CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION
The existence of ethnic differences and cultural groups within societies is widespread and since times immemorial occur at most levels of culture ranging from the Bushmen of Kalahari, who live within the framework of Tswana society to modern Europe and America.

Ethnic groups in the near East were recorded by Herodotus almost 2,500 years ago and remained a Persistent feature of Byzantine, the Ottoman, and other near Eastern empires. Similar Situation occurred in ancient India and in Chinese civilization at all stages of its expansion. Thus it is obvious that plural societies existed in the past as well but a systematic examination of the sociological consequences of the phenomenon did not begin before the eighteenth century and then it was principally in connection with the concepts of race and race relation as developed in the following century. Gobinean (1850–1855) and Chamberlain (1899), linguistic Scholars like Sir William Jones, the Grimm brothers and Max Muller not only examined the evolution and development of Indo-European languages but also inadvertently encouraged the Growth and elevation of the ideas of race as an ideology and as the most significant index distinguishing culturally different groups from one another.

Earlier historians had noted that ethnic Groups might be found in a society as a result of the gradual migration of either whole population or of segments, such as religious refugees, traders, craftsmen or manual labourers. They also observed that military conquest might bring in its train soldiers and civilians, who either settled permanently in the area or administered their conquest for a period of years before retiring and being replaced from the homeland, or again ethnic Groups might be incorporated into a society by altered political
boundaries. Sometimes a combination of processes was at work, however, a multi-racial or multi-cultural ethnic system came into existence, the type of society in which ethnic Group could be found varied as widely as the processes that brought them into being.³

Ethnic group is an amalgam of multiple identities, however, the hierarchical ranking of these identities may change with situational and relational contexts. At a given time a certain cultural marker may gain Pre-eminence with the other cultural criteria operating either in a subordinate or muted manner in the identity assertion of an ethnic group. In another situation, the ranking of the objective attribute may be different. The change in the Pre-eminence of cultural diacritics from “Muslim Bengalis” to “Bengali Muslims” during 1947-71 in the case of the people of Bangladesh, illustrates this aptly. In this respect migration, conquest, conversion, perceptions and policies of the dominant group, the processes of partition, division, and reunification of a political community as well as the imperatives and dynamics of modernization have serious implication for ethnic group identities, boundaries and relationships.⁴

Distinct ethnic groups could only come into existence as a result of the separation of mankind into isolated population, between which there was little or no interbreeding over fairly long period of time. This separation may have been brought about in various ways, but probably the chief cause was the formation of great barriers of frozen wasteland during a glacial period long ago. And once separated into isolated groups, our species begin the process of differentiation into recognizably different groups⁵.
Now today a major threat to the nation State has surfaced from a wholly unexpected quarter of ethnic aspirations, given shape by shared ethnic idealism. It was Walker Connor who alarmed the existing potential danger to the State integration in the form of ethnic diversity by drawing instances from the developed and the developing States, both in the West and in the East. This prompted the Scholars, to pursue their studies on the problem of ethnicity. To explain the gravity of the problem Greeley estimated that twenty million people had given their lives in the ethnic conflict after the 2nd World war and it was reported that nearly half of the world’s states have experienced the ethnic unrest.

In 1986, West Germany reluctantly moved to close its doors to refugees from Srilanka, and other nations. Chancellor Helmut Kohl is taking this step proclaimed, ‘we are not a nation of immigration. And we do not want to become one’.

Hitler sought to carry out the “final solution” to what he called the “Jewish Question” through the complete extermination of all the Jews in Europe. Jews were herded into cattle cars, transported to concentration camps, and systematically gassed.

Bosnia has witnessed the barbaric form of ethnic cleansing of Muslims lasted from 1991 to 1995 and claimed an estimated 100,000 lives. Thousands of muslims were massacred by croates, serbs and thousands of women mass raped. Excavation of mass graves portray the brutality of war.
Chechanya is another such example where Chechens are oppressed and killed. In the words of major general Alexander Mikhailov a spokesman for the federal security service, "the rebels had suffered terrible losses. We are not counting them in terms of corpses, we are counting them in terms of legs". This speaks the brutality in ethnic wars.  

Afghanistan is woven in the conflict between Tajik, Uzbek, Turkmans, Pashtun, Hazara, Durainic Quandherics, who in the game of dominance try to eliminate one another. They are just following the Darwin's theory of survival of the fittest. Thousands of Rwanda Hutu refugees are facing starvation, deadly diseases and vicious attacks from Zairian Tutsis. Somalia which is ragged in antagonism of different clans depicts the outcome of ethnic tensions. In 1993 loss of lives in Somalia peace keeping and the fact that the body of American Soldier was dragged through the streets by angry mob are very much alive in the people's memory.

The concept and efforts of creating a global village by modern techniques of communication, cyber-space etc, and the economic liberalization is looking to sharpen the consciousness of kind (ethnicity) on the universe, rather than to dwindle it.

Thirty two years ago, researchers of cultural change generally assumed that direct and continuous contact between groups of different cultures would lead to decrease in the differences among them. The groups involved in the ethnics or the respective 'bearers' of these cultures would gradually disappear as
organisational forms. This quite reasonable scholarly notion also carried ideological appeal. Karl Marx predicted the extinction of ethnic groups, asking, why should one continue to belong to archaic cultural grouping when one could become a "worker"? Many American social scientists cherished the "liberal expectancy" that antagonism would disappear by the mutual leveling of the cultures. Indeed, tribal communities in the IIIrd world have been dismantled and much cultural diversity has been erased by modern institutions. The army, religious missions, public administration, Urbanization, mass media and schools all work in the same direction.13

In the last 20 years, however, another trend has emerged on the world level, indicating that matters are somewhat more complex. The process of acculturation, diffusion, etc. will continue to cause many cultural differences to fade away, but new cultural differences will be introduced, sometimes in deliberate manner. The present world scenario presents that ethnic groups are affirming themselves more and more. They promote their own, new cultural identity, even as their old identity is eroded.14

Barth in his book "Ethnic Groups and Boundaries" states that distinction should be made between, on the one hand, the ethnic organisation of a group and the ethnic identification of individuals (I am Flemish) and on the other hand the so called objective, perceivable, investigatable culture by which the ethnic group was conceptually defined up until the late 1960's. In the former concept the ethnic group was composed of people with a common culture and descent, the ethnic group consisted of the bearers of this culture. The terms 'culture' and 'ethnic group' were often used interchangeably. Barth
pointed out that an ethnic group is first of all, a form of social organisation in which the participants themselves make use of certain cultural traits from their past, a past which may or may not be verifiable historically. Cultural traits that are postulated as external emblems (clothing, language etc) or even as fundamental values (e.g. faithfulness in friendship) can thus be taken from one’s own tradition or from other people’s or simply may be created.

The cultural traits by which an ethnic group defines itself never comprise the totality of the observable culture but are only a combination of some characteristic that the actors ascribe to themselves and consider relevant. The traits can be replaced by others in the course of time. For the vindication of the ethnic group, it is sufficient that a social border be drawn between itself and a similar group by means of few cultural emblems and values that make it different in its own eyes and in the eyes of others. Barth points out that the intensity with which a group profiles itself as an ethnic group and with which individuals stress their ethnicity, generally increases when there is intense spatial-geographical and social contacts between groups. The most isolated traditional group of people is probably the least ethnically self defined. There is a more chance that the Indian in Germany who always have to speak Germany will become more consciously Indian than their ethnic brothers and sisters in the India.

The present study is an attempt to explore the inter as well as intra ethnic relations in Ladakh- a part of Jammu and Kashmir State. The region inhabits seven important ethnic groups who are coming out from the Cocoon of traditionalism to the modernism. The study is based on the hypothesis that modernisation sharpens ethnic stratification (Eisentadt) and the intense spatial geographical and social contacts between the groups increases ethnic conscious
ness (Barth) and is contrary to the Apter’s melting pot concept.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Society is viewed in different ways by Sociologists and Anthropologists. Some see it as a stable and ongoing entity, and others describe it as composed of many groups in conflict, competing for scarce resources. The main theories regarding Race and ethnicity are functional, conflict and the new emerging labeling theory. Brief explanation is as under:-

1. FUNCTIONALIST PERSPECTIVE:

Functionalist generally assumed that there are certain basic needs or functional pre-requisites which must be met if society has to survive. They saw how for it meets these functional pre-requisites. Functionalist maintained that a certain degree of order and stability is essential for the operation of social system.

Functionalist view society just like a living organism in which each part contributes to its survival. According to this approach, if an aspect of social life does not contribute to society’s stability or survival- if it does not serve some identifiably useful function -it will not be passed on from one generation to next. For Emile Durkheim as long as people are differentiated by assigning them different roles, the society will function smoothly.

Reasonably speaking the bigotry between races or ethnic groups offers no such positive function but still then it persists. The functionalists, although agreeing that hostility is hardly to be admired, point out that it does serve some positive functions. Manning Nash (1962) has described four functions that
racial belief have for the dominant group. First, such ideologies provide moral justification, for maintaining a society that routinely deprives a group of its rights and privileges. Whites justified slavery by believing that Africans were physically and spiritually sub-human and devoid of souls. Second, racist beliefs discourage the subordinate from attempting to question of their lowly status, third, racial belief provide a cause to which political action can be allied and focus social uncertainty on a specific threat; racial or ethnic ideologies not only justify existing practices but serve as rallying cries for social movements, as seen in the rise of the Nazi party. Fourth, racial myths encourage support for the existing order by introducing the argument that if there were any major societal change, the minority would suffer greater poverty and the majority would suffer lower living standard.

There are also certain dysfunctions to prejudice and discrimination, that may disrupt a social system or tend to decrease its stability. Arnold Rose put forth seven ways in which racism is dysfunctional to a society and even its dominant group.

First, failure to use the resources of all individuals causes economic waste. Every employer loses by not hiring the most capable people and this choice means that consumers pay higher prices. Discrimination limits the search for talent and leadership to the dominant group. Nations may face shortage of physicians, lawyers, and engineers by discouraging a large part of population from pursuing those careers.

Second, prejudice and discrimination aggravates social problems and pro-
duces in the subordinate group a disproportionately large number of delinquents, criminals, mentally ill individuals, drug addicts and drunkards.

Thirdly, to keep the barriers alive the dominant group must invest a great deal of time.

Fourth, the relations between nations can turn hostile and the goodwill and friendly diplomatic overtures may be undercut by prejudice.

Fifth, group exclusion is a barrier to communication; the dominant group generally must suppress all accurate knowledge of minority and its culture from its group. The dominant can’t allow any influence by a group that is excluded from full participation.

Sixth, hostility directed at one group can be displaced and aimed at any group that happens to be a convenient outlet. Prejudice against one group contributes to a narrow, rigid, anxiety- ridden life that is closed to any social change, even if it is unrelated to majority minority (ethnic) relation.

Lastly, subordination of a group leads to general disrespect for law enforcement and unwillingness to settle disputes peacefully. When laws are misused or ignored the legal institution becomes weakened and illegality is tolerated.

CONFLICT PERSPECTIVE

In contrast to the functionalists emphasis on stability, conflict sociologists see the social world as in continual struggle. The conflict perspective assumes that social behaviour is best understood in terms of conflict or tension among
competing groups. Some of the early sociological work on in-group relations by Robert Park and Ernest W. Burgess (1921) identified competition and conflict as an important aspect in the distribution of economic rewards. Sociologist Hubert Blalock (1967) has stressed that competition may be present even when overt conflict is absent, which is especially true when people such as those in minority groups lack the power to express their dissatisfaction.

The conflict model is administered when examining race and ethnicity, because it readily accounts for the presence of tension between competing groups. The competition according to the conflict perspective, takes place between groups with unequal amounts of economic and political power. The minorities are exploited by the dominant group, or at the very best, ignored; The conflict approach tends to be viewed as more radical and activist than functionalism, as it emphasizes social change and redistribution of resources.

Those who follow the conflict approach in race and ethnicity have repeatedly remarked that the subordinate group is criticized for its low status, while as the responsibilities of the dominant group for the subordination are ignored. William Ryan (1976) called this an instance of blaming the victim, portraying the problems of racial and ethnic minorities as their fault rather than recognizing society's responsibility.

3. LABELING APPROACH

Related to the conflict perspective and its concern over the victims taking the blame is labeling theory. Labeling theory, introduced by Howard Becker, is an attempt to explain why certain people are viewed as different or less worthy
and others are not. Students of crime and deviance have relied heavily on labeling theory. A youth who misbehaves according to labeling theory, may be considered delinquent if he comes from the “wrong kind of family” while another youth, this time one from a middle class family who commits the same sort of misbehaviour will be given another chance.

The labeling perspective directs the attention to the role that stereotypes play in race and ethnicity. The image that prejudiced people maintain of a group towards which they hold ill feelings is called stereotype. These are exaggerated images of the characteristics of a particular group. This labeling is not limited to racial and ethnic groups only but touches the exconvicts, gamblers, lesbians, homosexuals, prostitutes, etc. People who deviate physically or mentally from society’s standards also are seen as different and are generally subjected to second class treatment, such as being labeled as unemployable. The physically handicapped, the blind, the deformed, the deaf and mentally retarded are cast out from the main-stream of the society.

The labeling approach point out that stereotypes when applied by people in power, can have very negative consequences for people or group falsely identified and these false images or stereotypes become real in their consequences.

In certain situations, people may respond to stereotypes and act on them with the result that false definitions become accurate. This is known as Self fulfilling prophency. A person or group described as having particular characteristics begins to display the very trait that were said to exist. Thus, a child who is praised for being a natural comic may focus on learning to become
funny in order to gain approval and attention.

Self fulfilling prophecy can prove devastating for the minority groups and such groups often find that they are allowed to held only low paying jobs with little prestige or opportunity of advancement. The rationale of the dominant society is that these minority individuals lack the ability to perform in more important and lucrative positions. Minority group members are then denied the training needed to become the members of superior status and are locked in inferior positions.

The problem of ethnicity is age-old and it will continue. After analysing the above theoretical views about racism and ethnicity, it seems that in Ladakhie Society all are applicable. First, the ethnic groups of Ladakh are interdependent. Mons who play the drums and flute on occasion of festivals, Garas who are blacksmiths, and Bedas who are carpenters do the services for Bhots and other groups who inturn pay them cash or kind. So there is a mechanism of symbiosis which is essential for the survival of the society. So the functionalist approach has a relevance with Ladakhie Society no doubt with all its dysfunctions.

Similarly the ethnic groups Bhots, Baltis, Dards and Arghun are in a state of conflict and competition. Nodoubt the conflict is dormant

Hypothesis:

This study accepts the Eisentadt s theory that introduction of modernization in geographical and political periphery sharpens the ethnic stratification. con
trary to the Apter’s melting pot concept of modernization churning the narrow loyalty towards state building. The Eisentadt’s theory is further supported by Barth’s theory who in his book “Ethnic Group and boundaries (1969) points out that the intensity with which a group profiles itself as an ethnic group and with which individuals stress their ethnicity generally increases when there is intense spatial geographical and social contacts between groups. The most isolated traditional group of people is probably the least ethnically self-defined.

The hypothesis is substantiated by applying Chicago school of thought. In 1920 sociologists based in Chicago developed an ecological approach to study the social life and that latter on became known as Chicago school. The relationship between the environment and the organism is known as ecology. Members of Chicago school applied this concept to the growth of cities and argued that behaviour can be explained in terms of the urban environment. They argued that growth of cities produced a distinctive neighbourhoods each with its own characteristic style of life. Clifford Shaw and Henry Mckay applied this perspective to deviance. They divided the city of Chicago into five zones, drawn at two miles intervals, and radiating outwards in concentric circles from the central business district. They examined the rate of crime for each of these zones and discovered that delinquency rate steadily decreased from zone I, the area surrounding the central business district, to zone V on the outskirts of city.

The same model is applied by the researcher to testify the hypothesis. Ladakh region is comprised of two districts Leh and Kargil. District Leh has 89,474 population with five blocks and 108 villages and hamlets. Leh proper is the
only Urban area with immense influence of modernization and its impact dwindles towards the peripheral areas. Using statistics on ethnic sharpness it is found that consciousness of kind and the prejudice or competition steadily decreases from zone I that is Leh proper, the modernised area, to the zone IV the traditional and the geographically isolated zone. The questions were posed on Locality preference, Friendship network, relationship, spouse choice and extension of help. The results are as under:

1-In zone I st 95.5 percent of the sample study live in their own neighbourhood and 99.3 percent prefer it while it is 62.6 percent and 60.2 percent in zone II nd, 30.8 percent and 25.4 percent in zone IIIrd, 18.9 percent and 6.5 percent in zone IV th.

2-In Zone I st 83.6 percent youth have friends from their own ethnic group and 85 percent prefer it, while it is 50.8 percent and 49.6 percent in zone 2 nd, 22.3 percent and 21 percent in zone 3 rd and 2.4 percent and 1 percent in zone 4 th.

3-Only 3 percent of the sample study invite other ethnic groups on occasions of marriage and festivals in zone 1 st, while it is 25.8 percent in zone 2 nd, 64.3 percent in zone 3 rd and 92.3 percent in zone 4 th.

4-98.9 percent of the sample households are endogamous in zone I st. it is 74.6 percent in zone II, 52.4 percent in zone IIIrd, and 38.3 percent in zone IV.
5.2.5 percent of the sample households extended help to other ethnic groups on occasions of Agricultural activities, plantation and construction of houses in zone Ist, while as it is 35.6 percent in zone IIInd, 78.3 percent in zone IIIrd and 99.6 percent in zone IV.

The same trend was seen in district Kargil. Thus it may be concluded that the Leh and Kargil towns which have the influence of modernization are more ethnically conscious than its surrounding areas.

**METHODOLOGY**

This is an empirical study based on the field investigation conducted by the researcher. An intensive study of all ethnic groups was carried out. Collection of data was done through non-participant observation by administering a household survey schedule.

Sample was taken as per the population ratio of seven ethnic groups of Ladakh, who are Bhots, Baltis, Dards, Champs, Mons, Brokpas, and Arghuns. Due representation was given to rural-urban, Male-female, rich-poor, and literate and illiterate.

In addition to the field work, secondary sources were also utilised in order to get a qualitative picture of the topic under study. These secondary sources material included books, articles, journals, newspapers, official statistics and so on.

Thus the information collected from primary and secondary sources about ethnicity and ethnic relations is put in a systematic order.
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