

**Social stratification  
and social  
inequalities. we  
attempted to answer  
the followi...**



s Social Stratification In sociology, the term social stratification refers to the socially created inequalities that exist in a society. Social stratification can exist due to a number of factors like; wealth, power, prestige, age, gender, ethnicity, race, etc. All these factors create inequalities in a society in one or another way, and ranks one group above another group in terms of social acceptance. The people who make up the demography of a particular stratum may share common lifestyle, interest and identity, which may help distinguish them from the rest of the strata that exist. Clearly, in a stratified society, the idea of egalitarianism is out of question (Holborn & Haralambos 1-2). The concept of democracy refers to equal distribution of all the resources in a society, and the common people constituting to the source of political authority, owing to the absence of hierarchical system in all the institutions. An egalitarian society is where democracy can exist. This is a kind of society where the entire population shares the resources equally amongst themselves, and therefore no stratification of any kind exists (Tilly, 1). One of the most important features of an egalitarian and a democratic society is the prevalence of social mobility. Social mobility refers to the upward or downward movement from one stratum to another. A socially mobile society is an open society where there are relatively high chances of changing one's status etc. Nevertheless, a stratified society provides little opportunity for social mobility and makes the idea of democracy impossible to co-exist. The social status and positions in such kinds closed societies are ascribed by birth. This means, there is little opportunity for people to change their status and position. The Hindu caste system provides a very good example of an autocratic, closed and a stratified society. In the traditional

Hindu society, there were five main strata that constituted racial purity. On the highest order were the Brahmins, they were the Hindu priests and scholars, who held the highest authority and power in the traditional Hindu states, and mostly constituted the rules and regulations that governed the states. After the Brahmins, there were groups with lower level of authority and power, till the untouchables, on the extreme end. The untouchables, defined as ugly and filthy, performed the dirtiest jobs and their existence polluted the environment for the upper classes. Such was the autocratic and closed system of hierarchy in the traditional Hindu states, that never in their lives, could an untouchable change their position (Bhattacharya, pp. 9). Nevertheless, in contrary to the above argument, the current day capitalist societies provide the counter evidences of democracy existing in stratified societies. The stratified system of the capitalist societies provides an example of an open society. Functionalist sociologies, like Talcott Parsons believe that in such societies, there is ascribed class position, and level of prestige and power. In such a society, the racial, gender, or ethnic differences do not matter, instead personal qualities, hard work and wealth are the factors that constitute to the social position of an individual (Lipset & Reinhard, 282). In light of the above arguments, it could be rightly concluded that although democracy and social stratification, may seem impossible to exist together, but diversity being a major feature of the current day post modern era makes the irresolvable factors, explainable, and possible. The biggest evident that backs this statement being the present day stratified societies, that gives way to democracy side by side. Work Cited

Bhattacharya, Jogendra. Hindu Castes and Sects: An exposition of the origin

<https://assignbuster.com/social-stratification-and-social-inequalities-we-attempted-to-answer-the-following-question-can-democracy-exist-in-a-socially/>

of the Hindu caste system and the bearing of the sects towards each other and towards other religious systems. Thacker, 1896. Holborn, Martin, and Haralambos, Mike. Sociology: Themes and Perspectives. Collins Publications, 2004. Lipset, Seymour, and Bendix, Reinhard. Social Mobility in Industrial Society. Transactional Publishers, 1991. Tilly, Charles. Democracy. Cambridge University Press, 2007.