Chapter - 2

A Theoretical Perspective of Elites.

The study of elite theory is an important component of modern political system. The concept of elite is not new. It is evident in the writings of Plato and Aristotle. The term Elite is used in different context under varied conditions for identifying its nature and role in the respective political system. However, it received serious attention during 19th century because of two Italian contributors viz., Vilfredo Pareto, a Sociologist and Gaetano Mosca, a Political Scientist. The Social scientists like Robert Michaels, Harold Lasswell, James Burnham, C.Wright Mills and Ortega Gasset have developed the 'Elite Theory' based on sociological, psychological and economic dimension. Karl Mannheim, Anthony Downs and Joseph Schumpeter are other leading exponents, who further developed this theory under different political systems.

Western Concept of Elite:

The term Elite is derived from Latin word 'Eligere' which means to choose or pick. The term elite was first used in Military administration as a choice of persons. The Concise dictionary defines the term Elite as choice, pick or select few. According to Harper's English dictionary it means 'Cream of Working class'. International Encyclopedia of Social Science describes 'Elite as a group of persons possessing certain fundamental features of life'. It is used as 'Choice' in 14th century and 'Best of the best' in the 15th century. "The
term elite was introduced to describe standard of excellence and latter extended to refer superior social groups such as highly successful military units and upper ranks of aristocracy"\(^1\). The nature of elites gradually shifted from aristocratic and oligarchic elements since 19\(^{th}\) century towards democratic elements. It shifted from Plato’s aristocratic rationality and Aristotle’s nobility of ancient period to superior groups of medieval period and then towards distinct and exclusive quality as the base for elites identification. The study became scientific with the emergence of liberal-democratic institutions in the West. The study received serious attention and recognition in every form of political system and became more popular in the early 20\(^{th}\) century.

**Vilfredo Pareto [1842-1923]:**

Vilfredo Pareto, an Italian Sociologist is regarded as major exponent of elite theory. He contributed to the 'Theory of Elites and Circulation of Elites' in the book 'The Mind & Society'. He applied socio-psychological factors to identify the elites and their nature. According to Pareto the marked degree of qualities differ from person to person in every society. In every civilized society only few persons shall have such inherent quality or marked excellence. In his opinion men are born unequal everywhere and unequal physically as well as mentally with regard to their abilities and capacities. Thus he made social stratification and class distinction on the basis of psychological traits such as 'superior class people as elites and the inferior one as non-elites'.
According to Pareto “By elite we mean the small number of individuals who in each sphere of activity have succeeded and have arrived at a higher echelon in the professional hierarchy “2. He defines elites as a superior class of people who possess better qualities and highest indices compared to others in their respective field. He identified them as the best in a particular field or branch in each sphere who exercise profound influence in a civil society. The elites are sizeable in number who occupy the highest positions on the basis of certain attributes and marked qualities. He divides the society on the basis of requisite qualities and the function they undertake in civil society in an organized fashion. Pareto advises elites to possess certain qualities to remain or maintain themselves in power. He calls the qualities as residues, on account of which an elite assume top position in a civilized society. “He has given six kinds of residues: 1] persistence of aggregates 2] sociability 3] activity 4] integrity 5] sex and 6] instinct of combinations”3. Pareto has given prominence to ‘Persistence of aggregates and Instinct of combinations’ to maintain elite status in a civilized society.

Pareto endorses Machiavellian views regarding the nature of human beings. In his opinion, man is guided by sentiments and passions. He is basically a creature of impulses and instincts. Every society has two types of individuals namely, foxes and lions. Foxes are bold and courageous but not cautious, yet use cunningness to survive. Lions are strong, conservative, tradition loving, orthodox and loyal to the ideals of family, religion and
country. They prefer to use force but not cleverness. Hence, people get their rulers from these categories.

Pareto divides civil society as governing and non-governing elites. He advocates inherent natural qualities and unequal distribution of residues in a civil society. On this basis, he proposed circulation of elites and nature of governing elites in a civil society. He argues residues of foxes believe in cunningness but reluctant to use force. They lack fidelity, hence unable to form stable society. The lion residue of elites possesses strong loyalty towards family, tribe, state and nation. They display patriotic fervour, strong nationalistic sentiment and feeling, rely more on force and manipulate power for the nationalistic concern. This will enable to overthrow a fox regime and establish their rule. The lion rule will not survive for longer period of time as society is dynamic. Hence it needs innovativeness. Here once again fox residue will come to rule.

According to Pareto "history is a graveyard of numerous fallen elites". There is uninterrupted cycle of rise and decline of elites in history. It is necessary to combine the elements of fox and lion residue to have a strong and stable society i.e. Persistence of aggregates and Instinct of combinations. Hence, the governing elite must have a good balance with combination of fox and lion residue for social and economic stability to establish social equilibrium.
Gaetano Mosca: [1858 – 1941]:

Gaetano Mosca, an Italian Political Scientist developed the ‘Elite Theory and Circulation of Elites’ expounded by Pareto in his famous book ‘The Ruling Class’. He adopted analytical method in his theory. According to Mosca ‘Elites in a society were nothing other than a ruling class’. He divided society as ruling and ruled class. The ruling class holds an elite status due to its ability in an organization. It is sizeable in number and smaller in group and better organized compared to the unorganized ruled class who are majority in number. The elites are organized minorities in a society.

Mosca adopted organizational approach for his study. He believed oligarchy elements as the base for elite recruitment. He quotes “In all societies from societies that are meagerly developed and have barely attained the dawning’s of civilization down to the most advanced and powerful societies - the two classes of people a class that rules and a class that ruled. The first class, always the less numerous, performs all political functions, monopolizes power and enjoys the advantage that brings. Where as the second the more numerous class is directed and controlled by the first in a manner that is more or less legal, now more arbitrary and violent and supplies the first in appearance with instrumentalities that are essential to the vitality of political organism”5. The larger the political community, he adds later ‘the smaller will be the proportion of the governing minority to be governed by, and more difficult it will be for the majority to organize against the minority.
Mosca, firmly believes that an elite holds power in an organization on the basis of ability and aptitude to command and exercise political control. They hold and retain power as long as they had aptitude to command and rule remains constant. Once the ruling class looses the aptitude to rule, command and control, there is possibility of replacement of elites. In this way Mosca admits the circulation of elite’s theory advocated by Pareto. The ruled class who are large in number among whom has the ability shall replace the old, thus new elites emerge says Mosca. In his opinion, the elites who do not adapt to changing conditions and failed to solve the emerging or new problems or interests are likely to replace by the new one. Thus, Mosca advises the governing elites to bring gradual alteration in the political system in order to make it confirm to changes in public opinion.

Robert Michels [1876-1936]:

Michels, the student of Mosca repeated the organizational approach in his famous book entitled ‘Political Parties’ [1915]. He defends the ‘Iron Laws of Oligarchy’ which provides unchecked and uncontrollable power to elites in a political system. But his theory of elite differs from Mosca. Michaels admits the virtue and ability of elites in controlling the political system. He believes elites as a minority group hold, influence and controls the political system by virtue of ‘Iron Laws of Oligarchy’. According to Michels “Elites consists of those few persons who are able to control the apathetic, indolent and slavish people who are susceptible to flattering and obsequious [obedient] in the presence of strength”6. His argument is based on the supreme power and grip
of elite in an organization. According to him, "Organization is simply another way of spelling Oligarchy". In his opinion, even the most democratic modern societies and within those societies the most advanced parties are unable to escape from the 'Iron Laws of Oligarchy'. The power of an organization is vested in the hands of leadership which is exercised by bureaucracy and other leading politicians of the party. The party hierarchy becomes an established career, once the leaders reach the pinnacle of power, nothing can bring them down. The elites power is sustained because of mass - mind, which is uncareful, slavish, apathetic, inaptitude and politically neutral. The shrewd leaders use their power, skill and oratory. Thus they dominate and influence the masses to follow and obey their orders and follow directions "If the laws are passed to control the domination of leaders, it is the law which gradually weaken and not the leaders". According to Michels, the leadership retains power simply because it is already constituted and continues so. Thus, Michel’s elite theory proposed conservative nature of oligarchy in modern democratic polity in a contemporary society.

Harold Lasswell [1902 – 1978]:

Lasswell, an American Political Scientist, identifies elites on the basis of 'Power and Influence Perspective'. His book called 'Politics, Who Gets What, When, How' quotes elites as those persons who get values which include deference, income and safety. He divided the people into elite and masses. According to him ‘Politics is the study of influence and the influential’. The influential are those who get the most of what there is to get. He quotes, "The
few who get the most of any value are the elite, the rest, and the rank and file". Thus, Laswell divided society as elites and masses.

According to Lasswell, "Elites are the power holders of a body politic". They are the holders of a high position in a given society. In his opinion elites are the most powerful group in a society who hold highest position of power in a political system. A person who gets least power is mid-elite and the least one as masses and the highest one as elite. There may be several types of elites in a society. The concept of elite is classificatory and descriptive designating the holders of high positions in a given society. The elite status is determined by which he terms it as wants which means values. He gave top priority to elite of power and further classify as elite of wealth, respect and knowledge. Lasswell postulated value sphere in to 8 characters - namely power, enlightenment, wealth, well-being, skill, affection, respect and rectitude.

Lasswell argues that the elite’s decision making power and action need masses back up and support if they need to be effective. Elite may take authoritative decision backed by force but its fate depends on the support of masses. If the masses disobey elite’s power or decision, he may have to lose the position, and then the counter elite with backup and support of the people usurp the position.

James Burnham:

James Burnham’s “Managerial Revolution” adopts economic approach to identify elitism. Burnham like Lasswell admits power as the parameter to
identify elitism in a contemporary society. Burnham's approach looks similar to Marx's views but in reality it differs in several aspects. According to Burnham the power of elite depends upon degree of control over the principal means of production and distribution. On the basis of such control an elite manages to get preferential treatment in the society and able to prevent the rest of others to enjoy the same position in the society. “Thus the easiest way to discover what the ruling group is in any society is usually to see that group gets the biggest income”\textsuperscript{11}. Burnham firmly believes that political power of the elite is the result of economic power, he enjoys and experiences in a given society. He explained that capitalist system would be replaced by a society that is controlled economically and politically by a managerial - elite as the capitalist had passed in the control of business to professional managers. The basis of elite (Political power and prestige) was the control over production. The managerial revolution ultimately leads to the consolidation of managerial power as the State takes over the industry, manager and the bureaucrat become interchangeable. Thus Burnham advocates the power of managerial - elite competent and defends the present system whereas Marx vests the power in the hands of labour class elites and totally rejects capitalist society.

C. Wright Mills:

According to Mills, the basis of elite power is economic and social not just economic as argued by Burnham. He advocates that those who occupy
top positions in the institutions are power elites. They move on to positions of the power in government.

According to Mills “Elites are those who hold the leading positions in the strategic hierarchies”\textsuperscript{12}. He is concerned with power and rule rather than legal sources of legitimacy. In his opinion power is not an attribute of classes or persons but of institutions. His book Power Elites- 1959 adopted ‘Institutional Power Approach’ for the study of elites. It is the power in an institution that determines the position, status, authority and influence of elite in a modern society. The institutional power determines the role of elites and further empowers them to determine or fix the role of others in a contemporary society.

Ortega. Y. Gasset [1883 – 1955]:

Gasset provides unprecedented power to masses. He firmly believed that people choose elites on the basis of their outstanding abilities. They select their leaders by pouring their vast store of vital enthusiasm, belief and trust that they may guide and lead the masses in better way. They remain in power as long as they enjoy the trust and confidence of masses. According to Gasset, the rule and the ruled, capacity to lead and capacity to be lead is natural and common in human phenomena. Thus on this belief he has developed masses backed elite theory.

Gasset defines elite as a person of outstanding ability, who assumes power with the back up of masses. In his opinion masses recruit and remove elites. Thus elites are the chosen elements of the population. Masses render
support and repose faith in their administration as long as they are satisfied and feel safe. He quotes, “The masses revolt when aristocracy becomes corrupt and inefficient, and the motive behind the revolt is not that they have objection of being ruled by aristocracy but would like to be ruled by more competent aristocracy. The fact of aristocratic rule thus cannot be lost sight of.

The central concern of Gasset is to tell that when masses are in a country believed that they can do without aristocracy, the nation inevitably declines. In the disillusionment the masses again turn to the new leadership and a new aristocracy emerges”13.

**Modern Concept of Elite Theory:**

Karl Mannheim, Anthony Downs and Joseph Schumpeter are the other leading exponents who further developed elite theory under different political systems. They revised and reconciliated the elite theory by providing a democratic framework under modern political systems.

**Karl Mannheim: [1893 – 1947]:** Karl Mannheim initially related elite theory with Fascism and anti intellectual doctrine and later reconciliated between elite and democratic theory. The theory of elites proposes the rule of few and a microscopic minority which is obviously opposed to democratic form of government. He argues that the nature of society remains democratic, even though the policy and decision making is in the hand of chosen elites. The people cannot take direct part in the government but they can make their aspirations felt at certain intervals and this is sufficient for the government. “Manheim asserts that though the actual shaping of policy is in the hands of
elites, it does not mean that the society is democratic"14. He proposed the
method to narrow the gap between elites and masses for the stable
governance. He insists that selection of elites must be on the basis of merit
and a shortening distance between elites and masses in order to ensure
compatibility between elite rule and government.

Joseph Schumpeter: Joseph adopted institutional method to identify the
nature of elites and forms of government. In his book, 'Capitalism, Socialism
and Democracy' he proposed plurality of elite theory. "According to him the
forms of government should be distinguished by their institutions and
especially by their method of appointing and dismissing the supreme makers
of law and policy"15. The democratic method is the institutional arrangement
for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to
decide by means of a competitive struggle for the votes of the people. This
shows that democracy is not a government of the people or a means to give
effect to the will of the people. The role of people is merely to choose their
rulers from competing elites. The one great merit of democracy is that it does
not allow political leadership to wield absolute power. Leadership must draw
up policies to win over the electorate. The initiative remains in the hands of
the leaders and the people merely to decide which among them want to
represent them. He added an economic input while choosing the competitive
elites in a democratic society.

Anthony Downs: Anthony an author of 'Economic Theory of Democracy'
recognizes the role of economic inputs is a major factor in elite recruitment.
Parties in democratic politics writes Anthony Downs “are analogous to entrepreneurs in a profit seeking economy, so as to attain their profit ends, they formulate what ever politics they believe will gain the most votes, just an entrepreneurs to produce politics what ever products they believe will gain the most profits for the same reason”16.

According to Western elite theory protagonists, inequality is largely found in every society. In their opinion masses lack certain qualities [residues/values], attitudes and actions which cannot withstand on equal footing on par with the elites. Such traits and elements distinguish and demarcate the gap between elite and non - elite. The distinction and the gap between the two identify their position and status in a society. The chances of mass becoming an elite is possible in form of circulation or replacement of elites by acquiring certain attributes or receiving mass mandate, yet the gap remains and continue in a society.

Elites emerge in every society because of set traditions, socio-economic status, physical and mental aptitude, charismatic personality and so on. They are sizable or minimum in number in a given society and normally hold or usurp power, position and status. They are the microscopic minority of the society thus hold the elite status due to distinct qualities compared to the rest such as pre-eminence, prestige, status, ability and capability to deliver the goods and services. There is distinct gap and between elites and masses who are non-elites and non power or position seekers or gainers.
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Elites and non-elites evolve and constitute social organisation and compensate each other in an organized society. The elite recruitment differs in each political system. In a Monarchial form of government, a rule of few normally belongs to Kinship or upper strata of society who is identified as elite. In an Oligarchic form of political system, it is a government by the few privileged who occupy coveted and esteemed position on account of pre-eminence and status in society compared to the rest. However in democratic polity, elites are the chosen elements of public through periodic elections held at regular intervals, still it is the privilege of few to rule or administer, generally assume the power on account of specific attributes, skill and strategy. Even though there is provision and opportunity to change or remove them in their place, similar elite assume the position thus makes it a distinct and keep the gap that exists before or as it is in relative term. Hence we may assume that the nature of elite is an organized microscopic minority of a given society though the nature of political system differs. They command the willingness, acceptance of the masses even it may be a dictatorial in nature.

The above observations reveal the nature of elitism as,

1) The division of society is natural, rational and functional.

2) Elites agree that society is broadly divided into two categories – elites- and masses. Elites belong to ruling class or power holders where as masses are the non – elites belong to ruled class on account of natural differences in terms of specific qualities and attributes.

3) Elites are an organized minority class in a society.
4) Elites hold or manage or secure or maintain power on account of specific qualities cleverness, strategy and skills.

5) The dominance and pre-eminence of elite is inherent in social organizations. It is not alterable although there is chance for circulation of elites more so in democratic polity yet it is elite who ultimately holds the power and position. The masses shall not get chance to rule or administer. Karl Mannheim proposes to select or elect elite on the basis of merit to shorten the distance and gap with non - elites to ensure compatibility yet the rule and dominance of elite prevail over the non -elite.

The elite theorists' views revolved around distribution of power in a society. According to them the social background and personal attributes play significant role in elite recruitment and distribution of power. The direct influence of social background and distinct attributes of a person is evident in elite recruitment. The social background, distinct attributes and charismatic personality do have closer link which identifies the nature of elites and non-elites and their respective role in society. The social background such as heirachy, kinship is powerful indicators in formative political system. Where as distinct qualities and charismatic personality holds the key in identifying or choosing elites in democratic polity. They do have positive influence in elite recruitment. There is no uniform opinion among elite theorists regarding the distinct type of attributes or traits that an elite should have, but they do agree that capability, efficiency and professional attitude and approach do have significant impact while choosing the elite. Modern theorists like ...
Schumpeter and Anthony Downs who are protagonists of plurality of elites advocated the significance of economic aspects in elite recruitment.

The Western concept of elitism does not exactly suit or identify the nature of elites according to 'Indian Freedom Movement' context. The Indian elites are different from the Western elites on certain attributes and features, yet the two are microscopic minority of a society. The Indian elites came from professional background such as Lawyers, Doctors, and Teachers and so on. Here we observe the concept of Pareto who proposed professional hierarchy as a parameter to identify elites. The Indian elites compose value excellence such as enlightment, respect and rectitude as proposed by Lasswell in his theory. The Indian elites received masses confidence and support because of their outstanding ability as advocated by Gasset. The views of these three western elite theory protagonists resemble or may be found in Indian elites during the transition period from a traditional society towards building a modern India on a secular platform. The net composition of these attributes is observed among enlightened Indian elites at the time of national movement. Ranade mentioned specific traits, such as wealth, intelligence, reason and social status as a parameter to identify elites. He advised the elites to direct their energy, intelligence and experience and status for social, economic development of the masses who are unlettered, illiterate and ignorant and bring political consciousness among them. In this background social status, educational experience and professional competency in terms of service
orientation towards nation building exercise and complex social issues certainly influenced elite recruitment in India.

The Indian elites are not power holders but ruled by alien government. Their endeavour is revolved around liberation process of the nation. The western elites are power holders and seekers where as Indian, the freedom lovers and seekers. The Indian elites are identified on functional basis and act in the larger interest of apolitical and unorganized society. They serve with a vision to bring awareness among masses and emancipate them and the nation socially, economically and politically on constructive base in a sustainable manner. Hence the concept of elites according to Indian Freedom Movement context may be defined as a body of enlightened persons among the newly educated class who possess excellent pre-eminence with an attitude of work culture towards national reconstruction compared to others rest in a contemporary society. Elites are such persons who have better perception of national issues, socio-economic problems and dedicate their service for the realization of Swarajya on Swadeshi principles. Elite may be called as an enlightened person who holds or possess entrepreneurial quality and dedicate service for nationalistic purpose.

In short 'Elites are the torch bearers of social change and transformation who not only act in a hostile environment but also educate, motivate and guide others to join national mainstream concerning national issues to regain Swarajya on Swadeshi principles'. The nature and operation of elites in apolitical society of British-India period widely differ compared
to the Western concept as they have to operate in hostile environment due to causative socio-economic and political factors.

**Elitism in India: A Historical Perspective:**

The elite theories propagated by the Western Scholars cannot be adapted to Indian condition in 'Toto' because of different socio-cultural settings and political conditions prevailed during the pre-independence era. The elite status was determined on the basis of heredity, hierarchy, tradition and continuity in Monarchy and Aristocratic or religious bent of rule or governance, since ancient to medieval period in Europe. It was also similar in India. A gradual shift appeared after 'renaissance and industrial revolution' in Europe. Since then intellectuals gradually penetrated the kinship patronized elite corridor. As a result new form of elite recruitment emerged and mercantile and industrial society took firm root in Western Europe. The formation of 'Constitutional Monarchy' and establishment of liberal democratic institutions in Britain brought flexibility to an elite character. The autocratic and despotic rule in Italy, Germany unification process and the French revolution changed the complexion of elite character. It was in this background Western Scholars particularly the Italians advocated elite theories. In quite contrast, the nature of elites in India remained same, with Brahmin, Kshatriya followed by Vaishya retaining a dominant position until the expansion of Mughul rule in India. Even under Mughul rule too, except few modification elitism was largely revolved around military and feudal cadre. It was only after the advent and expansion of British rule in India that
western influenced educated Indians belonged to upper and middle class emerged as elites in India. It was observed that socialization process in India was restricted to upper strata and remained so since millennium largely due to illiteracy, lack of educational opportunities for the majority of people and the downtrodden Shudra community. Hence social mobility and power was restricted to upper strata of the society. Even though Indian social mobility was strong but its nature was apolitical. Hence no concrete elite theories emerged in India or an attempt made to evolve unlike the western scholars.

The above observation provides comparative difference regarding emergence and nature of elites of two different environment and political systems. The national - liberal type of elites replaced the monarchial- feudal nature elites since 16th century in Western Europe. In India the monarchial - feudal elites evolved since millennium, lost importance and dominance during British rule. They replaced by reformatory and revival forms of elites in the first phase and later as national -liberal elites since 19th century largely due to British legacy in India. The marked and a distinct gap of nearly three centuries for the transformation of an elite structure and nature of political system between the two indicate the difference and significance. It is observed that internal factors and conditions influenced a change and circulation of elites and their structure in western European countries. 'In India, it was largely due to alien rule, role and impact'. Hence it is important to study the evolution of elites in India from historical perspective for the research to
analyze and review their contribution towards the liberation of motherland from foreign yoke.

The elite structure in India was based on the ascribed status, since the ancient period. The ascribed status determined the value of excellence on the basis of distinct qualities in terms of service rendered by respective 'Varnas'. The social structure was pre-determined according to the 'Varna-System' as quoted in Manu - Smruti. The Manu - Smurti legitimized the political, religious and socio-cultural setting of traditional and conventional society restricting specific specialized service to the upper strata. The social stratification composed of Brahman, Kshatriya and Vaishya Varna and followed by Shudra Varna, bottom strata of society to serve the upper strata and undertake manual service.

"The Social structure of elites in traditional India was based on the principles of hierarchy, holism and continuity ... the cardinal values of the Hindu tradition. King and Priest (Kshatriya and Brahmaan) were the important Varnas, derived their power and role due to their ascribed status in traditional society. The socio-cultural and moral frame was provided to these two Varnas to perform their service and activities in a co-operative and complimentary way". The Kshatriya-Varna was entrusted to protect the territory internally and externally and protect Priestly class, strictly adhere to Varna - norms and provide congenial environment. The Brahman, a Priestly class was entrusted to perform moral and religious activities and advise king to perform and stick to Raj - Dharma. The third kind of elite belong to Vaishya
- Varna assigned to perform economic activities who serve as the support base for self sufficiency and development of entire social system. Shudra, the last Varna was entrusted the manual work, thus denied and deprived of important and specific duties although its composition was significant. The traditional Indian society ascribed upper status to Brahmin, Kshatriya and Vaishya, on the basis of their inherited distinct qualities in terms of value - excellence. Manu - Smurti which was treated as the base and foundation of the Varna system, specify distinct qualities as the base to determine the status not simply the birth as a parameter to determine the same. Yet it was determined, identified and continued on the basis of birth in a particular Varna or Caste on holistic principle as part of convention. Since then the hierarchy, heredity and holistic and loyalty principles continued and succeeded and determined the traditional elite structure in India in a closed net work and designed and assigned duties to perform harmoniously.

The Kshatriya normally a King or Emperor was political elite. He appointed ‘Ministry of Council’ belonged to various categories such as Amatya (Minister), Priest, Senapati (Commander - in - Chief), Yuvaraj, Samant - Raja, normally on the basis of heredity, loyalty and patronage. He was surrounded and supported by subordinate elites who served as a group in a co-operative and complimentary way in a closed net-work from top to bottom. The size of elites depended on the geographical territory of the kingdom. In Mauryan time the emperor had his own centrally administrated territory surrounded by ‘Vassal - Kingdoms subordinate to him in a varying
degrees. "Vassals themselves had Vassals of their own in petty local chieftains calling themselves as rajas. The relationship of king with his Vassals was not contractual as in the west; it was governed by arbitrary relationship of power and conquest". It was similar during the Chalukya, Chola and Vijayanagar dynastic rule in South during ancient and medieval period. The relation and network between the King or Emperor and the Vassals or Samant remained as long as the former was able to control his territory. Once he loses or equation changes the elite structure remains the same but the power and stakeholders change. Thus the elite structure and its nature was predominantly monarchial, feudal and charismatic and remained same. Even the circulation of elites followed the same path where Varna or may call caste affiliation which was deeply rooted in the then social system that helped to maintain the status quo defended it as a natural or divine right.

The advent and consolidation of Mughal rule modified certain administrative system but the elite structure was more or less remained the same. Mughal, to retain their sovereignty and control the vast territory, appointed prominent elites to the key positions such as Wazir, Diwan, Subedar, Qazi, Sadar Bakshi etc. The religious functions were delivered by Ulemmas, a Priestly Class in Emperor’s Council. Majority of them were Muslims and only few Hindu elites appointed for coveted positions in Civil and Military administration. The Emperor was supreme. His powers were indivisible and inalienable. He was symbol of unity and preserver of peace above all expected to rule according to Islamic traditions and obey the
commands of Ullemmas. Emperor Akber brought flexibility and introduced Indo-Persian elements in his administration which synthesized and infused co-operative role of elites in India. "A more compact feudal structure of elites emerged with the establishment and consolidation of Moghal Empire". Under their Imperial rule the defeated or accepted native kings became their Vassal thus maintained their elite structure. The introduction of Manasabadar system emerged as new feudal nobility during their rule. The Muslim rule only replaced the persons or officers involved in elite status and not the system as such it was succession of one class of elites by another in the same system rather than a change in the structure or functions of elite.

The advent and consolidation of British rule in India provided avenues and fillip for the emergence of new kind of elites in India. The national-liberal type of elites replaced the traditional elites during the long standing British regime. It began with the advancement of British India Company rule since 1760's by providing a space to local traders and businessman to serve as middlemen to suit their economic interest initially in the Presidencies and recruited Sepoys in their Military to retain their supremacy. With the introduction of reforms in socio-economic and educational sectors, the new form of professional elites gradually entered the national mainstream. i.e., Bureaucrats, Social Reformers, Educationalists, Journalists and Entrepreneurs. Among them quite a few enlightened elites established 'Voluntary Organizations and Mass-Media' especially at their respective Presidencies through which undertook national awakening
exercises and created patriotic fervour. Since then the freedom movement began under one common platform, the INC from Presidencies to Provinces and towards Tehsils to rural areas from 1885 to 1942 under the spirited guidance of national and local elites.

**Indian Concept of Elitism and Nationalism:**

Nationalism and Elitism go hand in hand and are co-related as far as Indian Freedom movement is concerned. In a way they are two faces of the same coin. Whether nationalism is prior to elitism or vice versa is a debatable point of view. What is important from the study point of view is to probe and study their emergence. Here it is believed that the nationalism and elitism emerged in India due to the legacy of British Raj. The spirit of nationalism was anti-colonial by nature. This view was endorsed by several scholars except like Annie- Beasant. But the concept of new form of elitism emerged in India due to several contributory factors introduced by British in form of various reforms which cannot be rejected wholly. At the same time the spirit of nationalism upsurged in India due to the shared experience under alien rule in different sectors and cannot be denied from holistic point of view. Here it is important to study and review the views and approaches put forward by several scholars.

**Annie-Beasant:**

Mrs. Annie Besant, a noble elite and front runner of Indian freedom movement endorsed her view that nationalism in India was not born just because of British rule or grace. It was inherent and evident in Indian history.
The cultural heritage of India simply portrays her glimpses in each sector since millennium which was even unknown to Europeans of that age. She quotes "Indian national consciousness was not a plant of mushroom growth, but a giant of the forest with millennium behind it"²⁰. Beasent argues that the nationalism was embedded in Indian culture since millennium. The British rule in India had indeed strengthened the nationalistic feeling and prepared the country for self government. Besant admits that British rule in India has performed well in educational sector but its imperial record in economic sector was dismal. British hands had been used to drain the wealth of India. Beasent claims that "a prosperous and wealthy nation which once had enjoyed security of property, immense industrial output and a flourishing merchant class has now been reduced to poverty and wrecked by famine and starvation. ..... She believes that deteriorated situation could be arrested by showing vigor and strength and regain the lost glory of India through Indian National Congress. India under impetus of nationalism would regain her lost liberty and become self governing nation"²¹.

Beasent's views are more spiritual, philosophical and historical in a sense that portrays the scenario and glory of ancient civilization and depicts the same that is embedded in Indian culture even in modern period is not true. Several scholars disagree the views of Beasent's statement that nationalism never grew or permeated in India on large scale. It was only after the advent of British that an opportunity raised to infuse the spirit of nationalism and a need of integrated nation hood. Secondly Beasent speaks of
religious integrity and cultural nationalism that bonded Indians since millennium under common culture thread is true. In reality, India hardly witnessed political homogeneity except for few occasion as it was ruled by several Kings, Emperors from time to time, place to place. The loyalty and obedience was restricted to particular province, kingdom so long they were protected by the former. The unified political integration as one unit was hardly visible in India. Hence, Beasant’s approach may be rejected on this background. If nationalistic feeling and sentiments were so deep in peoples mind, since millennium, how there was no resistance to the foreign rule, why the elites were silent? Beasant’s views do not properly answer to these questions. In spite of such draw backs, one may find positive elements in her proposition. Her views of cultural heritage of the past indeed boosted the morale and spirit for the national movement cannot be overlooked. The native elites, specially the revivalists like Dayanand Saraswati of Arya Samaj, extremists leaders like Tilak, Lala Lajapat Rai, Aurobindo and literary celebrities like Bankim Chandra Chatarjee and Ravindranth Tagore highlighted the significance of rich cultural heritage of India and sacrifice of national heroes and their valour, martyrdom which framed and infused the spirit of patriotism during the freedom movement.

M. N. Roy:

Manabendra Nath Roy, an author of India in Transition (1922) presents the emergence of Indian nationalism and role of the middle classes during the British reign. He adopted economic approach in his study. His
views relied on dialectic materialism of Karl Marx. According to him, the
nationhood and nationalism concept emerged due to the advent of British
imperialism in India. He rejects the views of Beasant and on the contrary
argued that concept of nation hood was unknown to India. He quotes India
during the days of Hindu and Muslim rule was a mere geographical
expression. Hindu kingdoms that rose were theocratic and patricidal in
nature and what motivated them was “dynastic ambition, pure and simple.
Under Muslim rule although India was brought under one central rule it was
not a nation because the court of Delhi was not the centre of a national
state”22.

Roy argues that feudalism as the basis of social economics received
first death blow with British victories in the middle of eighteenth century and
during the next century. It was progressively weakened with the last vestige
of feudal power shattered by the failure of the revolt of 1857. The middle class
realising the decay of feudal order consciously supported the British to
safeguard their material interest in order to establish a more advanced
economic system. In a way it was reciprocal and beneficial for the both.
British rulers in acknowledgment of this support gave the middle class
opportunities to trade, invest in land and acquire modern education and
professional skills. Roy contends that the British permitted the new learning
on the belief that its products would be their natural ally and oppose any
reactionary upheavals. How ever the result turned out to be quite different,
for modern education was to let loose “that dynamic social force which was
destined to prove eventually mortal to British. Not only did the Indian intellectuals class showed signs of vigour in social and religious reformism, but more significant its members also became the forerunners of Indian nationalism"^{23} who worked to bring about the dissolution of British imperialism. Roy argued that the intellectuals, land owners and traders desire was to foster their class interest. British realizing their ambitions perceived threat in future imposed restrictive measures to check their economic advancement. On the contrary, the newly emerged class established associations in respective Presidencies to protect their interest and pressure the administration to redress the grievances which combined economic and political elements. They began asserting nationalistic views through agencies and media to build consciousness and form public opinion. According to Roy, economic necessity forced the intellectual bourgeoisies to begin political struggle which was initiated in form of Indian National Congress. The intellectuals who were the vanguard of the movement proclaimed that the sovereign power is not vested in individual but in the entire community united in to a nation. They raised issues such as representative institutions, Indianisation of Civil Services, the development of home industry and boycott of foreign goods.

In the opinion of Roy the newly emerged middle class whom he identifies as bourgeoisie desired to strengthen the capitalist society in India. The middle class intellectuals, combining land lords and traders main motive was to strengthen their base and economic interest. Hence they established
economic motivated political associations to put pressure on British administration which has imposed repressive measures, discriminatory tariff to check their economic advancement. In order to garner the support of masses, elites of these associations furiously made campaign and made publicity in the name of nationalism. They have hardly done any good to peasant community and industrial workers who were the worst sufferers under the alien regime. Even the Congress an all India Organization established by these bourgeoisie directed its activities to safe guard the interest of these associations and did not take up the cause of masses. Thus it was clear ploy and deception policy of native elites in the name of masses to cry for nationhood and self rule. He further perceived growing class conscious among workers pave the way to form trade union to fight for their rights. As a result, revolution takes in a capitalist society which will be a setback to national movement as masses withdraw its support to Congress.

Roy’s theory relies heavily on Marxist materialistic interpretation of history towards the emergence of new class [elitism] and the concept of nationalism. Several scholars criticized his theory as purely based on Marxist notion and suits industrial societies not the agrarian and plural society like India. His claim of ‘Bourgeoisies State’ and Congress purely an economic motivated organization at All India level to safeguard and promote it’s interest was biased and purely personal opinion. His views discard and hurt the primary motive of promoters of All India Organization and the national interest and pride. It overlooked the role and contribution of national elites
and the Congress at All India level. Roy's prediction of working class revolt and diversification from Congress during freedom movement was hardly visible. He simply filled Marxist inputs as a major determinant factor to the rise of new economic and social groups to whom he called as capitalists of modern India. In spite of drawbacks one may find valid point in his concept that the economic factor played one of the important roles and the British economic policy indeed created a new class in Indian society. This class provided valuable inputs to the national movement.

B. T. McCully:

McCully, a Research Scholar published a monograph entitled "English Education and the Origin of Indian Nationalism". He explained the factors for the rise and growth of nationalism and emergence of new type of class which may be termed as elites. In his opinion the word nationalism was truly unknown to India.

McCully conceives, "English education as the agency through which nationalism entered India". The emergence of new form of educated class namely the elites are the product of English education which imparted modern, liberal, secular and common education to Indians. The government patronage combined with missionary zeal and private enterprise had helped to produce the educated class in India. They essentially belonged to upper Hindu caste coming from middle and lower income group belonged to Presidency Capitals and District Towns. The so called educated sought employment in government and liberal professions which the Company
administration provided to fulfill its needs. As the days progressed the number of educated increased and the employment opportunities decreased, thus dissatisfaction against the alien regime began. It was due to their resentment and aspirations that the seed of nationalism germinated in India. British policies were responsible for chronic unemployment and deteriorating situation and the worsening economic condition. According to him it were these issues that provided fuel for the national agitation.

In the opinion of Mc Cully, the newly educated Indians were deeply influenced by western liberal ideas and rational thought and its democratic structure. Such impact encouraged and influenced them towards democratic thinking under the shared experience. Gradually they alienated from rigid traditions which were harmful to their existence and survival. The secular and common education imparted a sense of unity consciousness and identity among the educated class which was able to perceive the common economic problems. This gradually helped to build class solidarity and narrow the parochial, regional and caste oriented problems and complexity. The educational experience and professionalism gave them a psychological edge and superiority over the masses. They made an endeavour to bring national consciousness and patriotic fervour among the masses by utilizing various platforms. This enabled to gain the support of masses to fight against the alien regime. Thus, he argues that British rule in India produced an atmosphere for the favourable growth of national sentiment. It was an English education which alone played significant role from which a distinct class emerged
capable of transcending linguistic and caste differences. He quotes "certainly not religion, not indigenous learning, not traditional forms of social organization nor all three could have done so. To what extent the new education imparted by the British provided integrative force which brought together in a single cause natives of different provinces and localities speaking different tongues".

Mc Cully identifies nationalism as modern phenomena which emerged in India due to British rule. He rejects its existence in pre-colonial rule. He implicitly advocate that elitism born in form of educated middle class in Presidencies and District towns due to British patronization of modern and secular education which later became a potent weapon in national movement. The modern liberal and secular education brought uniformity, unity and integrity. This helped to narrow the provincial, regional, and linguistic and caste differences which dominated since millennium took back seat and thus provided national interest a primary and top priority.

His theory advocates that British educational policy was alone responsible for the rise of nationalism. English education was a key factor for the emergence of new form of class which played important role in national movement. However, he has not given due importance to economic and social factors and cultural aspects. The British rule indeed brought educational reforms but its economic policies badly hit the social base of rural India. The villages lost self sufficiency and indigenous technology. The repressive economic policies employed against native traders and business
community compelled to form economic and political associations to safeguard their interest which gradually became a platform thus transformed to establish INC at All India level. He has not highlighted such potent elements which played crucial role in the movement. Yet his theory highlights English education and knowledge as a major determinant factor that brought a secular and modern outlook among the native educates. This focused them towards national interest and narrow parochial, regional, linguistic, and caste difference which itself is significant contribution of McCully.

In the light of above observations, the emergence of elitism and spirit of nationalism in India may be summarised as:

1. Elitism in India is the product of alien rule on domestic soil.

2. British liberal education is the key factor for the emergence of new kinds of elites in India.

3. The alien administration provided avenues for the emergence of new classes and elites in India, primarily at Presidencies later the same expanded to other urban segments.

4. The new kind of elite's normally belonged to ascribed or upper strata of urban society primarily came from upper and middle class with liberal and rational western educational background. They succeeded in breaking the conventional traditional kinship elite corridor dominated by aristocratic elements and feudal lords.
5. The first generation of new elites were revivalists and reformers who synthesized the good old tradition of ancient culture and the liberal progressive bent of western culture as a new vista for social change and transformation to build modern India on humanitarian and secular principles.

6. The new kinds of elites were the pioneers of Indian renaissance who stood and served in favour of socio-religious reforms to awaken the masses who were slumbered in darkness since millennium.

7. The modern elites established voluntary associations and utilized the service of Mass-Media as a platform for the realization of their vision pertaining to their respective sectors. The revival and reformative elites paved the way and laid the foundation and influenced for the establishment of political institutions at national level. As a result national-liberal elites became the front runners of national movement who initially began their career as reformers and later as retaliators due to anti-Indian policies.

Lastly new type of classes and elites emerged in India due to changing scenario under alien rule, primarily influenced by western education and later due to shared experience under British, which was a baggage of mixed fruits. It may be observed that not all the new classes shall be claimed as elites. The term elite as per the national movement do compose ethical and honorary connation based on service orientation towards nationalistic issues. Any person who has directly or indirectly participated or assisted in the political awakening endeavour which is complimentary to national movement may be
called as elites. In other words every freedom fighter is elite because of unselfish service and sacrifice for national interest. The quite a few among them offered distinctive service compared to the remaining and guided the nationalistic activities but the others followed their command as a disciplined soldiers and accomplished the mission that ultimately led to the realization of Swarajya. The service and contribution of soldiers cannot be overlooked hence the generic reference as elites of national movement.

**Elite Recruitment in British - India:**

The elite recruitment in pre-independent India may be identified on professional basis with reference to their function towards national movement. The distinctive service rendered by them towards nation building exercises on various platforms such as social, cultural, economical and political sector is a parameter to identify them as enlightened elites. The sectors look varied and different but inter-related and inter-woven to build modern India on liberal and rational outlook. Here we may believe that the concept of elites and spirit of nationalism evolved in India due to ground realities and the prevailed contemporary situations and conditions. The East-India Company rule provided the occasion and space to the rise of new social classes especially in strategically located coastal belts of Bengal, Bombay and Madras. We may observe that the western scientific education and service of Christian Missionaries provided necessary inputs to the rise of new social classes. The endeavour of Company administration to seek support and
assistance of local traders and native soldiers supplemented and complimented for the rise of new social classes on professional basis.

The first batch of elites came from Bengal who served as path finders, free from prejudice and attitude towards any religion and section of society. They made endeavour for human development index as a solution and remedy to achieve progress in tune with progressive west. They opted social reforms of comprehensive base as an approach to realise their vision. The liberation from ignorance, prevention of social evils and emancipation and welfare of downtrodden and weaker section of society was their primary goal. They established voluntary organizations and utilized the service of media (mass) for the realization of their vision or goal. Bengal and its elites were in fore front and front runners who influenced and made due impact on Bombay and Madras Presidency, Punjab and Pune and other important segments. The reason was obvious. Bengal was the first Indian province to be exposed to the system of western education and to the influx of western ideas and socio-cultural values. The benefits and marked a distinctive progress further expanded it's horizon thus laid a platform to build modern India. It is aptly quoted and pointed by several eminent scholars that ‘The vision of today’s Bengal, is a vision of India tomorrow’. The birth of new social classes and emergence of elites primarily began from Bengal in a sustainable manner and gradually expanded to other segments in a similar way with a progressive note.
In the light of above observation, we may identify the origin of new social classes of distinctive sector. It is observed that the birth of Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1784, Fort William College in 1800 and prior to that the service of Christian Missionaries in education, charitable services and the earlier encouragement and support to local traders and recruitment of soldiers in army indeed provided an opportunity to the rise of new social classes. The 1793 Permanent Settlement Act and subsequent educational reforms of Lord Macaulay 1813 and 1835 Lord William Bentik and establishment of Universities at Presidencies and encouragement to Technical courses were primarily responsible to the rise of new social classes. The major communities of Bengal especially belong to Bhadralok community coming from rich [few] middle and lower income groups were the major beneficiaries.

**Rise of Professional Classes:**

Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Dwarkanatha Tagore, Radhakant Deb and the effort of British elites such as Robert May, Davis Hare, G.A. Turnbull, Alexander Duff, Henry Louis, Vivian Derozio and service of Christian educational institutions certainly laid the foundation stone to impart and study western scientific education along with the native subjects. The introduction of English as a medium of instruction for higher learning provided the base. The upper communities belong to rich, middle and lower income groups realised the need and importance of western learning due to opportunities offered by alien administration in civil service. They took the advantage and seized the opportunity. The orthodox family too did not lag
behind. The Bhadralok community seized the opportunities and succeeded in cutting dominance and influence of feudal lords. Keshavachandra Sen, Ishwarchandra Vidyasagar, Shashiprasad Banarjee. Akshaykumar, Nagopal Mitra, Rajnarian Bose, Michal Madsudan Dutt and Gajendranath Tagore were the important few to name as first batch national liberal elites. They made distinctive service in the national movement. The majority of them were Brahmo followers who were primarily responsible to spread Brahmo message and vision in Bombay, Madras, and Punjab Province and expanded the base in Orissa, Andhra Pradesh and even in Karnataka. The long standing influence of such towering personalities and impact of western education was evident for the emergence of prominent young nationalists from the Bengal Presidency. Surendhra Banarjee, W.C. Banarjee, Bipin Chandra Pal, Bankim Chandra, Aurobindo and Swami Vivekananda were prominent among them.

On similar lines the new bunch of educated intellectuals whom we may call enlightened elites emerged from Bombay Presidency and Pune in Maharashtra. The traditional orthodox Chitpavan Brahmin was surprised beneficiary. The Parsee, Jain and Muslim (few) and Shetias of wealthy background and landlords belonged to the Maratha and Brahmin were the beneficiaries who too made distinct mark in various sectors. Atmaram Pandurang, M.G.Ranade, Dadabhai Naoroji, Badaruddin Tyabji, K.T. Telang, Madam Cama, Narayan Chandavarkar, G.K.Gokhale, G.H.Deshamukh, Jyotiba Phule, Vishnushastri Pundit and Agarkar and B.G.Tilak were prominent among them.
Rise of Economic Classes:

The Colonial rule provided the rise of new commercial class for the expansion of her trade “while the Britishers were expanding their trade in Bengal, they got support from traders in Bengal, and North India. Gupta, who was an influential trader and money lender helped the British in consolidating their position both in the economic and in political sphere”26. The rise of new commercial classes apart from the traditional changed the elite structure of Vaishya Varna. The upper and middle class belonged to Bhadrlok community of Bengal and Brahmin, Prabhu and Parsi community of Bombay, Chettiar and Brahmin community of Madras Presidency became the influential traders to increase the volume of British trade in India. The Company administration encouraged these new social classes as they were beneficial to British economic interest. Similarly these new economic class collaborated with the British for their economic advancement. It was reciprocal and beneficial for the two.

With the growth of native business class and trade, the alien administration started to impose stiff measures to curtail their progress. The native business community located in Presidency realising the threat, established economic oriented political organization in their respective location to safeguard their interest. Anil seal pointed out that the collaborator of the past became the corroborators of alien government. Ironically the influential business community generously donated funds towards socio-religious reforms activities such as Brahmo Samaj and Arya Samaj to create
awareness and consciousness and engage in socio-economic development for more than one reason. The Bhadralok community of Bengal, Parsee, Jain, Brahmin, Maratha and Bohara Muslim of Bombay and Western India, Brahmans and Chettriyars of Madras Presidency were important in this regard. Incidentally quite a few among them took direct part in national movement namely, Dadabhai Naoroji, Badaruddin Tayyabji, Phiroj Shah Mehta, Telang from Bombay, S.N. Banarjee, Anand Mohan Bose, Madan Mohan of Bengal and P. Anand Charlu, Veera Raghavachari and G Subramanian from Madras were right on top of among them. The remaining a lot indirectly supported the movement.

It is believed that industrialist of the period like Bajaj, Tata and Birla's generously donated funds to socio-economic and charitable services. On the face it did not appear to be political purpose but indeed contain latent motto. Dadabhai Naoroji was more vocal and highlighted the grave injustice meted by British towards the natives in his Drain theory. He even raised the issue as member of British Parliament in the House of Commons.

Agrarian Classes:

In a similar strain, alien reforms in agriculture sectors contributed the growth of new agrarian classes. The 1793[Lord Cornwallis] Permanent Settlement Act, ownership of individual properties, new tenancy rules sidelined the supremacy and dominance of feudal lords. As a result, land gentry gradually isolated from national mainstream. The new agrarian classes emerged and the commercialization of agriculture was encouraged and
induced to grow need variety of cotton for British textile industry. The growth faced dire consequence in the later stages. This led to the growing awareness among the farming community and rise of new form of elites in this sector to safeguard their interest against British.

Ranade's elite group was composed of Brahmans, Banias, Zaminadars and educated middle class.

Rise of Local Elites:

Culture is one of the prime elements of nationalism. It is a force to reckon which identifies the spirit of self-dignity and self-respect. The unscientific territorial division of undivided Dharwad district between British and Princely States of Maratha and Nizam since 1818 created dissatisfaction. The division of small Princely State in three pieces and distribution of few but small villages to distinct location further aggravated the conditions. In other words they became aliens in their own land with no power, authority and discretion to seek their welfare or development. Secondly, the economic policies introduced were quite contrary to their occupation and source of livelihoods which disrupted the social fabric of rural society. Lastly the geographical location of the study area, negligent and pathetic attitude of administration towards the needed development in each sector widened the gap compared to the adjoining locality. The said issues were primarily responsible which motivated and compelled local elites to plunge in national movement.
The national movement and local movement do have similar background. The two initiators have due influence and impact of western education. The former gave priority to reform and revival activities as a means and remedy for the existing social order. However, the local movement orientation was initiated towards cultural rejuvenation and later opted social and political awakening programmes. The literary celebrities played vital role to rejuvenate Kannada language and awoke Kannadigas under the clutches of Marathi culture and Maratha dominance. The later elites belonged to Professional sectors who received liberal and rational education and came under the heavy influence of national elites and political developments of Maharashtra namely Teachers, Advocates and Doctors etc. The literary celebrities and professional personalities received liberal education and had an advantage of access to knowledge and experience compared to the rest in society.

The last type of study area of elites came from socio-economic background. The socio-economic compulsions witnessed and experienced under alien rule induced them to plunge into political activities. The visit and impact of national elites and the prevailing circumstances led them to join national mainstream. They primarily came from agricultural and its related sectors namely the wealthy landlords and the weaving communities. These kinds of significant and distinct freedom fighters were found in the study area. The important programmes like Swadeshi, Constructive and Combative were successfully organized by these groups. This reveals the distinct feature
during national movement. The majority of elites have come from moderate and poor background except few who have sound background and education. It was also noticed in the study area that British rulers have encouraged local business community to expand their trade and later they became the Middlemen or Brokers. This in turn gave birth to new class of elites called commercial or business community.

The expansion of cotton trade encouraged new variety of cotton and subsequently leads to the establishment of ginning factories, but this in turn affected the base of local Handloom Sector. Initially the local farmers and business community received good return but within a decade they faced dire consequence like drought, famine and plague at local level as well as at national level. As a result, the awakened leaders of respective community specially belonged to Devang, Khastriya community rose to the occasion to resist the alien policies. This showed the means to some farmers and business men to join hands with national elites. It may be observed that the feudal background gave priority to pursue better education in order to seek better employment opportunities. They selected professional courses and became advocates and doctors. The middle class moved towards teaching profession. The majority of them belonged to Brahmin community who realized the significance of rational education. The enlightened among them perceived British as a threat to the nation and observed the nationalistic activities in surrounding area, hence determined to offer their service for national movement. The literary celebrities, doctors, teachers and advocates were the
first who took initiation and guided others. The weaving community and the inter dependant sectors joined the national mainstream due to the socio-economic compulsion. The professionals who mainly came from major or dominant caste plunged in national movement as a choice due to their social and educational background.

Sakkari Balacharya, Narayan and Achuta Huilagol and Garud Sadashivarao - the literary celebrities, Anantrao Jalihal, Venkatrao Huilagol, Vasudev Umachagi, Narayan Dambal, Anant Sawakar - the professionals and, Tirlapur, Bandeppanavar, Harapanahall and Doddameti from feudal background with relative educational experience and Kolli, Kalli, Jujagar, Kundaragi, Bakale, Khatawate, Wadone and others from weaving and other related or dependant sectors and the business community members related to these professions, Congress activists like Narayanpur, Vaidya may be defined as enlightened elites who offered their service for national movement in study area.
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