CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Social inequality is the basic fact of human life. It is natural, therefore, that the phenomenon of social inequality finds mention in the earliest writings known to mankind. Thinkers and philosophers right from the early times have devoted great attention to the study of social inequality. The subject of the rich and the poor, the rulers and the ruled is elaborately discussed in the early writings like those of Plato (427 - 347 B.C), Aristotle (384 - 322 B.C), Kautilya (4th century A.D), Manu (probably compiled, 200 B.C. to A.D. 200) and others. The society during Plato's time was divided into three classes: the guardians, the auxilia ries and the workers. Aristotle once said "Men are by nature unequal; there are by nature masters and slaves; mastery is agreeable and just for some; slavery is agreeable and just for others". ¹ Further in his 'Politics' he observed that society is divided into three classes namely 'very rich', 'very poor' and the 'mean' or the'moderate'. Kautilya in his Arthashastra has discussed in great details the subject of

---
social classes. In Manu's Dharmaśastra also there is a good deal of discussion of the subject. In the Biblical writings and in the early literature of ancient China also we find the description regarding hierarchical distinctions among social categories. St. Thomas and St. Augustine also discussed the subject in detail. They attempted to find out why human society is divided into different classes on the basis of power, property and prestige and tried to set forth the proper mode of arranging these classes in hierarchical order. Philosophers like Burke, Baudham and Locke in England, Rouseau in France, Hegel in Germany discussed and debated this problem of inequality and class system. For many social scientists and historians of the present century the problem of social inequality and class system has become the subject of immense interest.

Social inequality in one form or another has thus preoccupied the minds of thinkers right from the beginning of human society. Unequal distribution of human beings based on the natural factors like age and sex and social factors like wealth, prestige, ability, occupation etc., is a universal phenomenon found in primitive as well as in modern societies. This unequal distribution is everywhere associated with hierarchies of individuals and groups that sociologists call strata. These strata more or less get organized into a system of hierarchical relationship.
A classless society is a sociological myth. Pitirim A. Sorokin writes that "Unstratified society with real equality of its members, is a myth which has never been realized in the history of mankind". In some ancient societies the class system may not be sophisticated and well defined, nevertheless, they had a rudimentary form of class system.

Dahrendorf\textsuperscript{3} has rightly remarked that "Historically the first question asked by sociology was why there is inequality among men? Where do its causes lie? Can it be reduced or even abolished altogether? or do we have to accept it as a necessary element in the structure of society"? Further he writes that "By surveying the various attempts to answer them a whole history of sociological thought might be written".

Dahrendorf refuting the idea of private property leading to social inequality argued that if social inequality were really based on private property the abolition of private property would automatically eliminate inequality. But experience in propertyless and quasi-propertyless societies of the communist nations does not confirm this. Therefore, the origin of inequality is to be found elsewhere. Dahrendorf

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
writes: "the law is both a necessary and sufficient condition of social inequality. There is inequality because there is law, if there is law there must also be inequality among men*.

Every society is a moral community and, therefore, recognizes certain norms of conduct of its members. These norms have sanctions to enforce them by rewarding conformity and penalizing deviance. Those who conform with the social norms are rewarded and those who deviate from them are penalized. "This" he writes "leads to inequality of ranks and thereby stratification". Hence, he concludes that "the origin of social inequality lies neither in human nature nor in historically dubious conception of private property", but it is an offshoot of society's endeavour to ensure conformity to its accepted norms.

Talcott Parsons in his book "Essays in Sociological Theory" writing about 'An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification' has regarded social stratification as the differential ranking of human individuals who compose a given social system and their treatment as superior and inferior relative to one another in certain socially important respects". Naturally, stratification is a differentiated ranking of human individuals or groups arranged in

---

* In this context it is interesting to note the definition of law given by Sir Henry Sumner Maine a well known scholar of Jurisprudence, who said "Law is a command of a particular kind. It is addressed by the political superior or sovereign to political inferior or subject: It imposes on those subjects an obligation or duty and threatens penalty in the event of disobedience".

(Henry S. Maine "Village community in the East and West" London 1876, Lecture -III)

a vertical order on the basis of social system. There is always superior and inferior feeling among the members of different classes based on the commonly accepted standards or value system. These relations are essentially social relations. Parsons calls 'Patterning' or 'Ordering' of social relations as stratification system of society.

In other words social stratification as Pitirim Sorokin puts it in his work "Social and Cultural Mobility", is "the differentiation of a given population into hierarchically superposed classes. It is manifested in the existence of upper and lower social layers. Its basis and very essence consist in an unequal distribution of rights and privileges, duties and responsibilities, social values and privations, social power and influences among the members of a society".\(^5\)

Pitirim Sorokin then proceeds to give three important factors which lead to the stratification of society. They are: (i) living together, (ii) Innate differences and (iii) environmental differences.\(^6\)

In his opinion no human group can continue for any length of time without organization, and organization always means allotment of roles and statuses to the individuals, which in other words is stratification. Secondly, due to

---

differential permutation and combination of the chromosomes there are fundamental differences both in the physical as well as the psychic structure of the individuals. These innate differences find differential participation in society and this leads to stratification. Thirdly, the environmental differences which according to Sorokin are permanently operating, also cause social stratification. He observes "A primitive man who by chance happens to obtain a better place for fishing is in a more favourable condition to promote himself than another who, by chance is unlucky in his place of fishing". 7

Sorokin then proceeds to identify three major types of stratification, namely economic, political and occupational. Unequal distribution of economic wealth leads to economic classes; unequal distribution of political power leads to political classes and inequality among occupations brings about occupational strata. However, these three categories do not remain separated from one another because of the universal phenomenon of inter-correlation of strata. That is, there is the general tendency of the confluence of these three powers in a single group. That is, the class which is economically powerful tends also to acquire the other two powers namely the political and social and vice-versa. Though this is a general trend, it cannot be described

as an inevitable rule. Because a number of instances can be cited where superiority in one field may not be evident in the other.

Some thinkers like Ratzenhofer, Oppenheimer and Gumplovicz, have emphasized the role of war in the stratification of society. They observe that war has always been an important social force which has led to the stratification of society. Because, after every war there emerge two classes—the victors and the vanquished, conquerors and the conquered. The victors become ruling aristocrats, and the vanquished become slaves or subjects. In this way, every war leads to stratification.

This war theory of stratification has been contested by Sorokin. He writes that, war is no doubt an important cause, but it is not the only or the major cause of stratification. Because without war also there can be stratification in society due to such factors as, innate differences, social living and environmental changes. He, however, writes that war adds one more stratum to the existing number of strata in a society— the conquerors occupying the highest stratum.

Karl Mannheim, Tonnies and others have defined stratification as the arrangement of classes in a graduated

10. Tonnies, FiGemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. (Leipzig, 1887), which has been translated and supplemented by C.F. Loomis in Fundamental Concepts of Sociology (New York: 1940).
hierarchy. Thus stratification expresses itself in the form of classes. A group of individuals to be called as 'class' must possess two characteristics namely objective condition and subjective definition. The objective conditions like mode of living, food habits, clothes, style of life etc., help in the identification of class. Though objective conditions are important they cannot by themselves lead to the formation of a class. In addition to the objective factors the subjective attitudes are also important in the formation of class. The way in which different members of classes define themselves and define others is also important in the class-system. To put it in the words of Lippmann "the pictures that they carry around in their heads, the pictures of themselves and the pictures of others; help in the identification and formation of classes. Almost similar views are echoed in the writings of Karl Mannheim who observes that "Gradually class interests develop into a system which embraces all life and those interest are interwoven with political, religious and scientific interests, the result of which is the gradual development of class ideals and a definite class psychology. Each class tends to develop a frame of mind, a Weltanschauung."12

Morris Ginsberg in his book 'Sociology' has defined a class as "a collection of individuals standing to each other in the relation of equality and marked off from other portions by accepted or sanctioned standards of superiority and inferiority".  

MacIver has also given a similar definition of class. He writes "any portion of a community marked off from the rest by social status. A system or structure of social classes involves, first, a hierarchy of status groups, second, the recognition of the superior-inferior stratification, and, finally, some degree of permanency of the structure". According to him it is the general recognition of superiority and inferiority in status that forms the bases for identification of one class as against another.

No study of social stratification will be complete without the discussion of the writings of Karl Marx. In fact, Marx was one of the foremost to give a systematic analysis of social stratification. Marx explained that social class or stratification is determined by the system of relation to the means of production, and 'status' of individual or group is determined by their position in the system - ownership and non-ownership of means of production. Thus to him the nature of classes depends on the mode of

production and services. Hence, the basis of stratification-system or class-structure is economic. He stated "Life involves before everything else, eating and drinking, a habitation, clothing and many other things. The first historical act is thus the production of the means to satisfy these needs, the production of life itself". 15

Hence, man in order to survive and satisfy his basic needs has to work. In this process he exploits nature, comes in contact with different individuals and groups, develops co-operation as well as conflict and hence creates history. When classes emerge they are forced to participate in the struggle for existence, hence conflict becomes the main basis of relationship among the classes. In view of this fact Marx declared that "History of all hitherto existing societies, has been the history of class-struggle". He says "Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guildmaster and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large or in the common ruin of the contending classes". 16

Marx who once said that "the philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however,


is to change it." 17 was not content with the analysis and interpretation of class and class conflict in the evolution of human society. He went on to whip up a revolt of the poor against the rich, the proletariat against the bourgeoisie giving them the trumpet call of revolution: "Workers of the world unite you have nothing to lose except your chains".

Veblen's 18 theory of leisure class is another classical work on stratification. Like, Marx, he also believed that human culture has evolved through many stages and the present stage is the result of accumulated constant change. In fact, he divided human culture into three stages, the savage, the barbarian and the civilized. These stages are further sub-divided into lower and higher. The lower savage society was marked by a simple division of labour based on sex and a peaceful habit of life. With the transition from a primitive peaceful society to a warlike, predatory society, the leisure class gradually begins to emerge. Further, as society moves from the lower stage to upper civilized stages, these leisure classes become accentuated in magnitude and in other forms.

The rise of leisure class, in fact, coincides with the emergence of private ownership. Veblen writes that


private property associated with the pecuniary element and technological method of production are more prominent in giving rise to the leisure class. Members of this class are characterized by behaviour motivated by pecuniary elements, hence, there occurs an idea of status differentiation. Worthy and honourable employment becomes associated with the upper classes and unworthy and menial employment becomes associated with the lower classes. Thus employment becomes a major criterion to judge whether one belongs to the upper or the lower class.

Among the leisure class, according to Veblen, there is a system of hierarchical gradations. Members of each grade choose their next higher ones as patrons. It becomes incumbent upon lower classes to observe and approximate standards set by the upper classes. Exemption from industrial occupation and other employment which has to do directly with everyday work of getting a livelihood, is the characteristic of the leisure classes and it constitutes the most important factor in distinguishing them from the lower classes. This principle sometimes takes the extreme form. Veblen has cited the example of the absolute taboo on doing any type of work among some of the Polynesian chiefs. They are forbidden even to feed themselves and would rather prefer to starve than carry food to their mouth. Similar examples are also found in feudal Europe. The story is told of a French King, who in the absence of
a servant would not care to move the chair on which he was sitting, even if it caught fire and prefer to burn himself slowly to death.

In modern society, Veblen writes, the accumulation of wealth has become one of the most important bases of distinction between the upper and lower classes. Wealth has become "intrinsically honorable and confers honor on its possessors". He writes that wealth acquired through inheritance is more honorific than acquired through one's own efforts. Though the old bases of class distinction have been modified, they still continue to serve as a mark of distinction. What we witness today, said Veblen, is the transformation of modern culture into a 'pecuniary' culture, which is characterized by canons of pecuniary emulation, pecuniary standards of living, pecuniary efficiency, pecuniary education, with conspicuous leisure and conspicuous consumption.

Max Weber19 is another thinker who wrote on stratification. Weber puts forth his theory of stratification in response to the deterministic nature of Marx's theory of class-based stratification. Marx emphasized the role of economic factor in his theory of class. To him, control over property was the chief determinant of class.

But, Weber, without denying the role of economic factor, added two more factors namely power and prestige which were left out by Marx. Weber advocated that all these three factors namely economic factor, power and prestige are the interacting bases of social hierarchy. He writes that economic factor creates class, power creates parties and prestige creates status groups. Thus, to Weber, classes, parties and status groups are the phenomena of the distribution of power within a community. Power, that is the probability that one actor (or a group) within a social relationship, will be in a position to carry out his (its) own will despite resistance, is the keynote of Weberian theory of stratification.

Perhaps, the most significant contribution of Weber is in the form of making a distinction between 'class' and 'status group'. In this connection he refers to the term 'class situation' and 'status situation'. He writes that the basis of 'class' is economic interest - an individual belonging to a particular class possesses the same 'life-chance'; therefore, an individual's 'class-situation' is ultimately a product of the 'market situation' whereas the basis of 'status group' is the social order based on honour. For him, the way in which the 'status honour' is distributed is most vital in understanding the stratification system. Thus, Weber has concluded that 'classes' are stratified according to their relations to the
production and acquisition of goods: whereas the status groups are formed according to the principle of their consumption of goods as represented by 'special style of life'. To Weber, the differences in life-style are very important in understanding the phenomenon of stratification.

Thus, Weber's distinction of class and status group, has considerably helped understanding how societies were actually stratified into classes, than the economic determinism of Marx. In fact, after having analysed the various ways in which the classes have evolved and marked off from one another, Weber observes "classes are aggregates of individuals who have the same opportunities of acquiring goods, the same exhibited standard of living". 20

Talcott Parsons 21 was one of the early writers who presented the functional approach to study of stratification.

Parsons differentiated societies on the basis of "ascribed and achievement dimensions". He writes that non-literate and kinship oriented societies are characterized by ascribed orientation, whereas, modern societies are achievement oriented. In the ascribed oriented societies, the rewards are assigned on the basis of birthright


characteristics, whereas in achievement-oriented societies the rewards are attained by one's own efforts. Further, Parsons argued that in achievement-oriented societies, there must be a strong relationship between the division of labour and the distribution of rewards. The roles which involve the greatest degree of 'responsibility for the affairs of the collectivity' will have better 'facilities' at their disposal, and these facilities are "in themselves rewards". He further observes that the presence of division of labour and achievement values within a society, lead to differential rewards for position of varying responsibility. The differential rewards are the basis of stratification system. Parsons strongly argued that stratification is necessary and also desirable for a complex achievement-oriented society. It is necessary because it distributes rewards to positions according to the amount of collective responsibility assigned to them, and desirable because, this arrangement permits the entire system to function effectively. Parsons thereby seems to echo the views of Emmanuel Kant who stated that "Inequality among men is a rich source of much that is evil but also everything that is good". 22

Of the contemporary theories, the functional theory of stratification offered by Kingsley Davis and

Wilbert Moore (1945) is also important. In fact, Davis and Moore had developed a lengthy manuscript about the functional theory of stratification. But in the light of ensuing debate, they condensed their ideas into a brief seven-page article. From their article it seems that they were rather influenced by Talcott Parsons' essay on stratification (1942).

The theory advanced by Davis and Moore is in conformity with the analysis of functional approach to the stratification. In their paper, an attempt is made to explain that stratification is an inevitable phenomenon of social life. They emphasized that social hierarchy is the result of inevitability of differentiation of roles and duties. This differentiation of roles and duties is inevitable for the survival of mankind. These different duties and roles carry differential power and prestige. They write that every society performs two functions. First it must place 'the particular number' into 'the particular positions' and then motivate them to perform the duties associated with the positions. An individual cannot perform all or most of the functions by himself in a society. For different functions an individual possessing different caliber and ability is required. Such

individuals are rewarded according to the value attributed to the functions they perform. Here the functions which have the greatest importance for the society are given greatest rewards and therefore, the person who performs such functions occupies highest ranks. Unlike Talcott Parsons, they argued that such inferences are not only confined to the achievement-oriented societies, but all societies, simple or complex, distribute their members into certain positions and allocate differential rewards. Thus like Parsons, Davis and Moore also advocated that differential rewards are the basis of stratification and hierarchy.

While stratification refers to the ranking of individuals, classes and groups into different strata, the concept of mobility refers to a change in the position of individuals, classes and groups in the ranking of social hierarchy such as the stratification system. Thus, both the stratification and mobility are interrelated concepts. Miller has rightly said that "much about stratification can be explained by levels of and changes in rates of mobility. The study of mobility shows the system of stratification in movement that change is taking place". 24 Thus it is clear that mobility focuses attention upon

The term mobility has been defined by different thinkers in different ways. Pitirim Sorokin, who has published extensive literature on the subject, has defined social mobility as "any transition of an individual or social object or value - anything that has been created or modified by human activity - from one social position to another". 25

Lipset and Bendix, have also offered a similar definition of the term social mobility. According to them social mobility "refers to the process by which individuals move from one position to another in society - positions which by general consent have been given specific hierarchical values". 26 Further they write that in the study of social mobility "we analyse the movement of individuals from positions possessing a certain rank to positions either higher or lower in the social system". 27

Herbert Goldhamer in an article in the International Encyclopaedia of social sciences, has also defined social mobility as "the movement of individuals, families and groups from one social position to another".

27. Ibid., pp.1-2.
Hence, all these definitions emphasize the changes in 'position' rather giving less consideration to the changes in 'roles'. The latest researchers have proved that both 'position' and 'roles' are inseparable entities. In fact, the position of an individual is determined by his role. Therefore, mobility always corresponds to the changes in position as well as in the roles of individuals.

Bernard, 28 has aptly formulated a definition of social mobility in this direction. He writes that mobility refers to "Movement, either upward or downward, between higher and lower social classes; or more precisely, movement between one relatively fulltime, functionally significant social role and another that is evaluated as either higher or lower. This movement is to be conceived as a process occurring over time, with individuals (and their family units) moving from one role and social class position to another because of what they have done or what has happened to them in various kinds of social interaction, such as in their family or in their work organization, or during war or socio-economic expansion in their society".

Social mobility is a complex, multidimensional concept. It can be examined in terms of the movement both in the vertical and horizontal direction. Sorokin has

classified two types of social mobility (i) Horizontal social mobility and (ii) Vertical social mobility. By horizontal social mobility he means "the transition of an individual or social object from one social group to another situated on the same level". In this transition a change takes place without any remarkable change in the social position of an individual or social object. By vertical social mobility he means "the relations involved in a transition of an individual (or a social object) from one social stratum to another". Further, according to the direction of transition, Sorokin writes that there are two types of vertical social mobility as 'ascending' and 'descending' which he alternately called 'social climbing' and 'social sinking'.

The 'ascending' or 'Social climbing' according to Sorokin takes place in two different forms. First, when individuals belonging to a lower class improve their status and rise up in the class hierarchy. Sorokin described this ascending as an infiltration. Secondly, when an entire group belonging to a low class improves its status and rises to higher status en mass. In this case social hierarchy is affected whereas in the first case it is not. 'Descending' also takes place in two different ways. First, it is manifested when individuals belonging

to higher class lose their status and sink down in the class hierarchy without affecting the higher group to which they belonged. Secondly, when an entire group belonging to a higher class loses its status and sinks down in the class hierarchy. Such movement of entire group downward will either displace the old group or will create a new group side by side with the existing one.

Social mobility like social stratification is not a new problem, but it has been discussed and debated right from the early times. A considerable literature is available which points out that mobility in one way or another has preoccupied human beings right from the early times. Many historians have described the movement of population and both vertical and horizontal changes in the position of individuals, classes, and groups in different parts of the world.

However, a systematic research in the field of social mobility is a recent phenomenon. During the last few decades a number of research studies on social mobility have been undertaken. These recent researches have made the study of the social mobility as one of the most attractive fields of investigation for sociologists. A number of theories have been put forth by different thinkers to explain as to why there should be social mobility, as to what factors lead to social mobility and what are the consequences of social mobility.
Pitirim Sorokin, who has offered an extensive literature on social mobility has given certain important factors which lead to social mobility. In fact, he has divided these factors into primary and secondary. Among primary factors the most fundamental are: 31

1. Demographic factors, which lead either to the dying out of the upper strata or to their relative diminution in the total population;

2. Dissimilarity of parents and children;

3. Change of environment, especially of the anthropo-social environment;

4. Defective social distribution of individuals within social layers.

Demographic factors play an important role in the study of social mobility. It is an established demographic fact that the rich classes have a low fertility whereas the poor people have high fertility. Because of low fertility the rich class cannot replenish itself. As a result a 'social vacuum' or 'demographic vacuum' will be produced at the top of the class pyramid. This vacuum at the top of the pyramid signifies that some of the positions are not filled, and some of the concomitant functions are not

deligently performed. No society can tolerate such vacuum at the top. As a result it sucks the people from below to fill the vacuous condition, i.e., people from middle and low classes move up to fill the vacuum. But once a low class individual or a middle class individual joins the upper class his fertility also declines and hence vacuum is again caused. Thus, there will be perpetual vacuum at the top which leads to vertical mobility.

Dissimilarity of parents and children is another primary factor which leads to social mobility. Generally, it can be noticed that in every society successful men, eminent artists, scholars and scientists who have attained pinnacles of success, fail to leave behind worthy children. On the contrary due to some unknown reasons ordinary parents who have not distinguished themselves in any way beget illustrous and brilliant children who rise to pinnacles of achievement in various fields. As a result of this unique coincidence in nature, Sorokin feels that there occurs vertical mobility. Because sooner or later the dull and inefficient children of talented people sink down in the hierarchy whereas talented children of the poor class climb up the class ladder. Thus dissimilarity of parents and children leads to vertical social mobility - both upward and downward.
Change in the anthropo-social environment is also an important primary factor which leads to vertical social mobility. That is, innate, inherited qualities find manifestation and attain full fruition when proper social environment is provided. Sorokin has given certain examples to illustrate this fact. He writes that "A man with the specific talent for strategy may climb up very rapidly in time of war, and may not promote himself in time of peace. A fine artisan may rise in a society with a system of handicraft industry, and he may not have any chance in a society of machine production. A purely physical force often has been the cause of leadership in primitive societies, but it has much less importance in present society. An exclusive honesty and asceticism led to a social rise in the Middle Ages, and the same qualities are likely often to ruin a man under existing conditions. A few decades ago the manufacturers of bicycles had a chance to become rich men; a continuation of the same business now is a way to bankruptcy. A talented royalist writer is likely to be honoured in a monarchic society; and the same talent devoted to monarchy is likely to lead the writer to a prison in a revolutionary republican society." Thus he observes that these examples show that the social position of an individual depends not only on himself, but also on his environment.

Defective social distribution of individuals within social layers is another important primary factor which leads to vertical mobility. In every society we find the existence of the machinery of social selection. The important function of the social selection machinery is to see that, all the positions are adequately filled and all the functions are diligently performed. Therefore, it is the primary task of the social selection machinery to see that, important positions are held by highly qualified and efficient people and that the inefficient people are removed from their positions to low positions. Sorokin observes that in no society social selection machinery will be efficiently functioning. There will always be a lag between shifting and lifting, recruitment and retrenchment.

Besides these primary factors of vertical social mobility, there are several other secondary factors which lead to vertical social mobility. Infact, Sorokin has included local and temporary factors in the secondary factors of vertical social mobility. He writes that all these primary and secondary factors "permanently break the existing equilibrium of the social distribution of individuals and make vertical circulation inevitable".33

Dumont's theory of Social Capillarity also stresses the role of demographic factors. He states that "what is

gravity to the physical world, capillarity is to the social order.\textsuperscript{34} The property of capillarity is that, the thinner the liquid, the faster the rise of the liquid through the wick. If we compare the hierarchy to a wick and size of the family to the liquid then we can say that smaller family rises up faster in the hierarchy whereas a larger family rises very slowly in the hierarchy. That is, social climbing becomes easy and faster if the burden of the family is less, and social climbing is hindered and becomes slow if the family is big. Discussing about the intensity of social mobility Dumont writes that 'Social Capillarity increases as the society becomes more and more complex as a consequence of industrial-urbanism'.

Wilfredo Pareto (1848-1923)\textsuperscript{35} an Italian engineer-economist and sociologist has put forth a theory to explain the phenomenon of social mobility. The theory is popularly known as 'The theory of circulation of Elite'. Pareto has used the 'Elitist model' to show how mobility occurs in a society. Stratification divides society into two major divisions namely the upper class which contains the aristocracy or the elite and the lower classes. He has described

\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
the elite as those people "who have the highest indices in their branch of activity". The elite are supposed to possess the qualities of superior intelligence, character, skill, capacity and concrete objectives, whereas the non-elite do not manifest any such qualities. Pareto further divides the elite into two categories namely 'the governing' and 'the non-governing'. While the former hold key positions and in fact man the entire governing machinery, the later have no such positions and power. However, there is a perpetual struggle going on between these two classes to occupy power and positions. The governing elite remain in power so long as they retain their character as lions — namely the qualities of force, faith and idealistic convictions. But alas! these qualities are ephemeral and are not possessed by a particular class forever making the history "a graveyard of aristocracies". When the governing elite lose these lionine qualities, (which according to Pareto they are bound to lose sooner or later) and imbibe the baser-fox like qualities of "ruse" materialistic goals and emotions of masses that signals their decline. 
Pareto opined that the circulation is a two way traffic. When a class of governing elite sinks down the hierarchy, its place is now taken over by the others who in the meanwhile would have acquired the lionine qualities of rulers. Thus the process of sinking down and climbing up continues perpetually.
The reference group theory which was developed as a result of the works of James, Cooley, Mead, Hyman, Sherif, Newcomb and Merton, is very useful in understanding the structural conditions and motivational forces that give rise to social mobility. These writers have shed useful light on the various standardized social factors that provide for passage from one social group to another in the various institutional areas. Concepts such as the 'reference group' 'subject-group', 'anticipatory socialization', 'relative-deprivation' and 'marginal man' are very useful tools of analysis to understand the various dimensions of social mobility.

It would not be far from truth to state that a comprehensive study of stratification of Indian society and nuances of social mobility is yet to be done. This lacuna is, however, not for want of efforts in that direction. Economists, anthropologists, sociologists and other students of Indian society have been straining hard since long to probe into the various aspects of stratification and social mobility in Indian society. But unfortunately the efforts have not yielded the expected results. One of the reasons why the models developed by social scientists elsewhere to study the stratification system have not been wholly useful in the Indian context is the intervention of the very powerful institution of caste.
As a result two tendencies are clearly discernable. While the economists seem to stress the economic aspects of stratification with little or no reference to the caste principle, the others like anthropologists and sociologists seem to lean heavily on the caste principles of Indian hierarchy. In the beginning, following the popular Western model, the economists like Dentwala 36 identified four major classes in Indian rural areas like the agricultural labourers, cultivating tenants, cultivating owners and the landlords, and highlighted the lack of social mobility of Indian society by comparing the distribution of rural population into these categories in 1931 and 1951. Other scholars like Thorner 37 (1956) came out with a more sophisticated and realistic classification of groups in Indian villages, that are subsumed under the three main categories namely the Maliks (proprietors), Kisans (working peasants) and Mazdurs (labourers).

Though occasionally some of the economists did sound a note of caution that caste was important and that its influence could not be brushed aside easily, not much was done in the direction of setting the things right. For even as late as 1980, Krishna Bharadwaj writing about the subject observes that "when we arrive at a concrete

36. Quoted in Tylor, Ensminger et al., India's Roots of Democracy, Sociological Analysis of Rural India's experience in planned development since independence (Bombay, Longmans, O., -1965)

analysis of the social formations in a village economy, we cannot ignore the important role caste and other factors play. The exact intermeshing of the class and the caste structures can be understood only in the actual context of a rural economy".  

While the economists can be said to have erred on the count of overstressing the economic factors to the negligence of social and cultural factors in the study of Indian stratification, the anthropologists and sociologists have erred on the other count, that is, they have stressed too much the caste and its ritual aspects in portraying the picture of Indian stratification. This however should not be construed as denying the importance and usefulness of the works of W.H. Wiser (The Hindu Jajmani System -1958), D.N. Majumdar (Caste and Communication in an Indian Village - 1962) F.G. Bailey (Caste and the Economic Frontier - 1968), T.S. Epstein (Economic Development and Social Change in South India - 1962) and other notable anthropologists and sociologists who tried to give a more comprehensive picture of Indian rural stratification taking into consideration both the economic and socio-cultural factors. But unfortunately the lead given by these pioneers was not pursued vigorously by the later scholars. As a result the impression that one gets from

the works of these writers about the Indian stratification is that in the study of Indian stratification nothing else matters so much as caste and the associated ideas of purity and pollution.

Dumont\(^{39}\) (1970) in his famous book "Homo Hierarchicus" makes a distinction between hierarchy and stratification. He writes that hierarchy in its pure form is found in Indian society which is organized on the basis of caste. In such a system the various layers of society are well defined and clearly distinguishable. But stratification by contrast is a feature of societies characterized by vaguely defined classes having very thin lines of distinction between them. In such a society equality of all the classes is a fundamental social value. In such a system mobility is not only tolerated but also encouraged.

Hierarchy is a salient feature of the agrarian societies like India, whereas stratification is characteristic of the industrial societies of the west. Michal Young has very well summed up this distinction between the two as follows "The soil grows castes and machine makes classes".

The traditional Indian society was marked by "Status-summation" where a person's birth in a particular

---

castes sums up his other positions. In such a system a person who has a low status in the hierarchy of castes also has a low status in other hierarchies based on economic and political factors. Thus the fact that there is a close correspondence between caste-status and socio-economic standing has been underlined. This arrangement continued till recently. Andre Beteille\textsuperscript{40} (1971) for instance found a considerable congruence among caste class and power in a Tamil Nadu village till 1940. Similarly Cohn\textsuperscript{41} (1961) found that in the village Madhopur the high caste Thakurs enjoyed social, economic and political dominance as well. Bailey\textsuperscript{42}(1968) also found that in Orissa division of wealth and political power followed the caste hierarchy. This fact seems to be recognized by the government\textsuperscript{*} as well. The various state governments as also the central government while making provisions for what are called 'Backward Classes' have applied the caste criterion and not the economic one. As a result, whenever a reference is made to Backward Classes in government


\textsuperscript{*} See 'Backward Classes Commission'(Karnataka State) with L.G.Havanur as Chairman, 1975 and Backward Classes Commission with B.P.Mandal as Chairman- Dec. 1980.
records and even in scholarly works it always means low castes excluding the poorer sections of the high castes. Hence caste did provide a dependable index to assess the socio-economic position of an individual.

While the concepts of 'Sanskritization', 'Westernization', 'De-Sanskritization' introduced by M.N. Srinivas are of immense help in understanding the various aspects of caste dynamics, Beteille's work, (Caste, Class and Power -1971) is a significant contribution to study the dynamics of the modern Indian social system that has now acquired a much more complex and dynamic character under the impact of recent forces of social change such as adult franchise, social legislations, development of market mechanism etc.

Yogendra Singh (1977) writing about the changing pattern of social stratification in India has identified three trends of social mobility, at the village level, at the metropolitan and regional level and at the national level.

43. Srinivas, M.N: Caste in Modern India and other Essays (Bombay, Asia, 1962).
level, While the traditional upper castes seem to be experiencing a serious challenge to their positions at the village and regional level, at the national level they continue to hold their sway. Thus there seems to be an unevenness in the openness of the system of social stratification in India. Though a number of interest groups, quasi groups and classes are emerging they do not as yet have a structural crystallization in the system of social stratification. Thus he feels that caste still provides a reliable matrix for the analysis of stratification and social mobility in India.

Noel Gist\(^{46}\) (1954) found that in two cities of Southern India, there was 40 per cent of occupational mobility in all the caste groups, whereas in the case of Brahmns it was 82.7. He observes that most of the mobility is due to expansion of economy leading to more job opportunities. Edwin Driver\(^{47}\) (1962) found that education is a powerful means of occupational mobility. Sharma\(^{48}\) (1969) who also found considerable occupational mobility


in the six villages of Rajasthan observes that though the occupational mobility leads to changes in the caste structure it does not bring about corresponding changes in the class structure. Gangrade (1975) found that the rate of occupational mobility is quite high among the Harijans and the main reason for this is educational attainment.

Victor D'Souza and Sethi (1972) in their article have given four indices of identifying classes in urban India. They are (1) self-rating (i.e., identification of a respondent with a social class by himself), (2) size of income, (3) occupational prestige and (4) extent of education. They call the first one as the dependent primary index and other three as independent and secondary indices.

While using these indices they identified four classes in Chandigarh namely upper class (24.4), middle class (54.3), working class (18.8) and the lower class (22.0%). They also found that self-rating was significantly related to the objective characteristics of social class such as income, occupational prestige and education.

Dubey's (1975) book 'Social Mobility among the Professions' is one of the few attempts to study the mobility


patterns in a middle size Indian city. After ranking the various occupational groups according to the prestige values in modern India, he has tried to assess the rate and range of mobility on the basis of correlation tables. He observes that growth of education and other secular values and the privileges given to Scheduled and Backward castes have injected tremendous dynamism into the Indian social system. Thus he concludes that in India the movement of middle classes into the elite is undoubtedly the highest. However, doubts are raised about the findings of Dubey by Barnabas and others.

The book edited by James Silverberg entitled 'Social Nobility in the Caste System in India - An Interdisciplinary Symposium' is a very useful work in the field. Bernard Barber's article 'Social Mobility in Hindu India' gives a lucid analysis of the various aspects of social mobility in Hindu India such as the amount, social sources and processes. He has analysed the deep impact of the traditional values according to which to the Hindu, social mobility was both impossible and immoral in

his worldly life. He points out how this traditional ideology has influenced even the researchers who have tended "to work deductively from the books of dharmastra rather than inductively from the concepts held by live villagers". Then he goes on to discuss the various aspects of mobility such as structural determinants, unit of mobility, internal and external forces of mobility, natural happenings and their impact, technological change and its impact, urbanization and its impact and various implications of Sanskritization and Westernization processes. William L. Rowe in his article has analysed the problem faced by low castes in their attempt to climb up the social hierarchy through Sanskritization. Burton Stein in his article has provided a historical perspective of social mobility in medieval India.

Demle in his article has used the reference group theory to explain mobility within a metropolitan system of stratification in India. He has thus identified four models of conduct and behaviour for the upwardly mobile sections of the Indian society, namely (1) the Brahmenic model, (2) the Kingly (Kshatriya) model, (3) the Vaishya model, and (4) the Western model, and explained how the caste

---

situated in the various rungs of the hierarchy, especially those in the middle rungs have used these models for upward mobility. He has also stressed how in a metropolitan social milieu, the units to be ranked are increasingly regarded not as corporate caste but rather as individuals or groups of individuals. Edward B. Harper\textsuperscript{58} in his article has raised the basic question whether mobility can take place in a caste system. He has doubted this possibility. For he found that in his village the Holeru-untouchables continued to occupy the lowest ritual rank despite the great changes that have occurred in the village, that have strengthened the political, economic and social positions of the Holeru and other low castes \textit{vis-à-vis} the traditional privileged ones.

Dan Chekki's\textsuperscript{59} article entitled "Social Stratification and Trends of Social Mobility in Modern India" is useful in more than one respect. The article is an outcome of study among the Brahmins in the City of Dharward which is also our field of study. The author studied 115 Brahmin households and came out with some interesting facts about social mobility. On the basis of the contention that in modern urban India class cuts across the ritual hierarchy of caste and sub-caste, he identified three classes among

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{58}Edward B.Harper. In James Silverberg,(Ed.) \textit{Ibid}, 53,pp.36-64.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{59}Dan Chekki: "Social Stratification And Trends of Social Mobility in Modern India", \textit{The Indian Journal of Social Work} Vol.31, (4);1971; p.367.
\end{flushright}
the Brahmins of Gokul - a pseudonym of the suburb of the
city of Dharwad. He found that 20 per cent of the families
constituted the upper-class, 63 per cent middle-class and
17 per cent low-class. He observes that while making the
classification the objective and subjective criteria of
social class and the points of view of the researcher as
well as the respondents of the suburb were taken into
consideration. He found that material possessions, values
and behaviour patterns of the members of the different
classes among the Brahmins of Gokul were easily distingui-
shable, and that by and large, the social contacts were
confined mainly to the members of the same class. He
observed that, of the three classes, the desire for
upward mobility was very keen among the members of the
middle class.

The following are some of the important findings
of the study.

1. There is a very high rate (90.00) of inter-genera-
tional occupational mobility. Only in case of 5 per cent
of the households ego and the sons were engaged in the
same economic activity whereas 90 per cent were found
engaged in other occupations than that of their fathers.

2. The inter-generational occupational mobility that
has taken place in Gokul has brought about both horizontal
and vertical social mobility. In 50 per cent of the cases
the occupational mobility has led to only horizontal mobility, in the sense that there is no change in the class status between the two generations. In the case of 25 per cent of the households there is social climbing, in the sense that the sons have moved up in the class hierarchy. Whereas in case of 15 per cent of the households there is social sinking, in the sense that the sons occupy a lower rung in the class hierarchy than their fathers. Chekki, then proceeds to observe that vertical mobility is intensive in the middle and upper classes than in the low-class. However, there is no way of knowing from his analysis, the rate of social climbing, social sinking and horizontal mobility of each one of the three classes mentioned by him. Only there is a vague reference that upward mobility is relatively high among the middle class Brahmins of Gokul.

3. Writing about the generality and intensity of mobility in modern India he seems to agree with the contents of William Goode, that social mobility in India is comparable to many industrial countries of the West.

4. Commenting on the leverages of mobility he has mentioned three important leverages namely family and kinship, education and marriage. In Gokul, though the social status depended mostly on the individual’s performance in the non-kin oriented and impersonal occupational organizations of an urban milieu, the family and kinship
did function as bureau of employment, where considerations of family loyalty and kinship solidarity weighed more than merit in securing appointments for 30 per cent of the upwardly mobile Gokulites.

However, of all the leverages of upward social mobility in Gokul, education has been the most potent one. It has not only facilitated occupational mobility but has helped the upward mobility of both men and women of Gokul. He mentions that by and large the sons and daughters in Gokul have surpassed their parents in education. This fact has brought about tremendous repercussions in the rate and range of social mobility in Gokul.

Writing about the marriage as leverage of mobility, the author observes that 70 per cent of the marriages in Gokul are intra-class marriages where the mates belong to the same class, however there were 30 per cent of marriages across the class boundaries, of which 17 per cent can be described as hypogamous marriages (where lower class men have married upper class girls) and 13 per cent can be described as hypergamous marriages (where upper class men have married lower class girls). But the author has remained silent about the question as to how the inter-class marriages affect the class status of the households concerned.
5. Writing about the migratory movements of the Gokulites, the author observes that 15 per cent of the young men and women of Gokul have migrated. And this migration is essentially urban-ward migration. This he observes has accelerated the upward social mobility of young men in the lower and middle classes.

6. Commenting on the psychological residues of reference group behaviour mentioned by Merton, the author observes that in Gokul no such phenomenon is to be seen. He gives two reasons for this, "Social frictions, conflicts, disintegration and dissociative consequences (of reference group behaviour) have not been manifested probably because of relatively lower rate of social mobility and social change on the one hand and the insulating mechanisms of traditional socio-cultural constraints on the other". While the latter reason seems to be plausible the former tends to contradict the earlier observation of the author that social mobility in Gokul is relatively high (40.00).

7. As for kinship organization the author observes that, these changes have not weakened the kinship structure in Gokul. Relatives normally forget their status differences and help one another in normal and difficult times.

In the light of the foregoing discussion it can be concluded that due to the impact of modernization, the
The traditional pattern of stratification in India is being replaced by new patterns; especially the widespread modern educational system has not only introduced new values and ideologies among the different strata of Indian society but has also injected new dynamism into a system which was known for its changelessness. As a consequence, new occupations and hence new opportunities based on achievement rather than ascription have emerged.

The present study is an attempt to analyse in detail the various changes that are occurring in a specific occupation namely teaching. Efforts are made to study in detail the various aspects of mobility into and out of the teaching profession, socio-economic and demographic composition of the recruit teachers, their educational attainment, aims and aspirations, social legislations and their impact. It is hoped that this study will provide a glimpse into the changes that are now taking place in the stratification system of a small urban area in South India.

A controversy has arisen around the question whether teaching in India is a profession at all. Writers like Singh (The Indian Teacher, National, Delhi, 1969) and Shakuntala Saxena (Sociological Perspectives in Indian Education, Ashajanak Publication, New Delhi, 1975) who have applied Flexner's criteria of distinguishing professors from occupations have concluded that in India teaching does not fulfil some of these criteria to be called a profession. However, we do not propose to go into this controversy. We agree with Bernard Barber of Columbia University who holds the view that the line of distinction between the two is vague and indistinct. Hence in the body of our thesis we have used both the terms freely and interchangeably to describe the vocation of teachers.