Chapter -5

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

In a society where most people have little tradition of participation in the formulation and implementation of social welfare programmes, the elite group involved in social administration has a special responsibility to promote civic awareness about social problems, and to enlist public co-operation from different sections of the population. Social research provides the basic data not only on the effectiveness of services but also on such questions as why they are needed, why they function as they do and their implications for social, economic and political conditions. Further, the very task of identifying needs and problems rests with social research, and the analysis of social institutions and of social change requires continuous study. The development and establishment of statutory social welfare service have increasingly become important responsibilities of the state in every society, and this task requires the techniques of community organization and development to ensure systematic formulation, planning analysis and implementation of the programmes of social development. Again, the subject of social policy must be considered as an integral part of social administration, in view of the increasing acceptance of the welfare state. Indian social work education can no longer ignore the question of development and the introduction of indigenous approaches to promote the goal of ‘Indianization’ of professional social work, if it to be relevant to the prevailing conditions in India society.

The idea of democracy was first developed by the ancient Greek Philosophers. Democracy was visualised by Greeks not merely as a form of government but also a way of life in the public realm. The philosophers in ancient Greece conceived human life as comprising of two separate and distinct areas of activity- one, the private and, the other, the public realm. Democracy was postulated as the characteristics of the latter, because the former, i.e., the private realm was the realm of personal sentiments, emotions, love and affection and kinship. When we compare with one another these two realms of human life we come across certain principles which distinguish them from each other.
The private realm as indicated earlier works in accordance with the principles of emotional orientation and identification—psychological states which govern all familial relations. Further, the equalitarian ideal cannot be observed except in theory in familial relations, for despite all equalitarian ideals the male and the female members of the family on the one hand, and the older and the younger ones on the other cannot achieve absolute equality in their interpersonal relations and behaviour. Evidences from even the most developed social orders in the world show that absolute equality is still a distant ideal to be achieved in the family so far as the equality ideal, between the husband and the wife on the one hand and the parents and the children on the other, is concerned. Stratification on the basis of sex and age has not been eliminated even in the most developed societies of the world.

Another element in which the private realm in lacking is the attitude of objectivity and disinterestedness for we know that the family in any part of the world is an area of interest oriented relations. The parents always orient themselves towards the interest of their children, the husbands towards that of the wife, the brothers towards that of their sisters and vice-versa. Therefore, in all such relations, which are based on personal or interpersonal interest, the feeling of objectivity and disinterestedness will be found lacking.

Element of coercion is the third characteristic of the private realm. Coercion may be and is often applied in family relations by the husband against the wife and the members of old generation against those of the younger one. Whenever persuasion fails recourse may be taken to coercion. In this way the private realm of human life works according to principle of affection, identification, subjectivity and interestedness.

The public realm on the other hand works on the basis of principles which are diametrically different from and opposite to those which characterise the private realm. The fundamental principles of public realm can be enumerated as: disinterestedness, objectivity, attitude of friendship or otherness and persuasion based on rational dialogue and discussion. For the cultivation of the above attitudes and principles in the public realm, the Greeks propounded the creation of a society free from all sorts of inequalities chiefly the economic ones. According to the ancient Greeks who laid down the sociocultural edifice of democracy, the elements of
subjectivity, vested interest, identification and coercion can be removed only in a social order where individual are free and equal both economically and socially are free from economic wants and needs and therefore, from vested interests of all sorts. Only in such a condition they can visualise life in the public realm as an on looker, i.e. form the point of view of objectivity and otherness. Similarly the attitude of coercion may be present where hierarchy or stratification of statuses is found. Persons occupying higher statuses may coerce those at the bottom. Compromise of differences may take place only when all persons are treated equally and are endowed with the opportunity of debate, dialogue and argument. Since nobody thinks of his kith and kins but for community as a whole, the possibility of national debate and discussion and ultimately a compromise will always be present. In different words, persuasion through speech and not the use of might was regarded as one of the essential characteristics of the public realm.

According to Greeks the public realm only the realm of human action. To draw a distinction here between labour, work and action will not be out of place. Developing and elucidating the fundamentals of the public realm in modern terminology and perspective, Hannah Arendt (1958) has differentiated between labour, work and action- the three conditions of human existence. Labour is natural for human species for it bestows a measure of permanence of human works and achievements. For labour the presence of others is not necessary. Work, on the other hand, points towards the unnatural or artificial dimension of human existence born with the progress of civilisation. For work too, the presence of others is not necessary. Action, the third important dimension of human existence, requires the presence of others, it represents the collective life and endeavour of man as social being. Therefore, action which comprises the collective or social dimension of human existence becomes the source of history and history is nothing but collective memory. It is, therefore, action which brings the humans in the public realm of their life. Conversely the public realm works on the basis of action.

The Greeks visualised the use of proper speech (use of appropriate word at appropriate time) as the most effective action required for the success of the functioning of public realm. Speech, therefore, was regarded as political action by the Greeks. This shows that Greeks relied more on the power of words than naked
physical force. They, therefore, made speech the sole basis for the functioning of public realm.

When we analyse the fundamental prerequisite of democracy we are immediately led to the conclusion that democracy is nothing but the proper functioning of the public realm. It other words democracy and the public realm become inseparably associated. For cultivation of the essential attitudes and traits required in the individual for participation in the public realm, another essential condition apart from economic freedom and equality, was the availability of leisure. The concept of leisure in modern sense is a commercialized and superficialised version of its original connotation held by the ancient Greeks. Leisure today means being away from work, enjoying leave or vacation or holiday. In its original sense leisure connoted “Schooling” the entire cosmos, universe and nature being “The School”. Leisure in the original sense of the term connoted opportunity for creative activity. Josep Pieper has pointed out that behind the creation of the higher forms of culture leisure has been a essential condition. Leisure is an attitude of mind and implies being in conference with one’s soul with the result that the mysteries of the nature are automatically revealed. According to the Greeks, the democratic ethos should be made up of an intellectual atmosphere of debate and discussion not for the sake of debate and discussion but for the sake a leading the community to higher levels of organisation, welfare and progress. For this, original thinking was required and for original thinking the availability of leisure was deemed as a pre-condition.

Modern proponents of democracy such as Zevedei Barbu have also brought out the correlation of leisure and democracy. According to Barbu the attitudes of otherness and objectivity are the manifestations of the proper functioning of the ego and for the proper functioning of ego, leisure is one of the essential conditions.

John Locke can be regarded as one of the modern proponents of political democracy. According to Locke democracy is the communion and fellowship of man with others. This according to him was the main cause of human beings uniting themselves at first in political society. But the democracy propounded by John Locke has been an individualistic and limited type of democracy functioning in well-knit and compact social groups with high degrees of literacy and education.
But democracy in largely populated mass societies has travelled to the opposite pole from what Locke has conceived. The emergence of mass society in Europe after industrial revolution has brought democracy to the common man from the hands of a select few. With the transition from individualistic to mass democracy, the principle of representation has come to occupy the central place in mass democracies thus replacing the principle of direct representation by a select few as Locke has conceived.

The contention of some the modern thinkers is that the principle of representation which implies indirect participation of the people in political processes is in itself a negation of what democracy in reality stands for. Sidney Hook (1959) and Karl Mannheim (1954) have seem immense prospects even in mass democracy. According to Karl Mannheim, limited, individualistic type of democracy could have survived only in pre-industrial societies having either feudalistic or capitalistic economic and social structure. According to Mannheim democracy has assumed its real shape with its conversion into mass democracy because it provides an opportunity to all sections of the people to participate in the values of their society and the have a voice in decision making. The opponents of mass democracy on the other hand contend that with the emergence of welfare state the democratic set up, public administration planning and even politics itself have become highly technical in nature. The common people have no technical sense and technological knowledge. Hence their participation, whether direct or indirect, may spoil the democratic prospects and functioning of free institutions.

Kari Mannheim’s argument is that there is no doubt the fact that technocracy has become closely associated with democracy, but it does not mean that with the emergence of technocracy common people cannot play may role in it. According to Mannhein technocracy must have public control over it. The paradox involved here is more apparent than real. Democracy itself means the rule of the common people, the public. Common consensus of the entire people can be taken by the government in modern democracy on the fundamental principles of social and economic policy. Their technical aspects can be left to the discretion and decision of the experts. In this
way the public can still have a role to play in democracy which has now assumed much more technical dimension.

As Karl Mannheim has stated in clear and precise terms we cannot now swim against the current. In all societies of world which have witnessed or are witnessing industrial revolution and technological change, the process of democratisation of man and society cannot be stopped because industrial social order has everywhere released new forces and provided a new strength to the common people. The common people are demanding that they must be given representation in democratic politics. A political awareness has been created among the people who were previously kept aloof from politics with the presumption that their participation in the same would spoil democracy as they do not have the intellect and education necessary for proper functioning of democracy.

While being optimistic about the future of mass democracy all over the world Karl Mannheim has also warned against the four-fold danger implied in mass democracy. These dangers are as under:

1. Irrational tendencies in politics are likely to increase with the participation in it by the common masses. There is a likelihood of the emergence of what Max Scheler has termed as “Democracy of Emotion”. A concentrated effort in the direction of socialising and disciplining the common people politically should be a fundamental step in all democracies in the new states.

2. The increasing pre-dominance and influence of technocrats, bureaucrats and economic leader has to be jealously guarded for, if left unchecked, it may create an ever increasing hiatus between the government and the governed. Both technocracy and bureaucracy tend to isolate themselves from the common levels of social order. For this public control of the technocratic and bureaucratic control in necessary.

3. With the emergence of social welfare oriented democracies having a positive government, concentration of political power in fewer and fewer hands may be a possibility which may lead the state to the totalitarian pole, as has happened in Russia and other socialist countries where the general will of the people has been suppressed due to concentration of power. The public has to keep alert and vigilant on potential and actual events moving in the direction of concentration of political
power. In all the democracies, the people are sovereign, e.g. they are the source of all political power which is relatively unstable because it is always delegated and never parted with completely. The people, therefore, must guard against the political power becoming absolute and corrupt in the hands of a few political leaders and bureaucrats. The cost of political inertia and passiveness of the common people in democracy is always a totalitarian state. Therefore, public vigilance over political power is a necessary condition for the survival of democracy in mass societies.

4. Confrontation of military power may be another potential threat to the survival of free institutions. The public should also keep watch that such an event does not take place.

Another controversy raging over the years has been about the compatibility or incompatibility of democracy with capitalism on the one hand socialism on the other. When viewed in the historical perspective we find that democracy was first adopted as a form of government in the capitalist countries of western Europe. Hence, conservative and liberal thinkers all over the world argue that democracy and capitalism have been inseparably interrelated, that democracy has been a characteristic of capitalist societies, that democracy has been historically associated with capitalism and not with socialism. The argument has been that a democratic state should be a negative state. It should provide political freedoms to the individuals and safeguard their fundamental rights only. Its functions should be to create and maintain an atmosphere congenial to the exercise by individual of the fundamental rights and civil liberties and to defend the country against external aggression. The famous maxim of the liberal democrats has been “The best government is that which governs the least”. According to the proponents of negative state and minimum government, the moment a democratic state transcends its genuine limits of governance and assumes positive welfare functions, it takes a road ending in either serfdom or totalitarianism.

In Europe and England, Mises (1933), Hayek (1944, 1952, 1956, 1960) and Spencer (1940) had been the most formidable exponents of a negative state in a democratic framework. Both Mises and Hayek had upheld freedom of economic activity by the individual entrepreneurs. According to these thinkers, economics freedom is the cornerstone of democracy. If economic freedom is curbed or controlled
by the state or any its instrumentalities, it will ultimately amount to a negation of democracy itself. Hayek saw socialism, planning and welfare statism as the beginning of an end which will not be very different from serfdom. The so called socialist or welfare or positive state is bound to be caught in a political dilemma of freedoms versus controls. The state will tend to be more and more powerful with the onset of time, deriving its power from the people in the name of moving rapidly towards the goal of socialism or successful implementation of welfare programme and planning.

The idea of Miss and Hayek were but a reformulation and extension of Spencerian political and social thought. Spencer having been an organicist was a staunch believer in the individual’s freedom to face the consequences of his actions and activities particularly the economic ones. Spencer called it the law of “Conduct and Consequences”. According to this law, wealth and prosperity will come as a natural award to those who are intelligent, diligent and foresighted. On the contrary pernury, want and impoverishment will be inflicted by nature upon those who do not possess a capacity for adjustment, or are indolent and idle and want to live on the limited resources of the society without doing anything. According to Spencer shrewd and foresighted leadership and government will be of those who will allow the misfits to be gradually eliminated by not offering any patronage or protection to them. This Spence called as the law of “Expergation” – a law which can be seen operating throughout nature.

The Spencerian brand of social and political thought was introduced in North America by William Graham Summer who is sometimes, labelled as Spencer in American garb. The influence of classical economic and political theory cannot still be easily discerned from the social and political order in the U.S.A. The economy in the U.S.A. still continues to be a private economy to a large extent. Apart from certain essential services which have been owned and are being run by the state, a major part of economic activity has been left to private enterprise. Many thinkers of the western hemisphere impute the tremendous rise in affluence and wonderful functioning of democracy in that country to private economy based on the belief of the munificence of free competition. The success of democracy in U.S.A has led many social and political thinkers to conclude that democracy and private economy are inseparably interrelated. Taken broadly as a way of life and an attitude of mind democracy
cultivates certain variables which shall provide an enlightened prepestive to private ownership of the means of production.

Democracy taken as a complete way of life cultivates and has cultivated in countries like U.S.A. certain variables which make ever capitalism to work with a sense of social responsibility. Both Talcott Parsons and Hoselitz have analysed these variable- the important ones being collectivity orientation, achievement, universalism and specificity. The variables have been regarded as potent motivating factors for rapid development in a democratic ethos. Only genuine democracy can create the motives stated above as it has created the same in U.S.A. Any other except the democratic one could have not been so congenial to rapid social development and economic growth in the U.S.A. It is because the citizens of U.S.A. has accepted democracy as an integral part of their outlook and culture that such a rapid increase in affluence has been possible in that country along with the retention of the principles of the fundamental rights of individuals and the rule of law. In India the picture is entirely different. Efforts are being made for providing a strong socio-cultural base for democracy by the Indian people.

Social change has come to be regarded as old normal ubiquitous phenamenon of society. Some kind or degree of change has been experienced everywhere in human society. Contemporary change can be regarded as inevitable, unpredicatable universal and rate of change is not equal. However under the process of change, whole system does not change always. Change takes place in some aspect of society.

Jones has used the term social change to describe variation in or modifications of any aspect of social process, social patterns, social interactions or social organisations. Miller is of the view that identification of social change of large magnitude is easier than the changes of little magnitude. There are two kinds of social changes. Some of them are intrinsic, automatic, involuntary not having the power of will or choice and second type of social changes are product of the intervention of will or choice. Thus it is directed, stimulated planned. Modernization belongs to second category.

Daniel Learnee defined modernization as a process of social change, whereby less developed societies acquired characteristics common to developed societies.
Modernization is a vague concept and various meanings have been attached to it. Sociologists, Anthropologists economists, political scientists have used this term differently. But it has been accepted by all that modernization is the growing and wider acceptance of reasons rather than traditions in the different aspect of life. Modernization lies not in the adoption of western costumes or western food habits; but in extending the domain of the rational and secular to areas which are still under the spell of the sacred and tradition. Modernization lays emphasis on the new ways of thinking which is the basis of establishing modern society modern factory and modern government.

Myron Weiner lays down the essential characteristics of modernization as greater scope of government or wider range of functions performed by government; a highly developed two way network of communication between citizen and government; a more prominent role played by secondary associations; the legitimacy of legal authority, task oriented, bureaucracy recruited on the basis of skills and subservient to policy making; greater attention to public policy, and the citizen having a sense of attachment to the nation as a whole.

Wilbert E. Moore has discussed institutional framework of modern society. According to his institutions (political-social or economic) should have such characteristics such as: flexible and efficient institutions, political stability, elite capable of maintaining cultural conformity, high degree of urbanisation, stratification based on achievement, work organised on rational lines, multiplication of new types of voluntary association, family structure conducive to autonomy and initiative, and educational system capable of inculcating new skills and knowledge.

Alex Inkless has described characteristics of a modern man as: Openness to new experience, readiness for social change, disposition to form or hold opinions on larger number of issues, measures of information, time orientation to the present or the future rather than to the past, efficiency i.e. the belief that man can learn how to exert considerable control over his environment, orientation towards long run planning both in public or private life, calculability or trust i.e. more confidence that this world is calculable and that the people and institutions around him can be relied upon to meet their obligations and become prepared to trust the stranger, valuing of
technical skills and take it as the basis of distribution of reward, educational and occupational aspirations, and awareness of an respect for the dignity of other.

Social change means change in social relationship. As Mac Iver and Page says, “Our direct concern as sociologist is with social relationship. It is a change in these which alone we shall regard as social change.” While modernization means achieving gross national productivity, per capital output and per capital income, a process of structural differentiation, functional specialization and adaptive upgrading, man’s control over natural and social environment, transformation of all aspects of human existence. Modernization also indicates extent of use of technology.

Social change can be both positive as well as negative. Thus deterioration and improvement are two directions of change. Modernization is always for betterment. Social change may be intrinsic, automatic while modernization is always induced and planned. It always takes place due to political efforts.

In tracing the process of social change we have to take into account the changes in technological order. It is these which leads to cultural change which in turn causes social change. Social change is outcome of multiple factors-economic, social, cultural, political technological, industrialization urbanization are agents of social change. However, social change result is social disorganization.

The following are the process of modernization: secularization, commercialization, industrialization economic growth, rationalization, political development and democratization, accelerated social mobility, increased national standard of living, diffusion of literacy education and mass media, national unification and the expansion of the popular involvement and participation.

McClelland believes that there are two underlying causes of development of the impulse to modernization: The desire to prove oneself better than others and the need to promote the common good.
Factors retarding social change and modernization are economic restraint, where a new device is regarded as threatening, tradition and mores of leaders, group and communities, and resistance of inventions because of initial imperfection, the fear of the new, existing sentiments, inertia and opposition of vested interest.

CHANGES IN INDIAN SOCIETY

1. MARRIAGE INSTITUTION

Institution of marriage has experienced change in terms of age at marriage. In ancient time marriage used to take place at the age of 4 but now age at marriage has gone up to 18 and 21 years in case of girls and boys. Various acts pertaining to marriage have raised lower limit of age at marriage. Polyandry and Polygamy have been replaced with monogamy. Popularity of love marriage is on the increase. Previously the process of marriage was completed with in two or three days but now period has been cut short. These days marriage ceremony is completed with in twenty four hours.

2. FAMILY INTITUTION

There has been change in family size. A family consist of two children and parents is considered ideal. Previously family size was large. Number of nuclear family is on increase and joint family system is breaking. Individualism is increasing.

3. CASTE SYSTEM

According to India mythology there are four varnas i.e. Brahmin, Khastry, Vaisa & Sudra. Numerous castes are distributed over these. Each caste has been assigned a definite status. Thus there is hierarchy in caste system. Due to process of sankritization some changes have come in caste hierarchy. There was tremendous social distance among these caste Inter caste marriage and inter dinning was prohibited. Now rule of commensalism and marriage is getting week. Untouched ability is on decrease.
4. RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION

Religion is effective means of social control and socializing agency. Impact of religion is on decrease. Previously places were exclusively used for religious purposes, but now they are used to serve political ends.

5. ECONOMIC INSTITUTION

Division of labour and specialization is gradually increasing. Intergenerational occupational mobility has started. Urbanization and industrialization is expanding. Standard of living has improved.

6. POLITICAL INSTITUTION

In ancient period there was monocracy and feudal system which was replaced with british rule. Due to efforts of freedom fighters and able national leaders India attained independence. Since then democratic way of life has been adopted. In the beginning leadership was in the hands of upper caste only. Gradually it has perculated down to middle and lower caste also.

7. CHANGE IN STATUS OF WOMAN

Previously women folk was totally illiterate, ignorant and unaware. Due to expansion of education and political activities women are becoming politically aware, economically independent. Now there is improvement in status of women.

8. CHANGE IN PATTERN OR RECREATION

Previously there was no proper source of recreation. Due to technological developments, means of communication commercial recreation has emerged. Motion picture, dramas, T.V. serial, have become a common feature.

PROCESS OF MODERNIZATION IN INDIA
In preceding paragraphs the characteristics and indices of modernization have been discussed. If these are tested are tested in case of India we find that Indian society does not satisfy some of the major cannons of modernization. In India the nature of structural differentiation is not sufficiently advanced and structural flexibility is also not adequate. There has been improvement in skills and knowledge. No doubt there is proliferation of government activities yet two way net work of communication between citizen and government has not developed adequately although it exist at certain level. Even now the role played by primary associations life family, kins and caste seems to over weigh the role played by secondary associations. India has been successful in establishing legal authority but still there exist great deal of both traditional and charismatic authority. The bureaucracy in India seems to be status ridden, which partially accounts for its ineffectiveness. The recruitment is not always done on the basis of skills. Politics seem to be largely concern with office holding as political defection & craze for holding on the political power is widely spread among politicians. The attachment to the nation as whole on the part of the citizen seems to be woefully wanting, which is characterized by the regional and linguistic squables and rivalries. The particularistic loyalties seems to dominate than the universalistic. In India fissiparous tendencies are rampant as there are regional linguistic controverseries. Hence there is check of national integration. The relationship between centre and periphery is also satisfactory. Social mobilization and participation in national building programmes still need improvement. The process of economic specialization, division of labour is on the increase, urbanization is also increasing. India has developed a formal system of graded education and considerable number of private as well as public educational institutions are working here. There is improvement in educational standard. Diffusion of education is causing spatial and occupational mobility. Institutional frame work is neither sufficiently flexible nor efficient. Every now and then threat is posed to political stability and political process has not successful in transforming modernization into a creed. Indian elite is playing its role in furtherence of modernization, yet degree of alienation of the elite and the masses still exist, as the elite have not been able to carry masses with them. Although urbanisation is on increase but the amount of urbanisation is not of high order to make sufficient impact on the people. The number of voluntary organisation has gone up yet the association are largely governed by caste and regional ties. There has been radical change in the family pattern in the sense that there is a dependency pattern. which is
for from being conducive to modernization. Educational progress is largely academic and unrelated to the new needs of the situation. If we evaluate modernization at cultural level we find that primordial sentiments and tie based on family, kin, caste language & region has been kept in check so that they would not militate against nationalism and universalism. The phenomenon of age grade still effectively works, It hampers evolution and development of new status system and scientific temper slant on technological development has not permeated in whole country as in rural areas work is still done on traditional lines.

Ideals of modernization in personality system have not been fully realized. Most of the people have adopted western costume, language and way of living but their attitude thinking, ideology have not fully changed. Here new ideas new invention are not easily accepted as we have seen in case of family planning programme. Its popularity and acceptance took lot of time. Similarly new seeds, fertilizer and new medicine were accepted with great difficulty; New ways of marriage are not at all welcomed and approved. Love marriages have not gained approval of society. We feels irritated, if any member of family does love marriage. However new means of communication and new type of education for children has been accepted and used by majority of people. A readiness to express opinion’s is necessary for a person to be called a modern man. People in India take least interest in the matters, which are no concerned with them. Majority of people lack awareness. While taking or giving priority while giving opinion. The opinion expressed by a person of low status is not given weightage. Only a small section of people work with planning. The actions of people are guided by destiny and fatalism. Thus ideals of modernization could not be come-part our personality. Factors favouring social change and Modernization :-

The studies conducted by social scientists such as M.N. Srinivas, P.N. Prabu, A.D. Barnbas, Baily, Kapp K. William, K.C., Vyas, Kusum Nair, N.Khauri, N.K. Bose etc. found the factors leading to social change, economic development and Modernization such as: Political propaganda, Population growth, community development, education, contact with outsiders, impersonal relations, desire for higher status, social legislation, westernization and sankritization, planning and mixed economy, reward for creativity appropriate belief and values, punctuality,
determination to fulfill contracts agreed upon, conviction that profit are essential, awareness, arive for success, ability, dissatisfaction with one’s need, identification with status groups, commitment, communication, urban influence, industrialization and, monetization, public health and cheap postal services, and Nationalism.

Factors impeding social change and modernization are, casteism and faction lack of leadership, personified relations, joint family, imprecise relation, religion, limited aspiration, kinship ties, regionalism, communalism, competition, wedsted interest, institutional barriers, poverty, drug addiction, immobility, inefficient bureaucracy, corruption, growth of population, lack of belief in scientific approach, lack of confidence, conformity, risk, fatalism, apathy, emphasis on selfless action, some thing foreign, status habit, extreme individualism, limited opportunity, rigid values, family particular, laziness, a preference of leisure over work, and a preference for consumption over thrift.

CONSEQUENCES OF SOCIAL AND MODERNIZATION IN INDIA

In India we wish to build a society based on equality, liberty and fraternity and to achieve the objectives of social development such as: Reduction of economic inequality, reduction of concentration of economic power, social justice, development of backward areas removal of regional imbalance, improved level of living, expansion of employment opportunity, wide and equitable distribution of benefits, welfare of disadvantaged sections of population, and social and economic interaction.

Since India attained independence an efforts has been made to establish the just society and to ensure the conditions in which each is free to develop himself according to capacity and thus by providing opportunities for development enable each no contribute to the development of the society as a whole.

India could not achieve the goals of social development to a desired extent. Economic inequality still persists. Nearly 40 people live below poverty line. Maximum economic resources are still owned by a small section of people. An effort has been made to provide social justice. There is legal provision of equal work. Women and children are no more discriminated as against the men. Untouchability has been prohibited by law. Backward areas are being paid special emphasis through
special programmes such as Hill Area Development Programme, Tribal Area Development programme Drought Prone Area Development Programme Drought Prone Area Development Programme. There is improvement in standard of living. Government is keen in providing employment opportunities to its citizens. Various welfare schemes have been implemented for the benefit of weaker sections. People belonging to scheduled caste, scheduled tribes as well as backwards classes have been given various benefits.

However it has been observed that pace of social change and Modernization is very slow. Factors responsible for this retardation be removed. Objectives of social development have not been fully realized. In order to safeguard the interest of weaker section and vulnerable group various social legislation have been enacted. These acts will not be beneficial unless the beneficiaries themselve exert their right. An awareness is necessary on their part.

The need of Lokpal is directly related to draw such provisions which are needed to enhance the public convenience and easy access to the services for which a common man is entitled. The journey towards improving the situation has been started in 1968 with the Lokpal and Lokayukta Bill and many developments took place till 2013. Basically, it is a need of hour to inform the administration.

1. The Jan Lokpal System is very effective in combating the matter of corruption in the country.
2. Government should take special interest in order to make the government system and functionaries more effective.
3. It is basically involves the money transactions and the issue of money laundering.
4. The existing laws are sufficient in handling the issue of corruption but it is not backed by perfect investigation mechanism.
5. The Banking companies, financial institutions and intermediary shall maintain a record of all transactions of a specified nature and value and verify and maintain records of all its customers furnish such information in the specified authorities.
6. There are number of investigating agencies to probe into the matters of corruption like Central Vigilance Commission, Anti Corruption Bureau, CBI, other
Local Police and internal investigating agencies but still the problem is persisting because the corruption has ruined these agencies too.

7. Political will prevail above all especially in the Indian situation. Unless the all political parties are not ready to handle these issues collectively the problem can never be resolved.

8. The function of law is to ensure justice, stability and peaceful change. Despite of a long journey movements and struggles, this particular issue has not been taken seriously. Law has to deal with today’s problems. It has to maintain a basic and fundamental character, but he must not be static as nothing can be static in this changing world.

9. Public opinion and legislation and equally important in making progressive laws and changes. When the sense of social and political equality emerges, the urge to eradicate such evils and inequalities become strong.

10. Any legislation can be launched only when there is a favourable climate of opinion demanding legal mandate. That is why mass movements and intellectual currents must exist to produce effective social change.

11. Any wide gap or serious disparity between law and life will lead to unhealthy outbursts. In the matter of bringing the Jan Lokpal Bill this Public concern was seen throughout the country.

12. This problem is political and administrative problem which indeed most of the same population are on the both side. The same population is involved in taking bribe, when they have to use their power and the same is giving when they have to get their work done.

13. An Ombudsman is such an institution and India needs some such high powered vigilance body for the sake of good administration.

14. The Indian Constitution is a living document and must grow with the nation, its needs and aspirations. Amendments in these areas are very much needed.

15. Through the change, the disparity between classes or categories may be decreased and chances of the improvement of the absolute position of the poor will increase.

16. Multiparty system gives a greater decentralization and devolution of power and authority and all the parties existing in Indian Polity are not willing to accept the present form of the Jan Lok Pal Bill, unless and until it cannot be passed by the Parliament. It will not be in a legislation forum and cannot been implemented.
17. Consent and style of communication are of critical importance. The factors like society, context, levels, influence and the styles of communication within and across movements.

18. Actually the movement of Jan Lokpal Bill was defeated because it was emerged for an adhoc group who were having different motives altogether.

19. In Jan Lokpal movement the structural-functional approach, for which structural differentiation, reintegration and adaptation were used.

20. Challenge of passing of Jan Lokpal Bill was occasioned because the leaders committed fatal errors in terms of their personal lifestyle, compromised on the basic goal and mean of the movement.

21. There is a close relationship between good governance and public opinion. It ensures the reform of the public service, efficiency and cost effectiveness of public agencies and participation of poor, the marginalized and the under-represented.

22. Through the Jan Lokpal system the accountability and public policy will improve and the development will take in the right sense.

23. Civil society role in putting and advocating the issue of Jan Lokpal Bill cannot be ignored and there must be continuous constant efforts towards this goal.

24. The tools like advocacy and networking are most useful tools for improving the situation of corruption in India.

25. Conflict with the government in the society is very common. Even in a democratic system the conflict.

26. Structural functionalism requires the application of oriented intellectual community which can take care of the issues of public interests in the right/large forums.

Limitations of the Study

The topic of the research is very contemporary but since it is a very crucial and complex problem so data collection on such a sensitive issue becomes so difficult. The study has tried to find out the correlation of the Jan Lok Pal Movement with the other social movements strategy, crisis in development, corruption, Gandhi's approach towards social issues and development etc. Somewhere it may seem that the issue has been deviated from the main track but in totally and while considering the holistic
approach all the issues are important to cover which one way or another effect the community and common person. The whole movement of Jan Lok Pal bill is a movement of common person and no doubt it is above all caste, religion, race and creed. This was another reason to address the role of dalits or treatment with the dalits also covered. To deal with such an issue which has not been taken up widely is really a difficult task and a challenge to complete too. The researcher tried to sum up with all aspects which seems to me important for the studies. Any little deviation may be ignored in order to understand the problem in complete sense