Inter-personal relationships among individuals living in close spatial proximity exist in almost all kinds of human settlements. But the form and content of neighbourhood interaction may differ from one community to another with the variation in economic, ecological, cultural, demographic and physical characteristics. The interaction between an individual and the smaller groups in which he is born e.g. family, kin-groups and neighbourhood has a profound influence on his personality (Cooley, 1956).

The Concise Oxford Dictionary describes a neighbour as a "dweller next door regarded as one who should be friendly or as having claim on the others' friendliness, person near or next to another". This defines the neighbour as the person closest to us after our own immediate family, so much so, that at times, she or he takes precedence even over an uncle or aunt or distant relation. As such, he or she has some claims over our time, thought, affection and regards. The neighbourhood concept may also be defined both physically and socially. "Physically it refers to a part of a town or city made distinct by boundaries such as main roads, railways, rivers, canals, open spaces and having a certain similarity of housing type within the area. Socially a neighbourhood may be characterised by social similarities of the residents,
often especially by similarity of social class or ethnic group" (Dictionary of Sociology, 1979).

Neighbourhood are cells within larger settlements, growing naturally wherever people live close to one another. Neighbourhood means different things to different people. There is no consensus among scholars on how to define neighbourhood. A neighbourhood is a territory, a small area within a larger settlement. It contains dwellings occupied by people and usually community facilities and buildings with uses. The residents come into contact with one another and interact. They are neighbours on the basis of propinquity, that is, nearness regardless of any other social ties. Therefore, a neighbourhood is both a physical place and a social community. In sum, a neighbourhood is a limited territory within a larger urban area where people inhabit dwellings and interact socially. Neighbourhoods may differ from each other considerably as they clearly express multiple features—personal, social, physical, political and economic.

Any particular neighbourhood may be strong or weak in one or more attributes of community, but every neighbourhood is a community to some extent even if its shared values deviate from the dominant norm of the wider society. The relative strength of community is likely to be reinforced if the neighbourhood is occupied by people with similar ethnic,
racial or social class background. This is a major reason that most neighbourhoods house people with similar characteristics. This tendency accounts for ethnic concentration in particular neighbourhoods. Without reflecting much on the ethnic composition of a neighbourhood, they end up more likely in neighbourhoods with their own kind (Greeley, 1977). Through a combination of coercion and choice, some racial and ethnic groups concentrate in particular neighbourhoods. Exclusionary practices and many common features and factors have contributed to concentration of ethnic groups in certain neighbourhoods: persons with roots in Mediterranean and East European nations, Hispanics, people from different Asiatic lands and the Middle East, French, Canadians, native Americans etc. Poverty and limited economic opportunities especially during the initial period of immigration have restricted their housing choices, and social attitudes of others have kept them out of certain neighbourhoods. The need and desire to be together and the practice of the first immigrants attracting and helping later immigrants to settle near them, have led to the development of ethnic institutions and distinct sub-cultures based in particular neighbourhoods. Jews originally coming from a variety of nations have similarly coalesced because of discriminatory exclusion from some residential area (Hallman, 1984).
An attempt has been made in this chapter to find out the physical as well as social neighbourhood that existed between the locals and Namdharis. Before identifying the actual physical neighbourhood, we asked the respondents to indicate their preferences regarding the type of locality in which they would like to live. It is interesting to note that approximately 45 per cent of the local respondents would like to have the locals only as their neighbours.

The significant percentage of locals (45 per cent) had not only indicated their preferences for the neighbours of their own community but a majority of them had even preferred construction in the local dominated areas. A majority of the host respondents who indicated their preferences for local neighbours was less educated, younger in age and engaged in low prestige occupations. So far as the Namdhari respondents were concerned, they preferred to live in localities where both Namdharis and locals were living together. However, with regard to actual physical neighbourhood, it was found that a significant percentage of Namdharis (58.03 percent) was putting up in localities numerically dominated by the Namdhari population e.g. Ramnagar and Palace colony. A majority of the Namdharis who was living in areas numerically dominated by the locals, was surrounded by their own community members. There was a third category of a few
Namdhari families who were living in those localities which were not only numerically dominated by the locals but also had only locals as their physical neighbours. Without reflecting at their conscious and subconscious reasons, a large majority of Namdharis was in fact residentially segregated from the locals and mainly concentrated in the Ramnagar and Palace Colony. The tabulation of the data with reference to socio-economic background does not reveal any specific pattern. Localities, which were numerically dominated by Namdharis, had mix population of Namdharis. So far as their social status was concerned similarly in localities which were numerically dominated by locals we found Namdharis having higher education, high income but engaged in occupation of low prestige and were mostly from lower castes. Ramnagar and Palace colony where Namdharis are numerically dominating, were the areas in which they first settled and these were the localities where evacuee property has allocated to them. Others who could not found suitable place in these localities opted for localities dominated by locals. Geographical layout of Mandi township is such where expansion of city is very much restricted, hence pattern of resettlement found in other towns is not applicable to Mandi township.
After having described the physical layout, let us probe the social interaction the respondents have with their neighbours.

Activities people carry out in their role as neighbours can be called neighbouring. Neighbouring is a socially defined relationship ranging from highly formalized and institutionalized roles and obligations to highly variable voluntary exchanges. Neighbouring involves exchanges of services, information and personal approval among those living near one another. Keller (1968) defined neighbouring in terms of material and moral support. People with similarities tend to build closer neighbourhood relationships and this becomes particularly noticeable where the neighbourhood is also an ethnic or minority racial community. However, heterogeneity does not preclude neighbourliness.

The activities of the neighbours also include the needs prompting the exchanges e.g. the daily unexpected occurrence that is unforeseen yet recurrent such as running out of bread or needing to post a letter, an emergency such as a fire, illness or death, significant collective event during economic depressions and during job layoffs, material and spiritual aid exchange etc. Acquaintance with neighbours may range from scant to full, and our reliance upon the neighbourhood for goods and services may vary from little to
great. Neighbourhood ethos itself is a major influence because of the demands and expectations it creates such as the circumstances and conditions of mutual aid and whether residents are expected to be outgoing or restrained in their neighbouring.

The Namdhari and local respondents were asked whether they had approached each other in case of an emergency. It was found that in contrast to 36.70 per cent locals, 91.96 per cent Namdhari respondents approached the neighbours of the other community if an emergent need arose. Irrespective of their ethnic affinity, the respondents who had lower class background were more open in approaching the neighbours of other community. At the caste level, Namdhari of lower castes were more open in approaching the local neighbours at the time of emergency. Further Namdhari living in localities where locals have over representation approach the local neighbours more in contrast to those Namdhari who were living in such localities where Namdhari had over representation.

To counter check Namdhari's responses, the local respondents were also asked to indicate whether they were approached by the members of the other community at the time of emergency. The data thus collected revealed that 33.02 per cent locals and 91.02 per cent Namdharis respondents admitted
that they had been approached by the neighbours of other community. It was found that approaching the neighbours of other community and seeking help were mainly on reciprocal basis.

Keeping in view the earlier contention of the respondents, the locals and Namdharis, it was expected that a large percentage of the local respondents would endorse the statement of the Namdharis that in case of emergency they sought help from the locals. However, low percentage of the responses from the locals should not be construed as not endorsing Namdharis' contention. It may be mentioned here that the local respondents were only a sample of the local population. The locals from whom the Namdharis sought help might have not been included in the sample. The situation might have been different if we had counter-checked with only those local residents to whom Namdharis had approached for help. This issue has already been described in Chapter II.

The tabulation of the data supported the former analysis that the respondents with lower class background were more likely to approach the neighbours of other community. At the caste variable it was again the lower caste Namdharis who admitted greater interaction with the local neighbours at the time of emergency. Further Namdharis living in numerically local dominated neighbourhood admitted
having greater interaction with the local neighbours.

"Besides similarity of socio-economic status, the proximity of living is also important in the development of friendship and visiting each other's homes" (D. Souza, 1968). To find out the quality of interaction between the two groups of respondents, they were asked to indicate regarding their visits to each other's home. It is encouraging to note that a significant majority of the Namdharis and locals 97.32 per cent and 67.89 per cent respectively had been visiting each other's houses. However, in comparison to locals, Namdharis were more frequently visiting the houses of locals. The background of the respondents who had been visiting the houses of the other community was probed. It was found that both Namdharis and local respondents who had higher educational qualifications, were engaged in occupations of higher prestige, belonged to higher income group and were younger in age freely visited each other's houses. At the caste level it was noted that in contrast to lower caste Namdharis, Namdharis of higher castes were more open in visiting local houses. On the other hand among locals, Khatris and Brahmans were more liberal in visiting Namdhar houses. Further Namdharis living in localities where locals had over representation visited the locals more in comparison to those who were living in such localities where Namdharis
had over representation.

In order to have greater insight into the empirical reality, Namdharis and local respondents were asked to indicate whether they had been visited by members of the other community.

The data thus collected revealed that a majority of the Namdharis and locals (98.21 per cent & 68.81 per cent, respectively) admitted that they had been visited by the members of the other community at their homes. When background of such respondents was compared with those who had not been visited by the members of the other community, it was found that among Namdharis higher castes had been visited by the locals more in contrast to the lower castes. So far as the locals were concerned, Rajputs had not been visited by the Namdharis so frequently. At the class variable, the tabulation of the data supported the former analysis that respondents with higher class background and those who were younger in age had been visited more by the members of the other community. Further, numerically local dominated neighbourhood also played a positive role in such visits.

As social beings, each of us has personal relationships with others. Depending upon our mobility and
our personality, the number we relate to these personal relationships might range from a few to hundreds. They might include relatives, neighbours, friends, co-workers, fellow students and persons with whom we share particular interests. We meet people because of their functional role as shopkeepers, clerks, customers, teachers, clergy, politicians, recreation leaders and many more. We develop a more personal relationship with some of them.

The degree of closeness between the individuals can be gauged if we look at the way they share food with each other. Such a contention is more applicable in the Indian society which is marked by the concepts of purity and pollution. People of the same caste, religion and social class are more likely to share food/eatables with others than those who maintain social distance.

In response to the question, 'do you exchange eatables with your neighbours, all the local respondents and approximately 69 per cent of the Namdhari respondents gave the reply in the affirmative. They were further asked to indicate the occasions on which they exchanged eatables with their neighbours. It was noted that locals exchanged eatables on special occasions only whereas Namdharis exchanged eatables frequently irrespective of the special occasions.

To what extent Namdharis are being treated at par with
the locals or are they being accepted as equals? We asked the respondents whether they exchange eatables with the members of other community or not.

It was found that a significant majority of Namdharis (71.43 per cent) exchanged eatables with locals along with the members of their own community. However, a majority (82.4 per cent) of the local respondents was found to be exchanging eatables with locals only.

It was further probed to find out the background of the people who exchanged eatables with the members of other community vis-a-vis those who restricted themselves to their own community. The tabulation of the data revealed that Namdhari respondents who had higher educational qualifications, engaged in the occupations of higher prestige and who belonged to higher income group and younger in age were more open in exchanging eatables with the members of other community. At the caste level, it was noted that Namdharis of higher castes (Brahmins and Khatris) were more open in contrast to lower castes (Sunyaras, Ramgarhias and Chembas) in exchanging eatables with the locals.

Further, Namdharis living in those localities where locals had over representation were more liberal in exchanging eatables with the local residents of the town. So
far as the locals were concerned, respondents with lower class background and younger in age were more liberal in exchanging eatables with Namdharis. Among the locals it was the members of Rajput caste who had not developed such contacts and had reservations in exchanging eatables with Namdharis. However, in comparison to other castes, Guptas were more open in exchanging eatables with Namdharis because of their business contacts.

Individuals are linked to their society primarily through relations with other individuals: with kins, friends, co-workers, fellow club members and so on. We are each the centre of a web of social bonds that radiates outward to the people whom we know intimately, those whom we know well, those whom we know casually and to the wider society beyond. These are our personal social networks. Society affects us largely through tugs on the strands of our networks shaping our attitudes, providing opportunities, making demands on us and so forth. And it is by tugging at those same strands that we make our individual impacts on society— influencing other people's opinions, obtaining favours etc. The close friendships also tend to develop out of associations with those who are already in one's social network of personal relationship. In sum, to understand the individual in society, we need to understand the fine mesh of social
relations between the person and society; that is, we must understand social networks.

After family, kinsmen and neighbours, friends form the primary group network of relations. Most friendships are born in relationships or situations in which individuals interact with each other daily. Friendship is nurtured and supported by commoness with regard to likes and dislikes, exchange of money, goods, services and emotional support. After family and kinsmen, friends constitute a second line of defence. As and when we are in need of help and co-operation, we tend to look to those from whom we expect this. This way we develop some degree of reliance and confidence in each other.

To find out the social network of relationship between Namdharis and the locals, Namdhabi respondents were specifically asked to name three of their best friends. For

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namdharis</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh (Refugees)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu (Refugees)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tabulation of the responses, the background of the person who was named first was considered. Approximately 36 per cent of the Namdhari respondents had friends from the host population whereas 30.36 per cent maintained that their best friends belonged to their own community. It is strange to note that a good proportion of Namdhari respondents (25.89 per cent) was not able to identify any person either from their own community or from the host community who came up to their definition of best friend and it was for this reason that they had not responded to the question. It is interesting to note that most of these respondents are of older age group, engaged in the occupations of lower prestige, having low educational qualifications and are living in localities numerically dominated by the host community.

To identify Namdhari respondents with positive responses we analysed the socio-economic background of the respondents. It was noted that Namdharis who belonged to higher castes, were highly educated and were in the higher income range had best friends from the host community. In contrast, Namdharis who were less educated, had low income, were of low castes and were residing in localities numerically dominated by the Namdharis had best friends from their own community. In short, caste and class variables
played significant role in cultivating friendship across the community lines.

Instead of qualifying the word friend as 'best friend', we asked both Namdhari and the local respondents whether they had any friend from the other community. In comparison to only 48.62 per cent locals, 93.95 per cent Namdhari contended that they had friends from the other community. A high percentage of the local respondents (51.28 per cent) who did not identify Namdhari in their friendship circle is attributed to the fact that the locals have a large number of other local friends. The reason being their large population. These respondents were older in age and less educated. Namdhari on the other hand being numerically a small group interact both with their own people as well as local community and hence gave a more encouraging response. The Namdhari and local respondents who had identified members of the other community as their friends were having higher educational qualifications and were younger in age.

The more friends an individual has the self esteem he has for himself. The respondents were further asked to indicate the number of their friends from other community. In comparison to only 18.87 per cent locals, 88.57 per cent Namdhari maintained that they had more than five friends from the other community. The high percentage of Namdhari...
having friends from the other community may be attributed to the fact that Namdharis generally being businessmen have greater interaction with the locals, therefore, Namdharis felt that they had more friends from the locals. The tabulation of the data further revealed that respondents with higher class background had a larger number of friends from the other community. At the caste level it was noted that Namdharis of higher castes had more friends from the host population in contrast to those of lower castes. For the locals no clear cut pattern emerged.

To find out the frequency of interaction as well as the place of meeting between the friends of both the communities, the respondents were asked a few questions. How often they meet their friends of the other community? Where do they meet? We asked these questions keeping in view the size of the township. At Mandi, there is one main market where normally most of the people spend their evenings as well as go for shopping. This provides an opportunity for people to interact with each other. It was noted that only a few friends of each other's community met daily and a majority of them met occasionally. It was further discovered that market was the main place of meeting between the friends of both the communities. It was encouraging to note that approximately one third of the respondents meet each other at
their residences implying that their friendship is also known and accepted by their family members.

The network of friendships across the community lines can be further explored if we look at the extent to which they seek help from each other. As has been stated earlier, individuals seek help from friends when their family and kinsmen fail to provide such assistance i.e. friendship acts as a second line of defence. An individual turns to friends in emergency for aid, comfort or support. He gives and takes in the name of friendship. Let's now look at the type of exchanges that take place between friends of the communities under study. To find out the nature of informal help between Namdharis and the locals, the respondents were asked to indicate, whether they rendered help to their friends of the other community. Approximately 40 per cent of the locals and 50 per cent of Namdharis admitted that on a number of occasions they had helped their friends from the other community. It is important to highlight here that local respondents who rendered such help to Namdharis belonged to the higher social class and older age-group. Further, Rajputs among locals were in majority among the respondents who helped their Namdharis friends. On the other hand when the background of Namdharis who helped the local friends was explored, it was noted that they belonged to lower middle
class and younger age-group. In contrast to lower caste Namdharis, a higher percentage of higher caste Namdharis helped their local friends. Further, Namdhari respondents living in areas numerically dominated by the locals had a higher representation among those who extended help to their local friends in contrast to Namdharis living in areas numerically dominated by the Namdharis.

To probe further the interpersonal network of relationships, Namdharis and local respondents were asked to indicate whether they had received help from the friends of other community. The data revealed that in comparison to approximately 25 per cent locals, 54 per cent Namdhari respondents admitted that they had been helped by their friends from the other community. When background of such respondents was explored, it was found that those who were helped by their Namdhari friends were mostly younger in age and belonged to a higher class. Among locals it was the over representation of Guptas who had received help from their Namdhari friends. A majority of the lower class Namdharis older in age, was helped by their local friends. At caste level, among Namdharis who received help from the local friends, higher caste Namdharis had over representation.

The above analysis helps us to conclude that both among Namdharis and locals, respondents who helped their
friends from the other community and also received help on reciprocal basis indicated the development of strong friendship between the members of both the communities. It is however evident that such reciprocal relations are emerging at the individual level rather than at the inter-community level. The reciprocal exchange of services and help include domestic, medical, financial, administrative, political, social and business matters and in emergency e.g. accident, fire, illness, death etc. As a testimony of their strong friendship ties, some of the locals helped their Namdhari friends during communal riots of October, 1984. A few locals unmindful of the reactions of the other locals came forward to save the life and property of their Namdhari friends during communal frenzy, loot and destruction.

Taking into account the above discussion, it can be concluded that inspite of willingness on the part of both the communities to live in mixed localities, a majority of the Namdhari and local population found to be residentially segregated from each other. We also noticed that Namdhari and local respondents were interacting with each other on different fronts and carrying out various neighbouring, inter-personal and friendly activities. Factors such as higher class and caste of the respondents, younger age and physical neighbourhood play an important role in facilitating greater interaction and the process of assimilation.