CHAPTER - III

CLASS AND CLASS DIFFERENTIATION

The Concept of Class

"Class" as we understand today is historically a new phenomenon. Briggs (1983:3) says that "the concept of social "class" with all its attendant terminology was a product of large-scale economic and social changes of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Before the rise of modern industry writers on society spoke of ranks; 'orders', and 'degrees' or, when they wished to direct attention to particular economy graphics, of 'interests'. The word 'class' was reserved for a number of people banded together for educational purposes or more generally with reference to subdivisions in schemes of 'classification'.

In 1824, the Encyclopedia Britannica spoke of "classes of quadrupeds, birds, fishes and so forth, which are again subdivided into series or orders and these last into genera (Briggs, 1983:3). It was around the year 1824, that the word 'class' came to be established as a social label.

Briggs maintains that the word 'class' figured so prominently in the subsequent development of the socialist and of other social-vocabularies that the study of origins and early use of the term in Britain graduated beyond an academic exercise in semantics. He says that prior to this period there was no dearth of social conflict in pre-industrial societies, but they were not conceived of at that time in terms of 'class' as such. The change in terms of the use of the word or notion of class in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries reflected a basic change not only in mens' ways of viewing society but in society itself.

Briggs links words and social movements, in an English context. As a historian he has studied language as an indication of the emergence and characteristic
of social movements. He argues in favor of the importance of understanding the social meaning of the new language of class, which was developing at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

In caste and estate forms of social stratification, social position is ascribed normally. Therefore, it follows that both will be undermined by pressures tending to promote the value of individual merit and its regular reward. As a result both tend to disintegrate under the impact of capitalism and industrial capitalism above all requires specialisation of function and efficiency of performance. There is emphasis on the desirability of promoting individual merit with the result that, according to Karl Marx, social classes emerge between which there are no legal or supra-natural barriers to mobility.

Marxian View of Class

Marx argues that classes are denied in terms of their relationship to the instruments of production and the distribution of wealth. Essential to Marx’s thesis are the twin ideas of class-conflict and class-consciousness. Both arise from the invidious comparisons that can be made between class membership and power (Mitchell, Duncan G. 1981:197). Marx had predicted that in due time there will be polarisation of classes along the lines of the “haves” and the “have nots”. Those who own the means of production i.e., the capitalists, will be polarised from those who sell their labour in the market and are basically “have nots”. The ‘have nots’ do not have any property but they have only their labour to sell, which becomes a product in the market.

Marx believed that with this polarisation of classes, class consciousness will increase leading to class-conflict. In his opinion, all societies, except the primitive ones, were class societies and through the process of historical dialectical materialism in each phase of society i.e., the ancient, the feudal and the capitalist two polarised classes came to rise against each other leading to the new phase. He believed that this dialectical movement will finally end in Communist society when the existence of class will be finally obliterated.
There have been innumerable studies on social change in India using the Marxian viewpoint and analytical methods, such as the dialectical historical approach. Social change has been viewed by Marx through the process of dialectical historical materialism, where by mode of production changes from one epoch to another.


**Weberian View of Class**

If we question the usefulness of the concept of class in contemporary society, it will not be because we think that social distinctions and social differentiation’s have disappeared. But rather, it is to point to the greater importance of the differential status of particular groups as opposed to large social classes. Mitchell (1981:197) says that there is no evidence of the emergence of a society in which social differences are unknown but it has become increasingly clear that social status, which in contemporary Britain is emphatically associated with occupation, is the effective key to contemporary social stratification. Thus if castes are rooted in a ritual institution and estates in the institution of law, social classes must be seen to spring from the economy.

Max Weber, the noted German sociologist, however, saw social classes as not social groups but as aggregates of people possessing the same life-chances. He writes in his look, “From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology” translated, edited and with an introduction by H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills, 1952 that ‘classes’ are not communities they merely represent possible and frequent, bases for communal action. We may speak of a ‘class’ when

(1) a number of people have in common a specific causal component of their life chances, in so far as.................
(2) this component is represented exclusively by economic interests in the possession of goods and opportunities for income, and

(3) is represented under the conditions of the commodity of labour markets. (Gerth & Mills 1952:181).

According to Weber, the term ‘class’ refers to any group of people that is found in the same class situation. By ‘class situation’ he implies, the typical chance for a supply of goods, external living conditions, and personal life experiences, insofar as this chance is determined by the amount and kind of power, or lack of such, to dispose of goods or skills for the sake of income in a given economic order.

Thus, for Weber class is determined by the market situation and like status groups’ and ‘parties’ are phenomena of the distribution of power within a community.

In India the Weberian model of class analysis has been used by such distinguished Sociologists as Anil Bhatt and Andre Beteille. Bhatt (1975) has used the Weberian concept of class. He believes that Indian society is characterised by ‘status summation’. His study “Caste, Class and Politics” (1975) at a general level addresses itself to the interaction between traditional social structure and modern democratic politics. Specifically, he has examined in this study the extent to which the classical caste model of social stratification, characterised by status immobility and cumulative inequality obtains summation in the modern period.

Andre Beteille too, in his study “Caste Class and Power “ (1965), has used the Weberian model of class analysis, in the village Sripuram in South India. He found that a considerable amount of status congruence was found until 1940. In traditional Sripuram, twenty four percent of the Brahmins dominated socially, economically, and politically over forty nine percent of the artisan and service castes and twenty seven percent of the untouchable caste of the Adi-Dravidas. The Brahmans monopolised education, owned most of the land in the village, exerted great influence in the affairs of the village and with the higher level governmental authorities and enjoyed ritual and civic privileges. “In the traditional social structure, the cleavages of caste, class and power tended much more than today to run along the same grooves”(Beteille,A:1965, P.3). Thus, if one were to examine the profile of social
stratification in Sripuram during the 1940s, one would have found it to approximate the model of status summation.

Social Class in America

Besides the Marxist and the Weberian views of class there exists another view reflected in W. Lloyd Warner's book "Social Class in America", 1960 written with Marchia Meeker and Kenneth Eells. He begins with the words, "In the bright glow and warm presence of the American Dream all men are born free and equal. Everyone in the American Dream has the right, and often the duty to try to succeed and to do his best to reach the top" Warner in these words brings out the two fundamental themes of American ethos, that is, (1) all human beings (Americans) are equal and (2) that each of us has the right to the chance of reaching the top.

Although, he says the second theme is contradictory because if every one is equal then where is the need to reach the top. But in reality, society in America or anywhere else in the world is far from equal. People are born into different classes and thereby enjoy rights and privileges or suffer low status, discrimination as a result of their birth into it.

What this American Dream actually implies is, the possibility of acquiring a higher status through individual effort is relatively more in American society than in traditional feudal societies, for example, Britain or caste ridden society in India.

In American society amidst the New England Yankees, he identified six layers of classes. Upper class i.e., the old elite class; the lower upper class occupied the next position in the class hierarchy who were neo-rich but not "old" rich. They came-up through the new industries such as shoes, textiles, silverware and finance.

Below the upper lower classes are placed the members of the solid, highly respectable upper middle class. These three strata, the two upper classes and the upper-middle, constitute the levels above the common man. There is a considerable distance socially between them and the mass of the people immediately below them. They comprise three of the six classes present in the community.

The lower middle class, the top of the Common Man level, is composed of clerks and other white collar workers, small tradesmen, and a fraction of skilled
workers. Next is the upper-lower class, which is least differentiated from the adjacent levels and hardest to distinguish in the hierarchy. But it is clearly present and is composed of the "poor but honest workers" who more often than not are only semi-skilled or unskilled.

Last and lowest in the hierarchy are the lower-lower class referred to as "River-brokers" or the "low-down Yankees" who live in the clam flats, have a "bad reputation" among those who are socially above them.

Thus, Warner has identified six social classes in the community of New England Yankees during the 1960's based on criteria, such as, income, occupation, social status, housing i.e., where and in what kind of houses they live, education and marriage alliances.

Social class in America has been studied by him for several purposes. It is, as a concept and as a methodological tool that he studied class. It is the unit of the social system which explains the structure and function of society.

In his attempt to study social class in America, Warner and others have criticised Marx's theory of class. The reasons why he and the other authors of "Social Class in America" do not agree with the Marxian thesis-that the economic changes that our society is undergoing always results in a class war in which "the proletariat" will be triumphant and out of which a "classless society" will result are: (1) the presence of class-conflict-the relations between classes can be and often are amiable and peaceful, and (2) Classless societies (without differential status systems) are impossible where there is complexity.

Social class has been understood in various ways as is clear from the above descriptions. Some have looked at class as an objective reality, some have looked at it as subjective reality. For Max Waber class is an objective reality as it is determined by the 'market situation'. For Marx, it is both an objective reality, as well as, subjective since class and its members are affected by the economic condition, i.e., the mode of production. Mode of production includes both-forces of production, as well as, relations of production. Thus, in Marx's ideas we find the objective and the subjective elements.

In Warner's study of class in America we find the 'objective' view of class. He describes classes on the basis of primarily 'objective' factors which are the attributes of different classes.
For some sociologists, like Richard Centers (1949), class cannot be viewed as an objective reality since what people themselves think about class, and to which class they perceive themselves to belong, actually must constitute the analysis of class. He had studied class in the United States.

One of the major critics of Marx, and a Marxist himself, Pierre Bourdieu (1991) has contributed another way of explaining and analysing class. Bourdieu reflects Marx's class categories like, labour, market, forces of production and so on. He says that these categories do not explain the cultural aspect of class. For him human beings are not merely directed by economy and market relations but are influenced by the culture of the society.

The symbolic aspect of class is significant. He says "on the basis of knowledge of the space of positions, one can carve out classes in the logical sense of the word, i.e., sets of agents who occupy similar position and who, being placed in similar conditions and submitted to similar types of conditioning, have every chance of having similar types of conditioning, have every chance of having similar dispositions and interests, and thus of producing similar practices and adopting similar stances. This 'class on paper' has the theoretical existence which belongs to all theories.........................It is not really a class, an actual class, in the sense of being a group, a group mobilized for struggle, at most one could say that it is a 'probable class', in so far as, it is a set of agents which will place fewer objective obstacles in the way of efforts of mobilization than any other set of agents "(Bourdieu 1991:231-234). Bourdieu believes that social space means that one cannot group together just anyone with anyone else and ignore the fundamental differences, particularly economic and cultural differences, between them. He talks of the social world itself attaining the status of a symbolic system in the objective world itself through properties and their distribution. He talks of distinctions. The social space, and the differences that 'spontaneously' emerge within it, tend to function symbolically as a space of life-styles or as a set of stande, of groups characterized by different life styles"(1991:237).

Therefore, what Bourdieu is trying to say is that members of different classes make a distinction among themselves not only on the basis of objective reality but create a demarcation based on symbolic reality. For example, the style of living, kind of car one uses, nature of painting one buys, etc.
In recent years it has come to be believed, and is a common theme within sociology and other allied disciplines that 'class' is becoming increasingly irrelevant in the late 20th century. Thus, Pahl (1989:710) has argued that 'class as a concept is ceasing to do the useful work for sociology', and Holton and Turner have asserted that 'class is an increasingly redundant issue' (1989-194). However, Blalock and Hubert (1991) say that although there is much confusion that surrounds the use of the term, there are not enough grounds for the wholesale rejection of class as an 'outmoded nineteenth-century concept'. He finds it paradoxical that the redundancy of 'class' within sociological analysis should be raised at a time when the use of class by non-sociologists has increased rather than diminished.

Class is also defined on the basis of consumption rather than on mode of production and distribution in the recent years. Keeping in view the recent developments in the study of class and more generally, if work as employment is declining in its significance towards the close of the twentieth century, then it has been argued that other factors notably consumption, are becoming more relevant for the analysis of stratification systems.

Consumption is providing the basis for new social cleavages. Saunders (1987) has, for example, argued that the major social cleavage in contemporary societies is that between those whose consumption needs are largely met through the market, on the one hand, and those largely dependent on state benefits on the other. Similar arguments are developing to explain the emergence of putative underclass in the United States Peoples' identities are being increasingly expressed and manifest through consumption rather than production. As a result, it is argued by several contemporary sociologists, that outdated nineteenth-century class theories, obsessed with productionism should be finally abandoned.

Studies of Class In India

In Indian society, caste and class as two different forms of social stratification have often been found to overlap with each other. As Singh (1977:33) has pointed out, "the class element in the social stratification in India is organically connected with the caste stratification," He says that for heuristic purposes conceptual distinction should be made between the two concepts.
In Marxist as well as non-Marxist sociology, class is viewed as universalistic phenomenon. The substance of class is believed to be uniformly applicable to all societies irrespective of their historical and cultural differences or discontinuities. The assumption, according to Singh, may not be well founded and needs closer examination in the Indian context.

We find that in India, a series of overlapping or intermediary structural form exist that range from caste, ethnic group to class without having been individually crystallized. In other words, these categories of identifications of social groups and individuals are rather diffused in the Indian social structure.

There is no general agreement about the conceptual formulation of class in sociological literature. Controversies persist on the 'subjective' or 'measures of class and the validity of each. Debate exists on the issue of class-whether it is a 'component' of the system of stratification or its dialectical process. (S. Ossowski, 1969; W. Wesolowsbi, 1969). Controversy also persists about whether conceptual formulations of class should be 'attributional' or interactional and 'propositional'. The above opinion is validated by Singh (1977:33), which holds true for both Marxist, as well as, the non-Marxist formulations of class.

The 'attributional' method views class in terms of rigid values or attributes. Here, a set of indicators of status, individual or familial, are formulated and variations are measured through different scales and indices. A good example of this kind of study is seen in W.L. Warners' study of social class in America (1960) as described earlier.

The interactional aspect could be defined as that element in the stratum which implies a certain mode of relationship with other strata. Unlike attributes, it is not founded in terminal quality but is based on predictable interactions. Thus, interactional formulations of class is therefore, theoretically more powerful. The examples of the interactional class strata are: bourgeoisie, petite bourgeoisie, and 'proletariat', etc. as used by the Marxist formulations or categories like landlord, share cropper, money lender, and so on, as used in general sociology.

The attributional criteria have a synthetic character whereas the interactional ones are operational and dialectical in nature. According to Ossowski, in the
attributional criteria the focus remains mainly on ‘order’ in the class system rather than on the interactional phenomena, that is the processual aspect of ‘dependence’ among various classes.

In India, the analysis of class stratification has been undertaken by sociologists of both Marxist, as well as, non-Marxist theoretical leanings. The class categories used in the census documents and other socio-economic survey agencies are mainly based on attributional criteria of income, occupation or agricultural or non-agricultural modes of earning the livelihood.

The continental sociology of class, under the influence of Marxist and social historical traditions of class theory, focuses attention on the interactional aspects of class stratification. In this type of class analysis, the emphasis is not so much on measurement or scale presentation of the class configuration, but on explaining the historical processes of differentiation, confrontation and mobilisation of interest groups or classes depending upon the opposition of interests and values. (R. Aron, 1969, T.B. Bottomore, 1967).

This approach, too, takes into consideration the ‘attributinal’ aspects of class but goes beyond mere attributes to the processual, interactional aspects in its explanation. Thus, Wesolowski says that even Marx believed that “classes differed in terms of a certain number of attributes interlinked with each other. The bourgeoisie enjoy a higher income, higher level of education and higher prestige. The workers have low income, a low level of education and low prestige. The petite bourgeoisie have an intermediate income, enjoy medium prestige and their level of education is higher than that of the workers but lower than that of the bourgeoisie. This conception of class has appeared not only in Marx but also among many non-Marxist theoreticians”. (W. Wesolowski, 1969:128).

Singh (1977:35) says that this aspect of status attributes also known as “summation of status ‘or’ status crystallization” has been extensively studied both for caste and class by the non-Marxist sociologists also. But the distinguishing feature that marks the Marxist approach to the study of caste and class from the non-Marxists ones is that “in addition to attributional elements in the class formulation, the Marxist theory postulates general sets of propositions about the direction of changes in the class stratification and in the social system as a whole.
This systemic aspect of class analysis, according to Singh, renders Marxist approach more viable, if it is properly formalised. He says that compared with studies on caste, the literature on class is not as substantial. The reason is partly historical but mainly due to the existence of overlaps between the caste and class status situations or interactions in the social stratification system in India.

Since, often it is difficult to demarcate the line where the caste principle of stratification ends and class principle starts, sometimes social scientists end up making simplistic statement. For example, caste stratification is associated with the rural and class stratification with the urban situations. (See Rosen, G. 1966). This fallacy occurs probably because of the tendency of social scientists to look at social phenomena through neatly formulated continua based on abstractions rather than socio-historical evidences studied keeping in view the element of time and space. Even Marx’s writings on India suffers from this ‘fallacy’ which gives rise to an image of a ‘static India. (Singh Y. 1977:36).

Thus, it is believed that studies of class stratification must not only take into account the present day processes among the various class strata but also analyse them in the historical context of change.

Class, as we are aware of, refers to a system of stratification that is economic in character. We can have a class category depending upon the criterion of land, or one depending on the variable of money, or marketable yield or disposable income. The crucial aspect is all these criteria are directly convertible into money and that is the reason why money or wealth is always central in class stratification (Gupta 1992:14).

According to Bhatt (1975), Indian society is considered to be a society characterized by “status summation”. From this perspective, a person who has a low status in the caste hierarchy also has low status in other hierarchies of the society such as economic or political. The close correspondence between caste status and socio-economic status (which reflects on class position), though only recently more systematically and empirically studied, has been generally recognized. To explain this interlinkage, Bhatt gives the example of the Communists in India. He says that
when the Communists appeal to the low castes for political support, they argue that they are not appealing to casteism, but are in effect mobilizing the low classes.

E.M.S. Namboodripad argues that “There is a certain amount of intermingling between the two factors, class and caste. In the pre-capitalist society such as ours, caste is the main form through which class manifests itself. Low castes and low class has almost become synonymous. Thus, the once untouchable castes of India are commonly called “depressed classes”. The Government of India, too, while making special provisions for what are called “Backward Classes” mostly applied caste criteria instead of economic criteria at least in the initial period.

Bhatt says that it is not surprising that any reference to “Backward Classes” in India, even in research studies, included only low status castes and rarely, if ever, the poor or uneducated members of the upper castes. The underlying implication is that an individuals’ socio-economic status can be revealed to a great extent by having the caste status of that person.

In modern India, the socio-economic stratification is operationalized through such indicators as education, occupation and income. (Bhatt, A.1975:23).

G.Rosen (1967) has identified class in rural areas primarily through land holdings. He says that for the validity of caste system a high degree of village self-sufficiency was required. But due to increase in communication and market surplus, this village self-sufficiency has been undermined. Thus, the structure of landholding and the structure of market supply reflect on the class structure in rural areas.

He identified three groups in 1950/51 with respect to class structure of agriculture

(1) Larger landholders owning more than 15 acres of land and including a few with more than 50 acres. This class was numerically small, was engaged to some extent in commercial farming and was interested in profitable operations. In 1950 it would have included princely rulers and many absentee landlords, who did not till their land for either caste or social reasons. This class included the dominant castes, including the trader and land owner castes.

(2) The small land owners owning from five to fifteen acres. Their production was largely for subsistence and were often hampered by lack of capital and other resources for investment or expansion. They were often more productive
with their lands than the larger landholders. In many cases they were members of the higher castes; also, they were frequently members of lower castes both clean and unclean castes who had been able to raise their economic position and had purchased land as a result. They were probably aware of or may have become aware of, new economic, social and political opportunities, finally.

(3) The third group existed which included farmers with very small landholdings and various landless groups, besides low caste landless labourers, village artisans and petty village traders who were in many cases the clients of the dominant castes. Some of them acquired petty landholdings while some had moved down into this class as a result of continued subdivision of larger plots. Members of this group generally had no incentive for economic improvement and therefore, decline to seek other rural urban employment. They made no attempts to raise their social or political positions, whether within or outside caste system.

G. Rosen (1967) goes on to describe in detail the caste in urban areas and class in urban areas which are clearly interspersed. He talks of the social groups falling in the category of middle classes in urban area and the working classes in urban area. He has outlined the socio-historical development of classes in India, especially in the urban areas. He says that the middle class includes several categories of people based on their socio-economic, educational and occupational backgrounds. On top level, he places the leading businessmen, members of the government bureaucracy and the leading intellectuals. The higher income professionals, scientists, and technicians, the professional managers in industry, and the large merchants also he includes with the upper group of the middle class.

Below this group are the mass of clerks and relatively minor officials in government offices and private commercial and industrial firms, the school teachers, working journalists, struggling professionals, and the petty shopkeepers and probably small-scaled industrialists. Rosen says that although the lower middle-class group generally has a high rate of literacy and education and an inclination towards white-collar jobs, individual incomes are low.

The total size of he urban middle class he roughly estimated in 1952-54 as approximately 6.5 million urban middle class house holds in India (or less than 10 per cent of the 73 million households in all India). (Rosen, 1967:30).
The same way as the middle class groups, the working class also included several groups. These were generally, operating workers in factories and handicraft industries, construction workers, such relatively unskilled service workers like messengers (peons), cleaners, scavengers, as well as, more skilled washermen, barbers, cooks, peddlers in the commercial field, and the totally unskilled workers. This class totally excluded the agricultural occupations. The rough quantitative estimate of the numbers in the various occupations in this class in 1953/1954 made available by the National Sample Survey. The total urban gainfully employed labour force figured about 24 million in the 1953-54 year. Rosen writes that nothing much is known about the income of this class but at a guess it could be determined to range from Rs. 100/- per month to Rs. 200/-per month. Within the working class, as distinguished from the lower middle-class clerks, the factory workers were the most organizable class into unions.

In India, at the end of the II World War the membership to Trade Unions was close to one million workers. Unions have had very close links with political parties in India and Gandhi was the leader in the famous Ahmedabad strike that led to the formation of the Textile Labour Association. The leadership of unions was and still is rarely of working-class origin. (Rosen 1967:49).

Daniel Thorner, a Marxist sociologist, has studied the rural society in India extensively. He identified three classes in a general sense in the rural countryside. He says that “roughly speaking there are three principal groups, whom we can call proprietors, working peasants, and labourers.” These can be better termed as, malik, kisan, and mazdur.

By malik or proprietor he meant a family whose agricultural income is derived primarily (although not necessarily solely) from property rights in the soil. The malik or proprietor usually but not necessarily enjoys a high type of property right in the soil. He may hold directly under the government, or he may be a superior tenant with rights of occupancy, transfer, mortgage, and inheritance protected by law. The total amount of land held is such that the income from it serves to meet the major shares of the family’s expenses. One or the other of the family may act as the supervisor, but none is needed to work with his hands in the fields for survival (Thorner 1973).

The ‘kisans’, or working peasants constitute the second class. They have a recognized property interest in the land. They may be small owners, or tenants with
varying degrees of security. By and large, but not always, their legal and customary rights will be somewhat inferior to those of the maliks in the same village. Their chief identity is the size of their land holdings which is such that it supports a single family. That, too, when one or the other member of the family actually perform the field labour. The produce of the kisan may not be often enough for sustenance of the entire family. But it does contribute the major share of expenses of the family which is often supplemented by other sources of employment and agricultural labour.

The third class found in rural areas is that of the labourers or mazdurs. This group comprises those villagers who gain their livelihood primarily from working on other peoples’ lands. The mazdurs may be having tenancy rights in the soil, or even property rights, but their land holdings are so small that the income from agriculture or renting out comes to less than the earnings from selling their labour in the fields. Wages may be received in cash or kind. In practice, Thorner says, the lower ranks of croppers and tenants-at-will are almost indistinguishable from mazdur and will tentatively be included in this category.

In the above classification the key factor is the amount of actual labour contributed to the production process and the share in the product. The extent to which income is received despite lack of participation in agricultural work may indicate the enormity of the agricultural problem. (Thorner D., in Gupta (ed.) 1992. Social Stratification, p.p. 265).

Thus, we see that despite the diversity of social arrangement found in the rural countryside in India, Daniel Thorner has attempted to reduce them into well-defined and precise social categories on the basis of;

(1) Type of income obtained from soil (a) rent; (b) fruits of own cultivation, or (c) wages;

(2) The nature of rights (a) proprietary or ownership; (b) tenancy (with varying degree of tenurial security); (c) share-cropping rights, or (d) no rights at all.

(3) The extent of field-work actually performed: (a) absentee who does no work at all, (those who perform partial work; (c) total work done by actual
cultivator with family labour and (d)where work is done entirely for others to earn wages (Thorner (1956:4)

Besides George Rosen and Daniel Thorner there have been many sociologists, like, Kathleen Gough; Ramakrishna Mukherjee; Yogendra Singh; A.R.Desai; Baljit Singh; P.C.Joshi; D.N. Dhangare; Andre Beteille and many others who have described social class in rural India using different methodological tools and categories in different parts of the country. The crucial aspect is that no reality is static and unidimensional. Every reality like society itself is constantly in a flux. It is multidimensional and dynamic. Therefore; all these studies only throw a certain amount of light on the picture of Indian society. To perceive the dynamic, processional aspect of class and caste in India, one must situate it in a socio-historical, cultural and political context that is in the context of space and time. Thus, the emergence of different and new classes in India, their interlinkage with each other and with caste, with cultural, political and economic transformations taking place in society is of great importance.

**Class Differentiation in India**

The sociology of Indian class stratification, while taking into account the present day processes among the various class strata, must also analyse them in the context of historical changes and forces which have shaped society in India and socio-historical changes which still continue to change the class pattern till the contemporary period.

As Singh (1977) has pointed out, studies which throw light on the class structure and its processes in the traditional Indian Society reveal that class structure was related to the modes of production and ownership of property. It is also related with the growth of cities, markets and banking institutions and the institution of power. Kings, feudal chiefs, priests, merchants, artisans, peasants and labourers formed the class categories. Not only the feudal and aristocratic classes, but also the merchants formed an important element of this class structure.

**Classes In Pre-British India**

Infact, unlike China, Japan or even the European Continent, the merchants in India did not occupy the lowest position on the scale of social hierarchy (Singh
The status crystallization of the merchant and other classes did take place concomitantly with caste and subcaste but still their social mobility rested in the mode of economic, relationships. This fact introduced elasticity or dynamism in the functioning of merchant classes which was quite out of proportion with the caste system of stratification into which their class status was embedded.

According to Helen B. Lamb (1959:25), there is an apparent contradiction between the hierarchical view of society, as contained in Indian Caste system, and the obvious vigor of Indian trading communities which is quite puzzling. Infact, this reveals to a large extent that there has always been mobility in the caste system and that the rationale of caste as freezing the positions of different groups of society is nothing more than a myth. In reality, the position of many castes has changed over time, and wealth and prosperity have been crucial factors in achieving an improved status. This has been collaborated by MN Srinivas, as mentioned in the previous chapter.

The apparent vigour and vitality of the merchant class and changes in the class status of various castes took place due to the creation of economic and political institutions through which economic surpluses could be mobilized from the village to the cities. Singh (1977:37) says that “If the emergence of new feudal ranks under the patronage of kings constituted the political base of traditional class structure, the rise of the merchant class, cemented the economic foundation.

“The process of social transformation of classes in India began as far back as 600 B.C. when “there was fusion of Aryan and pre-Aryan peoples and cultures. Kingdoms emerged embracing several tribes and centred in the rich Gangetic plain. Settled agriculture, trade, cities, the concept of private property all came into being, and one can assume that in this whole transformation traders played a crucial role.” (H.B. Lamb, 1959:27;C.A.F. Rhys Davids, 1923).

From 600 B.C. onwards till the first millenium A.D., Indian society evolved ‘an active material cultural tradition which coincided with the development of banking, emergence of guild organizations. It was during this period that Buddhism as a religion appeared. This gave strength to the growth of artisans in cities. However, during this time the spread of banking divided the trading communities
into; first, those who became big urban financiers, having pan-Indian networks and secondly those who remained in the villages or small towns as traders or money lenders.

The sphere of economic activities of the small town traders and money lenders was limited but the social base of the financier class which was created so far back in history has interestingly continued in several parts of India, such as, Gujarat, South India and Rajasthan in the form of big business houses (V.I. Pavlov, 1964; S. Bhargava, 1935; D.D. Kosambi, 1956; H.B. Lamb,1959). Business classes declined due to foreign invasions especially in the Gangetic plain. This period saw the re-emergence of Brahmanism. Their re-emergence coincides with the decline of cities and growth of village settlements. These settlements were by and large more economically self-sufficient than earlier ones.

During this period the growth of the business classes became confined to certain pockets of India, mainly Gujarat and Rajasthan. Their role was limited in sphere, but was quite active throughout the medieval period. According to Irfan Habib(1963: pp.118-119), a contradiction existed among the rural economic structure and the urban economic structure. There was an imbalance during the Mughal period created between the economically self-sufficient village, which not only produced for itself, but also for the urban markets but it did not receive anything in return from the urban centres. He says that probably it was this contradiction which accounted for the social contradiction which existed in the form of an individualistic mode of production in agriculture, on the one hand, and the organisation of the village community, on the other. But inspite of these contradictory elements, the dynamism of the class structure of both cities and villages continued. Villages constantly geared their agricultural production to cater to the urban markets in far off regions for new crops both for food and cash(Irfan Habib,1963:1963;D.R.Gadgil:1959). Thus, we can see that there existed not only agrarian classes in the villages but also a stable class of merchants, middle men and bankers thrived in towns and cities and kept the mercantile activities going.
Classes During Colonial India

The socio-economic, political, cultural forces let loose by the long rule of British in India and their policies brought about far reaching changes in the society. It affected the castes and classes in India to the extent that a gradual transformation of both took place.

The changes brought by the British in India not only changed the political and the economic structure itself to some extent. Earlier existing castes and classes redefined themselves to suit new needs and this process gave rise to some new classes, such as the middle class. This middle class which emerged during that time was a class of English educated elites who were in the true sense "Indian by birth but English in behaviour and attitude". This class was ultimately instrumental in bringing about social and religious reforms on the one hand and on the other throwing the shackles of slavery from the British rulers. They were the flag bearers during the freedom movement. Leaders like Gandhi, Nehru, Ambedkar, Bal Gangadhar Tilak and several others helped shape India as a modern nation with a written Constitution and a parliamentary form of Democracy with every citizen having an equal right.

Some of the major changes brought by the British could be summarised as:

1. Changes in agriculture
2. Changes in trade and commerce
3. Changes in transport and communication
4. Development of educational institutions, and
5. Development of administrative machinery

According to Singh (1977), the early British economic and political policies in India led on the one hand to the destruction of many older bases of class formation and on the other created new foundations for the emergence of a feudal agrarian class structure. The land settlement policy adopted by the British government in some parts of the country changed the class structure in the rural areas and created new vested interests for agrarian exploitation.

As Beteille (1965) discovered, in his study of a South Indian village, Sripuram in Tanjavur, the British agrarian policy led to commodification of land. It disturbed the traditional class/caste structure. Earlier land was held by the upper caste Brahmans and the lower caste non-Brahmans and Adi-Dravidas owned very little or no land. The lower castes only worked as labourers. But new economic policies of the British
government disturbed this balance as some of the non-Brahmans and even Adi-Dravidas managed to gain economically, receive education and were able to buy land. This broke the nexus between upper caste-upper class and lower-caste, lower class.

Singh(1977:39) says that the agrarian system as it evolved during the British regime in India was based either on the Zamindari or the Ryotwari type of land settlements, the Mahalwari system was yet another variety of land system which closely resembled the Zamindari system. All the three systems generated nearly the same type of agrarian class structure in the villages. The class structure in the rural areas everywhere in India had a feudal character. The Zamindars were tax collectors and non-cultivating owners of land, the tenants were the real cultivators often having no land tenure security and the agricultural labourers in most parts of India had the status of bonded men who were attached as labourers to the landlords hereditarily. The British colonial power, however, continued to support this highly exploitative system inspite of several peasant unrests having taken place during that time, since it suited their own existence in India.

The British policy of trade and commerce, too, affected the bulk of Indian artisan classes. It led to the decline of many towns and cities and destruction of cottage industries. Large scale migration took place towards rural areas. The pace of ruralisation had already set in with the decline of the Mughal empire and the intervening social and political unrest. The East India Company's policies brought about changes in the traditional economic structure and its former class structure. These policies affected the currency regulations and banking practices. Its' favoured treatment to the port towns and neglect of vast number of inland towns, policy of taxation and tariff and several other biases influenced the economic and social structure(K.Davis,1951; A.K.Bagchi,1970).

Due to the British rule, in cities a new industrial and mercantile middle class came into being and there also emerged a new bureaucratic -administrative class. But according to Y.Singh(1977), the British only succeeded in altering the nature of class circulation in India, and not its social base. He says that the sociology of Indian class stratification bears a deep imprint of these historical antecedents in two respects, first, the middle classes that subsequently emerged maintained the structural continuity in terms of recruitment and social background with the previous class structure, and secondly, the British contact set a process of new cultural adaptation among the new middle classes(Misra,B.B.1961; Mukherji,D.P.;1958).
As far as the first point is concerned, it is seen that the rise of new classes among different communities followed their caste and traditional class orientation. For example, it was seen that Baniya caste, who were traders by vocation in traditional India, were the first to take up modern commerce, banking and industrial enterprises in British governed India (Misra, B.B. 1978:14). Similarly, Brahmans were the first to take up modern education and enter the professional classes.

These caste communities took up the new challenges and entered these new spheres of activities first because they were already having the basic disposition towards these occupations. Thus, on the eve of independence, as the above fact implies, the Indian social structure remained by and large the same, as it was in the pre-British India since those who were at an advantage earlier, continued to get further opportunities to grow and excel. But the change which was brought about by the policies of the British government in terms of education, law, values of rationality, equality and humanism, as discussed in the previous chapter, brought about a new consciousness and awakening amongst the lower castes and classes.

New economic opportunities led to social mobility and education and new occupations by and large succeeded in breaking the close link between high caste-upper class and lower caste-lower class.

**Class In Post-Independence Period**

The challenge to the feudal class structure in India emerged with the rise of the nationalist movement. As mentioned by several sociologists (see P.C. Joshi, 1971; H.D. Malvya, 1955; U.P. Zamindari Abolition Committee Report, 1948) the National leaders not only accepted a radical agrarian ideology but also actively undertook the cause of the exploited peasantry. They led the Kisan movements in several parts of India.

Thus, after independence the land reform were introduced in most states and a beginning was made for transformation of the agrarian class structure. Singh (1977:43) says that the impact of land reforms on the agrarian class structure has been uneven. It led to the eviction of smaller tenants. This is evident from the decline in the percentage of holdings reporting land lease. He says that for the years 1953-54, 1960-61, and 1961-62 the corresponding all India figures of land lease are 39.85, 27.33, and 23.52 percent. There is decline in successive years.
This is further confirmed by the study conducted by A.M.Khusro of Hyderabad. He found that in Hyderabad region, land reform led to marked decline in tenancy and growth of owner-cultivators. Thus, the reforms in reality led to further immiserisation of the smaller peasants. They received very little but lost more from eviction than the bigger tenants. The study of M.B.Desai and R.S.Mehta (1969) in Gujrat shows that land reforms on the one hand gave ownership of land to some tenants, it also created a new phenomenon of ‘concealed tenancy’. This feature tended to perpetuate the agrarian class differences.

The land reforms introduced after Independence, therefore, proved to be a mere rhetoric for the poor peasantry. The Sociological studies of land reforms in India, however, come out with the comparative data that it was the landlords who benefited most. Out of the landlords category, the real beneficiaries appear to be, not the upper castes, but the intermediate class of peasants. These intermediate classes replaced the older zamindars in matters of economic as well as political power in the rural areas. Thus, in Uttar Pradesh, for example, the traditional zamindars who were mostly Rajputs, Brahmans or Bhumihars are now being challenged, in economic and political area, by the middle caste peasants belonging to the Ahir, Kurmi and other intermediate classes. The power of the feudal families is declining everywhere in India (Singh, 1977:44).

P.C. Joshi (1971) has summarised the new developments in the agrarian class structure and relationship. He says that:

1. The decline of feudalistic and customary types of tenancy and its replacement by more exploitative and insecure lease arrangements.
2. The increasing importance of commercial tenancy based on the rich and middle strata of the peasantry who are part-owners and part-tenants and possess resources and enterprise for dynamic agriculture
3. The decline of feudal landlords and the rise of commercial oriented landlords either functioning as owner-farmers or utilizing the mode of a new, non-customary type of tenancy for the pursuit of agriculture as a business proposition.

All these developments have led to the emergence of the commercial peasants. This has had two consequences. First, it has increased the efficiency and productivity of agriculture and brought about the much celebrated "Green Revolution" in some
parts of the country during the 1970's and 1980's and second, the rise of agricultural
capitalism in villages and prosperity of some castes; at the same time as, others of
poor peasantry and lower castes and even upper castes becoming poorer and their
general decline, leading to increased rural class conflict. In fact, Singh (1977) points
out that the agricultural prosperity of a few magnifies the poverty of the many and
leads to social discontentment. This further leads to class movements and radical
political mobilization.

The rise of the middle class peasantry into new landlords, in some parts of the
country, is described as the process of "embourgeoisment" of these social strata. A
study of social stratification and change in six villages of Rajasthan by K.L
Sharma (1968) reveals the process of embourgeoisment taking place. He found that
in some villages, not only the agricultural labourers but quite a few of the ex-
landlords had lost their earlier status and were reduced to a status which he calls
"proletarianization". In opposition to these strata, the neo-rich peasantry has replaced
the older landlords and emerged as the new bourgeoisie.

Kotovsky (1964:160), too, observes the above trend of proletarianization in
villages in India following capitalist farming and rise of prosperity of some. He says
that the ruination and proletarianization of bulk of peasantry is growing more
intensely all the time.

Since, more than seventy percent of the population in India lives on agriculture,
the process of embourgeoisment, on the one hand, and proletarianization on another,
led to far reaching changes in the caste and class structure of society. The process of
mobility and dispossession of the landed rural elite in interaction with the urban elites
-who were generally moneylenders, speculators, traders and professional persons like
judges, lawyers and clerks-that slowly the western educated elites, who engineered
the cultural and political renaissance in India, were born. (Singh, 1977:57).

Rise of The New Middle Class

In the contemporary period, there has emerged a large middle class, both in
the villages, as well as cities, which can be differentiated from other classes on the
basis of income, style of life and ability to shape economic and political decisions of
the government. Kisan movements led by middle caste leaders in Haryana, Western
Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra and Gujarat are evidences of the growing powers of the
middle classes in rural areas. The urban middle classes, too, can be clearly identified
on the basis of consumption patterns, life style, education and professional attitude. The Indian middle class has been estimated at over 300 million people, as discovered by the National council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER) during their extensive surveys on the consumption of manufactured goods. It was found that television has been the single biggest factor in opening up a huge rural market for consumer products and creating a higher level of aspirations among the huge middle class in India.

But What is "Middle class"? The dictionary definition of middle class refers to the intermediate class. S.L. Rao (TOI, Oct. 3, 1993) says that NCAER classifies the population into five categories, if one takes the 1991 census into consideration, there are 352 million literates, the urban population is 217 million. The organised labour force is 295 million. If one takes intermediate group earning between Rs. 12,500 and Rs. 56,000 a year per household, that comes to around 335 million. Rao (1993) says that the whole problem arises because of Western standards, this 300 million or so number looks very large and is assumed to be able to want and afford similar products as their counterparts in industrialised countries. But they are not the same and the equivalent number is much smaller. At the same time even more of the Indian population has the aspirations to consume. He gives the example of Nirma washing powder. Nirma brought into the market the consumption of 700,000 tonnes of detergents. It is the largest single branded detergent in the entire world.

The above definition of middle class India is obviously based on income and purchasing power of consumer products. Rao explains the attitudes of the middle class in terms of their asset holding capacity. He says that their figures show that if we take the proportion of purchases by households whose income is up to Rs. 25,000 a year, they buy 75 percent of many consumer goods: cooking oil, tea, toilet soaps, washing cake, tooth powder, mechanical wrist watches, transistor radio sets. More than 50 percent of the purchases of Black and White TVs, pressure cookers, electric irons, comes from this lower income group.

It is clear that the Indian consumer however, poor he might seem, is really very keen to consume, he has aspirations. Therefore, Rao asserts that in future too, the Indian masses would want to consume and with better programmes and more choice, the demand for television will rise even faster. As it does, we will witness real boom in purchase of consumer products.
Gurcharan Das (TOI, June 4, 2000) a noted journalist, comments on "The goodly middle class" that our real tragedy in the last fifty years is not poverty but that we did not create the middle class. Our Socialist policies suppressed initiative, jobs, economic growth and middle class opportunities. Hence, our middle class was barely 8 percent of the population in 1980. It was only after economy started growing from the 1980's. The middle class has tripled as reported by NCAER and is now 18 percent of a much larger population. Das says that given the right incentive system, the middle class invariably pulls itself up through hard work, self help and education in a competitive society, and the task of the economic reforms is precisely to create such an incentive systems. If the reforms are successful they will succeed in making a majority of India's population middle class within a generation".

According to him, the social reforms in India after the 1980's have negatively affected not the poor, but the rich who had vested interest in maintaining excessive control over the economy. He is also against providing subsidies which have not helped the poor at all but the more powerful social groups who had cornered the privileges for themselves. Thus, he says that it is the task of experts in the academia, the NGOs and the development institutions who need to dig deeper into the explosive growth in our middle classes to gauge success of the reforms.

According to Dipankar Gupta (TOI, June 3, 1998) this kind of definition of middle class which is primarily based on consumption patterns and things that can be possessed is typical of societies which are marked by great inequalities. The western concept of middle class is not so single mindedly built around consumption. It has a lot more to do with the emergence of the idea of the "public", of citizenship and social changes that the middle class effected in the transition from medieval times. The emphasis, in the West is on how the middle class relates and interacts with others in society. This stands to reason because, historically, it was the middle class in Europe that firmed up the institutions of democracy, eroded feudal privileges, and ushered in the era of individualism.

Gupta states that the Indian middle class scores negatively on all these counts. It's commitment to the principles of democracy is very weak. It is content instead to function on the basis of patronage and clientalism. He gives the examples of the way this class gave into the Emergency declared by Indira Gandhi. This reveals its inherent authoritarian tendencies. The Indian middle class is after all a very privileged section of society. It is poor by Western standards, but is rich in comparison with
those below it. The gulf between the middle class and the population below it is so wide that they are often seen to be living in two different worlds. Gupta believes neither the Indian nor the Western middle class is actually in the middle. In India it is really the better off who call themselves the middle class. But in the West today, it practically includes the entire population. The Western middle class has such a wide social base that it leaves little room for the politics of patronage and privilege to flourish, as it does in India. This is what objectively strengthens democratic institutions and practices in Western societies. For the Indian middle class it is only the consumption which matters.

Gupta's definition of middle class is, therefore, quite different from the statisticians and economist's definition of middle class based on income and consumption patterns. It is: based rather on socio cultural aspects, value base and ideological orientation of different classes in society. Indian middle class as an emerging new class is extremely unlike the Western middle class. But to some extent it does shape the economic and political policies and thereby shape of India, as it wields not only economic power but social and political power as well.

**Middle Castes/Class in Uttar Pradesh**

The social structure of Uttar Pradesh is predominantly caste-based and castes have played a crucial role in determining the nature of political power. A caste-based census of the population in UP was conducted way back in 1931 but which more or less remains unchanged till date.

The major castes found in UP, according to this census (1931) are Brahmin, Rajput, Vaishya, Ahir, Chamar, Pasi, Kahar, Lodh, Pathan, Gadariya, Teli, Julaha, Kurmi. A remarkable feature of UP has been that it has been the home of majority of the Brahmin population of India. They constitute 9.2 percent of UP population. Rajputs or thakurs constitute 7.2 percent. The middle castes make 42 percent of the total population and the Scheduled Castes and Muslims constitute 21 percent and 15 percent of the population respectively.

The caste system in Uttar Pradesh is ultimately related with the class division. This has been clearly evident from the study of Basti district, Sultanpur district in eastern Uttar Pradesh and Meerut district in Western Uttar Pradesh to be discussed in Chapter 4. By and large generalization could be made. The upper castes consist of
Brahmins, Rajputs or Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, Chauhan, Tyagi, Jats, Bhumihars and Kayastha. The Brahmins occupy the highest place in the caste hierarchy even though in terms of class they may not be dominant in all parts of UP. In eastern UP both Brahmins and Rajputs have been dominant castes. However, in western Uttar Pradesh Jats and Gujjars have generally occupied the dominant position.

In recent years the middle castes of Uttar Pradesh composed of Yadavs (Ahirs) Kurmis, Jats, Lodhs and Gujjars have moved up the socio-economic hierarchy. "The intermediate castes in UP could be broadly divided into two categories viz (a) upper strata of middle castes such as Yadavs, Gujjars, Kori, etc. mostly belonging to the peasant castes; and (b) the lower strata of intermediary castes, such as, Kewat, Teli, Nai, Murao and Kochi etc. The upper layer of the intermediary castes are big landowners while the lower strata consists wholly of the landless labourers.

The former have made the most of land reforms and prospered at the expense of traditional big landholders like Thakurs and Kayasthas. The position of the Scheduled Castes has continued to remain socio – politically and economically pathetic. They operate approximately on 10.5 percent of land as against their 21 percent share of the total population". (Hindwan, S. Hindustan Times, August 14, 1995).

The Scheduled Castes remain mostly illiterate and agricultural labour seems to be their prime occupation. The total percentage of agricultural labourers in Scheduled Castes of UP is as high as 90 percent in some districts. Some amount of social mobility has taken place as is evident from the progress made by the jatavs in Western UP, emergence of some Chamar caste members who have taken up lead positions in the formation of Bahujan Samaj Party. Mayawati, who became the first dalit chief minister of UP under the tutelage of Kanshi Ram considerably made the Scheduled Castes in UP conscious of their rights and aware of the fact that they can fight the upper caste oppression and exploitation using the same tools as their oppressors have used since ages, ie political power. Their rising consciousness and prosperity of miniscule of their population has led to widespread caste riots and communal strifes. Surprisingly it is not the upper castes who are seen to be fighting the scheduled castes but the intermediary castes/classes who have emerged as lower caste oppressors.

It is clearly evident from the composition of UP's population that the state is numerically dominated by the intermediary castes, like the Yadavs and Kurmis, followed by the upper castes, such as, the Bhumihars and Rajputs. It is seen that the
numerically large intermediary castes like Yadavs, Kurmis and Korris had benefited most from the land reforms and Zamindari abolition after Independence. The lower stratum of the middle castes; however; did not make much progress.

Sudhir Hindwan, in his article on “The rise of Yadavs and Kurmis” in Hindustan Times, August 14, 1995 writes that “recently there has been a major shift in the position of the upper strata of middle castes who have acquired dominant positions in economic and political spheres of rural and urban life by virtue of their control over land purchased through their lucrative business of potatoes, milk and fruits. Yadavs and Kurmis among the middle castes have become the two most powerful castes in the state (that is Uttar Pradesh). The steady upward mobility among the Scheduled castes has created jealousy among the upper and upper middle castes”.

**Economic Transformation in Uttar Pradesh**

Dreze & Sen (1997: p. 37) say that two recent developments in the regions’ agrarian history can be considered to be significant turning points. The first came with the reforms of land revenue and property rights that followed India’s Independence. This was the new governments step to redistribute land through what is called the ‘Zamindari abolition’ which took place in 1950’s as a land reform measure.

These reforms abolished the role of private intermediaries in the land revenue system and led to a clearer definition of private property rights in land. The structure of land ownership has remained the same by and large ever since then. The early reforms coincided with the post-independence adoption of social and economic development as official goal of public policy.

The second development was the spread, in the nineteen sixties and seventies, of modern agricultural practices in western Uttar Pradesh, and their subsequent diffusion to other regions of the state. This development led to what is popularly known as ‘the Green Revolution.’ It led to general prosperity of the region. But it is a debatable issue whether it reduced poverty or made the gap between the rich and the poor much wider.

Both ‘Zamindari abolition’ and the development in agricultural practices in Western UP were two episodes, not very dramatic in their impact in themselves
(compared with, for example, land reforms and productivity growth in other developing regions, including parts of India), they do define the broad parameters of change in the economic circumstances of the bulk of the population. The land reforms limited the powers of large feudal landlords, and gave ownership rights to a vast majority of tenant farmers who previously did not own land.

Prior to Zamindari abolition, legal ownership of land in Uttar Pradesh was vested with between 3 to 8 percent of rural households (see Hasan, 1989, and Stokes, 1975, for various estimates). After Zamindari abolition, the proportion of rural households owning some land ranged from 70 to 90 percent depending on the precise ownership criterion (see H.P. Sharma, 1994, for results of the 1953-54 round of the National Sample Survey).

The land reforms did not, however, eradicate landlessness, nor did they prevent the persistence of massive inequalities of land ownership in the state. The land ownership structure has changed little in Uttar Pradesh in the last 40 years since the Zamindari abolition took place.

Landownership pattern, when examined shows that, the bottom 40 percent of all rural households in Uttar Pradesh owned 2.5 percent of the total area in 1953-4, while the top 10 percent owned 46 percent of the area. More or less the same size distribution was observed in 1982 (H.R. Sharma: 1994; Dreze & Sen: 1997: p.38). These aspects of social mobility and change and the consequent transformation of society in Uttar Pradesh will be discussed in further details in the following chapters.