cousin from an uncle, distinguish between mine and thine, or right and wrong, or polite or impolite. It is clear,
therefore, that the behaviour of man as a human being in the society is dependent upon symboling.

As regards sentiment or attitude as component of culture we find the same situation. The attitudes that constitute the subjective aspect of mother-in-law taboo, for example, require symboling for their existence.

Subhuman animals are not capable of such feelings. The loathing of milk, attitudes towards chastity, snakes, bats, death, etc., are all produced and given form and expression in human society by the exercise of the ability to symbol. Without it there is no difference between man and animal.

So far as the technological sector of culture is concerned, it is found that apes use tools with great skill, ease and versatility. One ape may learn the use of tools from another by observation and imitation. But there is a great difference between man's use of tools and that of ages. The use of tools in the human species is, on the whole, a cumulative and progressive process. It is this that distinguishes neolithic from paleolithic cultures; the Age of Coal and Steel from the Middle ages. Tool using with the anthropoids is not a cumulative or progressive process.

We see that culture has been made possible by and is fully dependent upon the symbolic faculty, the knowledge, man's beliefs, his social systems, his institutions, his rituals, his traditional attitudes, his codes of ethics, forms of art; and, finally his technology. Culture's cumulative and progressive process consist of two general types of elements—(a) material and (b) nonmaterial. In the material aspects of culture are embodied those human products that can be experienced with the senses. Automobiles,
razors, shoes, pencils, disks, televisions, radios, trains and countless lots are the material objects produced by our culture. The non-material culture includes the group expectations, the folkways, technicways, mores, values, traditions and all other psychological elements arising out of social life. The fundamental basis of culture is inherent in the minds of men, not in the external manifestations. Ideas are the real foundation of culture. All the machines in the world will become of no use without the knowledge of how to use them. Man is a symbol making and using animal. The understanding of these symbols is fundamental to an understanding of culture. The meanings attached to the different aspects of culture are more important than the physical form these aspects may take. Sometimes the material and the nonmaterial elements of culture are viewed as unreal and illusory. That is, the real cultural elements are said to be the mental; the physical aspects are merely the manifestations of the ideas and techniques handed down in the cultural heritage. Culture, in short, is essentially mental and not physical. The key to culture lies in the mind of man.

Material objects have been produced by man's cultural activity. It is not the supernatural power of someone which created automobile rather it is the product of a long chain of human inventors, each of whom improved on or added something to the finished output. The trace of long continuous cultural progression may be examined through the invention and the improvements upon the modern automobile. Man was the first to work with his hands and brains and transmitted the material product and techniques down the ages. Its result is visible to the whole world.
The nonmaterial cultural heritage equally forms an important part and it has a human source. Usually customs, taboos, habits, commandments are attributed to a supernatural power which is not true. These psychological elements of the cultural heritage are manmade. Group expectations composing social and moral codes are the products of historic and cumulative way of life. There cannot be parity of the efficient progression between the non material and the material aspects to the same degree. Many old customs are yet superior to the customs existing thousand years ago but the superiority of the modern automobile can be undisputedly established on the old means of transportation like oxcart. The great ideas of our day are thus the product of our cultural development.

Culture constitute the social heritage in another sense. Culture is not inherited. The traits of culture are passed on through the group and social relationships. The process of transmitting the cultural heritage is an everlasting phenomenon till man survives on the earth.

Culture is again the source of the uniformity of human behaviour. The folkways, mores and the rest of the group expectations form an integral part of culture. To each rising generation, these elements of culture provide an arranged set of responses. The individual finds already his ways of behaviour worked out for him. He becomes a part of the group.

When other cultures are interpreted or evaluated in terms of their own by the vast majority of persons, this tendency is called ethnocentrism. This tendency is more prevalent in modern nations. The criteria is based on the culture of those who judge it. A culture may be considered good so far as it is
capable of satisfying human desires based upon innate species needs and the desires which itself, the cultural system or its predecessor has created. If the culture is not functioning properly in terms of the physical needs of its members or in terms of the desires arising from the culture itself, then that culture may be considered bad one. Hence the judgement of culture is based not upon the standards of a particular culture but rather upon the biological and cultural needs of its members.

Culture is the product of human behaviour. It has some characteristics that make it a unique phenomenon. Culture is learned behaviour and takes the form of society acquired group habits. Just after the birth and in the process of social conditioning the individual starts learning it. The ability of the human being to communicate symbolically means that he is able to acquire culture from other similarly equipped human beings. Culture can also be transmitted from one human being to another and from one generation to the next. Human beings share certain expectations which form social quality of culture and which are the product of group experience and habits. Along with the habitual forms of personal behaviour the individual also learns the habitual forms of group behaviour arising from customary social relationships. Culture is also regarded by the members of the group as an ideal pattern of behaviour. The disparity is quite visible in practice between the ideal and the performance. Culture satiates human needs, both biological and social. The continuance of a particular pattern depends upon its ability to satisfy certain innate or socially acquired wishes. The persistence of individual habits depends how far they satisfy whether
conscious or unconscious desire of the human being, in the same way the
group habits of culture must satisfy the needs of the group. Its continued
failure will bring about the eventual disappearance of culture. The culture
has got an adaptive quality. It is obvious that the culture changes and this
change brings adaption to forces outside of the culture. Geographical
environment matters much in this connection though it is not the
determining factor of the development of culture. The integrative quality of
culture is related to a consistent and coordinated pattern. This quality is
apparent in a simple and isolated culture where constituent elements do
not change rapidly. Integration is not so apparent in our own heterogeneous
and interdependent culture, where various elements are continually
entering the culture and the constituent elements are in a perpetual and
dynamic process of change. Within wide limits, however, all cultures show
definite tendencies towards integration.

The purpose and function of culture are to make human's life secure
and enduring. All living species behave in such a way that their kind is
perpetuated. Human beings and subhuman beings both execute this
behaviour by somatic means, i.e. with their bodies, muscles, organs, etc.
But human beings alone have the privilege to employ the extrasomatic
tradition i.e. culture to sustain and perpetuate their existence. To be
precise, the functions of culture are to relate man to his environment on the
one hand and to relate man to man on the other. Man is related to his
habitat by means of techniques, tools, attitudes and beliefs. Tools are used
to exploit the resources of nature; dwellings and clothing provide shelter;
and pots of many kinds are used in the process of living and survival. This has been carried on from time immemorial collectively and individually. It is the business of culture to organise human beings for this purpose. Social organisations like families, lineages, guilds of artisans, priest-hoods, etc. should effectively make a coherent whole for the survival of the human species.

The function of culture is to serve the needs of man. These needs can be fulfilled in two ways—(1) by exploiting the resources of the external world and (2) by drawing upon the resources of the human organism only. Clothing, utensils, ornaments, etc. are obtained from the external world. But man has inner and spiritual needs that can be fulfilled without drawing upon the external world at all. Man needs consolation, courage, confidence, companionship in the light that life is worthwhile. It is the business of culture to serve these needs of the spirit as well as the needs of the body. Life is a continued struggle of pain, suffering, loneliness, fear, frustration etc. Man requires friendship, courage, inspiration, hope, comfort and consolation to face this struggle of life. Cultural devices serve Man's purpose. Mythologies encourage and reassure him. With the help of ritual and magic he can capture the illusion of power and control over events. He can even control the weather to some extent, cure disease, look to the future, increase food production and overcome his enemies. Some cultural devices relate him to the spirit world of enjoyment. Cosmologies give him answers to all fundamental queries of life and death. Thus culture gives man a sense of power and of confidence. It assures him that life is worth living and gives him
the power to face it. It comforts and sustains him when he meets defeat or frustration. It provides him with divine and human companions. Culture, in short, gives man the illusion of importance, omnipotence and omniscience.

In every culture we find association among members of the community. These are tribal or community feasts or festivals. There are clubs and societies. The sociological sector of cultural systems serve the inner, spiritual or moral needs of man just as the ideological, theological and scientific sector does. Even technological sector provides satisfactions that are not utilitarian in character. Craftsmanship can provide the craftsman with pleasures and satisfactions quite apart from the fruits of its use. Grinding a symmetrical stone axe, carving a perfect canoe paddle, weaving a basket, making a spear, etc., as technological processes provide psychic satisfactions in and by themselves. Significantly beauty and use are often united in handicrafts. Craftsmanship can provide beauty as well as use, can provide nourishment for the human psyche, as well as articles to serve material needs. Thus we see that culture in all its aspects—ideological, and technological—serves man's inner, spiritual needs as well as his outer, material needs. Actually these two classes of needs are not separate and distinct.

There is a significant relationship between man and culture. The two are inseparable in actuality—We shall discuss this relationship in its generic and specific aspects. Let us first see the generic aspect. Culture was the outcome of the actions of man. Supercats, supercows or superants could not create the culture we have today. They are quite different in their
natures from simians and even from each other. It is the nature of man—his bodily structure and functions, which make possible certain developments within and impose certain restrictions upon the culture building process. Our culture is a function of our vision to a certain extent. The continuous activity of our sexual life has a deep effect upon our social organisation. If the offsprings of 'Homo Sapiens' were born in litters, like pigs or puppies, instead of singly, kinship systems would undoubtedly differ from those that have been realised. If adult men and women were simply ten inches or ten feet tall, there would be corresponding differences in culture. Even a minor biological difference might make a significant change in our culture. Then, it is quite evident that culture, in a general sense, is a function of the structure and properties of the human organism. The developments of culture are possible by certain properties and capabilities of man. But at the same time certain limitations are also imposed upon the scope and content of culture by the same properties and structures of man.

If there is a significant and fundamental generic relationship between man and culture, there is no instance of a specific relationship between a grouping—a physical type, race, tribe, or nation—of mankind and a type of culture. None can argue that the physical type of the Chinese disposes them to eat with chopsticks or to write with a brush rather than with a pen. But there are many who believe that a people's temperament shapes their political, social, or economic system. They are by nature aggressive, submissive, individualistic, communistic, etc. These beliefs, however, are not supported by scientific evidence. As people differ in physical shape, they
may also differ in temperament. But it is difficult to identify and measure these differences. The influence of culture upon the behaviour of people is very powerful and overriding.

Culture may be viewed in a number of significant ways for purposes of scientific interpretation. We may think of the culture of mankind as a whole, as a stream flowing down through time. Implements, utensils, tools, customs, codes, beliefs, rituals, art forms, etc. comprise this temporal process. It is an interactive process; each culture trait, or constellation of traits, acts and reacts upon others, formulating from time to time new combinations. We call these cultural elements inventions. These events can take place in juxtaposition or in conjunction with one another. When an invention is possible, it is inevitable also. An invention is like a shower of rain. When certain favourable factors and conditions are present in proper conjunction rain will fall and when they are not present it will not rain. There is no difference here as such between possibility and inevitability. It is the same with inventions. When certain cultural elements are present and in proper conjunction, an invention will take place; when they are not, the invention will not take place. The stream of culture undergoes changes of content as well as alterations of form as it flows. Old elements are dropped, and new elements are added. Metals, coal, petroleum, atom may be introduced into the culture stream at stages of development. Stone axes, oxcarts, and spinning wheels may drop out as they become incompatible with their respective contexts in the stream of culture.

Culture may also be viewed as a non-temporal system in the form of
culture of mankind as a whole. We may consider it merely as an organisation of cultural elements without regard to chronological systems. A system is an organisation of things and events so interrelated that the relationship of part to part is determined with relation of part to whole. An atom, a molecule, or living organism is a system. Culture, also, has systematic organisation. System implies both parts and inter-relationships among parts, or structure and function, or process. Technological, social ideological and attitudinal may be thought as the structure of a cultural system.

When we think of culture in general, or of the culture of mankind as a whole we call it simply 'culture'. But when we think of the culture possessed by a tribe, nation, or region, we call it a culture or cultures. The culture of mankind in actuality is a single system; all the so called cultures are merely distinguishable portions of a single. The culture of mankind as a whole may be considered temporally as a flowing stream or nontemporally as a system, or as both. For certain purposes and within certain limits, the culture of a particular tribe, or group of tribes, or the culture of a region may be considered as a system. Thus one might think the culture of the Seneca tribe as constituting a system. The culture of all mankind does indeed constitute a self-contained, closed system. But the cultures of tribes or regions are not self-contained, closed systems in actuality. The culture if any distinguishable group of people at any given time is complete, i.e. contains all the kinds of elements that the culture as a whole contains.

Culture is a complex whole. Earlier we have already referred to its material and non-material aspects suggesting that the most important phases
exist in the minds of men. The constituent parts of this entity that is at once so tangible and so intangible may be examined. In the process, we shall consider the relationships of these constituent parts to one another and to the whole of the culture.

The trait is counted as the simplest element of culture. It is the smallest component part into which culture can be divided for purposes of analysis. Any given culture is composed of thousands of individual traits, each the result of human activity. The complexity of a culture is a function of the number of traits comprising it. Primitive cultures have relatively few traits, especially those pertaining to the material aspects of life. Some primitive cultures have plenty of rituals and ceremonies in their non-material culture. The complexity of a culture grows with the advancement of civilization and thousands of new traits are added to the total heritage. In material terms, contemporary American culture is certainly the most complex the world has ever seen. Culture traits may be either material or nonmaterial. The dividing line between the two in practice is by no means arbitrary. Material traits combine with nonmaterial to form a complex and functioning whole. The nail is useless unless a technique exists for using it as well as making it. The shoe string has no meaning apart from the custom of wearing shoes. The majority of material traits thus have some customs, technique or behaviour sequence in connection with them. Man cannot live by material traits alone. Neither can he live without them.

We cannot imagine culture traits in isolation. They are encountered in combination with other traits, forming a dynamic interrelationship. The
individual trait acquires meaning only in its relationship to other traits and to the combination of related traits as a whole. The focal point may be a material trait or nonmaterial one, or more often a combination of the two. Each trait in the group bears some functional relationship to the others and can be understood completely in terms of this relationship. This group of functionally related traits is known as a culture pattern. The pattern may thus be viewed as a number of culture traits grouped about a central interest and deriving their meaning in terms of this central theme. The various related traits falling into line in the pattern assume meaningful relations to each other. the pattern is the most important functional unit of the culture. The child rarely learns individual and isolated traits, but rather learns the practices and expectations of his culture in the form of configurations or patterns. The parts of these patterns are meaningful only as they are related to the pattern as a whole.

The culture pattern implies a regularity in behaviour that would be impossible if every person acted in random and individual fashion. The person learns a certain pattern regarding such varied forms of behaviour as eating breakfast, going to school, playing football, having a date, or getting married. Each larger culture and to some extent each subculture has its own set of patterns which it imposes upon the individual and thus insure a minimum of uniformity of behaviour. When most of the members of the group are acting under the sanction of the basic expectations, a certain degree of regularity is observable in their behaviour. They are consciously or unconsciously following the same pattern of culture.
Culture patterns are, strictly speaking, intangible and exist only in the minds or the habit forms of the individuals comprising a certain group. Patterns are visible only as they take shape in the behaviour of individuals engaged in regularised activity under the impulse of common group stimuli. There are degrees of visibility of patterned behaviour, ranging from the regularised activities in which persons physically engage to their internal reasons for so doing. Boys and girls of high school or college at a party are engaged in behaviour that is extremely regularized and stylized. Their reasons for dating, dancing, and related behaviour may be equally patterned but not so visible. In other words, the majority of the boys and girls may be having a date because they wish to appear popular and accepted in the group, rather than because they have any special affection for the temporary object of their affections.

Culture patterns vary with respect to the degree of standardization and the social media that bring about the standardization. In a primitive society, regularity of behaviour results from word-of-mouth instruction whereby the individual learns the ways of thought and action expected in the society by personal word and immediate example. In a large mass society such as our own, regularity of behaviour is the result of mass means of communication, besides more intimate efforts of the primary group. Radio, television, the comics and the cinemas are among the media of mass communication that play an important role in cultural patterning.

The patterning of culture takes place largely in an unplanned fashion and without any conscious design on the part of the persons who carry the
culture. The degree of planning varies between societies, with the socialist and communist societies engaging in a greater degree of formal patterning than the societies committed to a laissez-fair philosophy. The United States has been noted for the essentially unplanned nature of its culture patterning, which approach is inherent in our conception of pioneer individual freedom. In spite of the lack of planning of a culture pattern, a certain uniformity and consistency arises by virtue of the similar interests and needs of the group using the pattern. We may take the game of baseball as a homely example of a culture pattern. In the hundred years since its invention baseball has accumulated a stock of traditions, legends, folkways, technicways, and mores which have become part of the cultural heritage of every American boy. Formal and informal rules of the game are included in the pattern. The huge physical investment represented by organised baseball, with its fields, its consolidated coaching and scouting systems, and its valuable properties in the persons of the star players are important material phases of the baseball pattern. Publicity is also part of the process by which interest is maintained in the individuals and teams throughout the long playing season. The final and indispensable element in the baseball pattern is the millions of devoted fans who support their team through thick and thin. The person brought up in American culture understands the meaning and role of the baseball pattern because he has absorbed it during his formative years. American culture has many other patterns. Business, the professions, government, the family, religion, education, recreation and other central interests all have clusters of meaningful behaviour centring
about them. The important consideration here, however, is to realize the presence and role of the culture pattern as a functioning unit. By its very nature, culture tends to cluster and form meaningful relationships or patterns.

Culture patterns may also be considered in functional terms, that is, from the point of view of the part that they play in the life of the group. Many of these forms of patterned behavior have rather obvious functions such as to earn a living, raise the young, and control the individual in the interests of the group. The patterned behavior known as dating in our society may have one function of providing entertainment for the adolescent. At a deeper psychological level, the function may be that of giving emotional security to the individual by conclusively demonstrating his or her ability to have dates and therefore acquire status in the group. The patterns of any culture cannot be fully grasped, however, merely on the conscious and rational level. The emotional need that the pattern fills in the lives of the members must also be considered.

In concluding our discussions of culture patterns, it should be noted that the pattern is central to culture itself. In other words, culture as a whole is in a sense nothing, but the over-all pattern that human action takes in a particular society. The pattern should not be confused with the action itself, but should be understood as the norms that govern and direct the action.

The powerful influence of culture can be seen since the very birth of man in this world. The infant of the human species enters the world cultureless. His attitudes, values, ideals and beliefs are powerfully
influenced by the culture that surrounds him on all sides. It is so powerful that it can even hold the sex urge in check and achieve premarital chastity and voluntary promises of celibacy for life. It can cause a person to die of hunger, though nourishment is available, because some foods are branded dangerous by the culture. It can cause a person to disembowel or shoot himself to wipe out a stain of dishonour. Culture is stronger than life and also stronger than death. However death is also a concept; only man knows death. But culture triumphs over death and offers man eternal life. Thus on the one hand it can deny satisfaction, on the other it can fulfil desires. It is an integral part of the individual personality. Therefore, a matured personality is a product of the function of both biological and cultural factors. It is impossible to differentiate these factors from each other and to evaluate the magnitude of each of them in particular cases. In those cases where the cultural factor is constant, personality may vary with the variation of the biostructure of the individual. But there are no fixed tests that can indicate howmuch is the ability of the man to make change due to innate endowment or cultural experience. Variations of personality can still be possible but within the confines of these two constant individuals might undergo a number of experiences. For example, a group of women might have the same experience of having a baby, graduating from college and getting married but the sequence of effect upon personality development would be quite different.

Improved knowledge leads to a deeper understanding of cultures quite different from one's own. It is understood that universal needs can
serve culturally diverse means. To make it more clear worship may assume a variety of forms. Morality may consist of ethical rules of conduct rather than interfering in the rules themselves. What is moral in one culture might be immoral or ethically neutral in another. For it may not be moral to kill a baby girl at birth or an aged non-productive grand parents. But for certain society or sects it may acquire a moral value. Another example is which is better or worse monogamy or polygamy. A large number of people may agree or disagree in their judgements as such cases are subjective and therefore unscientific.

Some cultures have more effective means of coping with disease than others. And this superiority can be examined on the death rates of the people living in different cultures. There are many other ways in which meaningful difference can be measured and evaluations be made. It may be noted that there is no equivalent to saying that man is happier or that the dignity of the individual is greater in an industrialised or agriculturised sociocultural system than in one supported by human labour alone and sustained wholly by wild foods. The statement that socio-cultural system contains a better means of providing food for combating disease than another holds no good. Every socio-cultural system exists in a natural habitat. Of course this environment exerts an influence upon the cultural system. There are instances of adoption to environmental conditions. The present view is also that the environment permits and at times encourages and also prohibits the acquisition or use of certain cultural traits but otherwise does not determine cultural change. Culture is also contagious.
Some of the sociologists are of opinion the culture may diffuse from people or region to another. It may also offer some advantage, some utility or pleasure such diffusion in sociocultural system is isolated by physical barriers such as deserts, mountain ranges and body of water. But where there barriers are not present diffusion is easily possible. In the age of science there is no barriers as such. 'Tapu', a Polynesian word, is incorporated into the English language. The use of tobollo has intered one system after another until it is virtually world-wide. The horse and firearms were incorporated into cultures of plains Indian tribes. The transmission of culture traits from one system to another is called 'diffusion'. A variety of agents and agencies of diffusion transmit elements of culture from one group to another. Trade, warfare, conquerors, prisoners, intermarriage, sports, exploration, diplomats, literature, scholars, travellers, universities, newspapers, the radio, the television and motion pictures have all spread cultures, traits and patterns within a society and from one society to another. Such diffusion has taken place everywhere and in all times.

Diffusion may take place between tribes or nations of approximately equal in military and political power. But in other instances, it takes place between socio-cultural systems widely different in this respect. The victory and colonization of various parts by the European nations are its examples. It is alleged, in such case, that cultures of the stronger nations are imposed on the weaker ones. To some extent it is quite true. The acquisition of foreign culture by the subject people is called acculturation. It may be vice versa also.
Thus we can conclude that culture is the creation of man or che both were created simultaneously. It is an integral part of human’s behaviour. It consists of knowledge, belief, art, morals law, custom, rituals language, tools, techniques. With the passage of time some cultures become obsolete and some new ones come into existence. There are certain factors which help in the diffusion of cultures of different peoples. Whether the strong or the weak—all nations when they come into contact with one another embrace their cultures. Culture is an integral part in the life of man and hence it has a great impact on his personality and the society in which he is surrounded by.

Literature coming from bilingual cultures demonstrates how the tension or interaction between different cultures, languages and systems can be utilized for narrative purposes. The fiction itself is a cross cultural phenomenon. It follows the models of the West. It is the result of the meeting of two cultures. Therefore, we witness in the culture contact two sets of values coming into conflict with each other, each struggling for its own supremacy over the other. The cultural consciousness represents a healthy blend of authority and experience in a complex human situation though the situations have been aggravated by social, historical and economic changes. In fact, the logic of cultural transition compels new ways of self-differentiation, new forings of identity, continuity and affiliation.

Cross-cultural Conflicts has been one of the most favourite themes of Indian-English as well as Anglo-Indian writers. It presupposes an awareness of the interaction between two cultures and an attempt to come to terms with
them. The Indian-English writers such as B. Rajan, Mulk Raj Anand, Santha Rama Rau and Raja Rao have dealt with it in a uniform manner. There is usually a hero who has stayed in the West and, on his return, is faced with the problem of adjustment. The protagonist is initially enamoured of the West but soon realizes that it is his own country where he belongs. In *The Twice Born Fiction* Meenakshi Mukherjee studies how the theme is handled by individual writers and comes to the conclusion that “the Indo-Anglian novelist more often than not is trying to reconcile within himself two conflicting systems of value.”

The Cross-cultural Conflict in Jhabvala’s fiction has social, cultural and spiritual dimensions. In the social context Indians and Europeans meet, fall in love, get married, and face either mutual dissonance or familial friction. In the cultural context they face the problems of adjustment of diverse backgrounds. Jhabvala is, of course, very much concerned with the problems of European men and women trying to get adjusted to Indian society and its mores. In the spiritual context she portrays Europeans who are fascinated by gurus, the torch-bearers of India’s ancient spiritual heritage. The spiritual element in these gurus may be bizarre or genuine, yet the charm they hold for Europeans is unmistakable. The relationship between Indians and Europeans is thus varied; it has at least three prominently portrayed dimensions in Jhabvala’s fictional world. Jhabvala as an artist in the realism of fiction thus seeks three kinds of reality, the social reality, the cultural reality and the spiritual reality. She is pre-eminently a novelist of domestic life, its joys and sorrows, its harmony and friction, its
fulfilment and frustration. Since she is concerned with a money-civilization in its domestic setting, she seeks to present the material reality which is significant in the metaphysic of her art. However, this metaphysic in her cosmos has also a spiritual dimension partly revealed in the charm that Europeans feel about the gurus, the inheritors of India's spiritual glory. In this way Jhabvala's quest for the material reality is supplemented by, and harmonized with, her search for a spiritual reality. This dual quest finally leads to the basic unity of her art in which the real and the ideal, the material and the spiritual are harmonized into a unified vision of her art.

The Expatriate tradition evolved out of Britain's encounter with India and found its most powerful expression in the genre of fiction. Through the two centuries of British rule fiction writers have analysed this encounter. Though some have supported and others criticised the Imperial policy of separatism with regard to India, nearly all the writers have raised significant questions about its validity. Being in a state of exile themselves, the possibility and desirability of assimilation in an alien land was a dominant concern in the writing of the expatriates. India became independent in 1947, but the concern persisted. Writers like Paul Scott, Philip Mason, Jon Godden and Rumer Godden continued to question the ideology that had kept the two races apart for two centuries and to analyse its effects on both.

Ruth Prawer Jhabvala is one of the European writers currently writing about India. Born in a Jewish family, she was aware, from her childhood, of her racial history of rootlessness, and having married a Parsee was exposed to a racial history of exile. She has also been an expatriate thrice over. In
consequence, she brings a greater degree of personal involvement to her exploration of assimilation in India than her predecessors of the expatriate tradition for most of whom their state of exile was incidental and temporary. The extent and nature of Ruth Jhabvala's involvement is perceived in her complex response to the question of cross-cultural assimilation as revealed in her autobiographical writing and the manner in which this response is transmuted into the varied responses of her Western characters. In her last novel written in India, *Heat and Dust*, the novelist structurally interlocks two planes of time, fifty years apart, in order to examine the differing depths of the alien's penetration into the separate India's of 1923 and 1975. Drawn from different segments of Western life both past and present, her Western characters represent, each in a special way, some aspect of their creator's quest for assimilation in an alien country. With Ruth Jhabvala's racial and personal history of exile this amounted to a compulsion.

Her Indian characters also represent aspects of this quest. One of Ruth Jhabvala's major contributions to the fiction written by expatriates in India is her introduction of the Intra-Indian context into a tradition of writing that obsessively viewed India as it affected the European. In her first five novels and in many of her early stories, Ruth Jhabvala explores Intra-Indian interactions on the cross-generation and cross-familial levels. The clashes and resolutions she depicts, in this early phase of her writing career, reflect in a vicarious way, her own predicaments and their resolutions vis-a-vis India.

The expatriate novelist is, by and large, conditioned to grapple only
with the issues that relate to his own race in India. The Englishman’s position and prestige, his burdens and predicaments, his joys and sorrows, his strength and his weakness, his inability to understand the native character, his obsessive race-consciousness and his faith in the Rule Britannia are all reflected in expatriate writing. What is conspicuous by its absence is the intra-Indian context which lay well beyond the boundaries of British social life in India. Nowhere at any point, prior to the fiction of Ruth Jhabvala, has this tradition revealed an interest in the culture, religion or psyche of the native except as it affected the European.

Cross-cultural Conflict is also handled by Markandaya. Born in 1924 and brought in Madras, Markandaya comes of an educated Brahmin family. She went to London where she supported her writing by working in a Solicitor’s office. Now married to an Englishman and settled permanently in London as an expatriate, She continues to write under the maiden name.

She has to late nine novels but she shot in to prominence with her very first novel Nectar in a Sieve, published in 1954. Her second novel Some Inner Fury was published in 1955 followed by A Silence of Desire (1960), Possession (1963), A Handful of Rice (1966), The Coffer Dams (1969), The Nowhere Man (1972), Two Virgins (1973) and the Golden Honey Come (1977). She has achieved a world-wide distinction as a Indian English novelist.

In the present dissertation an attempt has been made to study the Cross-cultural Conflicts as portrayed in the novels of Kamala Markandaya and Ruth Jhabvala by examining their important works dividing in to specific periods.