In this chapter, first of all, the sources of data shall be discussed. Next the universe of the study will be elaborated. Thirdly, the procedures employed in this study will be spelt out; and fourthly the techniques used in this study will be explained. Then the population characteristics and salient features of the villages studied will be discussed; and in the end the limitations of this study will be brought out.

The Sources of Data

The sources of data for this study consist of both primary and secondary sources. Taking the latter first, the secondary sources consist of the following:


(b) Ph.D. dissertations of A.M. Shah (1964), A.S. Patel (1960) and Neera Desai (1964). The dissertations of Dilip Shah (1979) and B.T. Patel (1980), which throw light on economic and agricultural extension perspective of milk cooperatives in Kheda district, have also been studied.

(c) Government of India publications - the Plan documents; "Report of Ram Niwas Mirdha Committee on Cooperation"; "Report of the National Commission on Agriculture". Included here are the various census documents and also the Public Accounts Committee Reports.

(d) Publications of the State Governments like Kheda District Gazetteers and the Gujarat State Gazetteer.

(e) Publications of banks like the Reserve Bank of India and the National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development.

(f) Publications of Indian Dairy Corporation (IDC), National Dairy Development Board (NDDB) and those of Kheda District Cooperative Milk Producers' Union Ltd.

(g) District panchayat publication like Statistical Outline of Kheda District.

(h) Publications of international bodies like FAO, ILO and ICA.

(i) Studies of voluntary organizations.

(j) Journals like the Economic and Political Weekly; the Seminar; the Indian Cooperative Review; the Cooperative Dairying; The Cooperator; the Economic Development and Cultural Change; the
Contributions to Indian Sociology (n.s.); and the Sociological Bulletin.

(k) Village level documents - both from the panchayats and the milk cooperatives. It includes land records, membership and disbursements of payments in the MC, minutes of general meetings and minutes of managing committee meetings.

(l) Lastly, mention may be made of articles in newspapers, both in English and Gujarati, including those in the Indian Express, The Times of India, the Prabhat (Gujarati), the Business World, The Illustrated Weekly of India, and the Purchase. These, especially, were articles in the context of OF controversy.

All these above works give a good background information on cooperatives and cooperative principles, dairying and milk cooperatives as well as on the social milieu of Kheda district (and Gujarat) in which the milk cooperatives are located. These sources shall be drawn upon throughout the course of this study.

The primary sources of data consist of the following:

(a) From informants, who gave us information on various aspects of social milieu in Kheda district, talukas and villages.

(b) Observation; and

(c) Household census and interview of select people in each of the four villages.

Before proceeding further on the techniques, it is necessary to elaborate the universe of this study and the procedures adopted in selection of the four villages.
The Universe of this Study

The universe of this study is the village milk cooperatives in Kheda district. The intention is to present, in particular, a hitherto not much studied dimension of milk cooperatives in Kheda district, as well as to throw light on milk cooperatives in general.

In this study, a comparative analysis is made of four milk cooperatives (in Kheda district) in the context of the social structure of the villages. These four villages have differential caste domination and differential agro-irrigation facilities and enable us to study how MCs perform in villages having such differential facilities.

The perspective adopted may be termed as the perspective from below; and this meant staying in each of the four villages for a sufficiently long duration, in this case not less than six weeks in each of the four villages.

The population, location and other salient features of the four villages studied, shall be discussed in greater detail towards the end of this chapter.

The Procedures

As stated earlier, the intention was to study four financially successful MCs in the context of differential caste domination (Patidar and Kshatriya) and differential agro-irrigation facilities (with canal irrigation and without canal irrigation). It was decided to make a study of four medium sized villages which were multi-caste in composition (and also multi-religious, if possible). This gives rise to the following matrix:
Before proceeding further, the meaning of the terms 'caste domination', 'irrigation' and 'medium sized' villages shall be elaborated.

The reason for choosing Patidar and Kshatriya dominated villages for study, is because these are the two principal castes competing for power and position of dominance not only in the district but even in the State. The rivalry between the two castes is old, and as this aspect will be discussed in greater detail in chapter four, a discussion shall not be preempted here. For operational purposes caste domination has been worked out in politico-economic terms, viz., land holding at village level. This meant that at village level, Patidars or Kshatriyas should be a large landholding caste, though they may not necessarily hold more than 50% of the land in the village.

The term irrigation refers to the existence of canal irrigation. Much of the canal irrigation facility in Kheda district exists in the fertile Charotar talukas of Anand, Borsad, Nadiad and Petlad (See Appendix A). Although another taluka, Matar, does have irrigation facility comparable to some of the Charotar talukas, it is not
in the same position as its soil is not rich and of fertile variety of the Charotar tract. The two villages chosen from irrigated area for this study are from the Charotar tract. Balasinor taluka, as seen in Appendix A, is the least irrigated taluka. Nor does it have any government canal (i.e., river canals). Anand taluka has the highest percentage area covered by irrigation from all sources.

Of the four villages chosen for the study, villages Jol and Katol have irrigation facility, i.e., canal irrigation. Both these villages have canals which, on paper, can cater to the needs of the entire village land (i.e., 100% irrigation) although there are some areas in both villages where water cannot reach owing to the nature of the terrain (hilly terrain or being located at a higher level than the canal). The two villages in the dry area, Parabiya and Meghaliya, are located in Balasinor taluka and have no river canal irrigation facility. Both do have well irrigation, and have canals leading from tanks located a few kilometres away, but these are often dry as the water level in the tank/reservoir is not sufficient to be let out in sufficient quantity. The percentage of cultivable area irrigated in Parabiya is 19.09%, while Meghaliya has 6.43% of its cultivable land irrigated.

Having clarified the operational aspects of the term irrigation, now the attention will be turned to the reason for choosing medium sized villages. Large sized villages were not chosen because they were unwieldy for an individual to study for a Ph.D. dissertation. As far as small villages were concerned, the informants told us that they tend to be single caste villages, and some of them, like in Balasinor taluka, do not have MCs. For medium sized villages to be
of single caste composition was not a common occurrence. Next the meaning of the term medium sized shall be explained.

At the time of the commencement of this research study in late 1981, the detailed 1981 Census figures were not published. Only the provisional district level decadal growth rate (1971-81 at +22.67%)\(^1\) and the provisional district level population for 1981 were available. Owing to this, a projection from the 1971 village census was made so as to get an estimated population for each village for the year 1981 in the Charotar irrigated talukas and in dry talukas of Kapadvanj, Balasinor and Thasra. This projection was made by taking the 1971 village population figures and multiplying it by the decadal percent growth figures (+22.67%). Having got the population estimate for each village, the villages were then categorized on the basis of intervals of 1000 as shown in Table III.1. The categorization has been restricted upto 6000+, as there were few villages which had population above this, and they were predominantly in Charotar - irrigated region, with a large number of them being in Anand taluka. Once this was done, it gave us an idea of the nature of distribution of villages by population intervals. Working on an assumption that about one-third of the villages in each of the talukas would be in small, medium and large categories, it was found that villages having population below 2000 in the irrigated-Charotar area would be in the small category, while those falling in the 2001 to 4000 category would be in the medium category. Those above 4000 would be in the large category. On the other hand, in dry Balasinor, Kapadvanj and Thasra talukas, villages falling in category below 1000 would be considered to be
## Table III.1

Frequency Distribution of Villages in Various Categories (Intervals '000) according to 1981 Population Estimates in Select Talukas of Kheda District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taluka</th>
<th>1000 &amp; less to 2000</th>
<th>2001 to 3000</th>
<th>3001 to 4000</th>
<th>4001 to 5000</th>
<th>5001 to 6000</th>
<th>6001 +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nadiad (W)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anand (W)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsad (W)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petlad (W)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balasinor (d)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapadvanj (d)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasra (d)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N.B.:** (W) 'Wet' i.e., irrigated-Charotar area.
(d) 'dry' area.
(e) excludes uninhabited villages.

**Source:** Population estimate made for each village by taking 1971 census figures and multiplying by the provisional decadal (1971-81) growth rate (+22.67%). The source for 1971 figures: Census of India 1971 Series 5 Gujarat District Census Handbook Kheda District Parts X A & B.
small, while those in 1001 to 2000 would be medium sized and those having population of above 2000 would be in the category called large. Table III.2 shows the distribution of villages in the various talukas.

Once this was done, the next step was to identify the Patidar and Kshatriya dominated multi-caste villages in the medium sized category. This process was completed with the help of officials in charge of cooperation and statistical information in the Taluka Development Office.

Once this stage was crossed, the next stage was to identify villages with MCs which are running well financially. Preliminary information about the MCs in the Patidar/Kshatriya dominated villages were gathered from officials in charge of cooperation at Taluka Office, and also from informants. As an aid in the selection of villages, Amul's classification of MC into audit categories\(^2\) based on managerial performance was made use of. A choice of MCs was made which were in audit category 'B' in the year preceding the commencement of the study; and also which had been in this category (and implying financial success) for a number of years right from the time the MC was started in the case of villages which were not very old and had come into existence over a decade ago. For a village which had come into existence in 1951 like Jol, information for about 10 years or so was taken into account as the yardstick on the basis of which to make a judgement.\(^3\) All these entailed visits to each of these villages to cross check the information.
Table III.2A

Distribution of villages in Small, Medium and Large Categories in Select Irrigated Talukas of Kheda District according to 1981 Population Estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Taluka</th>
<th>Small 2000 &amp; below</th>
<th>Medium 2001 to 4000</th>
<th>Large 4000 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=121</td>
<td>N=129</td>
<td>N=102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadiad</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anand</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsad</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petlad</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III.2B

Distribution of Villages in Small, Medium and Large Categories in Select Dry Talukas of Kheda District according to 1981 Population Estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Taluka</th>
<th>Small 1000 &amp; below</th>
<th>Medium 1001 to 2000</th>
<th>Large 2001 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=140</td>
<td>N=108</td>
<td>N=101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balasinor</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapadvanj</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thasra</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the shortlisting of the villages, the next step was the issue of staying in the villages, and to identify the village where someone was willing to host a researcher for a sufficient duration.

Village Voj (Patidar dominated) is located in Anand taluka; and its population estimate was 3448. The estimate for Katol (Kshatriya dominated) was 2469. Both these villages are located in the irrigated-Charotar area. As for the villages in the dry (and non-Charotar) area, the population estimate was 1656 for Parabiya (Patidar dominated) and 1992 for Meghaliya (Kshatriya dominated). It may also be stated here that all four villages were at a sufficient distance from the nearest town.

The Techniques Adopted for Data Collection

The data for this study were collected from various sources:

1) As stated earlier, from primary and secondary sources, like census, Gazetteers, district and taluka documents, from the village panchayat and milk cooperative society records and books on the MC of KDCMPU.

2) From informants. These informants were categorized into two groups: one group consisted of those who were knowledgeable about the district. This group consisted of professors, social workers, and an officer at the Thermal Power Station near Balasinor who has been working in the district for sometime. The information from these people gave a good background information to a researcher not belonging to the district (or for that matter
to the State). These informants also helped in identification and selection of the villages for the study. The second set of informants were those at the village level. They consisted of at least one elder member of each caste and school teachers. These people gave information about the village. As for information about the MC, usually an employee of the MC gave information with regard to it. The data suffers from one limitation, viz., lack of information from women inspite of attempts to acquire them. Conversation with women belonging to the dominant caste was possible only in Patidar dominated villages. In Kshatriya dominated villages, such opportunities were rare; and even if available women would shy away from discussing about the MC or about the family.

3) The actual study of each of the four villages by turn, was started in summer of 1982. The stay in each village was possible only during the vacations, and interviews were taken by going on weekends and holidays during the intervening period. In three villages, Jol, Katol, and Parabiya, lodging was in the village while in the fourth village, Meghaliya, it was in a neighbouring village, Jorapura, at a distance of about a kilometre and half. Meghaliya is a part of the group panchayat consisting of Jorapura and a couple of other villages. These two villages share a common panchayat office (although having two different panchayat committees), a common 'talati', and a common service cooperative (called Seva Sahkari Mandal) for the distribution of essential commodities like cooking oil, sugar, etc. and for distribution of other inputs in the process of cultivation like seeds, fertilizers including urea and ammonium phosphate. In the case of Meghaliya, it was a daily visit from early morning to late evening. It may be mentioned here
that Parabiya shared a panchayat and a panchayat office and a service cooperative with a neighbouring village Vasadra, although MCs were separate in both the villages.

In the irrigated villages, Jol and Katol, the lodging was in the MCs as the MCs had a building of their own and had facilities for staying, unlike the villages in the dry area, which had no MC building. In Jol and Katol, it was noticed that whenever any household (belonging to the dominant caste) had a large number of guests, they would be put up for the night at the MC. In Parabiya and Meghaliya, the MC was located in a hired building; and residence in them was not possible as amenities for staying did not exist. So in Parabiya, the lodging was with the then chairman of the MC, while in Meghaliya, being a village which was poorer than the other three, the possibility of residing in the village seemed difficult, and the offer for putting up had come from a school teacher in the neighbouring village.

The data got through observation are based on the perspective from below, viz., that of the villager. The data collected suffers from a limitation (inspite of attempts to overcome it) in so far that it does not have a perspective from the lowest of the low of the village society for two reasons:

i) The lowest section of the village both in terms of caste and class (i.e., the landless), were not in a position to accommodate a researcher for a long period, as the stay in each village was for a minimum of six weeks.
ii) Secondly, the entry into each village was through someone who knew the secretary or the chairman of the MC. Neither the MC secretary nor the chairman were from the lowest stratum. In all the four villages, they came from the dominant caste and were landholders.

4) Fourthly, data were collected through a household survey in each of the four villages. About one-third of the households were selected for further intensive interview to get to know why members supplied milk to the MC, and if they were not members why they were not so. This selection was made on the basis of purposive stratified sampling.

The household survey involved gathering information for each household as to whether they were milk producers, whether they were member(s) of the MC, and whether they supplied milk to the MC and whether they held land. First, a house list was drawn for the entire village, and then house by house information gathered with regard to the above mentioned points. Information on land was cross checked with the land-records; and for those who supplied milk, the information was obtained from the records of the MC. By this process information was obtained on caste, number of milk producers, the number of households that were 'covered' by the MC, and the number of households that were landless, marginal peasants, small or big farmers. The operational aspects and meanings of these terms are discussed later on in this chapter.

The purposive stratified sampling for the interview was adopted so as to gather data from all caste groups and/or religious groups - even those having one or two households, to cover all
sections of landholders including the landless, and to cover people residing in the fields on their own plot of land.

For the purpose of the study, our attention was confined to the revenue limits of the village. Usually the revenue limit was the social limit of the village as far as identification or location of a household was concerned. But in Meghaliya, the houses were dispersed over five clusters and when one asked a person to which village he belonged, the response would be to refer to the cluster to which he belonged. But when talking to a stranger (as they did initially with us) or for legal revenue purposes, they would refer to the generic 'Meghaliya'. In Parabiya, there were 15 households that lived previously in the precincts of the village but were given houses, under the 20-point programme, which were located in the jurisdiction of the neighbouring village, Vasadra. These people still interact with Parabiya by coming there for buying their necessities, or to catch a bus to go out, etc. A few of these households have been interviewed. Similarly, households of the Bharvads (cow-herds/shepherds), who reside in an area which fell within the jurisdiction of a third village, Jetoli, but who supplied milk to Parabiya MC, were interviewed so as to know more about them.

During the visits for the interview, a person belonging to the village would accompany us so as to forestall suspicion (regarding the stranger) and to introduce the researcher to the person concerned. Inspite of this there were cases of a few people who did not want to be interviewed, especially amongst the women (widows). In the cases where a widow could be interviewed a male from the neighbourhood would respond to the queries at the widow's request.
Inspite of attempts to forestall suspicion, there were some sections in all the four villages, who felt or had a suspicion that the researcher was an agent of the CID, who had come to the village to investigate under the cover of a study, some past crime, usually a "murder" which had taken place some time back.

Two villages, Katol and Parabiya, were not studied previously by anyone. In village Jol, a group of students from the Sardar Patel University had conducted a survey for an MA Course in late 1970s. Meghaliya village is one of the three villages adopted by the ACC (Associated Cement Company) factory in Sevalia, as part of its rural development programme. The Rural Development Officer had conducted a survey in the beginning of 1980s for their project.

Meaning of the Terms Used in this Study

The term landholding (and land held) include both land owned and/or land leased in for cultivation. Tenancy is widespread in this district and is common in all the four villages studied. There are cases where some households claim, in comparison with the land owned in land records, a larger/lower share - reflecting the existence of tenancy. Landholding for the purposes of this study has been computed for each household. Land ownership record is in the name of individuals and there are in some cases, more than one land owner in a household. On the other hand, in some cases, the land is in the name of father or some other member of the family, in which others have a share even though they stay in separate households. The nature of land tenure is very intricate; for instance, a person may be an owner - cultivator, tenant-cultivator and also a labourer at the same time. As our purpose was
to find out whether land as a resource plays a more important role than caste, so for the purposes of this study, land resource has been categorized into 'landheld'. Once having done this, landheld has been categorized into four categories: the landless, i.e., those with no form of landholding and who subsist by selling their labour; the marginal, i.e., those having between 0.1 to 2.5 acres of land; the small, i.e., those having from 2.5 to 5.0 acres. Those having land of 5.0 acres and above have been categorized as the big landholders.

The rationalization for following this form of categorization partly stems from the classification of peasants/farmers into such categories by the state. This categorization is used for land owners so as to determine who is to be given loan and the extent of subsidy under various schemes. This criterion is applied uniformly irrespective of whether the area is irrigated or non-irrigated; having rich fertile soil or poor/rocky/sandy soil; whether it is double cropped or triple cropped or single cropped area. Thus, this criterion has an inherent limitation in reflecting accurately the economic resource of a household. In spite of this limitation, the same classification has been maintained in a slightly modified form. It has been applied (i) to households (rather than individuals as done legally) and (ii) the households are classified according to landheld. Such a classification may not exactly reflect the class structure and dynamics of the rural countryside of Kheda district, but it enables us to understand which category of landholding household benefits from the milk cooperatives.
Next, the operational aspects of the term 'milk producer' and 'those who have supplied milk to the MC' shall be explained. All those who owned/shared at least one buffalo/cow of milk yielding age, irrespective of whether the animal(s) was/were yielding milk were considered to be milk producers. The reason for doing this was because there were cases of buffaloes/cows being pregnant and not yielding milk at the time of the survey, but which would yield milk after calving. As for those who have sold milk to the MCs in the two irrigated villages information regarding the names of persons, who have sold milk in 1980-81, and the amount of payment they received from the MC was obtained. The households to which these persons belonged were located/identified and the data classified accordingly. In the case of dry villages, breakup of figures for an annual year were not available. So our attention was confined to those people who were supplying milk to the MC between October 1981 and March 1982. From the record books, information about those who have supplied milk on first and fifteenth of every month from October 1981 to March 1982 in the case of Meghaliya, were collected. In the case of Parabiya, the information of who supplied milk was given by the secretary/collector for 1983-84.

Population, Location and Salient Features of the Four Villages

The actual 1981 population figures for the four villages turned out to be different from what was estimated by the procedure adopted. They were for Jol 3807, Katol 2730, Parabiya 1480 and Meghaliya 1855. The villages in irrigated-Charotar area showed an increase of 35% (Jol + 35.43% and Katol + 35.62%) during 1971-81, the percentage decadal growth being much higher than the district
average of +22.99% and the State growth average of +27.67% during the same period. In contrast were the two villages in non-irrigated dry area, where their percent growth increase during 1971-81 was below 15% (Meghaliya +14.22% and Parabiya +9.63%), a figure much lower than the district and State average population growth percent for the same period.

Having pointed out the population characteristics, the location and salient features of each of the four villages will be highlighted by turn.

**JOL**: Jol is a Patidar dominated multi-caste and multi-religious village located at a distance of about 6 kilometres from Vallabh Vidyanagar and about 10 kilometres from the taluka headquarters, Anand. Jol is located in the heart of the irrigated - Charotar tract. It neighbours a famous religious centre of the Swaminarayan sect located in Vadtal. Prior to Independence, Jol was part of the Baroda State.

It is connected by an all weather metalled road, connecting Vallabh Vidyanagar to Vadtal and Nadiad, the largest town of the district. State transport buses link it to Anand, Vadtal, Vallabh Vidyanagar, Nadiad, Petlad, Borsad, Ahmedabad and Baroda. Jol has electricity and piped water facilities. A major branch of the Mahi canal system skirts the periphery of the village.

Jol has a panchayat office of its own and the MC is one of the earliest MCs of KDCMFU. The MC was registered on October 22, 1951, and at the time the study commenced, the membership figure was 536.
The MC has an imposing two storey building located close to the main road and at the entrance of the village. The ground floor has separate rooms serving for milk collection, for testing fat content of milk and for selling 'Amuldan' (cattlefeed). The first floor has an office room, where the records are kept; and a huge hall which is used for meetings. This hall alternates also as a room for guests to stay. The first floor also has a bathroom and a toilet. The flooring is mosaic and each room has a fan. The MC also has a TV installed in it. Since early 1983, a new electronic fat testing machine has been in operation. This machine was acquired at a cost of about Rs. 22,000/-.9

The MC society employed, in 1981, 7 persons. Besides the secretary, the others employed consisted of a person to fill milk, a tester, a 'tester-helper', a person to sell Amuldan, a peon and a helper for AI. In 1983, an additional person was appointed as a cashier. These 8 people are employees of the MC and they are paid salaries based on a scale.10

The MC during the course of the study improved its audit classification from B to A.

The secretary of the MC is a Patidar. All secretaries of the MC since its inception have been Patidars; and the present incumbent has been a secretary since 1973. Of the other office-bearers, four are Kshatriyas, one a Christian and one a landless Patidar. The cashier is from the neighbouring village and is a Kshatriya.
The only milk marketing outlet is this MC. In the past there were private vendors, but now there is no alternative marketing outlet. In the outer fringes of the village, near to the limits of Vadta and Kanjari villages, a private vendor collects milk in the mornings as people find it more convenient to sell milk to him. This is at a distance of about 2 kilometres (half an hour's walk from the MC). This private vendor also collects milk on the basis of fat content. Collecting milk on the basis of fat content is the feature in Kheda district whether be it a rural trader or an urban milk vendor.

In Jol, the panchayat and MC are institutions in contrast. Since 1968-69, for a period of 10 years, the MC has been having a Patidar as a chairman. Records prior to 1968-69 are not available at the MC. The panchayat since 1956-57 has been having a Kshatriya as a sarpanch, although prior to 1956-57, a Patidar had been a sarpanch in Independent India.

Jol does not have a high school and aspiring students have to commute to VadtaI, at a distance of about 2½ kilometres, to study.

KATOL: Katol, the Kshatriya dominated multi-caste and multi-religious village of Charotar tract, is situated about 12 kilometres from the nearest town, Borsad, in Borsad taluka. Katol has also another branch of the Mahi canal system serving it; although there are certain portions on the southern side of the village where canal water cannot reach as the terrain is undulating and form part of the outer fringes of the Mahi ravines.
The village is served by an all weather road, leading from north-east to south-west, connecting it to Sisva and Bhadran villages on the north-east, and to Dhewan village in Cambay taluka, on the south-west. Another road, relatively more recent, on the northern side, connects the village to Ras. Ras village is located on a State highway and on a broad-gauge railway line.

Katol has bus services throughout the day to Borsad and Petlad. It is also connected by two daily bus services to Ahmedabad.

Electricity and piped water exist in the village. The village has its own panchayat. Till recently only a primary school existed, but now a high school is coming up.

The MC has its own single storey building, consisting of 3 rooms: one to collect milk, another to sell Amuldan and the third room is where records are kept. Two of the rooms have ceiling fans. The only TV in the village was located in the MC; but it has broken down and has not been repaired. The MC building is located in one corner of the village.

The secretary of the MC is a Gohil. The Gohils are also known locally as Darbar Kshatriyas. In Katol one can identify three different status categories amongst the Kshatriyas; the upper level consists of the Gohils; the middle level consists of various groups whose patronymics are Solanki, Chavda, Padiyar, Parmar and Makwana. The third level, the lower level, are the Thakurs.

The sarpanch of the village is a Thakur who also was the chairman of the village MC. He is a small landholding farmer.
The deputy sarpanch, a marginal landholder, was a middle level Kshatriya.

It would be pertinent to point out that the district level Kheda Zilla Panchayat President is a Gohil from Katol; and during the course of the study, Katol benefited by his political leverage. Owing to his efforts, a new high school along with a hostel for boy students is coming up.

The MC has 6 office-bearers, a secretary, a milk filler, a tester, a peon, an AI helper and an Amuldan seller. The Katol MC is in contrast to Jol MC. Here the office-bearers form a nexus between power structure and the MC. The son of the sarpanch is incharge of AI, while another panchayat member (a Gohil) is the milk filler. Sometimes he alternates for the secretary. His son sells Amuldan in the MC. The MC secretary is a Gohil who is a rich landlord, with a tractor and a private tube well. One of the persons who works for him is the peon of the MC.

Katol MC, which came into existence in 1963, is not the only retail outlet for milk. There exists a private trader who operates what is called a 'bhatti', a place where a form of condensed milk-'khoa' (local name 'mava')-is prepared from milk. The khoa is sent by cycle to Ras from where it is transported by rail to Vasad, a major centre for collecting khoa; and from Vasad it is sent to Bombay. In addition to the bhatti, a private milk vendor collected milk in the mornings and evenings. He was from the neighbouring village of Sisva. The collection from Katol, Sisva and five other villages was transported to Anand to a private dairy.
This private trader closed shop within a year or so, but a new one had come into existence wherein a person belonging to the village runs the milk collection centre.

**Parabiya**: Parabiya is a Patidar dominated multi-caste and multi-religious village, located at a distance of about 17 kilometres from Balasinor town in the dry Balasinor taluka of Kheda district. It is situated at about the halfway mark on the main road connecting Balasinor to Virpur. The village is connected by regular bus services to Balasinor, Virpur and Sevalia in the same district and to Bayad in the neighbouring Sabarkantha district. Daily buses ply through Parabiya for major towns of Ahmedabad, Baroda, Godhra, Nadiad and Modasa.

Near Parabiya, at a distance of about 3 to 4 kilometres, is a tank, which, when there is water, irrigates a part of the village. Other than this, the only other source of irrigation is well water, wherever it is available. A further catch is that well water is costlier than canal irrigation. So the peasant must be able to afford the cost, failing which they have to depend on the rains.

Parabiya has a secondary (10th class) school. It (Parabiya) has piped water and electricity.

Parabiya shares a panchayat with the neighbouring Kshatriya dominated village of Vasadra, located at a distance of about 1½ kilometres. Persons from Parabiya hold 7 of the 10 posts on the panchayat. The sarpanch has been from Parabiya since 1958 and since that time only two individuals, both Patidars, have been sarpanch. The present sarpanch came to be elected for the first
time in 1973. Although sharing a common panchayat, Parabiya and Vasadra have two separate MCs. The Parabiya MC is located in a building hired by the MC from the former panchayat president and father of the chairman of the MC. The MC came into existence on June 20, 1967. The Vasadra MC, which now has its own building, came into existence a year earlier in 1966.

Vasadra has a MC secretary who is a Patidar from Parabiya. This same person also served as secretary of the MC in Parabiya for some time in the early years of the existence of the MC. The present sarpanch, B.G. Patel, who was then a panchayat member, took over as secretary in 1971 and was the secretary of the MC till 1975. He was succeeded by a Kshatriya who had to leave the MC under a cloud. Three persons occupied the post for short spells before the sarpanch again became the secretary in 1979. He was the secretary till mid-1984 when he resigned to be succeeded by a Kshatriya friend of his. The dynamics of Parabiya shall be examined in greater detail in the following chapters, so a further discussion will not be pre-empted here.

Parabiya MC has at present 4 employees - a secretary, a tester, a milk filler and a peon.

In Parabiya, besides the MC, a person hailing from U.P. operated a bhatti. But this did not run for long. Subsequently another bhatti came up, located on the main road, but this also operated for a short period. The only alternative outlet for milk is the Vasadra MC.
MEGHALIYA: The fourth village, Meghaliya, a Kshatriya dominated village, is located at a distance of 8 kilometres from Balasinor and situated at a distance of about a kilometre off the main Balasinor – Virpur road, on an all weather road to Janod.

Meghaliya is also multi-caste and multi-religious in composition. Meghaliya is served by a canal from a tank located at a distance of about 5 kilometres or so. More often than not, the water in the tank is not sufficient for it to reach the village. Canal water, if at all available, is only for a few months.

Of the four villages studied, Meghaliya is economically most backward. Although backward, inequity between caste groups is not so sharp. In fact one does not see a pukka house built by cement and mortar in the village. Tiled roofing is common. At the time of commencement of this study in 1983, electricity had not reached the village. Only in the latter half of 1984, did this facility become available. Piped water facility is non-existent, and women have to draw water from wells. Meghaliya has only primary schools.

The village is dispersed over five clusters of housing settlement - called Meghaliya, Jadavpura, Beka-na-muvada, Dattardi and Vad-na-muvada. The village shares a panchayat building with the neighbouring Patidar dominated Jorapura village. Although they do share the same building, the panchayat is separate. The talati-cum-secretary of the panchayat is common for both the villages.
The village is dominated by middle-level Kshatriyas whose patronymics are Chauhan, Jala and Beka. Most of the Chauhans are in Meghaliya, Vad-na-muvada and Dattardi; while Jalas are in Jadavpura and Bekas in Beka-na-muvada. Hypergamy exists amongst the Kshatriyas, with Chauhans accepting women in marriage from Jalas and Bekas. Bekas and Jalas do not exchange women in marriage. The distinction between the two is not sharp and it is a matter of dispute as to who is superior. No darbar Rajpur exists in the village. Although hypergamy exists in marriage, economically there is not much of a distinction between Chauhans, Bekas and Jalas.

The MC which came into existence in April 1970, is located in Meghaliya cluster. It was situated in a hired building till October 1984, when it shifted to a newly constructed building of the MC.

There is no alternative retail outlet for milk. If anyone wishes to sell elsewhere, he/she would have to go to the neighbouring Jorapura village MC or to other neighbouring villages.

Limitations of the Study

The first limitation of this study, as pointed out earlier, was the limited data from and on women. In Patidar dominated villages, the Patidar women belonging to the family of the secretary (in Jol) and chairman (in Parabiya), did give some idea about their views. But in the Kshatriya dominated villages, conversation was not possible except beyond greeting each other. In one village, Meghaliya, women belonging to the Scheduled Caste were forthcoming.
but this was not so in the other villages. (Scheduled caste persons in Meghaliya, unlike those in the other three villages, were fair skinning much more than even the dominant caste people and had grey eyes, thus indicating an element of foreign blood in them). By and large there were few opportunities to talk to women. Even when a chance was available, as during interviews, usually a male neighbour would do the answering. This is not to say that women did not answer questions at all. Usually the few who did, would answer questions concerning family size or the animals they own; but when it came to questions concerning landholding, they refused by saying they did not know and would wait for a male member of the household to come and give an answer, although the women did correct/confirm the male members while calculating the amount of land they held.

The second limitation, as pointed out earlier, was the inability to gather information from the perspective of the 'lowest of the low' owing to reasons mentioned earlier. Conscious attempt was made to talk to both the landless and the Scheduled Caste, so as to gain their confidence. And it can be said with sufficient degree of confidence that success was achieved to a large extent.

Staying in the MC to indicate no attachment to any section of the village society, did help partially to overcome this suspicion/gulf between the landless, the Scheduled Caste and the researcher. Of the two remaining villages, staying in a village outside Meghaliya also helped in gaining the confidence of the Scheduled Caste and the landless. Actually, Meghaliya being a poorer village than others, the gulf between Scheduled Caste and others was not so conspicuous. As for Parabiya, the stay was with the chairman of the MC (a Patidar) as there was no other way out.
In spite of these limitations, there was a distinct advantage enjoyed by us and that was of being a non-Gujarati. It enabled us to interact freely with all the castes and gather rich information, which would not have been possible had the researcher belonged to Gujarat and one of the local castes.
1. This figure was based on provisional population totals. Based on final population totals, the figure for 1971-81 for Kheda district was +22.99%.

For Gujarat, the figure for the same period, based on final population totals, was +27.67%.

The provisional and final figures are derived from

2. Amul has classified milk cooperative societies, on the basis of managerial criteria, into audit categories A, B, C and D.

Milk cooperatives in A category had very good management.
Milk cooperatives in B category had average management.
Milk cooperatives in C category had not good management.
Milk cooperatives in D category had bad management.

This classification was based on Primary Cooperative Societies Audit Classification issued by Kheda Zilla Sahakari Sangh, Nadiad.
### Audit Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.A. : Not Available.

3. This was based on the information supplied by the MC secretary in three villages and the chairman and milk tester in the fourth village (Parabiya).

4. Talati is the village level government official to look after land records and to collect revenue, and also acts as the secretary to the panchayat.

5. A MC building was constructed in 1984.

6. Meghaliya at the time of the study, did not have any electricity although villages in the neighbourhood had. In the middle of 1984, electricity became available to three of the five clusters in Meghaliya, although only a few households have availed this facility. For many, raising the amount necessary for deposit for meters, was burdensome. Meghaliya
was the only village, of four villages studied, which did not have piped water facility. It was the only village of the four studied, which did not have a person owning a tractor. Another interesting indirect evidence can be presented. During the course of the study, no person brought milk in stainless steel utensil to the MC, unlike in the other three MCs where the wealthier sections brought milk to be sold in steel/brass utensils. In Meghaliya, the utensil used most is aluminium, which is the container by which the poorer sections brought milk in the other three villages. This is not to say that there are no brass vessels in Meghaliya. There are, but they are used by very few wealthy farmers.

7. The actual 1981 population figures were got from the village panchayat records.

8. The membership number increases continuously like that of a savings bank account. In 1984, the membership of MC in Jol was 618.

9. This type of electronic fat testing machine is now manufactured in India. It is found in other villages. One village where this machine was seen was in Vasadra, near Parabiya, in Balasinor taluka.

The interesting feature of this machine is that it tests fat content to percentage points over 100. Being electronic, it has a digital display; and the entire process to test fat content in an individual case takes a few seconds to operate, unlike the conventional acid -
test procedure. Another handicap with the conventional procedure was that the readings could not show a high fat content beyond 100 percentage points.

10. The MC societies are classified into 8 grades based on annual quantity of milk purchased. At the top is class I over 7 lakh litres; class II between 6 and 7 lakh litres; class III between 5 and 6 lakh litres; class IV between 4 and 5 lakh litres; class V between 3 and 4 lakh litres; class VI between 1.5 and 3 lakh litres; class VII between 75,000 and 1.5 lakh litres; class VIII up to 75,000 litres. Each grade had a separate scale of salary: Thus, for instance, a secretary of a MC which was in class I (at the top of the grade) would be on a salary scale of Rupees 260-15-335-18-371-21-413-25-488. On the other hand, a secretary of a MC which was in class VII (at the bottom of the grade) would be on a salary scale of Rupees 114-7-135-9-153-11-175-14-231.

11. There were 28 persons from Beka-na-muvada and 4 from Dattardi who were members in Jorapura MC in 1982.