CHAPTER I

CLASS STRUCTURE DEFINED

Technological changes led to the growth of class structure a lot. Industrial Revolution opened the large vistas of development in the various fields of life. Machines became the key tool of vast production. In the first phase of the Industrial Revolution, textile industries had the upper hand. Previously men and women used to wheel now it was replaced by the textile industries. The second main phase of the Industrial Revolution after the advent of textiles, mining and metal manufacture had three main aspects. These were the rapid growth of railway transport and communications of ship-building, scientific methods adopted in the production of machines, and the rapid development of banking and of industrial investment. These three inter-related aspects of the Industrial Revolution in its second phase all connoted increased mobility of human beings and of merchandise of money both for current spending and for investment and of capital equipment. Some new skills also emerged on the scene, e.g. those of the engine-builder and the engine-driver, of the signal man and
the civil Engineer, of the banker and company promoter and
of managers and under-managers and technicians in many forms
of enterprise.

The third phase was largely marked by the growing
application of science, especially in metallurgy and in various
branches of engineering - and also as a smaller scale in the
chemical industries. These things helped a lot shape out the
social structure. It grew more subtle and complex. People
started enjoying varieties of privileges and chose professions
suiing to their own tastes.

CONCEPT OF STRUCTURE:

The concept of structure is very difficult to be
defined. Divergent attitudes prevail as regards the definition
of structure. He holds the opinion that the purpose of
teaching is to "give a student as quickly as possible a sense
of the fundamental ideas of a discipline", that "underlying
principles - - give structure to the subject", that
"grasping the structure of a subject is understanding it in
a way that permits many other things to be related to it
meaningfully. Ford and Pugno assert the fact by commenting that the concept of structure is "an educational expression in search of a definition."

By going through the above mentioned things we arrive at the conclusion that structure deals with two dimensions. The first deals with those fundamental concepts, propositions, principles, generalizations, understandings and ideas that are fundamental to each discipline. The second deals with the organizations, methods of inquiry and ways of approaching knowledge that are distinct structure helps students learn what is important, it helps in retention, it fosters transfer of learning, and it proves much helpful in reducing the gap between the work of scholars and that of the thing going in the class room.

1. The uses of strucuralism Raymond Boudon, P.No.(48).
2. Ibid., p.no.49 (London 1968).
Warner and Lunt, emphasising the behavioural aspect, state thus "a social structure is a system of formal and informal groupings by which the social behaviour of individuals is regulated". In this way the switch has been shifted over here to social relations and behaviour of the members of the society.

Malinowski remarks further "one must not only consider the character of institutions and their traditional norms equally governing human conduct, it is important to study the real activities which may differ from the prescribed expectations owing to social pressures. The actual behaviour of individuals and the way in which the social standards, the ideal patterns, the sets of expectations change have also been considered as important constituents of social structure as the ideals and expectations themselves. Social structure thus, has not been considered something static, but something dynamic, rather both a process and as a product.

As stated by some social theorists the elements of social structure usually includes groups, organizations, institutions value structure, political system, religious sects, status-role system, communication pattern etc.

According to Raddiffe Brown (196 - 14) the social structure is to be defined as "the continuing arrangement of persons in relationship defined or controlled by institutes, i.e. socially established norms or patterns of behaviour." Under the social structure, we study the compact relationships and behaviour of the people, their mode of thinking. The importance and place of family as a social institution is widely known and perfectly established from the point of view of its content structure as well as functions in all social system.

The broad study of social structure has been divided into various sub-groups. Major one of these included family, personal relations, marriage, status of woman, caste and kinships, class constitutes as one of the major aspects
of social structure. It plays an important and active role in shaping the future of society. Family, treated as a functional unit, is explained more in terms of inter-relation, which is perhaps thought of as more important, rather than inter-relations. The treatment of the family as a nucleus of wider social organizations, in terms of relationship is comparatively limited.

The inter-relationship of members has been stressed by Burgess and Locke (1960: 8) in the following words:

"as a group of persons united by ties of marriage, blood or adoption; constituting a single household; interacting and communicating with each other in respective social roles of husband and wife, mother and father, son and daughter, brother and sister, and creating and maintaining a common culture."

3. IMPORTANCE OF CLASS IN SOCIAL RELATION:

Various groups in society help one another at the time of need. A man cannot satisfy his own needs by himself. He has to depend on others for various reasons. Various groups of the class contribute a lot to the social, political and cultural development of the society. They co-operate with each other in pushing the human civilization ahead.

4. TYPES OF CLASSES:

The British Institute of Public Opinion has roughly divided the both sexes into three grades - upper, middle and lower. Though there is no exact division as such. It differs from persons to persons. Dudley Baxter, in 1867, assigned less than a quarter of the population to the upper and middle classes together, and more than three quarters to the working classes, despite the fact that he assigned all shop assistants, as well as all clerks, to the middle group.

A. UPPER CLASS:

A hundred years ago, 'upper class' definitely meant, gentleman' or 'gentle woman' and something besides; and the
prefix, gentle' had in most peoples minds a define relation
to family anticidents as well as to occupation. The upper
class constitutes a body of persons like Peers and baronets,
with their wives and the peers' children. These two bodies
of persons still constituted primarily a landed aristocracy,
and then new men whom they accepted into their ranks had
usually bought land as a pre-requisite to acceptance.

Round this class of landed nobility and landed gentry
circled a host of relatives, well-to-do or quite poor, who
claimed gentility because of their family connections.
It has regarded as a dreadful if somebody among the
gentry marries his or her daughter with anybody out-
side the charmed circle of gentility. There is, for
example, a story of Mrs. Dliphant's, called The Railway
Man and his Children and published as recently as 1891, which
is largely about the social dilemma of a lady who finds her-
self led to contemplate marriage, not with an engineer driver
or booking clerk, but with a wealthy and highly intelligent
Civil Engineer who goes about the world designing and
superintending the construction of Railways. From Jane Austen near the beginning of the 19th century to Thackeray in the middle of it the major novelists are full of these imputations of urgently manners and feelings to all sort of social climbers; and naturally the cluster of the popular writers made even more of the point.

Parallel to this emerged a new rich class, whose position depended on trade and industry, and this class, with its following of lesser employers, tradesmen and managerial workers, already dominated the life of the larger towns and the industrial districts and sent its representatives to Parliament in large enough numbers. This new higher class, except at the very top, did not yet mingle much in private social relations with the gentry. It was predominantly Nonconformist, hostile to the landed interest, proud of having made its own way in the world and of not tracing its ancestry back beyond a grand-parent at most.

From the 18th century the business class had their Dissenting Academies for the higher education of their
own sons, by no means exclusively for the ministry. The 19th century observed both a great increase in schools with a commercial bias for middle-class boys and a rapid reconstruction of the old Grammar Schools in the towns to meet middle-class needs.

It was through the Public Schools (including both new and the old) and through the reformed and expanded Grammar Schools, that the cultural gulf between the gentlefolk and the new wealthy and well-to-do came to be bridged. The social claims and prestige of the gentle folk died hard. When the middle classes won the votes and had the majority, in Parliament in 1832, there was for a large time surprisingly little change in the social composition of the House of Commons. The new wealthy class did not have any desire to be legislators, rather they kept stuck up to their own business affairs. They only wanted to have a Parliament that would pass the laws they required; and they remained content, for the most part, to let the gentry sit in the House of Commons, provided the conditions were fulfilled. Their attitude was as the whole
favourable to further extension of the sufferage, because they insisted as further voting with a view to overthrow the aristocracy, which still held fast in many small boroughs as well as in the country constituencies. Nevertheless the House of Commons remained largely an assembly of 'gentleman'. It contained no fever than 70 members who were Lords, Baronets, or Honourables, as well as a big contingent of country gentlemen and members of aristocratic families.

Side by side with the gentle folk and the rising business classes there existed, a century ago, a rapidly increasing body of professional men, whose social status was gradually changing. The new professions that were rising rapidly in social importance raised awkward problems of social status for the old-fashioned. Accountants and bank managers, company managers and managing directors, Civil Engineers of various types, architects emerging from the ranks of builders, were all developing pretensions to rank with the older professions, and in various degrees were making good their claims, while comparing the position and structure
of the upper and middle class a century ago with what exists today, the first notable difference lies in the shrinkage, relatively of the upper class. The titled aristocracy remains, but has been immensely diluted by the ennoblement, not only of a host of country gentlemen the Victorian era, but also since then of a much greater host of successful businessmen, followed, latterly, by a cohort of Trade Union and Co-operative leaders. The House of Lords is still overwhelmingly conservative, it is still predominantly an assembly of wealthymen, but it is no longer a one-class institution. The peerage as a whole is no longer, under the crown. The top layer of an aristocracy = baronets are to-day, socially, a much more exclusive order than peers. This is partly an outcome of the educational assimilation of the upper and middle classes but it is also the result of a decreased will and ability on the part of the gentry to subsidize poor relations in order to prevent them from disgracing the family by entering into ungentlemanly occupations.
Gradually the upper class nearly ceased to exist. For practical purposes, the great majority of those who used to feel they belonged to it, even as mere hanger-on, have completely merged into the 'upper middle class'. Inter-marriage causes them to overlap, and the descendants of the rich of Yesterday are often not to be differentiated from the old aristocrats. They remain, and prefer to be as middle class in outlook.

INTELLECTUAL CLASS:

The 'intellectuals' as ever are difficult to place in the social hierarchy. They found new vistas and opportunities in the various fields like in journalism and authorship, in publishing and in the public services, in higher teaching and broadcasting and script-writing and acting and in representing Great Britain, Publicly or privately in a host of capacities overseas.

---

But today the composition of the "intelligentsia", in respect of social origins, is changing fast as a result of the rapid development of state and state-aided secondary schools - now renamed Grammar Schools - and of the never Universities. The immense growth of the civil service of the higher branches of education and of the social services generally, has created a wide range of salaried positions for the intellectual 'aristocracy' and has made Grub Street and the whole tribe of the disappointed as described in George Gissing's novels before. The class whom we name Middle Class are neither intellectuals nor professionals of any sort nor products of the Public Schools. Farmers and retail tradesmen, and the middle sections of the civil and Local Government services and commercial concerns, are still by far the most numerous groups outside industry and in industry there are technicians, the middle and lower ranks of management and administration, the smaller employers and as the borderline the foremen, fore women, and supervisors of the manual productive processes and the analogous grades in the transport services.
The lower ranges of the middle classes fall very broadly into two sections — the salary-earners and the profit-makers. The farmers and retail tradesmen constitute the main body of the second group; and the nature of their income has a big effect in determining their economic and political affiliations. Though the Labour Party has done a great deal to benefit the farmers, it does not easily win their votes; and though retail traders have done well economically under state control, they still vote mainly for the Conservative Party. The salary-earners, as the other hand, have provided many more converts to Trade Unionism and to political Labour, partly because salaries have become much more a matter for collective bargaining, except in the higher ranges of industry and commerce, but because there is less educational and cultural difference than there used to be between most salary-earners, outside the high professions, and the more manual workers. The salary-earners are, however, an unstable political force - it is clear from the figures of

the General Elections of 1950 and 1951 that a good many of them, after voting for the Labour Party in 1945, again changed sides. Otherwise Labour would have lost fewer seats in the dormitory suburbs, especially in Greater London. The rise of the working classes has not been, as the whole, at the expense of the middle classes—it has been much more a social levelling-up than a levelling-down except for the really wealthy Six Years of Labour Government did not materially alter the social structure, except at the two extreme ends. In modern civilized countries, the class structure is exceedingly complex and that any classification regarding the notion of the 'middle class' is bound to be arbitrary and to be lacking in scientific precision. By going through this method, we can only arrive at a very rough estimate of the numbers of persons included in the groups and sections of groups which the particular investigator has decided to assign to the middle classes.

The second method, on the other hand does enable the investigator to give an answer which is not the result of
his personal assessment of what constitutes a member of the middle classes. It is the familiar method of question and answer. The investigator draws up a list of classes, which he cannot make more or less elaborate on the assumption that social classes can be designated as "upper", middle, and lower, or working", with more or fewer sub-divisions, such as 'Upper middle' and 'lower-middle', within the three main categories. In the British Institute of Public Opinions Poll, taken in 1948, no fewer than 47% of those asked assigned themselves to one or other sub-division of the middle classes, as against 46 per cent who assigned themselves to the working class and 2% who regarded themselves as belonging to the 'upper class' = 5% kept silent. In Canada in a similar Poll in 1948 no fewer than 65% claimed to belong to the middle classes = in the United States a Fortune Poll of 1940 recorded a "middle class" percentage of 790 while in a Gallup Poll of 1939 the 'middle-class' proportion rose to 88. In the American case, those who declared themselves to be being below Middle Class, confirmed themselves as not belonging to the "Working Class but to the 'Lower Class'. For some
purposes, the class to which people feel they belong may be a matter of considerable sociological importance; but it is not easy to tell how stable such feelings are, or how far the answer is correct and durable. The British Poll of 1948 gave those questions three choices within the middle classes — upper middle, middle and lower Middle — as against only a single category of working class, no distinction being made between skilled labourers and workers, or even between workers in regular employment and the groups at the very bottom of the social scale. These might present a more valid account of the true state of feeling about class, in all its confusions; but they would leave the investigator who is in search of objective measurements entirely unsatisfied. It is possible to ask people directly what they think is meant by 'class', and to analyze the answers so as to discover how far members of the same social groups tend to give the same definitions, or members of different groups different definitions. A great deal can be done to study the middle of classes by modern methods/field work and statistical analysis.
MIDDLE CLASSES

The very term 'middle classes' implies the notion of a society divided into classes, and at least suggests a main division into three - upper, middle and lower. By having a review of the West European and American societies we arrive at this particular conclusion that theirs are the highly diversified social structures.

Where there exists a recognized aristocracy, labelled by its possession of land or of merchantile wealth and of privileges attached to such possession, by way either of titles or of offices or of status in gildder municipal bodies, the main body of the upper class can be easily identified through there may be much disputes about its exact limits.

In the familier case of aristocracies based on landed property, there are usually a small number of great families extending outwards through the households of younger sons and the marriages of daughters outside the inner circle, so that the feelings of kinship to the great extends far beyond the reality.

of greatness. There may be considerable revalries and wide differences of culture between the members of these land-holding classes; but whenever they are faced with the rise of claims to social status and privileges resting not on land but on commercial or industrial wealth they tend to be thrown together on the basis of a common claim to be regarded as 'gentlefolk', and to develop a common standard of manners and, up to a point, education, in the hope of marking themselves off from their plebeian rivals.

Merchant aristocracies, which are a product of great trading centres, are usually much less closed than aristocracies based on land. They can, indeed, especially in city states, close their ranks to a considerable extent and establish great hereditary merchant dynasties almost as exclusive as the landed nobility can achieve. This possibility, however, is greatly restricted by the development of national, as against town or city economics, for even though the United States has its Morgans, Rockefellers and Vanderbilts, neither

of these can properly be described as constituting an "upper class" to the exclusion of everyone else.

Whereas the existing aristocracy depended for its upper-classness only in part on wealth or economic position and quite largely on heredity and family connections, the rising class of industrialists was differentiated at the outset almost exclusively by its economic position, as the driving and directing force in the new forms of business enterprise. Individuals here and there might set out to climb out of this class into the aristocracy; but in the main the new men wished, not to secure aristocrates, but to achieve political as well as economic influence for their own collective values. They fought against aristocratic privilege, as well as against claims from the mass of people which seemed to threaten the process of wealth accumulation by which they had risen to economic authority. The industrial capitalists thus came to form, on a national scale a conscious middle class, or at any rate the economic nucleus of such a class. Some of them wished to overthrow the classes above them, and to take their place. They were content for
the aristocrats who sided with them to do most of the
governing and to continue to regard themselves as the upper
class, provided that the government did not govern too much,
and protected their property against levellers from below
as well as against extortions in the interest of the old
aristocratic class.

This advancing middle-class group speedily produced
its effects on other parts of the social structure. With
its expanding consuming power and rising standards of living
it paved the way of market for consumers' goods and services.
It fell in need of superior shop-keepers and master craftsmen
to minister to its needs, and brought into existence a host
of shops which set out to do permanently a middle class trade.
The professions and the superior tradesmen, hitherto mainly
dependent on upper class customs came to provide more and
more for middle-class needs and became there with themselves
more and more 'middle-class'. But the new professions - civil
Engineers, rail way technicians, and dissenting ministers -
remained much less gentlemanly in social estimation, and much
more akin to the various grades of essentially middle-class
industrial employers.
LOW CLASS:

These later developments were still at an early stage when Marx formulated, in the 1840s, his theory of the historical evolution of the class struggle. In the Communist Manifesto, as well as elsewhere, Marx insisted that, whereas class struggles had existed in all historical ages, the essential characteristic of capitalism was to reduce to two only the classes between which the struggle for power would be finally fought out, with the propertyless proletariat, or working class, as the destined victor. At a time when, in the more advanced countries, the middle elements in society were in fact increasing more than ever before in both numbers and influence, Marx represented these elements as in process of being relentlessly crushed out by the advance of capitalism. Marx, thinking despite of his labour among British blue-books largely in German terms when ever his mind turned to the main body of the middle classes, regarded the petite bourgeoisie as a class in process of talics extintion because he thought of it as dependent as obsolescent techniques of small-scale
production.

MARXIAN VIEWS REGARDING THE CLASS IN SOCIETY:

In Marx's view, then, there were from the standpoint of the future, only two historically significant classes - capitalists or bourgeoisie, and proletariat. The leading section of the bourgeoisie, originally the leaders of the middle classes against the aristocracy, had developed in the advance capitalist countries into the true upper class. He did, however, think that what was left of the 'middle classes' - middle, that is, between the higher bourgeoisie and the working class - was made up of heterogeneous elements incapable of following an independent policy. The Marxian theory in effect involved a splitting of the middle class, at the point of its decisive victory over the old upper class, into contending factions representing the one a progressive and the other a reactionary relation to the powers of production.

Wherever Marxism won acceptance, the middle class ceased to be looted down upon as a coherent or creative social grow up,

and came to be thought of as merely as nuisance getting in the way of the real historical conflict between the developed grande bourgeoisie and the proletariat - a decaying class to liquidate which or any of its elements, was simply doing the work of history.

This notion of the middle classes seemed, in Great Britain, to be confirmed by the eclipse of the one great Liberal Party. In Western Europe, except in Great Britain and Scandinavia, the conflict between communism and social Democracy, by splitting the working class, has handed political power back to predominantly middle class groups whose autogonism to Socialism ranges them with the grande-bourgeoisie, but does not make them by any means entirely its servants.

The phrase 'middle class' is often used as if it were simply the equivalent of the French bourgeoisie or of the German and other equivalents of that essentially urban designation. But in truth 'middle class' and bourgeoisie are not only different words, but stand for essentially different ideas. Bourgeois, to any historically minded person, calls up at once the image of a body of citizens asserting their
collective, as well as their individual, independence of a social system dominated by feudal power based on land holding and on the services attached to it; whereas the words, middle class' call up the quite different image of a body of persons who are placed between two other bodies — or perhaps more than two — in some sort of stratified social order. The bourgeoisie is by his very name a claimant, not for himself above but for a group with which he identifies his claim, to social power and recognition. He is one who claims, in common with the rest of his group, to be allowed to manage his affairs as suits best the way of life for which his group stands.

The middle class conception is quite different from this. The bourgeoisie, as such, is not in the middle of anything — at any rate not consciously so we find it standing some what between an aristocracy based on land and privilege and an unprivileged mass which included the great majority of the people. But this is not, historically, a legitimate way of looking at the bourgeoisie as he emerges into the light of the individual record. It is illegitimate to do either of
these things, because the very term, middle-class' implies being in the middle of some unitary structure that can be at least loosely defined. But the bourgeoisie, in its earlier phases of development, was not in the middle of anything that can be defined as a unitary structure. It came to be in the middle only later on, when largely as the outcome of similar struggles in which it had played an ever-increasing part, cities ceased to be mainly enclaves in predominantly rural cities dominated by feudal institutions and came instead to be the predominant elements in societies in which industry, commerce, and the use of money and credit had become the main formative influences. Especially in capital cities and great centres of long distance trade and exchange, the bourgeois came to be an middle class standing between the governing class - the aristocracy on the one hand and the main body of citizens on the other, but this middle status still related mainly to their positions in the towns. Over a large part of Europe. Though there was developed an urban bourgeoisie, there never did come into existence any thing that can properly
be called a 'middle class', at any rate not on a scale great enough to set its mark on the general course of social and political development. Where the bourgeoisie did not spread into the country side, but remained an urban enclave in a feudal society either developing towards a peasant economy or still dominated by great land estates worked with serf, or quasi-serf, labour, there was no room for the evolution of a 'middle class' as a national scale, and none accordingly for the permeation of the whole society by the characteristically 'liberal' values which are associated chiefly with bourgeoisie development. This was the more so because in such societies the professional and intellectual classes developed largely as servants of the state, and thus became bureaucrats rather than 'liberals'. Since 'liberalism' could never strike real roots over a large part of Europe. That is why there are no foundations to-day over a large part of Europe for political or economic systems which comply with the requirements of 'democracy' as democracy is understood in the Western countries that have experienced capitalistic unification. That ineffect, is why there is an 'iron curtain' in Europe, and
why 'democracy' means so different things to Stalin and to Attlee or Churchill or Truman - clearly, membership of the middle class, or classes, is not simply a matter of income, either absolutely or of relative income within a particular social structure. Nor is it exclusively a matter of the nature and sources of the income received or of profession or calling. Nor again is it exclusively a matter of education, or of manners, for no definition based on these will avail to mark off one part of the middle classes from the upper class or another from the working class.

The intelligentsia, centred mainly on the upper professions, does not doubt form a recognizable and essentially middle class group; but its unity is much more of culture and manners rather than of economic interest or social and political attitude, and it forms only a fraction of the middle class, even on the narrowest definition. It has less in common culturally with most farmers, shop-keepers, or small employers than these have with the main body of skilled manual workers. What future lies before this ill-defined,
heterogeneous, 'middle class', that can be labelled as a class only because the groups that make it up can be identified neither with the aristocracy and grande bourgeoisie nor with the wage-EARNERS.

There is no doubt, an important difference in this respect between Great Britain and the United States, in that capitalism itself has been seriously challenged in the one country, but not in the other. In America, capitalism, though it has been forced to make industrial concessions to the claims of Labour and to the 'Welfare State' is still an advancing systems, carrying along with it a prosperous middle class income group into which more and more of the superior wage-earners have been able to climb. In Great Britain, on the other hand, capitalism, under pressure from the poorest sections of the population, has been forced to give ground by submitting to levels of taxation that have considerably reduced in equalities of spendable income, though not of political ownership. Nor has the suppression of capitalism by proletarian revolution crushed out the middle groups, even in the
Soviet Union. One is not allowed to speak of 'classes' as existing, save as survivals, in communist-dominated society; but no one denies the persistence of large differences of income and social prestige, or the existence of a marked tendency towards increasing differentiation, in the Stalinist epoch of Soviet development.

It is true that some groups usually ranked as 'middle class' have fared relatively ill—for example, civil servants, teachers, and local government officers, as well as small rentiers dependent on fixed money incomes. But there has been no sign of an impending erasure of the middle class as a whole, rather, a growth of some of its groups compensating for a decline of others, and resulting in a change in its composition and social stratification.

Some writers have gone so far as to claim that these tendencies are signs of the inevitable advent of what James Burnham has dubbed a 'managerial revolution' and proclaimed as a necessary product of the evolution of the 'powers of production', irrespective of differences of political regime.
James Burnham, in his much publicized book *The Managerial Revolution*, supported his argument by shifting at caprice from one definition of his terms to another, treating as 'the managers' now the great capitalist entrepreneurs and now the large body of technicians and managerial employees. Moreover, he resorted to a facile identification of this ill-defined 'class' in capitalist countries with the privileged 'managers' under the Soviet system, though such evidence as there is goes to show rather separateness than unity between the privileged income groups in the Soviet economic system and the governing party ELITE.

**CONCEPTION OF CLASS:**

After all, the conception of class, is historically, related very intimately to that of family status, not only for landed aristocracy but also for the social groups which base their claims on commerce or industry, or as monopoly, or near-monopoly of the 'gentlemanly' professions. Where the family loses its class character under the influence either of abundant economic opportunity or of an open educational system resting on public provision at the higher as well as
the lower levels 'middle class' tends to become merely descrip-

tive adjective. A 'middle class' may still be held to exist
under such conditions - that is really a matter of words -
but a bourgeoisie, in the sense, historically attaching to
the term, cannot.

The 'structural-functional concept (beyond its rigidity
of 'consistency' and 'here' and 'now' alone) in the analysis
of social structure, proved an important tool for various
social explanations. The former part dealt with the structural
aspect (positional arrangement with attached rights and duties
and latter with the thermal perspective, including all
functionary roles and objectives under holistic net work, the
description of various social and cultural elements could be
given in relation to one another as also the whole. As already
explained, in the area of social organization, kinship group-
ings like family, lineage and government for example, not only
have an organizational value but play definite roles in the
regulation of economic life, social control, marriage patterns

10. Social Structure & Systems, William M. Dobriner
P.No. 215. (California, 1969)
and sex relations. Historical perspective proves much helpful in providing more illuminating social explanations. Even R. Brown referred to the importance of historical enquiry, for a complete explanation of socio-cultural phenomena. It was only in the case of primitive societies that the historical information (which they referred to as pseudo-history) may not have proved useful to the structural functionalists where the clash among the family members or between the two classes is sudden, sharp and of a great magnitude, the possibility of conflict arises. The formation of nuclear families and the disintegration of joint families are very appropriate examples. A similar trend has emerged in the social purview of inter-family and inter-neighbour relations.

Kroeber, while discussing culture and environment, has pointed out that a group of basic factors (such as alternation in the environment, growth of population, changes in subsistence etc.) can have a deep influence on the fortunes of societies and may affect their culture materially. Marx and Engels' concept that 'the economic situation in the foundation of the
social order, does not hold true for the village community. It is not necessarily true that poverty, economic prosperity or changes in subsistence means have always influenced the norms of social control. Rather, laxity is the result of the altering nature of social relationships based on social groupings.

Primarily, social change is an outcome and product of "the establishment of change-orienting institutional net-work". This provided a solid, durable and almost persisting foundation to the concerned processes and elements of change. Even, the implementation of the aim of an institution was, many times, accelerated, directly or indirectly, by those of the others.

Certain elements of social behaviour in the context of inter-personal, inter-family and inter-neighbour relationship have undergone changes to meet the demand of new trends, forfeiting the values attached to it under the cover of traditional norm complex. An attitude to promote closer in-groups,

11. Social Structure & Social Change and Future Trends By R.S. Mann (New Delhi, 1979), P.No.135.
say of husband and wife, and parents and unmarried children is becoming stronger so much so that the consideration of certain other major kinship ties and links, are, at times, not considered very important. The channing economic and political traits and trends have resulted in the emergence of new patterns of social behaviours. Though conflicts may arise in the transitional stage, it can be reasonably expected that a new system will emerge which will be a synthesis of the old and the new to suit the changing patterns of societal norms.

As a consequence of new trends, the reaction of people to some of the traditional norms and practices has taken a new shape. As such, the community has been in gradual shifts from traditional oriented outlook to the progress-oriented one. This has been quite in consonance with the three of gradualism. As Bogardus (1954:119) has propounded:

"In the process of change, Gradualism' is natural; universal in nature. The free grows gradually adding only one narrow ring a year. A cluted grows gradually an inch or two a year."
In the present state of social formation, the three forms, namely traditional, transitory, saving devices, and so forth, have had as their direct objective to the increase in the quality and quantity of agriculture production. And beyond these, again there have gone changes in the relation of agriculture to industry, migrations from the farm to the city because of the lessened numbers required to supply the agriculture needs of the whole community, the decay or abandonment of marginal farm land, tendencies to agricultural depression, new struggles for foreign markets and new tariff barriers.

The behaviour of individuals where some choice was permitted change, the aspects where more rigidity was traditionally prescribed have remained unaltered. For instance, some villagers had their choice in the adoption of improved farm practices, and the change, of whatever degree, has been caused without any opposition from within the community, and similarly in the field of education. Force of social pressure, in these cases is strong enough to resist one of the deter-
ominants of an individual's social position, as explained in the traditional frame of social structure, has been the ownership of land. As already stated, the more the landholdings the higher would be the status of land ownership is considered good prospectus in the matter. That is why the connection with land is, except in rare cases, never altogether served. Most of those in service finally retire to come to the village.

It has been further observed that the authority, prestige and independent opinion of certain groups of people determine the acceptance or rejection of certain innovations. In this context, the anthropologists have singled out two classes of people. Barnett (1941) believes that the "marginal man", the deviant who is unsatisfied with traditional ways is most apt to be an innovator. The other promot view is that the 'prestige-laden individual is more effective as an agent of change.

In the context of social structure, under reference, it has been observed that when the accepted values, governing
social relations, acquire a new meaning change is motivated quickly. The traditional style of expressing respect in this community has been by making a gesture of having and touching the fleet of elderly persons. In a multi-caste village community, as the one under study, the sustenance and persistence of some forms of change can have a direct bearing on the socially stratified units. Change in less noticeable in the religious contents in comparison to other aspects of life. There is still greater dependence on the supernatural powers and their implications in certain walks of life social change has involved some forms of integration as well as disintegration in certain in ways of community life. Under the Jajmaani system the families from different castes depend upon each other and so maintained the symbiosis of the social and economic life. The duties and obligations, defined under this system, at time, extend even beyond the people of village and helped to promote a sense of cooperation and unity, and the families from different castes remain integrated.
There is unity in diversity, in spite of the social ranking, essentially on the basis of caste, the villagers are aware of their collective responsibilities, and act unitedly, when so demanded in the interest of the village community as a whole. To safeguard the community's interest, the people from different castes and groups pool their efforts and resources and many of them momentarily forget their rivalries and conflicts if any.

CLASS IN SOCIETY:

An important feature, hinting at inter- as well as inter-caste solidarity, is the system of reciprocity involved in gift exchange. Principles of such reciprocity are defined. The reciprocal gifts, as made on the occasion of both and marriage are not merely of economic nature, but are also connected to social and other spheres. These establish certain claims in respect of kinship and caste, obligations, family status, privileges of individuals and their title.

In any social system, most of the cultural practices or elements are functionally important. Their very creation is
meaningful, and progressive are to be found together. This
is particularly noticeable in respect of the caste-system
caste loyalty, kinship attachment, economic binding, religious
faith and personal outlook are certain other factors that
determine the extent to which a person can accept a change.
Literacy is minimum in the lower segment of castes and maxi-
mum in the higher ones. The nuclear family pattern is more
predominant among the lower than the higher castes. Mostly
the big land-owners have started using chemical fertilizers,
 improved seeds, pesticides and other better techniques in
 agriculture.

There being logical compatibility as well as incompatibi-
 lity in various culture elements, the change variation is
apparent. In case of the situation of incompatibility, the
innovations have faced more opposition. For instance,
educated men have switched on to western dress without
difficulty or opposition. But the same persons have not
incorporated Western ways in respect of their family, obliga-
tions and kinship usages. In certain fields, the thinking of
a person is so conditioned by traditional norms that even in the event of wishing to imbibe ways much thought has to be given to the matter before taking a final decision. The theory of 'culture lags', which maintains that one segment lags behind another, this holds true—Ogburn (1928-220) too, has reached a similar conclusion when he states that:

"forms of material culture, houses factories, machines, food stuffs change more rapidly than non-material things—beliefs, philosophies, laws, etc."

But at the same time, there has been an inter-dependence of factors underlying social change. Some change in relation to his fellows is observed when there is change in man's relation to his environment. In this connection Maclver (1957 = 512-13) has rightly emphasized that:

"The improvements in the breeds of cattle, in the use of fertilizers, in the varieties of seeds, in mechanical labour the same is realized by the majority of participants in the system. But in due course of time, and with changing conditions, few of the cultural
practices, once vitally important, can lose their vitality so much so that they persist without any meaning and relevance. Such practices are kept up by the people without understanding what they are meant for."

Change or continuity in attitude to certain elements of traditional social structure are found governed by the basic sanctions provided in the old as well as the new and alternative system. If the latter do not satisfy a man, he may, though reluctantly participation in the activity but his attitude remains are of support to the old system or practice was better than the new, though he reluctantly or under other conditions participates in the new ones.

There is a certain intimacy between a social structure and a protest group attempting to change it. The protest organization is derivative from this "parent" structure in so many ways that no such movement can be understood without constant reference to the social connections. In a way, the two structures are engaged in an elaborate dance with the motions of the one responding in subtle and other ways to that
of the other. Trade Unions are protest groups whose members are employed in the very business of the union is trying to change. The membership is individually and collectively subject to the power of the structure it is attacking.

The major works on social movements and social protest give only minimal and unsystematic attention to these connections. Each of the three major texts on collective behaviour deals with the "sources" of protest. Second, analyses are made of malfunctions in social system which cause discontent and protest to arise. Turner and Killian, for e.g., argue that collective behaviour of all kinds is triggered by unanticipated events, disruption of normal social relations or a clash in values within a society. In this kind of analysis, the movement is seen against the background of the social system from which it arose, and the researcher scrutinizes the social system for the precipitating malfunction which brought the movement into existence.

A stratification system is essentially the distribution of scarcities in a society. It is things both valuable and scarce that figure most importantly in the stratification system and in American society the emphasis has been as the achievement of these good things rather than the allocation by ascription into frozen and fixed strata.

Indeed, part of the basic ideology of American society is the formal admonition that "all men are born free and equal". But a system of stratification suggests the opposite — that all men are not born in the same and equal social circumstance. There is a characteristically cynical response to the naive assertion of universal freedom and equal, but some are born freer than others.

In the ordering of classes (men who share basically the same position in the allocative system) there is always the latent suggestion of privilege. All members of the family share the same class position and hence the family's class circumstances pass on to the children. This a rich, powerful, and prestigious family will pass on to the children. Wealth,
power, and honor. The reality of class and the latent ability of the family to "place" individuals favourably in the class structure is antithetical to the American belief in fundamental equality of everybody. Hence, there has been a predisposition to avoid public recognition of class differences and to avoid class terms.

Americans have no ready vocabulary to describe their class membership or the class structure of their society in general.

In Europe, awareness of class differences is far sharper and more sophisticated than in the United States. The psychological basis for the acceptance and recognition of social class differences in Europe had been established before the coming of the industrial age. The psychology of social class. The recognition and submission of an inferior social class to the dictates of a superior class - evolved from feudal times. As feudalism passed into industrialism, the caste system based

on relationship to land gave way to the rise of modern social classes based on production.

The United States never knew a feudal period or a significant landed aristocracy. As a consequence, Americans have never been sympathetic to an ideology based upon the principle of inherent privilege. The recurrent themes of "democracy", "liberty", "equality", and "free society" — the belief that a hard-working man might go as fast and as far as his abilities could take him — made the nations of European classes repugnant to the developing American tradition.

Out of the familiar, everyday conversations of Americans comes the tacit recognition of the patterning of class differences. Often the descriptions of the inequalities in the distribution of power or prestige and wealth are stated in symbolic or the most primitive conceptual devices.

Marxist's view regarding class is quite different from others. For Marx, human society is primarily organized around the basic needs — food, shelter, clothing. In the course of
the early history of mankind, according to Marx, a sort of parasitic, exploitative "class" arises which takes for itself the primary modes of production. This class uses and exploits, another class (nonowners) for its own greedy and acquisitive purposes. The state, in short, is simply the vehicle for the maintenance of class dominance and the prevailing economic order.

In the Marxist view, the key structure to the understanding of human history is class. Classes precipitate in the various historical levels (tribal, classical, feudal and capitalist) in terms of a critical relationship to the prevailing modes of production characteristic of each epoch - essentially ownership and non-ownership. The basis of the antagonism, Marx concluded, is the essential opposition of the "interest" of each polar class to the other. For example, in modern (capitalist) society, the working class, the proletariat, has class interests that are directly opposite to those

of the bourgeoisie. The capitalists, the owners of large scale industry and finance. According to Marx, the revolution of the working class was a historical necessity. It would be only through such a dramatic remaking of the institutions of society that the profit motive and class interests would be finally removed from human society. Class interest would have come to an end because (classes in the Marxist sense) would no longer exist.

Unlike Mark's single casual, monistic conception of stratification (economic determinism) Weber's view of the stratification system fused three variables - economic class, honorific status, and power.

The "class situation" for Webster consists of the "typical chance" for goods, living circumstances, personal life experiences, life chances, all shaped by the "market", the economic order. In his clear emphasis an economic determinants; Webster seems quite similar to Marx. But

whereveras Marx based his entire scheme of stratification as a single - variable approach, Webster’s system of stratification included two other critical conceptions.

"In contrast to the purely economically determined 'class situations' argues Weber, "We wish to designate as 'status situation' every typical component of the life of fate of men that is determined by a specific, positive or negative, social estimation of honour."


18. Ibid., p. 21.