

## MONICA WILSON'S MODEL OF SOCIAL CHANGE: A CRITICAL DISCUSSION

Heddy Shri Ahimsa-Putra\*

### IKHTISAR

*Tulisan ini memuat sebuah telaah kritis atas model dan metode penelitian yang ditawarkan oleh Monica Wilson (seorang ahli antropologi Inggris, murid B. Malinowski) dalam bukunya *Analysis of Social Change*, yang juga telah diterapkannya dalam penelitian di kalangan orang Nyakyusa, di Afrika. Ada beberapa ketidak konsistenan yang ditemukan oleh penelaah dalam model masyarakat yang dikemukakan oleh M. Wilson, terutama dalam pendefinisian beberapa konsep analitis yang penting. Akibatnya, menurut penelaah, model tersebut lantas kurang mampu menjelaskan beberapa fenomena perubahan sosial yang ada di kalangan orang Nyakyusa. Untuk mengatasi kelemahan ini penelaah mengusulkan pendefinisian kembali konsep-konsep analitis tersebut, serta penerapan yang lebih konsisten dalam penelitian.*

**A**s we know, social change is one of the phenomena most studied by social scientists, and that is also what we find in Indonesia. Numerous studies have been conducted on this subject by Indonesian social scientists. Some studies attempted to describe and explain changes in certain societies, some others tried to reach generalizations on the processes of change, while some other else were aimed at developing theoretical frameworks to study social change.

---

\* Staf Pengajar di jurusan Antropologi, Fakultas Sastra dan Kebudayaan, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta.

A classic study of the first kind is Sumarjan's *Social Change in Yogyakarta*. Unfortunately, only few serious studies on social change had been carried out by other social scientists since then. Results of various research mostly appear in the forms of research reports and articles in the journals. This might be interpreted as a consequence of lack of seriousness among the Indonesian social scientists in studying social change, despite their strong opinion on its significance to understand Indonesian societies today and in the future. The historians, who almost always deal with changes in societies, are exceptions in this case. However, this does not mean that they always have clear ideas on what social change is all about, how it happen, and how we can or should study it today.

Such a lack of seriousness - in my view - is due to the fact that few serious literature on social change are published in Indonesian. Many Indonesian social scientists seem to have been satisfied when they could describe changes within a particular society, even when they do not specify and discuss seriously what they meant by "social change". This has resulted in the absence of theoretical and conceptual discussions on social change.

If such is the situation in theoretical discussion on social change, the discussion on its methodological aspect is much worse. As far as I know the discussion on method of studying changes within Indonesian societies was raised implicitly by Koentjaraningrat (1984) in his study of two villages in the southern part of Jakarta. Unfortunately the issue is not taken by other social scientists. It is not surprising then that no serious advances had been made by Indonesian social scientists in their explanations and understandings of changes in Indonesian societies.

This article is a modest attempt to stir up discussions on methods of studying social change among us, Indonesian social scientists. I choose Monica Wilson's discussion and views on social change for two reasons. First, Monica Wilson's views on methods of describing and analysing social change is one of the clearest and the most explicit. This will enable us to apply them - if we want to - in our study of social change in Indonesia.

Secondly, Monica Wilson is an anthropologist who-like most other anthropologists-are not quite familiar with historical research methods and historical records. She tried to analyse and understand the

process of change through fieldwork and comparative studies of the present societies. In this case her method is basically in line with the one proposed and attempted by Eggan (1954), and by Koentjaraningrat in Indonesia. Thus, Wilson's scheme to elucidate and describe social change is an important step in anthropological study of such phenomenon. Therefore, a critical discussion of the models she used will help us honing our conceptual tools to improve our methods of description and analysis.

I hope our discussion will at least make us aware of many our unquestioned assumptions, aware of our uncritical acceptance of many unwarranted assumptions on social change, and the unclarity of our conceptual apparatus in studying the phenomenon of change. The awareness hopefully will lead us to more serious and critical discussions of our own assumptions and premises, - which are what we really need today - if better methodologies and more advance theoretical frameworks are to be developed.

In this article the discussion on methods and model for analyzing social change proposed by Monica Wilson in collaboration with her husband, Godfrey Wilson, is divided into five parts. The first is about the theoretical frame-work used by Wilson in her analysis of culture contact and social change among the Bantu in Pondoland, Africa. The second part contains a discussion of Wilson's analysis of the changes among the Nyakyusa, the ethnic group she had studied intensively for several years. The third part discusses what Wilson has achieved in her book *For Men and Elders*, and to what extent she had applied the model she proposed. In the fourth part the concepts she used in her theoretical framework are critically discussed, to see if there are some in-consistencies. The points discussed are then summarized in the last part.

## **I. The Model and the Method**

The contacts between the European and the indigenous people of Africa had brought the latter to a quick process of change. This phenomenon aroused the interest of a female British anthropologist, Monica Wilson, whose maiden name was Monica Hunter. Her interest in social change started with her fieldwork - when she was not yet

married- in Auckland, a village with 583 inhabitants, in the eastern part of Cape Province, Africa. Her focus here was on the problem of social changes among the Bantu - such as the nature, the degree, the mechanism and the direction of change-, as a result of their contacts with the European.

Her fieldwork had also a practical end, i.e. to understand the effects of the introduction of new economic activities, new administration, education and Christianity on Bantu communities. "I am concerned to discover the reactions of Pondo culture to European culture", she wrote (Hunter, 1938: 18), and to do this she firstly had to distinguish the cultural elements adopted from the European culture, from the cultural elements of the Pondo before the European came to the region.

However, some problems appeared. As a student of Malinowski, Monica Wilson had a functional theoretical framework in her mind. This put her into troubles as she eventually wanted to apply it in the field. She said : "Al-though a functional study of the community was possible, it was extraordinarily difficult, for the culture is not a homogenous one, but a mixture of partially fused elements which can only be understood in terms of the parents culture" (Hunter, 1938: 10). This means that she had to know the history of the culture she would study.

Another problem demanding her knowledge of the past was her difficulty in understanding the behavior of the Christian Africans. They slaughtered goats or sheep when a child was baptized. If someone married or died, the ceremony would be accompanied by sacrificing a beast. This ritual was combined with the ritual required by the Church. The custom of sacrificing animals was not part of the Christian traditions brought by the European. Obviously, the African had always conducted this ritual, but since Hunter had never had the opportunity to see all rituals in the past, she could not understand them in their entirety (Hunter, 1938: 10). The difficulty made Monica Hunter realize that the behavior of the present generation was not completely cut off from their forefather's patterns of behavior. She concluded then that "any culture can only be understood in its historical context" (Hunter, 1938: 11). The more the changes that have taken place, the greater is the significance of the historical knowledge in studying it. She knew too

that although she could study a society directly, she would still be unable to comprehend the process of change without making a comparison. Three things were thus required in her research, that is: (a) a comparative study of areas or people with different intensity or degree of influence; (b) the use of historical data, and (c) the consideration of new cultural elements.

To meet these requirements she chose in her study four Bantu communities which also had contacts with one another, with different degrees of European influence. However, they were not viewed as communities within an evolutionary scheme, in which one was considered more advanced or better than other communities (Hunter, 1938: 13). Nevertheless, one thing is clear here, i.e. these communities had similar cultural backgrounds. This means that the ancestors of these Bantu communities had lived under more or less similar conditions and influence. By comparing the cultures of the communities A, B, C and D, the results of various intensity of contacts would become visible, and this strategy seemed to have overcome the problem of acquiring historical data, which she encountered when she only did her fieldwork in Auckland, an area of the most intensive European influence, and she could not obtain accurate historical information, nor was there much of it. Thus, by comparing four communities of a similar socio cultural background, the chance of gaining more data and historical insight as well as deeper insight of the process of change, was greater, for by then she could interview more informants to reconstruct the socio cultural situations in the past. She could also check her data with more people. In short, her effort to get more information about the past became easier. In addition to her fieldwork, Wilson also tried to obtain historical data from old written sources.

In studying the phenomenon of change, the problem of contact mechanism, i.e. how the contacts actually happened, cannot be neglected. Here attention should be paid upon the condition of the institutions when the societies or cultures concerned are in contact. In this stage a process of intermingling of elements takes place, in which one culture is taking some elements from the other as it retains some of its own elements. Hunter called this processes "selective conservatism" and "selective borrowing", and for her these phenomena raised some questions of why some foreign elements were adopted, while some

original elements were abandoned. She believed that the European elements adopted by the indigenous culture were the ones "fitted in something already existed in Pondo culture" and "do not raise any direct opposition to it" (Hunter, 1938: 23).

The problem of cultural elements selection consequently compelled the re-researcher to pay attention to the psychological aspects of the persons adopting those elements. Here a more detailed analysis is needed to determine the processes of cultural elements replacement. Individual taste and personality factors would appear to play important roles (Hunter, 1938: 23). Only by a careful and more thorough study could the reactions of each community showing a similar background be explained.

Another problem in the study of culture change concerns the method to describe the process itself, i.e. how to construct a picture of culture under-going changes. Hunter found that the method of reconstructing the past from the accounts of the old men, describing as they said, and then presenting the current situation as the researcher saw it, had some weaknesses. To overcome these problems Hunter tried to combine two methods of description. First, with regard to the fields that had undergone many changes, like administration for instance, she would describe the past conditions based upon information acquired from old informants, and then provide a description of the field at present. Second, if the description was on cultural fields such as religion and magical beliefs, in which old and new elements worked together, she would illustrate the cults in the present situation with the endorsement that here new elements had been added and some original ones had eroded away (Hunter, 1938: 19). Those were the ideas of Monica Hunter, who later changed her name as she married Geoffrey Wilson, when she studied culture contact in Africa for the first time.

Monica Wilson picked up those ideas again a few years later with some modifications as she did fieldwork among the Nyakyusa and the Ngonde. Here her interest was directed more towards the problems of social change, i.e. changes in the working and the interrelations of social institutions, rather than to-wards cultural change. In contrast to her view of culture, which was never clearly formulated, Monica Wilson's view and model of society and how it changes was much more explicit.

In studying social change, Wilson started from four assumptions which clearly show her loyalty to the functionalist tradition. The first assumption states that regularities are present in social fields. The second says, that these regularities can be discovered and explained through comparative studies. Thirdly, the conditions of social life can be compared, to some extent, with the biological conditions of life, for certain similarity exists between social and biological life, i.e. both require a fulfillment of basic needs to continue their lives. The presence of some institutions within the society, such as family, laws and customs, belief systems etc., clearly demonstrate that there are necessary conditions for social life, which are called 'social necessities'. The last assumption states that there is a relative autonomy as well as interdependency among various aspects of society (Wilson, 1971: 2-5). These four assumptions lead Wilson to the attempt of discovering the functional relationships between different social institutions.

The model to be adopted here is a static model of society. However, Wilson realized, that this model does not conform to reality, since a society is always in motion. It never stops transforming itself. A society for her always shifts and alters in space and time (Wilson, 1977). This indicates that Monica Wilson has actually always been aware of history. The two dimensional view here, i.e. the functional and the historical, is the tool by which Wilson analyzes social change. Here she departs from the view of her teacher, Bronislaw Malinowski, whose anti-history opinions are so strong. For Wilson, a more satisfactory model of society is "a model that moves" (Wilson, 1977:27). Nevertheless, this does not mean that the static model of the society should be abandoned. It is still needed, relevant and productive in some ways. For, without it we would not be able to understand how the processes of change occur and which aspects of society undergo changes. The products of the static model form the basis of our comparative studies.

The four assumptions above have not yet provided us a complete picture what a society is according to Wilson. To know this we should go to another Wilson's book, *The Analysis of Social Change*, which she wrote with her husband. She states in this book that a society is "a nexus of relations, in which categories and groups of people involve one another", and these categories are a set of people or a number of people

whose positions in that network are similar, but they are never united or act as a group (Wilson and Wilson, 1945: 45). Two concepts are here fundamental: relation and category. Without defining what a relation is, Wilson further says that a relation has negative or structure form as well as positive or cultural content. The positive content is "nothing less than the world" which in this sense has two aspects: material existence and ultimate or religious reality. Collectively, this "finding and dealing with the world" is called *culture*, severally (separately?) it is called *social activity* (Wilson and Wilson, 1945: 46). Positively viewed a relation takes the form of social activity that has three aspects: practical, intellectual and emotional. "Broad uniformities" and "detailed diversities" are the necessities of an activity. The negative form of relation is called *social structure*, which is "the systematic form of limitation" serve to check eccentricities and preserve the complementary diversities. "It was inherent, negative condition of human relations". In other words, social structure is, for Monica Wilson, "the application of social pressure" (Wilson and Wilson, 1945: 49), which has different forms in each aspect. The negative form of relation in its practical aspect is "legal pressure" which serves to maintain the life or continuity of legal structure or organization of relations; in its intellectual aspect it takes the form of logical pressure, while in its emotional aspect it becomes "conventional pressure". To put it in another way, the negative form of relation is none other than rules, norms, conventions, followed by members of a society (Wilson and Wilson, 1945: 47-48). Wilson's model of social relations as it is put in a scheme appears in the following page. In this scheme each relation is shown to contain six element and three forms, in which the dominance of each element varies. Some relations are pre-dominantly moral, some are more scientific, while some others are more philosophical (Wilson and Wilson, 1945: 82).

As far as social change is concerned, the fundamental change is the change in scale. By scale Wilson means "the number of people in relations and the intensity of relations" (Wilson and Wilson, 1945: 25). It is this very scale that distinguishes the traditional African societies from the modern ones. The scale of a modern African society is relatively greater than that of the traditional one. We can measure this scale and make a comparison, but the scale in itself does not mean



much to us. It is only a device to detect social change. Based upon such analytical framework Wilson tried to explain the phenomena of changes in Africa, particularly among the Nyakyusa and the Ngonde. Since relation is a fundamental concept, it is not surprising at all that she has "The Change of Relations between Generation and between Men and Women" as a subtitle of her book *For Men and Elders*; a book on social change among the Nyakyusa and the Ngonde.

Scheme 1

	practical aspect	Intellectual aspect	emotional aspect
Material aspect	Economic element	Scientific element	Technical element
Structural form	Legal form	Logical form	Conventional form
Religious aspect	Moral element	Philosophical element	Artistic element

Source: Wilson and Wilson, 1945: 82.

## II. Social Changes Among the Nyakyusa and the Ngonde

### a. The Theoretical Framework.

Talking about changes in society and the method to study them, Wilson started with a thesis that a change is reflected in diversity. Social changes begin with an individual's behavior deviating from the common behavioral patterns, which is then followed by others. As the deviation becomes more popular, more people imitate it. New norms are then created and accepted by a group of people within the society. When this stage is reached, a social change occurs. A process of change is thus a set of experiments of new behavioral forms by an innovator which is then joined by the others (Wilson, 1977: 21).

Many kinds of change take place within a society in a period of time, such as changes of statuses, of personnels, etc. But it is not with these kinds of change that Wilson was concerned. She dealt instead with

changes in the structure of a society, i.e. changes in the categories of persons and the relations between them (Wilson, 1977: 23).

Wilson's starting points or premises may thus be summarized as follows:

- a. The seed of change is contained in the diversity.
- b. A change-especially social change-starts with deviance of an individual's behavior.
- c. Social change takes place when the deviance is followed by more people and becomes an established pattern of behavior.
- d. Social change is a change in the structure of a society, in the categories of persons and their relations to each other.

These premises have of course further consequences in the way we view and analyze the process of change. First, they present us with a problem of how to know that a diversity is the diversity that will lead to a social change, for as we know, there is no homogeneous society. This problem is answered as follows:

"It is true that no society is wholly homogeneous but the degree to which diversity is admitted in generalization varies. Every scientific study makes generalizations, and must do so if it is to illuminate facts. This implies that some diversities are ignored and others are admitted.." (Wilson, 1977: 25).

Thus, in addition to finding some generalizations or regularities within the society, a researcher must also be able to determine the diversities that are relevant to the problems he is studying. Wilson further added that a diversity was relevant as long as it created a variation in a framework of "common language and custom", and more importantly, if this diversity could then change the existing social relations (Wilson, 1977: 25). She gave the following example for what she said. If a Nyakyusa woman preferred the blue color for her dress instead of yellow, this did not indicate any change in social relation, but if she chose imported cloth instead of the traditional bark cloth she made by herself or by other Nyakyusa woman, then it may indicate a change. This example, I think, is not entirely clear nor accurate, because if blue is chosen not only for its color as such, but for its deeper significance

which would later influence social relations, then there is no difference between the choice of color and the choice of material. But, aside from this unclear example, we may assume that what Wilson meant by relevant diversity was the diversity which was closely related to or which would later have impacts on social relations.

Another implication of the premises above is that in his or her fieldwork the researcher has to pay attention to the behavior of individuals. This is what every anthropologist does actually; for social science derives its data from the people's behavior. However, in this case the researcher has always to be ready to take into account deviant individuals, although he is not an innovator. Any deviance should be considered significant, since there would always be a chance that a deviant would become an innovator. Otherwise the researcher would lose some important data pertaining to social change.

Still another implication is that the researcher should direct his or her attention to the structure of the society, to the categories of persons and the patterns of relations between these categories. Unfortunately, Wilson did not provide us with any definition of what the structure of society is. We are not sure here whether Wilson's concept of structure is similar to Radcliffe-Brown's notion of social structure.

In addition to some implications above, some problems arise as we apply Wilson's approach to social change. One of them concerns with her concept of *category*. Since social categories exist not only in a researcher's mind, but also in the mind of the people studied, this raises a question concerning the point of view a researcher should take in determining the relevant categories in his or her analysis. Wilson's discussions indicate that she took the re-searcher's point of view for she determined which social categories were relevant during and after changes took place among the Nyakyusa (Wilson, 1977: 143). However, she was not very explicit about this. This problem did not seem to appear in her mind.

Monica Wilson further said that to be able to discern the process of change she compared societies that had similarities in their "language and custom". The similarity in language is easy to discern, but this is not the case with respect to custom, for custom as a whole is a very complex phenomenon that may include both ideational and behavioral patterns. Unfortunately, Wilson did not explain what custom was for

her. Yet, despite the absence of definition on custom, Wilson believed that the Nyakyusa and the Ngonde were the proper societies to be studied and compared, for they had similar customs.

#### **b. The Nyakyusa in Brief**

The process of change among the Nyakyusa described by Wilson was a process that went on for almost one hundred years, i.e. from 1874 - the time when the Nyakyusa was first mentioned, described and reported by other people especially the European - until 1971, when new marriage law was introduced by the Tanzania government. However, the situations that Monica Wilson compared were not of 1875, but the life of the Nyakyusa in 1934-1938 when Wilson was doing her fieldwork among them. She deliberately chose the declaration of new marriage law in 1971 as another point in her scheme of time, for she believed that the new law would bring significant changes in social relations between Nyakyusa men and women, which is the subject of her book (Wilson, 1977: 27).

The changes that took place among the Nyakyusa were complex. Many aspects of social life were interconnected, that it is not easy to unravel and describe them in a simple way. Nevertheless, I will try here to discuss them succinctly, and the discussion will be confined to the way that social lives had changed, especially changes in relations between generations and between men and women.

The Nyakyusa is one of the ethnic groups living in East Africa. They inhabit the district of Rungwe, a plateau in the southern part of Tanganyika on the northern side of lake Nyakyusa. This fertile plain, stretching from the lake to the Rungwe volcano, is located 5.000 feet above the sea level, and is densely populated. Compared to other ethnic groups around them, the Nyakyusa was a prosperous people (G.Wilson, 1951: 253). At the time when Wilson was doing her fieldwork the people lived on rice agriculture introduced by the Arabs, and coffee brought by the German missionaries. These crops were the main sources of wealth. In addition to them, maize, bananas, cassava and vegetables were also cultivated. The Nyakyusa also grew millet from which beer - an important drink in their daily life - was made. Meat and curds they consumed could be acquired from their cattle.

Living near the Nyakyusa, to the southwest, across the Songwa river, are the Ngonde, who apart from some slight differences in some aspects of their culture, can still be regarded as one ethnic group with the Nyakyusa (Wilson, 1977: 142). Compared to the area of the Nyakyusa, the area of the Ngonde was easier to reach by water.

One of the differences between these two ethnic groups is that the Ngonde had a kingdom with a divine king, the office of which was believed to be eternal. The rise of this kingdom was due among others, to the development of ivory trade and exchange of cloth in the area, which did not penetrate further into the north side of the Songwe, where the Nyakyusa live. The Nyakyusa did not have such kingdom. What they had was small chiefdoms, which were always splitted into two with every generation. Sometimes these chiefdoms merged into one big chiefdom, but they never grew into a kingdom. Each chiefdom comprised about 100-200 people. No slavery was known among these chiefdoms, while among the Ngonde this institution was present.

The similarity between the Nyakyusa and the Ngonde was the presence of what Wilson called "age-village", which also set them apart from most of their neighbouring ethnic groups. Here men of the relatively same age lived nearly all their lives together, with their wives and children. Each village consisted of about 30-40 households. The men had usually lived together since they were children, when they still had to herd their fathers' cattle. Generally one group of herd boys would form the nucleus of a new age-village (G.Wilson, 1959: 270). As they reached mature age their fathers would gave them a piece of land near the village where they could build their own huts, and they would hand over their duty of herding the cattle to their younger brothers. They themselves would start to hoe the lands for their fathers or cultivated them for themselves. In this phase they no longer slept with their parents at home, but with their own peer group in the village they had provisionally built. However, their parents would still provide them with food and they would go to the house of one of them to eat there together. These young boys were thus members of two villages: the village of their fathers and of the young boys. Economically they were still dependent upon their parents, but socially they became more

independent (G.Wilson, 1959: 272). In one village several groups of herd boys could be found. They were from groups of relatively same age which would form a new age-village.

A Nyakyusa chiefdom consisted of 8-14 such villages, each of which had its own leader who was chosen by senior leaders of other villages. The chosen man should ideally be a man who had much hospitality towards his neighbours, who could solve their problems wisely and could lead them in ritual as well as in wars (in the old days). A leader was also a representative of the chief. However, the chief was to some extent also dependent upon the village leaders, for he would not give any order until he had consulted them. Before the coming of the European, an age-village was also a military unit, because war between chiefdoms was endemic at that time. The wars were not intended for conquest but for raiding the cattle, from which young men could get cattle to pay the dowry.

When the boys of a boys-village reached certain age, the elders would held a ritual which Wilson called "coming out" ritual. The ritual was also a legitimization of a village division, for in this ritual the area of an old chief and his "great commoners" (leaders of age-villages) was divided and handed over to their sons with their own great commoners. Eight age-villages in a chiefdom was the most common number in Nyakyusa. Thus each new chiefdom was generally comprised four age-villages.

There were three main stages in "coming-out" ritual, i.e.: (a) public selection of great commoners or the election of new leaders of age-villages, (b) public recognition of the two new chiefs, and (c) the handing over of land to the boys on which they may later built their own villages. The important stage was the third process, i.e. the handing over of land to the young boys. When the first two phases were over, the young boys were shown the land on which they could establish their own villages. At this moment the lines between two chiefdoms and between the age-villages were drawn. Nevertheless the boys did not move to the new land all at once. They moved there gradually (G.Wilson, 1959: 280). The new villages would become the formal villages of the new generation and the young men would be acknowledged by the people as "real Nyakyusa". The land was then theirs, and they no longer were regarded as members of the young boys

groups. The problems of everyday life were handled by their own great commoners and their own chief (G.Wilson, 1959: 280).

With the split of the old chiefdom, the Nyakyusa believed that the old chief's authority would decrease, while the power and authority of the new chiefs would be greater. Old villages would be extinct as their inhabitants grew older and died out (G.Wilson, 1959: 282). In other words, the "coming out" ritual is also a ritual of "authority and land redistribution" (G.Wilson, 1959: 88), which at that time could still be easily carried out in Nyakyusa, for the land was still abundant.

The individuals undergoing the ritual together had usually strong ties of solidarity with each other. Together they formed a unit vis-a-vis the generation of their parents and their sons. However, each Nyakyusa generation was also divided in two sections or chiefdoms, and each section had also a sense of unity with respect to their place of residence (M.Wilson, 1954: 96). Among the Nyakyusa a generation was always related to a chief. The name they bore was the name of their chief, who was the central figure during the coming-out ritual. If an heir to a chiefdom died, he was replaced by his brother.

Another important phenomenon among the Nyakyusa, which could also be found among some other African societies, was the role of the cattle played in people's daily lives. So important were the cattle that almost all aspects of their social activities involved cattle. A young man who had cattle -either from his father or from raiding- could begin to seek for a girl he wanted to marry. Had he found the girl, he gave cows to her father as a pledge. The number of the cattle given for a girl varied and depended upon the social status as well as the wealth of the families concerned. The common number was between 6 to 10 cows, although it sometimes reached a total of 30 cows. Before the European came the number of the cattle exchanged was lower and marriage with just one cow was not unusual (G.Wilson, 1959: 258). Since the cattle demanded were not given all at once to the girl's father, a marriage thus took place in phases. It sometimes took some years to complete the payment. When a young man wanted to marry while he still had no cattle, he could work on the girl's father's land, but he thereby lost his claim to his children. If his wife bore a child, it would belong the girl's lineage (M.Wilson, 1977: 60).

Before living with her husband and set up her own household, a girl visited and slept with her would-be husband from time to time. The betrothal of a man with a girl could also be contracted when the girl was still a child. A girl was very important both for her father and her brother as a source of cattle income. Therefore, they were also obliged to protect the girl. If the husband did not treat his wife kindly, her father could take her back and re-turn the cattle he had received from her husband (G.Wilson, 1959: 237).

With the exchange of cattle, a man had a strong control over his wife(s) children. They belonged to him and his sons had the right to inherit things from him, while the cattle given for his daughters became his property (G.Wilson, 1959: 257). These cows were also circulated within the lineage, and this served to maintain the relations between members of the lineage. The cattle exchange between and within lineages formed a network of obligation. This reciprocal relations could be enforced through the conventional or moral pressure as well as through the courts (M.Wilson, 1977: 31).

Since the coming of the European, war and cattle raiding were stopped. The result was the increasing dependence of young men upon their fathers to obtain cattle, because the only alternative open to them was to hoe their father's fields. The father customarily did not give many cows at once to his son. He gave them to him one by one, and this took a long time. It is not surprising then that during this period the average set age of marriage was high among the Nyakyusa men.

The Nyakyusa also practiced polygyny. Godfrey Wilson wrote that polygyny among them was supported by two things. First, there was a taboo for a husband to have a sexual intercourse with his wife who just bore a child. This taboo was prolonged until the baby was weaned. Secondly, there was no paid employment, that the only way to get more labor was by marrying more women (G.Wilson, 1959: 262).

The wife of a polygynyst got a piece of land which was cultivated by her husband and his sons, while they themselves had to plant, care for the plants and do the harvest. The produce was mainly for each wife and her children, and some of it went to the husband. From the abundant supply of his land, a man could entertain his friends and neighbours, by which his authority and prestige increased among his companies (G.Wilson, 1959: 260). In this case a man was actually



dependent upon the hardwork of his wives, yet his position was stronger than theirs. He could force them to work hard, for he had given cattle to have them (M.Wilson, 1977: 135). The authority of a husband over his wife had also a mythical sanction. They believed that a wife could be barren or that her children would be sickly, if she did not obey her husband.

However, husbands are not always good to their wives, and divorce was not seldom among the Nyakyusa. A divorce was considered legal if the cattle given for a wife had been returned by her family. It sometimes happened that a woman who ran away from her husband was given back by her father as he did not want to give the cattle he had received. When a divorce took place, the children would be belonged to her father (M.Wilson, 1977: 41).

If a wife died, her position would be taken over by her sister or her brother's daughter, whereas in the case of a husband his heir, i.e. his younger full brother or his son by another wife, would become his substitute. If a wife died without being replaced, her husband might claim the cattle he had given for her lineage, while if a widow refused to be inherited by the heir of her husband the heir could claim the cattle. Through such a system of inheritance, the continuity of lineage relation, which was the ideal for the Nyakyusa, could be maintained (M.Wilson, 1977: 35).

Among the Nyakyusa a married woman had to observe the strongest taboo, i.e. she was not allowed to meet face to face or to see her husband's father (her father-in-law). If she met him, she had to avoid him. It was said that the women did this out of respect towards their father-in-law and their fear of sexual association between her husband and his father. Consequently, a polygynist who had many daughter-in-laws was avoided by many women, and this added to his dignity in his society (M.Wilson, 1977: 103). The taboo accorded well with the presence of age-village, because in this way the wives can live separately (and peacefully?) from her father-in-law.

Such was the lives of the Nyakyusa as seen by Monica Wilson and her husband in the years of 1934-1938. This picture, of course, appears static. Though it seemed that the Nyakyusa were and would always be like that. Minor social changes had inevitably occurred among them. These would then accumulate and lead to a great change.

In her later works (1917; 1976; 1977) Wilson described in detail the social aspects that had changed considerably, by presenting concrete cases. Here, she also was aware of the time dimension of her descriptions, that she even noted the years of events leading to significant changes among the Nyakyusa.

### c. Changes Among the Nyakyusa

One of the fields in which change had taken place was the administrative or political field. Here the traditional temporary status of a chief became a fixed status and the chief—who was then appointed by the colonial government—received salary from the government as well. There was thus no "coming out" ritual any more, for it was no longer needed. Since the mechanism of replacement was abolished and the chief became part of the political network imposed from the outside, there was no process of redistribution of authority from generation to generation which had always been regulating the Nyakyusa's political life. The result was that the younger generation lost their authority and power and they could not become members of decision makers.

The coming of the European meant also the stopping of wars between chiefdoms which resulted in the disappearance of an alternative for the young men to obtain cattle. Fortunately, this loss was substituted by the emergence of new alternatives. The missionaries arrived in Nyakyusa brought education with them, which gave benefit to the young generation. The young Nyakyusa became more educated and they had greater chances of getting jobs which required particular education and skill.

At the same time, the goldfields in Lupa were opened and the Nyakyusa could work there for a few months as migrant labourers. This had led to some changes never imagined by the Nyakyusa. For example, the married men who went to work in Lupa would not dare to leave their wives unsupervised. Huts were then built for them near the husbands' fathers houses with the intention that their mother-in-laws could keep an eye on them. This, according to Wilson, was a radical change for the Nyakyusa, since it made the wives living near their father-in-laws and made the chances of seeing each other greater (M. Wilson, 1977: 104-105).

Furthermore, with money in his hand a young Nyakyusa that just returned from working in the goldfields could buy cattle and could marry a girl whenever he wanted. He was not dependent upon his father anymore. The result was that the marriage age among the young men decreased. Many young men married as soon as they could buy cattle. They could also buy beer and even ask their father to join them drinking with their friends. Such a thing would never happen in the past. Beer was exclusively for elders. A Nyakyusa was not permitted to drink until he had undergone the "coming out" ritual. When the elders did drink, they would sit apart. Their children, wives or sons might not join them talking and drinking beer.

The introduction of coffee and rice enabled the Nyakyusa to earn higher income and urged them to open new land for cultivation. Combined with the increase of population these activities made the available land scarcer. People could no longer easily find large tracts of uncultivated land. This made the establishment of new age-villages more difficult. Age-village system was able to survive only when the land was abundant. The system was becoming more irrelevant and was in the process of extinction as the strongest taboo between a man and his daughter-in-law weakened.

Another significant change among the Nyakyusa was the introduction of Christianity which prohibited polygyny. Although the prohibition was in strong contradiction with the Nyakyusa customs, many Nyakyusa were baptized and the number increased. New problems arose. The Christians were regarded as mean by the pagans, because their cattle were no longer exchanged for more women from other lineages. They kept the cattle for their own interests. The prohibition on polygyny seemed also to favour the individual who had many cattle, but this posed a problem for his wife because she had to work alone without the help of other wives - as was the case in the family of the polygynists-, to fulfill the demand of a large supply. As it is known, large supply played prominent role in the life of Nyakyusa men, for without this they could not entertain their friends, which also meant that they could no longer pursue the ideal of their people.

Since the coming of the European, the Nyakyusa women had better social position. The establishment of local court in the region to handle social problems strengthened the women's position yet more. In

marriage they may refuse the man proposed by their fathers and they would be backed by the court. Since the establishment of the church women were also able to take part in many important social events. They were allowed to become "elders" who make decisions concerning church activities, because in the church there was no difference anymore in position between man and woman.

The women who refused to be inherited after their husbands died were also supported by the missionaries. They were encouraged to be independent, to work the land by themselves. Hoeing land by women could thus already be observed among the Ngonde in 1914, although this phenomenon did not reach Nyakyusa until 1937. This female agricultural activity was also the result of the pressure from some men who wanted their wives to have clothes but did not give them the money to buy. The desire to buy clothes had stimulated the women to work on the land.

Those were some examples of changes among the Nyakyusa detected by Wilson after comparing the situation in 1934-1938 with the situation in 1970s. Instead of following straight line, the changes appeared inconsistent. Such a change Wilson called *zig-zag change*.

### III. Discussion

Now we get back to our problems, which can be formulated as follows:

1. How did Wilson apply her previous method to study social change in Nyakyusa? Did she use her method of studying culture contact in her study of social change?
2. Did she employ her model in *The Analysis of Social Change* to elucidate the process of change among the Nyakyusa?
3. Is her model in accordance with the method she used and her premises about social change? Can her model explain the changes she found among the Nyakyusa?

The first question is not very difficult to answer. Wilson still clung to the model that views society as a functional whole, in which a change in one element is assumed to bring changes in other elements.

Before analyzing social changes in Nyakyusa Wilson described the situation among the Nyakyusa in 1934 and 1938. Taking this period as a starting point, Wilson then traced the development of some aspects of Nyakyusa's life up to 1971, when the government of Tanzania introduced new marriage law.

With regard to the method she used, we have here two kinds of method: (1) method of determining the society to be studied, and (2) method of collecting the data. It is clear that Wilson still used her previous method to determine the society to be studied -namely comparing two or more communities with similar culture, located in different areas-, in order to understand the processes of change, especially the changes resulted from the contacts between societies with different cultures. In this case Wilson chose the Nyakyusa and the Ngonde to be compared. These two societies had a common language and similarities in social structure, economic system, kinship system, age-village organization and rituals (M.Wilson, 1951: 1-2). On the other hand, these societies live in different territories. The Nyakyusa inhabit a closed area that was difficult to reach, while the Ngonde live in a relatively open region, and is easily accessible by the water. The difference in locality led to differences in some of their cultural elements, but these differences could to some extent be neglected. This method of comparison to comprehend processes of change is also known in anthropology as *controlled comparison*, and had been used by some American anthropologists since 1950s (Eggan, 1954).

With respect to method of collecting data Wilson did not give us many new ideas, except for her view on the diversity and deviance as indicators of social change, which require the researcher to direct his or her attention to both deviant and common behavior. The emphasis on change itself had compelled Wilson not to devote her attention to the problems she dealt with when she studied the people in Pondo. The emphasis was then more on social aspects rather than on cultural aspects. The data she collected came from four sources: (1) direct fieldwork, which she did with her husband; (2) the oral tradition; (3) the writings of the eyewitnesses who had contacts with the Nyakyusa long before she came to the area, and (4) the writings of other social scientists who had done fieldwork in that region (M.Wilson, 1977: 27-28). Compared with the situation in Pondo, the situation in Nyakyusa

gave her more possibilities to reconstruct the picture of Nyakyusa's lives before the intensive contacts with the European began.

The second question is not easy to answer. As had been mentioned before, a society for Wilson is a network of relations between groups and categories of persons that have positive (cultural) content and negative (structural) form with different magnitude. Each relation has practical, intellectual and emotional aspects. How can we use this model to describe and explain social change? Since a society is a network of relations, it follows then that social change is none other than changes in relations, either in their aspects, form, or content. This means that our analysis should, first, describe the positive content and the negative form of relations within the society being studied at one point of time. Of course, we have to limit ourselves to some relations only, for it is not possible to examine all kinds of relations within a society. Our description of the aspects of each relation can either be separated or mixed (mingled). Separately we would describe a particular aspect of some relations, and then another aspect of the same relations. If it was not possible to expose each aspect, we could choose some aspects or one aspect only, of these relations. What is important here is our focus, i.e. which relations and what aspects we examine. We could also present or describe how the situation was in each relation, i.e. which aspects are predominant in some relations and which ones in the others. Then we should describe the situations of the same relations at another point of time. To create a more dynamic picture of the society being studied we may also reveal the course of events in the society from Time I to Time II, as had been done by Wilson. We could then demonstrate in our analysis which relations had undergone change and whether changes occurred in their positive content or in their negative form. Since each relation had a different predominant aspect, we needed to mention if there were also changes in it. I mean, whether or not a relation which previously had been predominantly intellectual for example, had become predominantly practical or emotional as the case may be. Those are more or less, what we would have been doing if we employed Wilson's model to study and describe social change.

However, if we examine Wilson's works on social change carefully, we would see that Wilson had analyzed social change not in the way we had expected her to do that. She did not, I think, entirely

apply and follow her model. What she wrote in *For Men and Elders* for instance, is different from what we thought she would have done it. It is true, that she had defined the relations on which her analysis was focused, but her discussions were concerned more than only with those relations, for she also discussed other social fields that had changed. On the other hand, she did not bother to define which aspects of relations she was talking about. Neither did she say anything about the positive content and the negative form of relations in her *moving model*. She did not discuss the link between her model of society as nexus relation and the individual behavior. This raises the question of why she no longer employed her old model.

The answer is, I think, that there are some discrepancies between her model of society and the reality she encountered in the field. Wilson's model seemed unable to capture the social phenomena she had observed. Is the model wrong or misleading? If so, where do its weaknesses lie? Before answering these questions I want to show first that there is a discrepancy between Wilson's old model of social change and the reality. Although Wilson seemed to have realized this, surprisingly enough she did not reexamine or revise her model.

As Wilson had said, social change started with deviant behavior of an individual, but the change did not take place until the deviation was followed by other members of society and the deviation became a behavior pattern of a certain group within the society. This very premise, I think, is the one which cannot be included in Wilson's old model. The old model gives much emphasis on relation, but how this concept is to be related to the reality in the field or be applied in fieldwork was not discussed. In the field, what we see are individuals moving, conducting behavior and interacting with one another. Relation as a concept, which means also an abstraction, was never defined by Wilson. She nowhere explained what should be abstracted from what we observe in the field, so that we can say that there is a relation between two individuals. The absence of definition makes us think of two different things, both of which were called "relation" by Wilson. Some examples here will show that Wilson was not consistent and was never clear in using her concept of "relation".

In a paper written with Godfrey Wilson, Monica Wilson stated that in any community we would always find a system or an

organization, because a society was not a heap of people without regularities or just a crowd. It is a group of people joined or united by a series of groups and relations. "The fault of the anthropologists", Wilson believed, "is that they only describe the activities without paying their attention to the human relations in them, which actually determine the forms of those activities" (Wilson and Hunter, 1942: 6). In another part she wrote that a social system consisted of "all those relations by which the members of some group of people are commonly and regularly united", therefore studying a society is basically an attempt to discover the relations existing within the society. In this case not every relation can be easily observed or discovered. There are relations which an observer can easily see within a short time, but there are also relations which cannot be discovered until he had been a year or so in the field. "A relation that is rigidly formalized in a conventional pattern of behavior is much more noticeable than a more informal one" (Wilson and Hunter, 1942: 7).

From the statements above we get an impression that *relation* for Monica Wilson (Hunter) is the 'collective representation' of Durkheim, for what can unite the activities of the people and determine their form if it is not the 'collective representation'? Another statement supports this conclusion. She wrote for instance, that "whatever people do together, whatever they eat or talk, whether they eat or pray, is shaped by their relations with one another. Only if we know their relations can we understand their joint activities" (Wilson and Hunter, 1942: 8). If she meant *relation* as 'collective representation', then it also means *culture* according to some American anthropologists. But, was it what she meant?

Monica Wilson's discussion on *relation* in *The Analysis of Social Change*, in which she said that a relation had a positive content and negative form, leaves us unsure. "The positive content", she wrote, "is nothing less than the world", and this collectively was called 'culture', and severally 'social activities'. Here we are confronted with another notion of *relation*. The positive content of *relation* is evidently social activities, and what is social activity? Wilson was silent on this point, but I think it is the behavioral pattern of individuals in their daily lives.



It should be noted here that the word *pattern*, with respect to behavior, has two meanings: *pattern of* and *pattern for* (Keesing and Keesing, 1971). *Pat-tern for* behavior is a set of rules, norms, ideas or frame of thinking used by the people to interpret or define the situations, and to guide their behavior, whereas *pattern of* behavior is our description. It is our abstraction of interactions between individuals and individuals' behavior. Wilson's concept of relation is confusing, because sometimes it refers to *pattern of* and sometimes to *pattern for* and *pattern of together*. Wilson did not seem to realize this and its negative implication for our fieldwork.

We know well that we have to keep *pattern of* and *pattern for* separate in our research and ethnography. We can describe all kinds of behavior patterns, such as marriage, residence pattern, agricultural activities, rituals and many other kinds of activities, without any knowledge of the ideas of the people about their marriage, agriculture, rituals and so forth. The avoidance pattern in the relations between a man and his daughter-in-law for instance, is very different from their concept of the taboo itself. These two realms should al-ways be separated in our analysis and explanation or interpretation, otherwise our ethnography will be confusing.

Back to the concept of relation, Wilson said further that a relation had negative or structural form, which she later called 'social structure', i.e. "the systematic form of limitation" served to check the eccentricities and preserve the complementary diversities. "It is the inherent negative condition of human relations" (Wilson and Wilson, 1945: 49). Hence, 'social structure' was no more than the application of social pressure. In its different aspects the negative forms of relations take form as laws, rules and conventions (Wilson and Wilson, 1945: 51-52). The meaning of relation here conforms to our assumption, i.e. a system of rules and norms or 'collective representation' in Durkheimian sense, or *pattern for*.

Is the difference between form and content in Wilson's view similar to our distinction between *pattern of* and *pattern for*? I do not think so. In the 'pattern model' we find people as human beings capable of interpreting their environment. Changes in the environment will influence their *pattern for* behavior, which will then generate different *pattern of* behavior, and the new pat-tern of behavior will in turn

influence the environment, which will then also change. In other words, we see in this model a dialectical relationship between system of ideas and the environment through the behavior of the people. In Wilson's model, the concepts of 'form' and 'content' give us an image that the content is determined by the form, and this, I think, is also what Wilson meant in her explanation about 'relation' I have cited above. The difficulty with this view is that we do not find here the human aspect, that people have ideas, knowledge, and can define or interpret their situations and adopt a certain strategy to solve their problems. Although Wilson also discussed social changes resulted from the contacts between peoples, we still do not know from her model how people use their system of ideas to interpret or understand their situations. Consequently, we have difficulties to explain why zig-zag change occurred. It is at this point that the 'pattern model' differs from Wilson's model.

We may assume that the difference between *pattern of* and *pattern for* is similar to the difference between *content* and *form* of explanation, but still we have difficulty in connecting her model with her premise that a social change begins with diversity in pattern of behavior, for pattern of behavior means social activity only, excluding 'social structure'. The implication is that we only have to look at the *content* of relations, while the *form* is left unobserved. Therefore, a change in social activity is only a change in its content, not in its form. Since a relation is both form and content at once, the corollary is that a change in social activities is not social change. Moreover, paying our attention only to the content of the relation gives us an unfavorable implication, i.e. the inability to explain or understand the "zig-zag" change.

The absence of an explicit definition of relation raises further question as to whether we still can use Wilson's model of social change. We know that there are some weaknesses in the model, but we also see that by using her model Monica Wilson was able to describe and analyze social changes in some African societies. She said that the most important change in Central Africa was the change of scale. The differences in scale distinguish the traditional Central African societies from the modern ones. In Wilson's view a scale was the number of people in relations and the intensity of these relations. The scale of the

modern Central African societies is greater than that of the traditional ones. This means that many African people nowadays have more relations with other people from other regions, and these relations are becoming more and more intensive. An African becomes more dependent upon the others. Of course, there have always been some interdependencies among members of a society, but their range and intensity vary according to geography and history. Since a social change is basically a change in scale, we may conclude then that an increase in the relations of a given society with other societies will lead also to many other kinds of change in that society, and this had been clearly demonstrated by Wilson.

Compared with the Ngonde, the Nyakyusa had fewer chances of establishing relations with people from other regions, because their area was more isolated. The result was that changes among them took place later than those among the Ngonde. For example, the emergence of the disproportion between marriage-able men and women caused by the prohibition of polygyny. This phenomenon was already observable in Ngonde in 1937, whilst among the Nyakyusa it did not appear until 15 years later (M. Wilson, 1977: 159). In 1937, the phenomenon of girls marrying in their twenties was found among the Ngonde, whereas the Nyakyusa were still surprised at hearing such a case. They spoke of the danger of pregnancy before marriage, and prostitution (M. Wilson, 1977: 159). When the Ngonde women were hoeing their fields in 1938, there were only few women did this work among the Nyakyusa. All the more so, it was still regarded as man's work (M. Wilson, 1977: 101). The same thing happened with the 'coming out' ritual, which had been abandoned in 1913 in Ngonde, but in Nyakyusa it was still carried out until 1934. We can see here that the increase of relation with other peoples brings changes to the society concerned. This means that we still can use Wilson's model to elucidate and describe social change. The point then is how we should define the concept of 'relation', so that we can use it properly. In this case we should keep the concept from becoming too abstract that we could not operationalize it in a fieldwork. What we need then is a definition of 'relation' that will be able to fill the gap between Wilson's model of society and her premises of social change.

When an anthropologist is doing fieldwork, what he sees in the field are individuals' behavior and interactions between individuals, some of which are patterned, i.e. repeated regularly, either in time or place. Two kinds of pattern are involved here: *pattern for* and *pattern of*. We cannot see the first pattern because it exists in the mind of the people, but it can be known by interviewing the people. We can also know it, to some extent, from their behavior. The second pattern (*pattern of*) - which is our abstraction of the individuals' behavior and interactions we see-, is what Wilson meant by social activity, but it is different from social relation, because the word *relation* implies that two or more parties are involved. Thus, in a social relation we find a contact between two persons, and we know this from their interactions for "relationship cannot but be abstracted from successive repetitive actions" (Nadel, 1957: 128), and this is what Wilson meant in her discussion of method of studying African societies. She said there that the relationships we had to search always involve two social categories: husband-wife; son-father; man-woman; boys-girls; parent-children, etc. (Wilson and Hunter, 1942: 6). Also, if social relation is a pattern of interaction between two social categories this is consistent with Wilson's statement on the changing relations between husband and wife, and father and son (Wilson, 1977). However, since that meaning is in contradiction with what Wilson meant by relation in her other writings, we should define it more explicitly. It would be more appropriate I think, if we use the concept of relation or social relation to refer to the *pattern of* behavior abstracted from the interactions between individuals.

Social activity, then, has broader meaning than social relation. It may include the behavioral patterns of a particular social category not in relation with other social categories. The activities of young boys herding their cattle, the old men sitting drinking beer, the women hoeing their fields and so forth, are all social activities-although only one social category involved, i.e. young boy, old man or woman-, since those activities have social 'meanings' and social 'functions'. These activities can also influence their relations to other social categories. The point here is that the application of these concepts depends upon the context and upon our emphasis. In *social activity* we put more emphasis upon the *behavioral pattern itself*, while in *social relation* our emphasis is

more upon the *pattern of behavior of a social category towards other social category*. Both social activity and social relation, if we follow Wilson, could have three aspects: intellectual, practical and emotional.

By giving social relation such meaning we can now see the link between the model of society as a "network of social relations" - meaning a network of behavioral patterns of social categories towards each other-, and the fact that social change begins with the deviation of an individual's behavior. A deviation which is then followed by others will become a new pattern of behavior of a particular social category towards other social categories, and this is what Wilson means by social change.

Our meaning of relation has some implications. First, on the concept of scale. To avoid any confusion with the concept of relation in *scale*, I would call the relation in a scale a *link*. Thus, the scale of a society is the number of people involved in *linkages* (not relations), and the intensity of these *linkages*. The word 'link' here gives also stronger impression of the presence of a joint or point of contact.

Another implication is that we are then able to understand why zig-zag change occurred among some individuals in Nyakyusa. It should be noted here that there were two different phenomena called *zig-zag change* by Monica Wilson. First, the change of a given social phenomenon, such as the marriage age of Nyakyusa girls; the number of the polygynist, etc. In a certain period these phenomena decreased, in another period they increased, or the other way around (Wilson, 1976: 402), as Wilson wrote:

"We have traced an increase in stock population in proportion to human population and then its decrease; a lowering of the marriage age of both girls and men, then a raising of the age particularly for the girls; an increase of polygyny during the first third of this century and the growth of large harems, then a decline in polygyny; an increase in the power of chiefs in relation to commoners and then a decrease.." (Wilson, 1977: 194).

The increase and decrease of index of social phenomena is what Wilson meant by "zig-zag" change.

The second meaning of "zig-zag" change is the inconsistency individuals' behavior (Wilson, 1977: 194). In Nyakyusa it was exactly the pioneers of changes who then became the obvious *resisters* to new changes, while the individuals who seemed to be conservative in accepting new elements became more progressive and quickly picked up new ideas and new changes.

"Neither 'beginners' nor 'resisters' were wholly consistent: there was a 'compartmentalized rebelliousness' and conformity. Mwaipopo had been a chief before whites came and he appeared the epitomy of conservatism: he administered traditional law; he attended and provided cattle for traditional rituals, whether kinship or communal celebrations; he hoed, he danced, he feared 'the breath of men'. He was generous, urbane, shrewd in court judgements. But when one looks closely at the evidence, his manner of life was not wholly traditional. He had 41 wives, and large harems were some-thing new; his heir (son of Mwaipopo's deceased elder brother) had 'come out', but Mwaipopo remained in power drawing a government salary; he refused to marry four sons in their late twenties be-cause, he said, they were still 'boys' who should hoe for him, but even a conservative opinion thought he refused too long. He set new fashions in wearing a splendid white toga, and a fringed black alpaca shawl; he carefully planted an exotic tree to add to the dignity of his homestead; and he agreed to killing a bull to re-lease Sakela from a daughter-in-law's obligation of avoidance" (Wilson, 1977: 180).

"The first generation of Christians, the elders of the Church were all 'beginners', but in the second many were more conservative than the foreign missionaries. As one young German missionary naively remarked in 1935: "It is more difficult for us than for the early missionaries, for customs have been established in the church and people want to stick to them. When the first missionaries began they had a clean slate". Typical of the 'conservative' elders was Nsangalufu of Kabembe, a man of perhaps 60 years old in 1935. He had been

employed in building the mission station as a very young man, and had settled there. He disapproved of education for girls: "If they learn to write, they will just write letters to lovers"; he insisted upon the traditional authority of a father over his sons, and the subservience of a wife" (Wilson, 1977:179).

Of the two kinds of zig-zag change, our new meaning of relation can help us to understand the second.

The individuals' behavior in the two examples above can be seen as a result of the realizations of individuals' interpretations or definitions about the situations they faced. Those patterns of behavior were considered inconsistent by Wilson. However, they would not surprise us if we remember what Mitchell (1966) said concerning the behavior of the Africans from the country-side when they came to stay in urban areas.

"This inconsistency is possible because all the values and beliefs in terms of which individuals interact in daily activities are not operative at the same time. Instead, actors operate in terms of specific values relevant to the way in which they and their co-actors have defined the situation. The inconsistencies in the value framework therefore...need not become patent...There is in fact an element of choice open to the individual concerning the way in which he may define the social situation." (Mitchell, 1966: 59).

What Monica Wilson found among the Nyakyusa is the same as what Mitchell had seen in urban Africa.

The situations the Nyakyusa encountered in 1934 were very different from the situations in 1970s. Their frame of thought, ideas, values, norms, etc. or their 'pattern for' behavior they used to define the situations had also changed. In different situations, the altered frame of thought would automatically produce different patterns of behavior.

Since we have put new meaning on the concept of relation, it seems to me that the concept of society may also be revised. Our definition of society should be compatible with our premise of social change and our view of human behavior. Therefore, we may now define society as a group of people of various social categories living in a

particular area who interact with one another and shows certain patterns of behavior on account of the existence of a certain frame of thought employed to interpret, define the situations or the environment. The important elements here are the social categories, patterns of interaction, and the frame of thought. Based upon this definition, social change is for us a change that involves both the kind and number of social categories and the behavioral patterns of and between the existing social categories. This definition, I think, fits nicely with cases of social change among the Nyakyusa described by Monica Wilson. New social categories, such as the Christians, the educated, the progressive, the conservative, arose together with new patterns of behavior.

#### IV. Conclusion

In this paper I discuss the theoretical framework developed by Monica Wilson in her studies of social change. I open the discussion by setting out her method and her model, followed by a description of her analysis of social change among the Nyakyusa. It is clear here that in studying social change Wilson based her method of study upon her experience of studying culture contacts among the Southeastern Bantu. However, as far as her model is concerned, she evidently did not wholly apply her model of society she built up in 1940s.

Our discussion demonstrates that there are some shortcomings in her theoretical framework. First, there is no clear definition of relation. This consequently blurs her model, which further leads to the mingling of two different phenomena which analytically should be kept separate, i.e. relation as a contact between individuals and relation as a pattern of behavior or pattern for behavior. Secondly, there is no connection between her model and her premises of social change. This, I think, is a result of the fact that her model is too abstract, while her premises of social change are very 'concrete'. One of the premises mentions "individuals", and in the analysis these individuals became more concrete. Conversely, her model of society puts more emphasis on social categories, which then creates some problems, as neither the link between categories and individuals nor the linkage between human behavior and the concept of relation was explained. Moreover, although Wilson discussed the form and content of relation in her model, she did



not mention anything about people or individuals capable of making new interpretations, of defining many kinds of situations in various ways, etc. The unfavorable implication of this is that the 'inconsistency of behavior' of individuals cannot be explained or understood.

Considering these weaknesses, I have suggested here a more limited and explicit definition of relation which allows us to connect Wilson's model of society with her premises of social change. In this case I only 'rearrange' some of the concepts she employed in her studies. I believe that we still can use the model of society as nexus of relation if we define *relation* as *pattern of behavior* of a particular social category toward another social category. I distinguish this pattern from the *pattern for behavior*, which is called the 'structural form of relation' by Wilson. This distinction enables us to understand why and how zig-zag change occurred among some individuals in Nyakyusa. Our concept of relation is also different from the one Wilson had in her discussion of *scale*. I prefer to call her *relation* here *linkage* or *link*, since this word can express better the idea of contact between two parties.

Despite its weaknesses, Wilson's method and model of social change have some important and relevant points for us, especially in their methodological aspect. For Indonesian social scientists who are not accustomed to using historical resources—such as colonial archives, personal letters, personal stories, etc.—, or historians who want to study particular change but hampered by the lack historical records Wilson's methodology provides a way of solving such problems, that is a comparative study of societies with similar culture and social structure, but experiencing different degree of change as they live in different location with different access to the outside world. Such a strategy may give the researcher some understandings of how societies react to similar cultural penetration, adapt to it and finally change.

Secondly, explicitly and with concrete examples Wilson talked about the source of change within the societies. Wilson's explicit discussion also provide us with more specific meaning of social change and things related to it. Wilson's clear views on this really help us in studying and understanding social change in the field. Her model and method can help us in our attempt to detect and trace the course of change within a particular society.

It is clear from our discussion above that what Wilson had discussed seriously many years ago are the things absent in our discourse on social change in Indonesia. Eventhough many social scientists talk almost everyday about social change, most of them unfortunately are never quite explicit about what they mean. It was such an implicit thought that had also led us to our lack of serious discussions on problems and methods of studying social change.

Our critical evaluation of Monica Wilson's theoretical framework on social change here is hoped to arouse new awareness and serious discussions on the methods and strategies of describing, analysing, understanding and explaining one of the most studied phenomenon in social science: social change.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Eggan, F. 1954. "The Social Anthropology and the Method of Controlled Comparison". *American Anthropologist* 56: 743-763.
- Hunter, M. 1938 "Contact between European and Native in South Africa Pondoland" in *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa*, B.Malinowski. International Institute of African Language and Cultures. Memorandum XV.
- Keesing, F.M. dan R.M.Keesing. 1971. *New Perspectives in Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Koentjaraningrat, 1984. "Ciracas dan Cilangkap: Dua Desa di Pasar Rebo, Selatan Jakarta" dalam *Masyarakat Desa di Indonesia Masa Kini*, Koentjaraningrat (ed). Jakarta: Lembaga Penerbitan Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Indonesia.
- Mitchell, J.C. 1966. "Theoretical Orientations in African Urban Studies" in *Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*, M.Banton (ed). London: Tavistock.
- Nadel, S.F. 1957. *The Theory of Social Structure*. London: Cohen and West.
- Wilson, G. and M. Hunter. 1942. *The Study of African Society*. The Rhodes-Livingstone Papers No 2.
- Wilson, G. and M.Wilson. 1945. *The Analysis of Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, G. 1959. "The Nyakyusa of South-Western Tanganyika" in *Seven Tribes of British Central Africa*, E.Colson and M.Gluckman (eds). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Wilson, M. 1951. *Good Company*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 1959. *Communal Rituals of the Nyakyusa*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 1971. *Religion and the Transformation of Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1976. "Zig-Zag Change". *Africa* 46: 399-409.
- 1977. *For Men and Elders*. London: International African Institute.