

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews relevant literatures, which analyzed class from various view points. It is further categorized into four sections. The first section deals with different criteria used by various scholars to analyze class. For instance, income, occupation, status, power and lifestyle are considered as the main criteria for analyzing class. A group of scholars who have attempted to analyze class had given more importance to some criteria, whereas other criteria are considered complementary in the analysis of class. This section deals with various studies focusing on different criteria in class analysis.

The second section of the present chapter deals with certain earlier works which discussed class from various theoretical frameworks. Most of the studies on class analysis make use of various theoretical models to analyze class. For instance, scholars working on class commonly follow either Marxian or Weberian model as a basic framework to analyze class. This section of the present chapter categorizes various studies in terms of the theoretical frame work they depend on.

The third section of this chapter deals with various studies discussing class-caste nexus. As already mentioned, caste is an inextricable factor in the social life of Indians. It also influences their work life. Scholars have different views on caste as discussed in the chapter on Introduction. However, this section analyzes various studies extensively dealing with caste-class interrelations. The fourth section reviews various studies on labour unions. It presents different views on the activities of trade unions and its role in promoting class among the workers.

Section I

Economy is an important criterion to analyze class. Most of the studies on class consider economy as a major criterion in analyzing class. Some studies claims that class is mainly an economic phenomenon. For instance, while analyzing class Pijil (1979)¹, Kluegel and Eliot (1986)², Ruccio et.al (1991)³, Marshall and Swift (1993)⁴, Akerlof and Kran (2000)⁵, Rose and Pevalin (2003)⁶, and Lippit (2005)⁷ consider it as an economic phenomenon. Thus, their main focus has been the material aspect of class.

On the other hand, a group of scholars argue that property and social status play a major role in acquiring economy. Though they also consider economy as the major criterion for class analysis, they stress the importance of considering property and status as complementary to each other in the production of economy. For instance, Wegren, et.al.(2006)⁸ in their study on the development of rural class structure in Russia, articulates the importance of property and social status in the economic production activity. Especially, most of the studies on rural class structure consider property and social status as the major determinants of economic position. Hence, they consider

¹ KeesVander Pijil, **Class Formation at the International level** in *Capital & Class*, Autumn,1979,pp.1-21.

² James Kluegel and R. Smith Eliot, **Beliefs about inequality** (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1986)

³ David Ruccio, et.al, **Class beyond Nation State** in *Capital & Class*, No.43, 1991, pp.25-41.

⁴ G.Marshall and A.Swift, **Social Class and Social Justice** in *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 44, No.2,1993, pp. 187-211.

⁵ George Akerlof and Rachel Kran, **Economics and Identity** in *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol.115, No.3, 2000, pp.715-754.

⁶ D.Rose and D. Pevalin, **A Researchers Guide to the National Statistics, Socio-economic Classification** (London: Sage Publishers, 2003)

⁷ D.Victor Lippit, **Who Appropriates the Surplus** in *Rethinking Marxism*, Vol.17, No.4, 2005, pp. 514-545

⁸ Wegren et.al., **Beyond Stratification: The Emerging Class Structure in Rural Russia** in *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol.6, No.3, 2006, pp.372-399.

economy in terms of property and status as the major criterion to analyze class. Studies by Nisbet (1959)⁹, and Hira Singh (2002)¹⁰ are also in this line.

Dahrendorf (1959)¹¹ analyses class more or less based on the Weberian model of authority. For him, social conflicts would arise among the groups which differ with respect to authority they enjoy over others. He considers authority as a kind of power attached to social position. His analysis of class based on power has been discussed in the first chapter. Andre Beteille (1965)¹² has also considers that class and power are closely interwoven. At the same time, he is of the opinion that caste, class and power can be treated separately in order to understand their relative importance in the process of change. Especially, he is of the view that class and power can be treated only by a process of abstraction.

Reeve and Lynn (1987)¹³, Hout, et.al. (1993)¹⁴, Anthuas (2001)¹⁵, Brewer (2002)¹⁶, and Charusheela (2005)¹⁷ also substantiate the importance of power in one way

⁹ Nisbet, **The decline and fall of Social Class** in *Pacific sociological Review*, Vol.2, 1959, pp.11-17.

¹⁰ Hira Singh, **Caste, Class and Peasant Agency in Subaltern Studies Discourse: Revisionist Histeriography, Elite Ideology** in *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol.30, No.1, 2002, pp.91-134.

¹¹ Ralph Dahrendorf, **Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society** (London: Routledge and kegan Paul, 1959)

¹² Andre Beteille, **Caste, Class and Power: Changing Patterns of Stratification in a Tanjore Village** (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1965)

¹³ Vanneman Reeve and Weber Cannon Lynn, **The American Perception of Classes** (Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1987)

¹⁴ Hout et.al., **The Persistence of Class in Post-industrial Societies** in *International Sociology*, Vol.17, No.3, 1993, pp.367-390.

¹⁵ Floya Anthuas, **The Material and Symbolic in Theorizing Social stratification: Issues of Gender, Ethnicity and Class** in *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol.52, No.3 2001, pp.367-390.

¹⁶ M.Rose Brewer, et.al., **The Complexities and Potential of Theorizing Gender, Caste, Race and Class** in *Feminist Economics*, Vol.8, No.2, 2002, pp.3-18.

¹⁷ S. Charusheela, **Class Analysis and Politics: Pushing the Boundaries** in *Rethinking Marxism*, Vol.17, No.1, 2005, pp.19-27.

or another to acquire economy. In such away, they treat power as also an important criterion to determine class.

On the other hand, sociological discussions on class either explicitly or implicitly view classes as essentially aggregations of occupational categories. Scholars in this line hold a view that operationally classes can be identified as groups of people having particular occupation. In other words, to them, occupation is an important criterion stratifying the people in terms of classes. For instance, Colbjornsen, et.al. (1987)¹⁸ say that the importance of class for identity and inequality is often overshadowed by other dividers in the populations. Occupation seems to be more important than classes for social identification. The occupation attains a prominent place in the analysis of class structure, especially in the industrial societies.

In support of the definition of class in terms of occupation, Erikson and Goldthrope (1992)¹⁹ define their class schema in the following way “...the aim of the schema is to differentiate positions within labour markets and production unions in terms of the employment relations that they entail” The notion of occupational relations is represented by them in the first instance by the distinction between employers, the self-employed and the employees. The organizing principle of the Goldthrope’s schema is the nature of the employment relationship, the key feature of which is the way in which work is exchanged for rewards. It is in the later stages developed into multi-stage occupational divisions as discussed in the Introduction Chapter.

¹⁸ T.Colbjornsen, et.al.,*The Decline of Class Society* (Bergen/Oslo:Norwegian University Press,1987), p.71

¹⁹ R.Erikson and G.H. Goldthrope, *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), pp.37-42.

Geoffrey and Colin Mills (1999)²⁰, (2000)²¹ in their study substantiate that the class schema of Erickson and Goldthrope is worth to analyze class in the industrial society in terms of occupation. They again reaffirm it during 2000 about the validity of Goldthrope's class schema. Singh (1971)²², Karunanithi (1991)²³ Savage (1991)²⁴, and Ishida (2001)²⁵ also considered occupation as a criterion in their analyses of class.

Wright (1982)²⁶ is of the opinion that class cannot be viewed simply as clusters of occupations. But, he also believes, in his own words "if a fine enough set of distinctions were introduced, class could be empirically treated as an aggregation of occupations. It is undoubtedly true that the association of class and occupation would be improved using more refined occupational categories". However, he used occupation as a major criterion to study the class position of people in his analysis of the American class structure.

Peter Armstrong (1983)²⁷ also uses occupation as a major criterion in his analysis of class relationship. His case-studies on the relationships between supervisors and workers in a medium-sized shoe factory reveal that the position of supervisors is

²⁰ Evans Geoffrey and Colin Mills, **Are there Classes in Post-communist Societies? A New Approach to Identify Class Structure** in *Sociology*, Vol.33, No.1, 1999, pp.23-46.

²¹ Evans Geoffrey and Colin Mills, **In Search of Wage Labour/Service Contract: New Evidence on the Validity of the Goldthrope Class Schema** in *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol.51, No.4, 2000, pp.641-661.

²² Jaspal Singh, **Trade Union Leaders: A Study in Class Background and Social Mobility** in *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, Vol.2, 1971, pp.63-68.

²³ G.Karunanithi, **Caste and Class in Industrial Organization** (New Delhi: commonwealth Publishers, 1991)

²⁴ M.Savage, **Making Sense of Middle Class Politics: A Secondary Analysis of the 1987 British General Election Survey** in *Sociological Review*, Vol.39, No.1, 1991, pp.26-54.

²⁵ Ishida Hiroshi, **Industrialization Class Structure and Social Mobility in Postwar Japan** in *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol.52, No.4, 2001, pp.579-604.

²⁶ Erik Olin Wright et.al., **The American Class Structure** in *American Sociological Review*, Vol.47, No.6, 1982, pp.715-726.

²⁷ Peter Armstrong, **Class Relations at the Point of Production : A Case Study** in *Sociology*, Vol.17, No.3, 1983, pp.339-358.

ambiguous. However, he also considers the occupational differences are the major criterion to ascertain the class categories. This has been elaborately discussed in the VI chapter on Interacting Situations.

A substantial body of research has found evidence that the opportunities and constraints of individual life courses is in one way or another determine class as it provides or restricts the chance of income, status, power and the life style. Moreover, these differences in life chances and opportunities further widen the gap between classes. Thus the life chances and difference in opportunity are also viewed as factors facilitating class differences in the mass public. However, they are not considered as a criterion to determine class. Breen (1997)²⁸ and Mayer (1997)²⁹ are also of the same view in this regard. At the same time, Svallfors (2004)³⁰, Sounders (1990)³¹ and Sorensen (1991)³² consider standard of life as a major criterion to determine the social class of people.

On the other hand, some other studies by Kiuranov (1982)³³, Robinson (1983)³⁴, Platt (1971)³⁵, John (1980)³⁶, and Devine (1998)³⁷ regard the aggregate of economy,

²⁸ R. Breen, **Risk, Recommodification and Stratification** in *Sociology* Vol.31, No.3, 1997, pp.473-89.

²⁹ K.U. Mayer, **Notes on Comparative political Economy of Life Courses** in *Comparative Social Research*, vol.16, 1997, pp.203-226.

³⁰ Svallfors, **Class, Attitudes and Welfare State: Sweden in Comparative Perspective** in *Social Policy & Administration*, Vol.38, No.2, 2004, pp.119-138.

³¹ P. Sounders, *Social Class and Stratification* (London: Routledge, 1990)

³² A.Sorensen, **On the Usefulness of class analysis in Research on Social Mobility and Socio-economic Inequality** in *Acta Sociologica*, Vol.34, No.1, 1991, pp.71-87.

³³ Chardar Kiuranov, **Social Classes and Social Stratification** in *International Journal of Sociology*, Vol.12, No.3, 1982, pp.5-28.

³⁴ V. Robert Robinson, **Explaining Perceptions of Class and racial Inequality in England and the United States of America** in *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol.34, No.3, 1983, pp.344-366.

³⁵ Jennifer Platt, **Variations in Answers to Different Questions on Perceptions of Class** in *Sociological Review*, Vol.19, No.3, 1971, pp.409-429.

³⁶ John child, et. al., **Class Perceptions and Social Identifications of Industrial Supervisors** in *Sociology*, Vol.14, 1980, pp.363-399.

occupational status, and power as the interrelated complex criteria to determine class. They consider class as the aggregate result of the different positions in economy, occupational status, and power. As mentioned earlier, Beteille (1965)³⁸ also used these as main criteria in his analysis of class in a Tanjore village in Tamil Nadu.

Section II

The following part of the present chapter reviews the work of various scholars in terms of theoretical framework they used to analyze class. As discussed in the previous chapter, Karl Marx and Max Weber are the most prominent theorists who have conceptualized class from different view points. Most of the scholars who have attempted to analyze class have followed either the theoretical framework of Marx or Weber.

For instance, Wright, et.al. (1982)³⁹ followed the Marxian framework in their analysis of class structure in America. He is of the view that the class structure of the advanced capitalist societies in the world can be analyzed within the Marxian framework. Ranadive (1979)⁴⁰, Jordan (1996)⁴¹, and Akerlof and Rachel (2000)⁴² have also followed the Marxian framework in their analysis with the same idea in this regard.

³⁷ Fiona Devine, **Class analysis and the Stability of Class relations** in *Sociology*, Vol.32, No.1, 1998, pp.23-42.

³⁸ Andre Beteille, op.cit.

³⁹ Erik Olin Wright, et.al., **The American Class Structure**, op.cit.

⁴⁰ B.T.Ranadive, **Caste, Class and Property Relations** in *Economics and Political weekly*, Vol.14, No.788, 1979, pp.65-68.

⁴¹ B.Jordan, **A Theory of poverty and Exclusion** (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996)

⁴² George Akerlof and Rachel Kran, **Economics and identity**, op.cit., pp.715-754.

John Gubbay (1997)⁴³ is of the opinion that defenders and critics of the Weberian project of class analysis have denied the validity and utility of the Marxist conception of class. He argues that the aims and structure of Marxist class analysis are quite different from those of Weberian class analysis. K.L. Sharma (1994)⁴⁴ prefers to maintain that both Marxian and Weberian concepts and theories are worth and relevant to analyze class in the Indian context. T.B. Bottomore (1966)⁴⁵, Santos (1970)⁴⁶, Hout, et.al. (1993)⁴⁷ and Kevin Smith (1993)⁴⁸ have also followed the Marxian conception of class in their analysis of class.

In India, Marxian sociologists like D.P. Mukerji (1958)⁴⁹ and A.R. Desai (1981)⁵⁰ were the most prominent scholars who have given importance to the Marxian conception in their analysis of class among the rural population. The studies of Rajendra Pandey (1984)⁵¹ and Gough (1980)⁵² have also attempted to study Indian society from the Marxian frame work of class.

⁴³ John Gubbay, **A Marxist Critique of Weberian Class Analysis** in *Sociology*, Vol.31, No.1, 1997, pp.73-89.

⁴⁴ K.L.Sharma, **Social Stratification and Mobility** (New Delhi: Rawat Publications, 1994)

⁴⁵ T.B.Bottomore, **Classes in Modern society** (London: Allen and Unwin, 1966)

⁴⁶ Theotonio Santos, **The Concept of Social Classes** in *Science and Society*, Vol.34, 1970, pp.166-195.

⁴⁷ Hout, et.al., **The Persistence of Classes in Post-Industrial Societies**, op.cit.

⁴⁸ Kelvin Smith, **Class Structure and Intergenerational Mobility from a Marxian Perspective** in *Sociological Quarterly*, Vol.22, 1993, pp.385-401.

⁴⁹ D.P.Mukerji, **Diversities** (Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1958)

⁵⁰ A.R.Desai, **Relevance of Marxist approach to the Study of Indian Society** in *Sociological Bulletin*, Vol.30, No.1, 1981, pp.1-20.

⁵¹ Rajendra Pandey, **Karl Marx's Theory of Class and Contemporary Marxist Conceptualization** in *The Journal of Sociological Studies*, Vol.3, 1984, pp.127-141.

⁵² Kathleen Gough, **Modes of Production in Southern India** in *Economics and Political Weekly*, Vol.11, 1980,

On the other hand, some scholars refute the Marxian conception of class to analyze class in the present social structure. For instance Pijil (1979)⁵³, Breen and Rottman (1995)⁵⁴ in one way or another refute the Marxian conception of class. Especially, Wright Mills (1972)⁵⁵ argue that the decline in the number of those engaged in farms and industrial production makes a rise in other kinds of occupations, corresponding to the increasing complexity and sophistication of the economy, jobs in trade, and service in professional, technical, managerial, sales and clerical fields. He is of the view that Marxian conception does not include these new occupational categories.

Malcolm Waters (1991)⁵⁶, Geoffrey (1993)⁵⁷, Cannadine (1998)⁵⁸ and Prandy (2002)⁵⁹ have followed Weberian conception of class in their studies. In India, Beteille (1965)⁶⁰, D'Souza (1967)⁶¹ Aggarwal (1971)⁶² and Anil Bhatt (1975)⁶³ have also followed the Weberian conception in their analysis of class in Indian society.

⁵³ Kees Vander Pijil, **Class Formation at the International level**, op.cit.

⁵⁴ Richard Breen and David Rottman, **Class analysis and Class Theory** in *Sociology*, Vol.29, No.3,1995,pp.453-473

⁵⁵ C.Wright Mills, **The New Middle Class**, Paul Blumberg, *The Impact of Social Class*, ed. (New York: Thomas y Crowell Company, 1972)

⁵⁶ Malcolm Waters, **Collapse and Convergence in Class Theory: The Return of the Social in the Analysis of Stratification Arrangements** in *Theory and Society*, Vol.20, 1991, pp.141-172.

⁵⁷ Evans Geoffrey, **The Decline of Class Divisions in Britain? Class and Ideological Preferences in the 1960s and 1980s** in *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol.44, 1993, pp.449-471.

⁵⁸ D. Cannadine, **Classes in Britain** (New Haven: Yale University press, 1998)

⁵⁹ Kenneth Prandy, **Ideal types, Stereotypes and Classes** in *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol.53, No.4, 2002, pp.583-601

⁶⁰ Andre Beteille, **Caste, Class and Power**, op.cit.

⁶¹ Victor S D'souza, **Caste and Class: A Reinterpretation** in *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, Vol.2,1967, pp.16-29.

⁶² P.C.Aggarwal, **Caste, Religion and Power** (New Delhi: Sri Ram Centre for Industrial Relations, 1971)

⁶³ Anil Bhatt, **Caste, Class and Politics** (Delhi: Manohar,1975)

Section III

This section presents the review of various literatures on caste-class relationship. The concepts of class and caste and the relationship between them have already been discussed in the first chapter.

Furnivall (1909)⁶⁴, Hulton (1946)⁶⁵ and Sherring (1974)⁶⁶ observe that the caste system is functional for Indian society. According to Senart (1930)⁶⁷, Blunt (1931)⁶⁸ and Bailey (1963)⁶⁹, caste system claims common origin and is dividing the population into a number of self-contained and completely segregated units. They stress the importance of traditional occupation in the formation of caste. They regard traditional occupation as an essential feature of this system.

⁶⁴ J.C.Furnivall, *India: A Study of Plural Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909)

⁶⁵ J.H.Hulton, *Caste in India* (Oxford: Oxford university Press, 1946)

⁶⁶ M.A.Sherring, *Hindu Caste and Tribes* (Delhi: Cosmo Publications, 1974)

⁶⁷ Emile Senart, *Caste in India: Facts and the System*, trans. S.Denison Ross (London: Methuen, 1930)

⁶⁸ E.A.H. Blunt, *The Caste System of Northern India* (London: Oxford University Press, 1931)

⁶⁹ F.G.Bailey, **Closed Social Stratification in India** in *European Journal of Sociology*, Vol.4, No.1.1963, pp.36-41.

On the other hand, Beteille (1965)⁷⁰, Srinivas (1966)⁷¹, Ghurye (1969)⁷², Risley (1969)⁷³ and Hutton (1983)⁷⁴ stress the importance of endogamy, hierarchy and heredity for the maintenance of caste system. Caste system is linked with the concept of purity-pollution and ritual status by the scholars like Hocart (1950)⁷⁵, Dube (1956)⁷⁶, Mayer (1960)⁷⁷, Srinivas (1966)⁷⁸ and Dumont (1970)⁷⁹.

However, the system of caste has been linked and discussed with the system of class largely after the Weberian conception of class. Weber (1977)⁸⁰ is considered one among the pioneers who have attempted to form an all-inclusive system of stratification. His conception of status group more or less resembles caste groups. After his attempt, a large number of scholars began to analyze the link and interrelationship between caste and class. It has already been discussed in the introduction chapter.

G. Karunanithi (1991)⁸¹ has also conceived the caste-class relationship from Weberian view point. He writes “stratification involves the unequal distribution of rights and privileges among the people. The rights and privileges determine their status. As a result, inequality - high or low, superior or inferior -comes into existence. The different

⁷⁰ Andre Beteille, *Caste, Class and Power*, op.cit.

⁷¹ M.N. Srinivas, *Social Change in Modern India* (Bombay: Allied, 1966)

⁷² G.S. Ghurye, *Caste and Race in India*, 5th ed. (Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1969)

⁷³ H.H. Risley, *The People of India*, ed. (Delhi:Orient Books, 1969)

⁷⁴ J.H. Hutton, *Caste in India*, 4th ed. (Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1983)

⁷⁵ A.M.Hocart, *Caste* (London: Mathew & Co, 1950)

⁷⁶ S.C. Dube, **Cultural Factors in Rural Development** in *The Journal of Asian studies*, Vol.16,1956, pp,19-30.

⁷⁷ C. Adrin Mayer, *Caste and Kinship in Central India* (Berkeley, university of California Press, 1960)

⁷⁸ M.N. Srinivas, *Social Change in Modern India* (Bombay: Allied Publishers, 1966)

⁷⁹ Louis Dumont, *Homo Hierarchicus* (Lonon: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970)

⁸⁰ Max Weber, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Trans. and ed. H.H. Girth and C.W.Mills (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977)

⁸¹ G.Karunanithi, op.cit.

groups of society are thus linked with one another by the relationship of superiority and subordination. Thus, caste ranks the status of people and forms a hierarchy which becomes a social scale to place an individual or a group”.

According to Dumont (1970)⁸², caste and class are separate entities. Caste is based on the ideology of opposition between pure and impure derived from Hindu religious values, whereas class stems from the opposition of superior and inferior determined by economy and power. Thus for him caste in terms of hierarchy and class in terms of economy and power are independent of each other.

Beteille (1991)⁸³, (1992)⁸⁴ argues that the relevance of caste was decreasing among the upper and middle classes in Indian cities, particularly among professionals, civil servants and managers. For him, they disassociated themselves from the caste occupation of their forefathers. Moreover, they departed from the lifestyle associated with their caste. Thus he is of the view that the significance of caste was diminishing in a number of social fields. Singh (1968)⁸⁵ (1974)⁸⁶ made a distinction between those who treat caste as a cultural phenomenon and those who define it as a structural phenomenon. For him, caste is a structural reality and he views that it would disappear when society in

⁸² Louis Dumont, *Homo Hierarchicus*, op.cit.

⁸³ Andre Beteille, *Society and Politics in India: Essays in Comparative Perspective* (London: The Athlone Press, 1991)

⁸⁴ Andre Beteille, **Caste and Family in Representations of Indian Society** in *Anthropology Today*, Vol.8, No.1, pp.13-18.

⁸⁵ Yogendra Singh, **Some Aspects of Continuity and Change** in *Sociological Bulletin*, Vol.17, No.2, 1968, pp.134-146.

⁸⁶ Yogendra Singh, *Sociology of Social Stratification in a Survey of Research in Sociology and Social Anthropology* (Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1974)

India evolves to a higher level of industrialization. Davis and Moore (1945)⁸⁷, Desai (1966)⁸⁸, Berreman (1967)⁸⁹ and Borber (1968)⁹⁰ have the same view in this regard.

On the other hand, some other scholars like Mukherjee (1957)⁹¹, Bose (1967)⁹², Harriss (1982)⁹³, Omvelt (1982)⁹⁴ and G.Karunanithi (1992)⁹⁵ is of the view that caste forms an ideal type of stratification system and as such it could exist forever, either alone or in co-existence with other forms of stratifications in societies. They refer to the mix of caste and class in certain occasions.

K.L. Sharma (1994)⁹⁶ rejects the view that caste and class are polar opposites. According to him, caste and class have been inseparable parts of Indians social formation. At the same time, he is of the view that caste is a very complex system and if it gets weekend in one aspect, it also gets strengthened in other forms with certain alterations, additions and accretions. Thus he also rejects the view that the process of social change will facilitate the transformation of caste into class. Further he explain that since caste incorporates class and class incorporates caste, neither 'caste view' nor 'class view' alone would explain the totality of Indians social reality.

⁸⁷ Kingsley Davis and Wilbert Moore, **Some Principles of Stratification** in *American Sociological Review*, April 1, 1945, pp.9-16.

⁸⁸ A.R.Desai, *Rural sociology in India*, ed. (Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1966)

⁸⁹ G.D. Berreman, *Stratification, Pluralism and Interaction: A comparative Analysis of Caste* in Anthony de Reuck and Julie Knight, ed. *Caste and Race* (London, 1967).

⁹⁰ Bernard Borber, *Social mobility in Hindu India* in James Silverberg, ed., *Social Mobility in Caste System in India* (The Hague: Mountain Publishers, 1968)

⁹¹ Ramakrishna Mukherjee, *The Dynamics of Rural Society* (Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1957)

⁹² N.K.Bose, *Culture and Society in India* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1967)

⁹³ John Harriss, *Capitalism and Peasant Farming* (Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1982)

⁹⁴ Gail Omvelt, ed. *Land, Caste and Politics in Indian States* (Delhi: University of Delhi, 1982)

⁹⁵ G.Karunanithi, *op.cit.*

⁹⁶ K.L.Sharma, *Social Stratification and Mobility*, *op.cit.*

Panikkar (1955)⁹⁷, Gough (1960)⁹⁸ and Stein (1968)⁹⁹ are of the same view of K.L. Sharma in this regard. On the contrary, Misra (1964)¹⁰⁰, Davis (1965)¹⁰¹, Berreman (1970)¹⁰² and Miller (1975)¹⁰³ have analyzed this phenomenon and found that the system of caste would transform to the system of class in the course of time. Moreover, they are of the view that caste is being replaced by class.

Beteille (1965)¹⁰⁴ studies the relationship among caste, class and power in a Tanjore village in Tamil Nadu. But, he treats each system separately. In this line, recently, Bhattacharyya (2003)¹⁰⁵ in his study in a village in Burdwan, finds that caste, class and power are complementary to each other. He also finds a striking association between caste and class. For instance, those who occupy higher caste in the village have more land holding and economically sound to occupy higher class.

Thus, the scholars have different views regarding the caste-class nexus. As mentioned, group of scholars considered caste and class are polar opposites and the emergence of class would replace caste. On the other hand, another set of scholars consider caste is an age old phenomenon and is entwined with the social life of people.

⁹⁷ K.M. Panikkar, *Hindu Society at the Crossroads* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1955)

⁹⁸ E. Kathleen Gough, *Caste in a Tanjore Village* in E.R. Leach, ed., *Aspects of Caste in South India, Ceylone and North-west Pakistan* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1960)

⁹⁹ B. Stein, *Social Mobility and Medieval South Indian sects* in J. Silverberg, ed., *op.cit.*

¹⁰⁰ B.B. Misra, *The Indian Middle Classes* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964)

¹⁰¹ Kingsley Davis, *Human Society* (New York: Macmillan, 1965)

¹⁰² D. Gerald Berreman, *Caste and other Inequalities: Essays in Inequality* (Meerut: Folklore Institute, 1970)

¹⁰³ D.B. Miller, *From Hierarchy to Stratification: Changing Patterns of Social Inequality in a North Indian Village* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1975)

¹⁰⁴ Andre Beteille, *Caste, Class and Power*, *op.cit.*

¹⁰⁵ Sukanta Bhattacharyya, *Caste, Class and Politics in West Bengal: Case Study of a Village in Burdwan* in *Economics and Political Weekly*, Vol.38, No.3, 2003, pp.242-246

Therefore, it can not be eliminated. But, it may co-exist with class in one form or another.

Section IV

This section reviews various works on labour unions. Especially it presents various views on workers' involvement in labour unions and effectiveness of labour unions. It also presents views on role of labour unions in promoting class consciousness among the workers.

N.R Sheth (1976)¹⁰⁶ (2001)¹⁰⁷ is of the view that unions are answer to feudal mindset and governance in a society ruled by mass production, complex organization of workplace, economic corporatism and rationalistic models of freedom, equality, social justice and democracy. He upholds the role of unions in protecting the worker's rights, ensuring social justice, leadership in raising workers' consciousness of interests in changing situations and raising the economic opportunity of workers.

Singh and Mahanty (2001)¹⁰⁸ come out with certain steps to be adhered by the unions to be effective in workers' welfare. For instance they insist that the unions should have clear vision, network of communication and organizing skills to be effective in this regard.

¹⁰⁶ N.R. Sheth, *Trade Unions in Social Reality in Industrial Relations in India*, ed. E.A Ramaswamy (Delhi: Macmillan, 1976) pp.64-68.

¹⁰⁷ N.R. Sheth, *Trade Unions in Word and Deed in Indian Journal of Industrial Relations in India*, Vol. 37, No.2, 2001, pp.280-284.

¹⁰⁸ Harbajan Singh and Niroop Mahanty, *The Role of Trade Unions in Bringing about Performance Oriented Culture in Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.37, No. 1, 2001, pp.154-159.

Mukerjee (1948)¹⁰⁹, Vaid (1965)¹¹⁰, Mahadevan (2001)¹¹¹ and Mital (2001)¹¹² have also justified the above views in their studies and have positive attitude towards the role of labour unions and their effectiveness in promoting workers' welfare.

Nair (2002)¹¹³ is of the view that trade unions in India have to develop new strategies on a broad perspective so that they might be able to meet the emerging challenges of globalization and liberalization. Gallie (1978)¹¹⁴ and Retnam (2001)¹¹⁵ are also of the view that unions should update their strategy to meet the advancement in technology and organization of work due to globalization.

Studies by Arya (1982)¹¹⁶, Ramaswamy (1983)¹¹⁷, Singh (1970)¹¹⁸, Bhatt (1975)¹¹⁹ and G.Karunanithi (1992)¹²⁰ find that economic and security motives are the important pulling factors motivating the workers to join unions. On the other hand, Dayal and Sharma (1976)¹²¹ and Mehrotra (1978)¹²² find that poor leadership, inter-union

¹⁰⁹ Radhakamal Mukerjee, *The Indian Working Class*, 2nd ed. (Bombay: Hind Kitabs Publishers, 1948)

¹¹⁰ K.N. Vaid, **Why Workers Join in Unions** in *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.1, 1965, pp.208-230.

¹¹¹ H. Mahadevan, **The Role of Trade Unions** in *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.37, No.1, 2001, pp.160-175.

¹¹² R.A Mittal, **Role of Trade Unions: Some Random Thoughts** in *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.37, No.1, 2001, pp.176-180.

¹¹³ V.Rajendran Nair, **Labour Relations in the Era of Globalization** in *ISDA Journal*, Vol.12, No.4 & 13,2003, pp.401-414.

¹¹⁴ Duncan Gallie, *In Search of New Working Class* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978)

¹¹⁵ C.S. Venkata Retnam, *Globalization and Labour Management Relations: Dynamics of Change* (New Delhi:Response Books, 2001)

¹¹⁶ P.P. Arya, *Labour Management Relations in Public Sector Undertakings* (New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications, 1982)

¹¹⁷ Uma Ramaswamy, *Work union and Community* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983)

¹¹⁸ V.B. Singh, *Labour Research in India* (Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1970)

¹¹⁹ Bhal J Bhatt, **The Changing Characteristics of the Indian Industrial Workforce** in *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.11, 1975, pp.143-160.

¹²⁰ G.Karunanithi, *op.cit.*

¹²¹ Ishwar Dayal and Baldev R. Sharma, *Management of Trade Unions* (New Delhi: Sri Ram Centre for Industrial Relations and Human Resources, 1976)

¹²² S.N. Mehrotra, *Labour Problems in India* (New Delhi: S. Chand and Co. 1981)

rivalry and fear of victimization are the major reasons for the lack of workers' participation in unions.

Political affiliation of the union is seen as a positive factor for its growth. For instance, Borgrate (1970)¹²³ in his study of Indian ports finds that political affiliation had contributed to the growth and development of trade unions. Crouch (1966)¹²⁴, Raman (1967)¹²⁵ and Ray (1985)¹²⁶ also substantiate this view that political affiliation contributed to the growth and development of unions in India. Ashraf (1974)¹²⁷, Aziz (1974)¹²⁸, Chatterji (1980)¹²⁹ and Dhal and Srivastava (2002)¹³⁰ hold the view that unions look for political power for better bargaining power with the management.

On the other hand, studies by Stagner (1956)¹³¹, N.R.Sheth (1969)¹³², Arya (1980)¹³³, Magenau et. al. (1988)¹³⁴ and Johnson et. al (1999)¹³⁵ find that the commitment of workers to their unions and the unions' effectiveness in promoting the workers'

¹²³ M.V.D. Borgrate, Trade Unionism in Indian Ports (New Delhi: Sri Ram Centre for Industrial Relations, 1970)

¹²⁴ Harold Crouch, Trade Unions and Politics in India (Bombay: Menaktalas, 1966)

¹²⁵ N. Pattabhi Raman, Political Involvement of India's Trade Unions: A Case study of the Anatomy of the Political Labour Movement in Asia (New York, 1967)

¹²⁶ R.K. Ray, Industrialization in India: Growth and Conflict in the Private Corporate Sector (Delhi: 1985)

¹²⁷ M.S.Ashraf, **Political Affiliation of Industrial Workers-An Area Study** in *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.10, No.2, 1974, pp. 126-134.

¹²⁸ A. Azis, **Aspects of Trade Unionism in Karnataka** in *The Economics Times* (Daily), Nov.5,1974.

¹²⁹ R.Chatterji, Unions, Politics and the State- A Study of Indian Labour Politics (New Delhi: South Asia Publishing, 1980)

¹³⁰ Manoranjan Dhal and Kailash B.L. Srivastava, **Trade Unionism: Perceptions and Attitude of Workers, Managers and Leaders** in *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.38, No.2, 2002, pp.177-191.

¹³¹ R.Stagner, Psychology of Industrial Conflict (New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1956)

¹³² N.R. Sheth, **Workers' Participation in Trade Union Activity** in *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.4, 1969 . pp.279-297. '

¹³³ Prakash Arya, **Workers' Involvement in Trade Unions** in *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol.23, 1980, pp.115-131.

¹³⁴ J.M. Magenau et.al., **Dual and Unilateral Commitment among Stewards and Rank-and-File Union Members** in *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.31, 1988, pp.359-76.

¹³⁵ W.R. Johnson et.al., **Moderators of the Relationship Between Company and Union Commitment: A Meta-Analysis** in *The Journal of Psychology*, Vol.133, No.1, 1999, pp.85-103.

welfare is positively related. Gordon et. al. (1980)¹³⁶ and Sinha (1983)¹³⁷ stresses the importance of workers' commitment in union activities for the successful conduct of union activities.

Trade unions are most often linked with class in the way that unions enhance group identity, class consciousness and awareness among the workers. Moreover, unions are regarded as a prerequisite for organizing workers for class action. Caplan (1979)¹³⁸ in his study among the voluntary associations find that it reinforces the class consciousness among its members and distinguish classes from one another.

Mukherjee (1970)¹³⁹ and Owen Nandy (1975)¹⁴⁰ also substantiate that the unions/associations have a tendency of grouping workers in class line and thereby facilitating class orientation among them.

Gallie (1978)¹⁴¹ in his analysis on the role of French and British trade unions finds that French unions saw their role as one of mobilizing the work force for a far reaching structural transformation (including class-wise) of society, whereas the British unions saw their role as one representing the work force. He also applauds the tendency

¹³⁶ M.E. Gordon, et.al. **Commitment to the Union: Development of a Measure and an Examination of its Correlates** in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.65, 1980, pp.479-99.

¹³⁷ Ramesh P.Sinha, **Workers' Participation in Unions and Participation Correlates** in *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.19, No.1, 1983, pp.45-56.

¹³⁸ Patricia Caplan, **Women's Organizations in Madras City, India** in Patricia Caplan and Janet M. Bujra, ed. *Women United, Women Divided* (Bloomington: Indian University Press, 1979), pp.99-128.

¹³⁹ S.N. Mukherjee, **Class, Caste and Politics in Calcutta** in E. Leach and S.N. Mukherjee, *Elites in South Asia*, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970) pp.33-78.

¹⁴⁰ L.Raymond Owen and Ashis Nandy, **Organizational Growth and Organizational Participation: Voluntary Associations in a West Bengal City** in *Contribution to Indian Sociology*, Vol.9, No.1, 1975, pp.19-53.

¹⁴¹ Duncan Gallie, *In search of New Working Class* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978)

of trade unions in facilitating class consciousness among the workers. Gallie (1983)¹⁴² further finds that the French workers are more critical of class inequality. He sees that the French unions provide chances to the workers to make themselves aware of the exploitative character of capitalist relations of production through their everyday experiences in factory. Moreover, he also finds that the polarization between left and right is greater in France and the greater class radicalism of the French workers is primarily due to the attitudes of those who identify with the parties of the left.

G. Karunanithi (1992)¹⁴³ in his study on the textile mill workers finds that unions play a pivotal role in organizing workers in class line. Like Gallie, he also sees that the communist unions are class radical rather than the non-communist unions because the former have strong ideological background as compared to the latter. E.D. Murphy (1977)¹⁴⁴ analyzes the efforts of Madras Labour Union in creating class consciousness during the 1920s. Reddy (2002)¹⁴⁵ in his historical analysis find that union play a major role in creating working class consciousness among the workers in the 1930s.

¹⁴² Duncan Gallie, *Social Inequality and Class Radicalism in France and Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983)

¹⁴³ G.Karunanithi, op.cit.

¹⁴⁴ E.D. Murphy, **Class and Community in India** in *The Indian Economics and Social History Review*, Vol.14, No. 3, 1977, pp.291-321.

¹⁴⁵ K. Venugopal Reddy, *Class Colonialism and Nationalism* (New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 2002)

Studies by Mukerjee (1948)¹⁴⁶, Karnik (1960)¹⁴⁷, Vaid (1962)¹⁴⁸, Fonseca (1964)¹⁴⁹, E.A Ramaswamy (1977)¹⁵⁰ and Sinha (1983)¹⁵¹ finds that union participation would in a way stimulate the workers' participation in class action such as participation in strikes, agitations and the like. The present study also considers that the labour union is an important aspect promoting class interest among the workers. Chapter VII on unions elaborately discusses it.

The present study is different and unique in many ways. For instance, scholars like Cahn (1961)¹⁵² and Merton (1972)¹⁵³ regard that the barriers and humiliating distinctions of social classes will evaporates in the course of time. The era of abundance, which began in the early 1940s made them to believe that prosperity would eliminate or greatly reduce class differences. They believe that everyone could enjoy good things of life. The depth and tenacity of this mentality created conditions conducive to the growth of the myth of classlessness. Howe (1948)¹⁵⁴ and Hodges (1964)¹⁵⁵ regard that class differences are destined to disappear under the modernization of life styles. They find that there has been a decline in the attachment of the workers in their collective ends and so also in their enthusiasm for action as a class in order to establish a new social order.

¹⁴⁶ Radhakamal Mukerjee, *The Indian Working Class*, 2nd ed. (Bombay: Hindkitabs Publishers, 1948)

¹⁴⁷ V.B. Karnik, *Indian Trade Unions- A Survey* (Bombay: Allied Publishers Ltd.,1960)

¹⁴⁸ K.N. Vaid, *Growth and Practice of Trade Unionism- An Area Study* (Delhi: Delhi School of Social Work,1962)

¹⁴⁹ A.J. Fonseca, *Wage Determination and Organized Labour in India* (Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1964)

¹⁵⁰ E.A. Ramaswamy, *Worker and His Union* (Delhi: Allied Publishers, 1977)

¹⁵¹ Ramesh P.Sinha, op.cit.

¹⁵² Edmond Chan, *The Predicament of Democratic Man* as quoted in Rajendra Pandey, *Social Inequality Features, Forms and Functions* (Lucknow: Anuj Publications, Lucknow, 1982).

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Irving Howe, *Notes on Mass Culture in Politics*, Vol.5, Spring, 1948, pp.67-73.

¹⁵⁵ M.Horold Hodges, *Social Stratification: Class in America* (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1964).

On the contrary, the present study attempts to study the importance of class factor in the modern industrial workforce. Moreover, unlike some other studies, it has not restricted its analysis of class in industry to a particular theoretical framework. As mentioned in the first chapter on Introduction, the study has applied various theories to analyze class during various situations in the mills. Moreover, only a limited number of studies have so far been done comparing the emergence of class in rural and urban industrial setting. This study has attempted to analyze how the rural and urban background of the mills would facilitate or restrict the emergence of class. It has also ventured to analyze how the different types of ownership would influence the emergence of class among the industrial workers. The present study is thus unique and different from many other earlier works on class.