

# Social Classes of Global Castes

Suraj Yengde

Inequality is a catchphrase for developmental and welfare economics. It has also become a rallying call for social and political justice. Inequality is not a condition, but it is a state that has been maintained by various forces who also despise inequality but embrace it partially as it benefits their goals.

We've spent important policy dossiers on understanding inequity through the dialectical partnership of economy and politics. What if public policy memos are themselves ingrained with retaining the biases of elite reproduction through social classes? The public portfolio of those who are responsible for articulating the understanding of society is filled with apprehensions of the historical Other.

An elite who is responsible for deciphering the conditions of its society will hardly emphasize the culpability of their own—family, clan, caste, ethnicity, race—in short, the social castes.

Caste is an unequal institution that prolongs justice for a considerable time period. It is not just the inequality that sits at the bedrock of this institution, but it is also the absolutism of power and ownership of resources within the geographical scale of the caste system. The caste system operates worldwide. It draws on the legitimacy of a particular reading of nativist history and considers external intervention as the corruption of supreme, respectable values of their society.

Presently, the major focus of caste is rooted in the religious dominion of relations. The absence of commonality built on the dominance of insulted dependability makes the caste system a manifestation of society's rigid and unscrupulous desires. Beyond the religious and social undertaking of this hierarchical system, caste legitimizes the ownership of resources held by one group at the expense of the other. It is done through arbitrary social laws and cultural dictates praised as tradition.

For example, the castes in the class system are units of ranked professions whose productivity is expected but not fairly compensated. The ones working with hard labour, sweat, creativity, and innovation are held as despicable units of people. The farmers, peasants, blacksmiths, and service providers, among a host of other groups whose vocation is premised on productive labour, are ranked as lower in the hierarchy.

The Dalits in South Asia, for example, are expected to participate in hard, menial labour, but their compensation is negligible. The traditional rules demand Dalits to be essential labour but not claim equal participation in the wages. The manual scavenging profession is a case in point. Human beings are forced to enter the manhole for a wage of less than \$30 per month.

Inequality here stems from the anxiety of the productive classes, who cannot be easily replaced. Therefore the only way to control the political economy of the vocational castes is to dominate them by ritual and religion—political fear. The policymakers have grossly committed a series of injustices to the victims of the caste system by making two overarching tragic mistakes. The first is to understand caste within the national political spectrum, and second to compare it with other contesting hierarchical societies.

By doing this, the policy was able to redress the injustice of one group over another. The mantra was that the state needed to intervene actively. In post-colonial societies, the power metric was imbalanced from the start of independence. Thus, the level playing field was not a precondition of a new state formation. In fact re-distribution of elite power sources amongst the ruling class was a precondition of the colonial freedom movements. These very groups of elites exercised the colonial structural power by becoming

policymakers during the colonial regime and post-independence technocrats. Their skewed understanding of the system reduced the towers of hierarchies to mere state handouts.

The policy frameworks looked at society in a deferential manner wherein the receiver, as well as the giver, were meant to operate in a change of bureaucratic, logistical loopholes. The Western institutions commissioned studies by inexperienced writers and scholars who did not belong to the community of victims. As a consequence, the state was politically asked to compromise for its ineptitude.

The framework of inequality has an economic basis legitimized through social laws and cultural values. The major focus on economic independence was regulated through state distribution of resources. However, the state's innate nature to control and dominate the masses disfigures the unity of the nation-state. Caste operates as an outside institution posing challenges to the state. But it also weaves through the state operation by accessing political tools of governmentality.

The policy recommendations for the policymakers are as follows:

1. Understand caste as an economic coercion with social and political rationalizations, regularized through laws and customs.
2. Inequality is not a standalone capital premise but a cumulative power monopolized by groups benefiting from the neoliberal policies of the state.
3. Caste has to be reimagined as a global predicament that regulates a society based on the historical regulation of the ruling classes' desires to invent a society based on those facts.
4. Caste has to be one of the primary indicators of assessing inequality in any society.
5. Impacted groups should be at the helm of producing commission-based reports for policy think tanks for national and international institutions.
6. To not see caste as a temporary relief from economic subordination but to invest in the projects that demand representation, accountability, and eventual extermination of the system.
7. The examination of inequality has to be understood from comprehensive intra and interdisciplinary approaches.

8. Addressing precolonial, colonial and post-colonial understandings of society through the experiences of power relations endorsed through culture and society.
9. The non-profit industrial chamber needs to be brought into a critical assessment for their work in the communities and beyond.
10. The lesson from caste studies is that to redress the injustice of inequality; the social classes have to be made responsible for their individuated position in the complex relational dynamics made accountable through taxation, compensation, and relief of reconciliation.

The unequal flows of finance should not focus on the country as a macro, hegemonic organization but on communities that are in cohesion with the internal dependable linkages with each other.

*Suraj Yengde* (सुरज एंगडे) is currently a W.E.B. Du Bois Fellow at Harvard University. One of India's leading scholars and public intellectuals, he is the author of the bestseller *Caste Matters* and co-editor of award-winning anthology *The Radical in Ambedkar*. His forthcoming book *Caste A Global Story* will be published in 2025.