CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION : PROBLEMS AND ASSUMPTIONS
We have made a detailed analysis of the available studies on factions in this introductory chapter. There is no agreed definition of a faction arrived at by scholars. Even some of the basic questions such as why factions prevail, who become the members of factions, and how certain people take the leadership of factions, have not been adequately dealt with. In view of these and some other queries we have provided a tentative list of characteristics of a faction. A faction could be looked into in terms of four criteria, namely, issues and interests, organisation, recruitment and loyalty. Such a scheme of analysis is based on our understanding of the available studies on factions. The themes of studies on factions could be classified as follows:

1) Caste and factions,
2) Issues and factions,
3) Leadership and factions,
4) Political parties and factions, and
5) Landownership and factions.

Our view is that factions are not a matter of deduction or inference. Factions represent a social reality, that is, related to segmentation and bifurcation of social groups based on interests, rules of inheritance and lineage diversification
etc. The context in which some of these rules of segmentation are found should be taken into account. None of the studies take into account the four criteria as a framework of analysis. Our view is that if this frame of analysis is adopted, some of the limitations of available studies could be minimised in our study of factions.

Factionalism could be understood in two ways: (1) as a tool of structural analysis; and (2) as an ideology. In the first case we have several studies of factions in which kinship analysis finds prominence. Kinship divisions are considered as factions. There is no role of leadership so far as this model of analysis of factions is concerned. Factions become spontaneous divisions in a given society. They become intrinsic to social structure. Clan or lineage Heads become leaders of these factions (clans) by virtue of their hereditary positions.

There are several implications of this view. One is that factions are enduring and primordial segments. Secondly, by analysing these clans or sub-groups factional divisions could be analysed, and this would provide understanding of social structure. Thirdly, factions in the form of clans could resist change particularly imposed by the sources external to their social structure.

Factionalism as an ideology refers to the role of leaders in dividing the people as their respective followers. The leaders take up the role of patrons in different political parties and within the parties. The factional leaders try to channelise the developmental resources in favour of their
respective followers, regimes and communities. The present power-politics, developmental schemes and allocation of resources could be examined from twin perspectives regarding factionalism as an ideology. We do not refer here ideology of opposed groups in Marxist sense, namely, conflict between the have and the have-nots, that is, between the patrons and their clients. Our reference is to the ideology of the power elite and circulation of the resources among themselves without allowing its percolation to the masses. Leach refers to the competition between the patrons to seek maximum support of the clients. However, he does not talk of factionalism as an instrument of monopolising the resources of society. Political scientists hold this view about factions prevailing at national and state levels. Sociologists have not studied factions considering them as political "monochrome in view of their social background.

There are several implications of the second view like the first one. Firstly, factions are not as enduring groups as the clans and lineages are. Secondly, the factions do not represent into the social segments such as clans, neighbourhood, and communities. They are not groups. They are less than groups, and also more than groups as they have extra group characteristics. Thirdly, all factions carry issues and interests

which cross the group or clan boundary. Therefore, factions
are not as well-knit as groups or clans are. Those issues
and interests could be understood in their oppositional context.
In the absence of opposition there would be no factions. Thus,
factions change due to external factors, such as party,
ideology and pressures etc.

Bujra's analysis of factionalism is comprehensive but
it is an inadequate frame for our study of factions.
According to Bujra factions involve people who already have
face-to-face, multiplex relationships, and are therefore,
political phenomena at the lowest structural level. 2
Factions within the village are different from the factions
within the political parties as the former have more structural
similarity than the latter. We do not hesitate to accept this
definition of factions of Bujra. However, his observation that
the 'elite' nature of faction leadership and the individualistic
mode of recruitment, taken together, would seem to account for
the lack of ideological focus in factions. This itself becomes
an ideology of vested interests, an ideology of distorting the
resources among the top ranks of the factions. Factions are
not formed on one side and the poor on the other. Hence,
factions could not have a dialectical process of transformation.
Nicholas observes that vertical and horizontal forms of political

2. Bujra, Janet M. (1975), 'The Dynamics of Political
Action: A New Look at Factionalism', American
Anthropologist, Vol.75, p. 149.
cleavages could work at the same time. 3 Factionalism, in
certain situations, could bring out caste or class conflict
as a possible political outcome. Our view is that such a
possibility is a very rare phenomenon. The politics of numbers
or numerical strength of the lower caste/class groups would
not result into horizontal political cleavage. We agree with
the view of Nicholas that it is difficult to establish a law of
concomitant variation between two variables where one of the
variables (political alignment) is by its nature in a process
of change. Bujra observes that factions are unfortunately treated
as things rather than as processes. 4 But as we indicated earlier,
factions do not emerge necessarily due to a dialectical process
or change. The faction leaders are not generally found from
among the top and the lowest caste groups. They are from the
same or marginally higher and lower caste groups, hence no
dialectical process of change in factionalism.

Considering the two views, namely, factionalism as a
tool of structural analysis, and as an ideology, we feel that
most of the studies of factions lack the blending of these
two perspectives. (We offer this blending in our study of
factions at three levels, that is, village, Panchayat Samiti
and Zila Parishad.) A blending of the two views is necessitated
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as factions by their nature comprise structural as well as ideological elements. In structural terms, factions are some kind of groups, and in ideological terms, they are alliances of some that structurally divergent elements. The groups and people who circumstantially or otherwise come to share the same goals tend to form a faction in opposition to other groups and people. The structural similarity of these groups and people contributes to the formation of factions but factions as entities are more than such a similarity of structural elements.

Terms of Reference

It is necessary to define the terms of reference which we will use in our discussion of factionalism. We have suggested that a blending of the above mentioned two views becomes essential for a comprehensive and deep study of factions. The terms used in our study are defined below in view of their operational relevance for our study. These terms are as follows:

1) Feudalism,
2) Party,
3) Development,
4) Social structure,
5) Ideology.

Feudalism

Weber characterizes feudalism in terms of private property of the means of military violence and in the corporate appropriation of the means of administration. Thus, Weber makes a distinction
between economic power and political power. Weber's notion of rationality is the basis of this distinction. Marx does not make such a distinction between economic and political power.

In Weber's definition of feudalism, particularly in case of Indian feudalism, the element of patrimonialism of the feudal is very significant. The patrimonial nature of Indian Jagirdar according to Weber makes Indian feudalism different from that of its counterpart in Europe. Weber observes: "The dominance of the feudal class tends, because of the structure of feudalised powers of government in normally predominately patrimonial, to set rigid limits to the freedom, acquisitive activity and the development of markets." Thus, feudalism becomes an ideology and gives way to the emergence of "traditional" social structure.

Kosambi's observation regarding Indian feudalism is quite interesting that the cultural leisure become hallmark of superiority during feudalism. This created an overall apathy of the people and sluggishness. However, according to Kosambi Indian feudalism was different from European feudalism.

This difference was seen in terms of family or community based production, a low level of production technique, absence of slave economy, political decentralisation and concept of land as territory and not as property. The same view has been

---

6. Ibid., p. 356.
taken by Sharma. He observes that feudalism was a form of social order in which the possessing class appropriated the surplus produced of the peasants by exercising superior rights over the land and persons. Thus, it was a system of proprietary rights in the form of land grants and its management.

Thus, such a system of feudal relation was not only a marked feature of ancient India but also continued during the medieval and the British period. The accounts of feudalism given by Habib and Desai proved that except some changes in the management of land relations and taxes the feudal system continued in spirit in the same way. Here we need to arrive at an operational definition of feudalism in India to facilitate our understanding of factionalism. Indian feudalism could be characterised in terms of having the following characteristic features.

1) Appropriation of corporate means for private ends,
2) Patrimonialism of the feudal,
3) Feudalism as an ideology,
4) Cultural leisure of the feudal class,
5) Agathy of the masses,
6) Family/community oriented production, and
7) Feudalism as a social system.

Thus, feudalism was a closed system which professed and advocated the styles and interests of the ruling class ignoring the interest and welfare of the masses. Patronhood was made a

too~b,v-th~feudal to conceal the real depth of the feudal system under the grab of its patriarchal character. The Jagirdars and Zamindars could make maximum exploitation of the resources and further their particularistic and narrow ends. Thus, it was not an ideology of opposed groups as such but, in effect an ideology of protection and monopolisation of resources. In course of time such a system became deviant and categorical. To question the authority of the feudal-patriarch became a sin and offence. In the present power structure one could find the elements of such a system. The nature of fight for power among the different political parties and their top upper caste/class leaders within the parties is an evidence of the continuity of feudal elements though in somewhat changed form. The faction leaders behave as patrons and distribute their patronhood as patriarchs. In other words, they exploit the public resources to further their personal ends in the name of the welfare of their respective factions to a large extent. It is not that all the faction leaders necessarily appropriate the corporate resources for their private ends.

Social Structure

There are two ways to look at the social structure of a given society viz. (1) historical and (2) empirical. However, we do not want to go into the details of methodological and theoretical orientations of the concept of social structure. Our concern is also not to discuss typologies of social structure/society to analyse the present social structure of a given people. It is necessary to know its recent history or contemporaneity, and therefore, one cannot make a choice in terms of either and or in regard to historical and empirical perspectives on social structure.
One should have a balanced view combining the elements of the two perspectives.

There are four distinct practices in any social formation, namely, (1) economic, (2) political, (3) ideological, and (4) theoretical. The dominant role may be taken by politics, or ideology, or by kinship in primitive societies. Each must be examined as a specific practice with a relative autonomy of its own. By adopting such an approach to the analysis of social structure one can determine the nature of dominance and its determinance in a given society. We do not here accept Althusser's assumption regarding the role of economy in terms of its "over-determination, relative autonomy and the distinction between determinancy and dominance." However, this frame of reference of Althusser may be used (without using his notion of class contradiction) in the analysis of the role of different social groups (castes and classes) in the understanding of factionalism and nature of dominance. Thus, the concept of social formation as suggested by Althusser is quite relevant for our purpose. The nature of relations between patrons and their clients becomes the focal point of discussion in our study. The different levels of relations between the faction leaders and their followers would constitute for us the "totality" of the social structure. In effect, this tends to be an analysis of different types of dominance and subordination. The social background of the faction leaders and

their followers could be analyzed by applying Althusserian frame of reference.

Bailey in his analysis of the Konds of Orissa uses the concept of 'structure'. He writes: "A structural analysis emphasizes the regularity, the continuity, the permanence of certain forms of social interaction, and of groups of persons." Bailey takes a functional view of social structure. He observes that social structure also subsumes the "social system." He further mentions that the word 'structure', strictly used, "refers to a higher level of analysis at which interconnections are sought not within a political or ritual "substructure" but between them. "Structure" thus carries with it the idea of "total social structure." The structure itself provides the resolution of conflict that arises within it, hence conflict maintains the social structure.

Singh makes a distinction between a structural analysis of change and the cultural one. The latter is made in terms of particularities of customs, values and ideational phenomena, their integration, interaction and change. "Structural analysis is focused on the network of social relationships, which though culturally distinct share common and comparable attributes at a higher level of abstraction called social structure." Thus, according to Singh, caste, kinship, class, occupational groups, factory and administrative structures which comprise distinctive


fields of social interaction constitute structural realities. Thus, in our analysis of factions the "structure" could refer to the analysis of caste, kinship, class, occupational groups and administrative structures vis-a-vis factions. Most structuralists consciously or inadvertently have taken a "functional view" of social structure, that is, social structure contains conflict. However, Althusser's view takes a dialectic view\textsuperscript{15} without examining the nature of dialectic historically and/or empirically. A combination of the two views on social structure could be of great help for our analysis. We shall try to analyze the same phenomena through a "combined" perspective.

**Political Parties**

Weber rightly observes that "parties live in a house of power... Their action is oriented toward the acquisition of social 'power', that is to say, toward influencing a communal action no matter what its contents may be."\textsuperscript{16} The communal action of "parties" always means a societalisation as party actions are always directed toward a goal which is striven for in planned manner. Further Weber states that "parties" may represent ephemeral or enduring structures. Their means of attaining power may be quite varied, ranging from naked violence of any sort to canvassing for votes...\textsuperscript{17} Weber's definition of "parties" does not tell us about the intra-party dissensions and bickerings. These, in general, may be due to some "ideological" differences and


\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., p. 194.
differential social background of members of the parties. A party may have a number of factions. A faction may oppose severely other factions within the party, and may be "friendly" with some factions of other political parties. Such a situation of antagonism within the party and harmony between different party factions is found due to ideological unison. 'Socialist' faction of the Congress Party, for example, has been sympathetic with some factions of the Communist parties and Socialist Party. This aspect of intra-party factionalism and inter-party factional unison has not been studied so far. (We would like to reflect upon this state of affairs later on in our analysis. Thus, formal power blocks (that is, parties) and informal groupings within the parties (that is, factions) may not provide the correct picture of institutional sources of power of groups and individuals. It is necessary to see the inter-party ideological alliances and the latent possibility of their formally coming together under the same party. As such, parties are not things but they are processes of change in power structure.

Two important studies of state-power politics could be cited here. Study of the Congress Party factionalism by Brass\(^\text{18}\) shows that the problem of maintaining internal unity has been a much more serious concern for the Congress Party in Uttar Pradesh than the organization of popular support. Brass observes that the Congress Party is riven by factional conflicts. The

faction is the basic unit of the Congress Party in Uttar Pradesh. The party has not disintegrated, it has survived because it is adaptive. The Congress has become traditionalised. The Congress performs its modernising role through traditional social organisation, the faction, which in turn adapts itself to modern party organisation. The role of factions is dual, both integrative and disintegrative. For Brass, as we understand the faction, is a tool of structural analysis of the Congress Party. The Congress Party is surviving because of the social character of the faction.

Situation accepts Weber's definition of parties and emphasizes their adaptive capacity. For Situation the party is an adaptive and qualitatively new social institution in a traditional society having continual political mobilisation and elite recruitment. Situation also like Brass gives premium to the problem of conflict management and institutionalised cohesion. He lists several problems in attaining internal cohesion in the party, such as goal-determination, cohesion among factions, organisational mobility and the attitudes of the elites, and the distribution of incentives.

Both Brass and Situation frequently make references to "democratic" and "traditional" societies in their frameworks. The ethos of their formulations is guided by their experience of American polity which they consider "modern" and "democratic." The concepts which are intrinsic to the "modern society" may not

be suitable for understanding the complex problem of factionalism in Indian polity. Cassign observes that "political parties are also systems of conflict." In the following sentence he states that "the party is essentially a conflict-oriented institution." In the next sentence he refers to "competition" between the parties. Further he refers to the "segmentary organisation of power." He does not make clear distinctions between these terms of reference. Conflict between "segmentary" groups and "organic" groups should be qualitatively different. Conflict among the factions within the parties (organic) is not independent of conflict between the parties (segmentary). Such a distinction does not lead to deeper understanding of intra-party factions and inter-party factionalism. Parties as systems or institutions of conflict/competition as observed by Sission do not give any idea of conflict that prevails between the economic dominants and the oppressed of the Indian society.

**Ideology**

Ideology is abstracted from varied sources, such as statements of public policy, doctrines about political issues, religious ideas, moral positions, aesthetic judgements and even from specific social practices. Thus, an ideology becomes a strong way of abstracting, conceptualising and evaluating the social environment. It may provide enduring social and intellectual

20. Ibid., pp. 7-11.

structures to social interaction. Brown arrives at some generalisations regarding the concept of ideology. These are as follows:

1) An ideology gives answers to important questions and defines approaches to them.
2) An ideology involves commitment to a recognised position.
3) Ideologies are concepts which make aware the individual about his society and culture.
4) Ideologies are therefore sets of structures, preferences or dispositions that intersect.
5) Many ideological systems have a core with peripheral variants.
6) The response to ideologies is personal although their basis is social. An ideology about other ideologies itself becomes a structure to which people can cling to interpret behaviour, so it screens out and simplifies the possible pattern of response.

Myrdal observes that an ideology can be studied from two different angles. One is its content of ideals and ideas. The ideology is then itself viewed as a "theory." This view is taken by "economists." Myrdal states that an ideology should also be looked on as a fact - as an aspect of the social reality from which policies emerge, that in their turn, influence actual development. Brown emphasis on social situation and ideology, and Myrdal's emphasis on ideology as fact - an aspect of social reality.

is relevant for our analysis of factions and social structure. Marxist concept of ideology\textsuperscript{26} is not quite relevant for us as it does not visualise planning as an instrument of ideology. Planning as an ideology in India does not specifically focus upon contradictions of production system. If we analyse the nature of planning as Myrdal rightly observes Lenin's theory of "imperialism"\textsuperscript{27} has influenced more the planning in India. The two views, namely, ideology as an instrument, and ideology as a fact of social life are interrelated, however, in our study the latter is more relevant than the former as it facilitates understanding of divisions within parties, inter-party conflicts and exploitation of resources by certain groups and individuals.

The situation in regard to power elite is not so simple. Their underlying real character may be hidden by postures which they take before the public. Mills writes: "We cannot infer the direction of policy merely from the social origins and careers of the policy-makers. The social and economic backgrounds of the men of power do not tell us all that we need to know in order to understand the distribution of social power."\textsuperscript{28} It is said that the men of power are: (1) honourable men; (2) they are adaptive people; (3) they are patriotic; and (4) they are 'servants' of the people.\textsuperscript{29} Mills questions these criteria. He observes a coincidence of power or men of power. Mill's thesis about the

\textsuperscript{26} Marx, Karl. cf. Gunnar Myrdal, Ibid., p. 726.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., p. 727.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., p. 280.
American power elite is not entirely untrue in case of Indian power elite. The more important point for us is that the power elite pretend to dedicate themselves for the welfare of the masses. But, in fact, they shirk their responsibility and distribute the major share of resources among themselves. This tends to be the ideology of the power elite. The counterparts of American power elite in India may not have been that conscious, at least apparently, to construe a strategy to distribute power, and privileges among themselves. Thus we propose to test Mills' hypothesis regarding the ideology of the power elite in the light of our data.

The "totality" of factions could be considered as a social formation. This formation could be divided into segments, that is, particular factions. Each 'faction' becomes a "sub-structure" within its social formation. The sub-structure (faction) consists of its leaders and followers. The faction leaders could be hierarchically placed in terms of their position and influence within the faction. Within a party, factions could be analysed and compared with the factions of the other parties. Thus, to work out the coincidence or divergence or both between men of power belonging to different parties and factions, hierarchy of parties, the hierarchy of factions within the parties and then the hierarchy of factions of different parties should be analysed. Ideological sharedness could also be understood of the factions of different parties by making such an analysis.
Development

The concept of development is of recent origin. Some scholars consider it as an improvement over the concept of social change, the latter being the value-loaded. However, some take objection to this view, and consider the concept of development value-charged probably more than any other concept. This is not the context wherein we indulge into conceptual wrangles. We could say that the concept of development implies particular kinds of social change from a particular base and towards an ultimate goal. Horowitz's view of development is more relevant for our purpose. He observes: "The existence of a development process is a social fact. The recognition of a need for development is a social value." Development as a social fact becomes a focal point of our analysis of factions as it refers to direction of the use of resources of a society. Horowitz writes: "Any theory of social change must indicate that development excludes; that is, how it distinguishes itself from such cognate concepts as industrialisation, externally induced transformation, growth of population and of the economy." However, Horowitz's concept of development also originates from his experience of the "developed nations" as he observes that the development implies a new technology which makes available consumer goods.


31. Ibid., p. 4.

32. Ibid., p. 24.
Myrdal's concept of development\textsuperscript{33} like that of Horowitz also implies a dichotomy of the notion societies in terms of a continuum of development or dichotomy of tradition and modernity. Myron Weiner\textsuperscript{34}, Brass\textsuperscript{35}, Rudolph and Rudolph\textsuperscript{36} analysed changes on power structure through such a frame of reference. Desai\textsuperscript{37} critically examines some of these dichotomies and suggests the Marxian model of development. As an illustration we refer to Myrdal's view of development. "Development" means the process of moving away from "underdevelopment", or rising out of poverty; it is sought and perhaps actually attained by means of "planning for development".\textsuperscript{38} Myrdal prefers the concept of "development" or "underdevelopment" inspite of its "indeterminancy" in terms of assessing a "rate of development." Myrdal's model of development in case of India refers to "the modernization ideals", which, in effect, are the ideology of the politically alert, articulate and active part of the population - particularly the intellectual elite.\textsuperscript{39} Myrdal is aware of the "ideology of planning" and its nature in terms of its beneficiaries, but he fails to reflect upon the effects of such an ideology. Myrdal holds responsible social

\begin{itemize}
\item Myrdal, Gunnar, op.cit., Vol.III, Appendix 2.
\item Brass, Paul. (1965). op.cit.
\item Myrdal, Gunnar (1968), op.cit., Vol.III, p.1840.
\item Ibid., Vol.I, pp. 54-57.
\end{itemize}
social and cultural (institutional) factors as barriers in the development of Indian society. Secondly, Myrdal's approach does not consider the historicity of Indian society and its traditions in their proper perspective. Mukherjee has given due weightage to the role of Indian tradition in analysing social change. Mukherjee observes: "The study of Indian social system requires a different approach to sociology because of its special traditions, its special symbols, and its special patterns of culture and social actions." 40

Having analysed the various points of view regarding the concept and nature of development we consider development basically as a social fact and not as a value. As a social fact development refers to a differential distribution of resources for different groups, communities and regions. The structure of factions and the nature of development could be related by considering the latter as a social reality and the former as segments having a combination of endurability and flexibility in their composition.

**definition of Faction**

Faction refers to a "segment" or "segments of alignment" within the same political system. A faction aims at maximum furtherance of the interests of its own members within the given power system. A faction is generally found in a contending and competitive situation as the members of another faction could also try to corner maximum facilities for themselves. 41 One could ask why factions prevail at all in human societies? Who

---

are the members of these factions? Who lead these factions? These and other several allied questions would be taken up in the present work.

A society has several general characteristics, and "factionalism" is one of them. But, can we hope to find any society without factions? If it is so, then that will be an ideal and utopian society. But, as a perennial feature of human history and civilization, unequal distribution of power and resources always results into a clash of interests. Conflict is a recurrent phenomenon, and factionalism is a characteristic form of conflict-manifestation and conflict-resolution. Sometimes it may also give expression to cooperation and association. But the basic principle of factional alliance lies in marking out one group of people from other groups in a given society. Thus, even though a faction may associate itself with another faction for the realization of certain factional goals, such a cooperation between two factions might be ensured for protecting the larger interests of society. In other words, certain conflicts which can completely wreck the system, if given full expression, are contained by means of such mutual recognition. Thus different factions can pursue their goals by maintaining a minimal order of social relations. A factional group, therefore, could be negative or positive, constructive or destructive. Factions in one form or the other are found

42. Soss, Richard (1972), op.cit., pp. 7-11.
uni

erely irrespective of the nature of society. Brass mentions that a faction performs integrative as well as disintegrative functions. The integrative functions which, even though less obvious, are more important in the long run. The disintegrative impact of factionalism is more manifest and less important in the long run. We could say that faction has properties of fission as well as fusion. This means that a single faction or components of more than one faction, may come together and form a new faction. The interplay between fission and fusion, comes into being through re-alignment of interests in terms of re-defining the factional loyalties. Thus, faction is ubiquitous and helps in converging and diverging ideas and interests of people.

Lasswell's definition of faction serves our operational and analytical requirements. He defines faction as: "Any constituent group of a larger unit which works for the advancement of particular persons or policies." Accordingly, factions arise through struggle or competition for power resulting into control over official and unofficial positions. As such factions would have at least three aspects: (1) recruitment, (2) activity, and (3) duration. We would use these criteria in analysing factions at different levels of Indian society such as village, block, and district. Role of socio-cultural factors such as language,


caste and religion at these three levels of administration is very crucial.

The term "faction" has generally been used to refer to "social groups" of varying complexities characterized by opposition to other groups. The term "faction" has been used in a variety of contradictory ways by social scientists. We would like to begin with definition of faction given by Nicholas. He regards "faction" as a kind of political process. In his comparative analysis of five case studies of factions he observes the following five characteristics of factions:

1) Factions are conflict groups.
2) Factions are political groups.
3) Factions are not corporate groups.
4) Faction members are recruited by a leader.
5) Faction members are recruited on diverse principles.

Here we would also refer to the two approaches to the study of factions as the literature on factions suggests in the case of India. These are: (1) Factions have a significant degree of permanence, and (2) factions are regarded as temporary groups. This is also expressed in terms of factions being as quasi-groups. We would like to label this view as 'structural' approach. There are two variants of the 'structural' approach. One could be called as the "political structural", which regards factions as "groups" occupying mutually opposing positions in their struggle for political power with a view to further the

---

interests of their respective members. The other variation of the structural view is the social structural model as suggested by Lasswell. 46 According to Lasswell, factions as mutually opposed not only in their struggle for political power, but also in several other non-political spheres as well. These groups may stand in a relationship of total opposition to each other. Lewis' study of factions 47 in a Delhi village is a case in point. He treats the dominant caste descent groups along with their clients and other traditionally associated lower castes as factions and imputes to these 'groupings' a significant degree of permanence. These groups do not confine their activity to political sphere only, but extend it to various other spheres, such as ritual, economic, commensal etc.

In contrast to the structural perspective, factions are regarded as temporary groups because they center around particular issues and problems. Pocock says: "...factions are not permanent groups but are relatively to particular circumstances." 48 Mayer also subscribes to this view when he talks about the 'particular' nature of disputes considering them as the pivotal criteria of faction formation. He regards factions as a specific variety of 'action-sets.' 49 This approach has also been called as the 'conflict' approach since its primary aim is to emphasize the

nature of 'conflicts' between different sets of individuals and groups. Epstein gives incisive expression to this view when she says that "It is not the member of factions that is important but rather the way hostilities between opposing factions are expressed."50 In a particular dispute, there can be only two opposing factions along with a neutral one. Since, this approach views the phenomenon of faction-formation as a consequence of crystallization of conflict, it has also been called as 'dynamic' or a 'processual' approach.

Studies on Factions in India

In this section we propose to review studies conducted over the last two decades. The studies on factions could be divided into two types: (1) those which focus on factions at the level of village community, and (2) the studies in which focus is on party alignments. While the studies of the first type focus on the village social organization in order to identify the groups which consciously try to further the interests of their respective members mostly through acquiring socio-political power. The studies of second type focus on one or more political parties with a view to identify intra-party or inter-party cleavages (referred as factions), and on acquisition of power for the benefit of their members. More often than not, such studies focus on power-politics at the regional or national level. Faction is used as an instrument of acquisition of power, hence as it could be referred as an ideology.

An analysis of the studies on factions shows that several criteria have been used in arriving at a single classification of factions. Two criteria, namely, the recruitment as the basis of faction formation, and permanent or temporary character of factions have generally been used. The micro-structural studies of factions are based on the criteria of caste, kinship and lineage, etc. While considering factions as enduring phenomena, the macro-structural studies consider factions as issues or problem-oriented, hence factions are ephemeral and interest-based. This could mean that factions and cleavages cut across caste and kinship lines.

Caste and Factions

Oscar Lewis' study of factions in Rampura (North India) is viewed as a pioneering effort. He made a comprehensive study of factions in a village near Delhi in the years 1952-53. Lewis observes that faction is a "group" and as such a characteristic feature of traditional village social organisation. Caste and other groups are based upon primary kinship ties and kinship divisions. Alliances between these kin groups could be called as factions. These groups carry out a wide variety of functions such as social, economic, and ceremonial on behalf of their respective members. Besides these, several other types of conflicts also center around such factional groups. Lewis observes that insecurity of life in the village is linked with scarcity of land and other resources. Such a situation of distribution of scarce

51. Lewis, Oscar (1958), op.cit.
resources leads to the formation of factions. New factions develop as and when new issues of various types arise, drawing members from various castes. On examining the historical growth of various factions in Rampur, Lewis found that these may develop around: (i) quarrels over the inheritance of land, (ii) quarrels over the adoption of sons, (iii) quarrels over house-sites and irrigation rights, (iv) quarrels over sexual offences, (v) murders, and finally (vi) quarrels between castes. The people of Rampur have a popular saying that dharas (factions) and quarrels revolve around wealth, women, and land.  

Lewis makes an interesting observation on the nature of leadership. He writes: "Leadership in Rampur is limited to faction leadership and is primarily of a protective and defensive nature in which each faction or combination of factions defends its interests. The leaders have little authority to make independent decision or to exercise power over the groups." Despite this the faction leaders are marked out from the rest of the members in terms of possession of wealth, good family background, a reputation for being charitable and giving elaborate feasts, advanced age, education, influence with the people, free time to further the interests of the group, humility, hospitality, trustworthiness, speaking ability, and support of large extended family.  

Lewis concludes that small groups (factions) existing within the castes are the locus of power and decision-making, and

---
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they are a key to the understanding of the socio-political reality of the village communities all over India. He discovered that there were as many as twelve factions (locally known as dharas). Caste-wise distribution of these twelve factions is as follows: Jat 6, Brahmin 1, Kumar (Potter) 1, Chamar 2, Shangi 2, Dharas not only denote hostile relations between groups, but they also indicate friendly relations. Dhillon who assisted Lewis in this study makes a similar observation in another comparative study of factions in a South Indian village. He writes: "while hostility towards other groups is a common attribute of factions and new factions are often formed as a result of quarrels and disputes, this is seldom the only or even the major force which holds factions together." 55

Three conditions are described by Lewis for the successful operation of a faction: (1) It must be sufficiently cohesive to act as a unit; (2) It must be large enough to act as a self-sufficient and participating group, for example, it must be able to summon an impressive number of relatives for a marriage party; and (3) It must have sufficient economic resources to be independent of other groups. 56

Yogendra Singh observes by and large the same attributes of factions as observed by Lewis. Singh made a study of six villages of Eastern Uttar Pradesh in which he analyses as many as 97 factions. In this study, as Singh reports, most of the

55. Ibid., p. 150.
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conclusions reported by Oscar Lewis on his study of Rampur were taken as a working hypothesis. The basic structural principles of organization of faction in each of the 97 factions under investigation were found to be confined to the following:

1) The whole caste-group working as a faction has relations of acceptance or rejection towards other factions. In such cases, the caste group usually consisted of a few households which often belonged to the same sub-caste, gotra, and lineage group.

2) Factions composed of subcastes or other sub-divisions within the caste had the following:
   a) Gotra relations.
   b) Brotherhood and kinship relations.
   c) Regional divisions due to immigration or outmigration within a caste or sub-caste.
   d) Division of a class on the basis of land settlement (Panna-tholla grouping of Western U.P. and Pali and thoka of the Eastern U.P.).
   e) Division of a caste into sub-castes based on occupational differentiation.

According to Singh, the term "faction" can be used structurally with regard to caste, sub-caste or its segments and not in terms of the members drawn from different castes or sub-castes. He writes: "Thus a faction may be defined as a group of households within a caste or sub-caste or as a caste or sub-caste rallying together for rites, rituals, ceremonies, community activities, and who stand together in relation of social conflict,"
co-operation and neutrality.\textsuperscript{58} He, however, recognises such a phenomenon as "Partibandhi" or "Goobandhi" which, in fact, refers to the process of clique formation. But this according to him would constitute a power group and not a faction group, which is essentially a uni-caste entity. Singh's observation in this regard is very significant: "The membership of a power group consists of factions and the membership of a faction consists of households."

The issue-wise break-up of the factions studied by Singh is as follows:

1) Inter-caste feuds on the issue of land reported in 44.3\% cases.

2) Feuds based on the violation of the commensal or connubial rules of caste or sub-caste reported in 30\% cases.

3) Serious fights and court-cases reported in 15.5\% cases.

4) Feuds about the inheritance of property reported in 10.2\% cases.

The study reports that a faction leader is, in all cases, much wealthier than the other members of a faction group. Also, he is supposed to bear a good moral character, older in age, and generally he should have more influence than other leaders. Singh agrees with Oscar Lewis that factions have an enduring character. However, we could say that faction leaders are not necessarily

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., pp. 61-63.
richer than their followers. Theoretically, this observation is not tenable, and it is not true always in practice. Secondly, factions are enduring but not as much as Thokos, clans and lineages etc. are. The factions have a combination of both permanence and temporariness. A faction is permanent as it carries structural segments as its units, and it is temporary as it has issues and problems which are not permanent as they are determined by factors external to the structure of factions which are themselves of a fluid nature.

Bailey discovered various factions all of which were rooted in caste divisions. He also found that different caste factions which approved of each other in their day-to-day functioning, bridged up their differences and acted as one unit whenever there was a common threat or problem faced by the village community. For example, in 1953 an experimental post office was started in Bisipara. It was running at a loss. The Government wanted to close it down. But due to the unity exhibited by the various village factions, authorities were constrained to revise their decision of closing down the post-office.

Thus, we may say that each faction group in the village maintained double affiliation, one with its own members and the other with the other factions in the village. These affiliations depended mainly upon exigencies of social situation that occurred.

---

in the village from time to time. An example of Boad distillers may be cited. Boad distillers, a caste, originally on the lower rungs of the traditional social hierarchy but which has been rising steadily in the social hierarchy maintains this double affiliation and stresses it in different contexts. Sometimes for the sake of furthering the interests of their faction-members the Boad distillers supported their faction group. On the other occasions when the issue related to broader affairs affecting the entire village community, they remained with one or the other bigger political faction.

**Issues and Factions**

There are a number of studies in which faction is considered as a group comprising of members drawn from different castes. Factional alignments emerge whenever an issue comes up. In such a situation different factions take differing stands in order to safeguard their respective interests. Since factions are formed on the basis of certain issues, they tend to be shortlived, that is, either they dissolve themselves or their membership changes as soon as the issue in question gets settled.

Yadav made a study of factions at the village level in Haryana. The village Kulthana studied by Yadav is in Rohtak district of the state. Yadav observes: “Factions are ephemeral interest-oriented groups that are formed on non-traditional bases of social organization and operate on the political as well as social level.”

According to Yadav, socio-cultural change

---

and factionalism are related, particularly, when there are new opportunities and an attendant spirit of competition. Yadav's observation is indicative of two theoretical points: (1) that the propensity on the part of individuals to form themselves in faction groups is related to a state of anomie which occurs since the individuals cannot undergo requisite mental and behavioural transformation called for under the changed socio-cultural conditions, and (2) that the situation of better material circumstances sharpens their achievement-orientation for the realization of ends for which they form faction groups. The colloquial expression for faction formation is 'dharabadi'. Faction membership is not ascribed, it is attained for realizing certain ends. However, since caste and kin groupings are ascriptive, they tend to exhibit primordial solidarities at different levels of social ties and organize themselves as exclusive interest groups. As such ascriptive social groupings provide the necessary infra-structure for faction-formation. Situations of emergency may, however, demand factional alliances on the basis of some strategic factors.

Leadership and Factions

Beals has studied leadership and factionalism in Namballi, a Mysore village, between April 1952 and August 1953. Beals

identified factions due to disputes over landownership. The disputes over landownership create a snowballing conflict which engulfs the whole village. Such disputes give rise to several factions in the village. Beals calls this phenomenon of faction formation as "schismatic" pattern of social relationship.

These schismatic groups will be referred as factions. The factions need not represent necessarily the castes opposed to each other and a conflict between economic groups. Rather, these are formed due to particular disputes. A person may join one or the other faction group irrespective of his caste or clan. It could thus be said that a faction exists because of particular disputes and that its membership changes as the disputes are over. Beals identified another social entity known as a "clique" which comprises of families of households. All these cliques studied by him included relatives, friends, and persons bound together. Further, all these cliques yielded political dominance in the village. According to Beals these factions prevented the village from achieving a kind of unity, the lack of which on occasions became an obstacle in the decision-making process in the village according to Beals. Thus, factions are non-enduring groups and are basically interest-oriented. The process of faction formation is also determined by the nature of problems which the people face at different points of time. In a situation of scarcity of essential goods, sufferings may aggravate tension which also accelerate the process of formation of factions. Beals
observed that the landowners (patrons) compete for the favour of the servants and seek the same by extending help and support to them.63

William McCormack studied factionalism 64 in a Mysore village in 1952-53. (Factions represent the stands which people take on a particular issue.) McCormack discovered three types of faction groups in the village Horasalli. First of all, faction is called the anti-government faction, whose leaders as well as the members maintain that government officers in these bureaucracies were interested only in bribes and nothing was done in the government offices without giving bribes. The second of these is the 'Government' faction, which recommends that villages should follow the leadership of the Patel (Headman) in all matters as he represents the government line of action. This faction works according to a typical slogan that 'we are for the public and the public is for us.' The anti-government group has wider audience, and appeal to the people more than the pro-government faction. The third is the 'neutral' faction which opposes both the village chief and the elders, and the other two village factions. An interesting feature of these factions is that the members are drawn from various castes but the factions are involved in the immediate interests of the

63. Ibid. See also, E.R. Leach (1960), op. cit., pp. 1-10.

persons involved. Further, McCormack also maintains that both
the membership and the leadership of these factions change in
accordance with the changes in the interests of the members.

Political Party and Factions

In the ensuing section we shall report three studies in
which role of factions in political parties both at the village and
regional levels has been analysed. No doubt any study of factions
remains incomplete if we do not take into account role of structural
elements such as caste, kinship and lineage, etc. However, role
of ideology, issues and politics should also be given adequate
weightage in understanding of factionalism.

Myron Weiner examines how factional ties exercised a
determining influence on the way individuals voted.65 It was
found that village factions bargained with candidates of various
parties to make available certain amenities to the villagers. They
could bargain because factional loyalties within the Congress
Party proved to be greater than the loyalty to the party as a whole.
The rural Ponnur constituency encompasses parts of two talukas of
Guntur district. One part of constituency known as Chebrela Firka,
is in Bapatla. Weiner observes that the structural factors of
factions were also decisively influencing voting behaviour at the
time of elections.

65. Weiner, Myron (1965), 'Village and Party Factionalism
and in Andhra: Ponnur Constituency', M. Weiner and
Rajni Kothari (eds.), Indian Voting Behaviour: The
Mukhopadhyaya, pp. 189-192.
Faction leaders and influential people, as reported by Myron Weiner, did not care about norms regarding ritual pollution, rules of marriage, customs and rites, while admitting others as members of their faction groups. Even members belonging to different castes, classes and occupational groups were found in the same faction group. "Faction groups" as observed by Myron Weiner performed an important role in the village affairs. They were involved in a variety of disputes of political and social nature. Even though a faction included both the rich and poor, members drawn from high castes and those who were economically well-off only wielded a significant influence on the course of action that faction chose to take.

Factions were not discovered to be permanent, and sometimes a faction group broke up and its members joined other faction groups in the village. Factions, generally speaking, did not endure unchangedly for a long time. We could say that conflicts and disputes created village factions, that is, factions increased conflict in the village. A faction group may have an alliance with different political parties from time to time. But this need not have any impact on its nature and internal composition. Weiner observes that faction may support Congress in one election and an opposition party in the next. It has happened that a party did not get votes of members of a faction in the subsequent elections though the faction did survive during this period. It is interesting to draw a parallel between this situation and the one
represented by the frequent floor-crossing witnessed in the political parties in the recent past particularly after 1967 general elections when in more than half the governments in the states had coalition or what was popularly known as Sanyukt Vidhayak Dal (S.V.D.). These S.V.D. governments did not survive till the next general elections. In 1969 in many states mid-term polls were conducted. We know that in the case of a faction the whole of a group may switch sides but in the case of a political party, it happens more often at the level of individuals.

Thus, the fact that Congress got approximately the same number of votes in Sangamjagarlamuli in the two general elections (1957 and 1962) does not essentially signify that the factions supporting Congress in the first elections have also done the same in the subsequent elections. The same may apply to the votes polled by the Communist Party of India in the two elections in Aremanda.

Paul Brass maintains that factions and factional conflict in India are a part and parcel of the indigenous social and political order. 66 Factional politics is a manifestation of the leader-follower relationship in the countryside. Factional politics develops in a given society under certain conditions. Paul Brass has pointed out the following conditions which are responsible for the emergence of factions within the Congress Party in Uttar

Pradesh. These are:

1) Absence of an external threat;
2) The presence of an internal consensus upon ideological issues, and
3) Absence of authoritative leadership.

Paul Brass makes use of these three conditions in explaining the growth of factional politics both at the state and district levels.

Richard Sisson spells out different levels of political groupings in terms of factions in the Rajasthan Congress Party. 

He observes that membership of factions at the level of Municipal Boards and Tehsil Congress Committees are heterogenous as they are drawn from numerous castes. Sisson's observations are based on his study of the Congress Party of Nagaur district of Rajasthan.

Two important political factions are observed by Sisson. One was known as Vyasa faction. It was led by Jai Narain Vyasa, who was an eminent leader of the People's Movement before independence. The other political faction in the district was led by the Jats who were also a numerically dominant caste in Nagaur district. These two factions exhibited splits and fissions at all the levels from village to state both socially and territorially.

Sisson analyses a particular conflict situation, which

---

arose between Lokparishad (dominated by the Vyas group) and Jat leaders in 1954. In this game of power-politics the Jat faction became successful, and the dominance enjoyed by the Vyas faction in the Parishad ultimately went to the Jat faction. According to Sissoon there were three reasons which contributed to this change in factional dominance. First, the Jat group displayed its organisational resources in a better way to forge cohesiveness within the ranks of the party. Second, they had a better and more pragmatic notion of what leadership meant in the modern context. Third, the Jat group drew their support from a single dominant caste group.

The scheme of analysis as formulated by Rastogi also could be referred in this context. The study approaches the phenomenon from three different directions: (1) group, (2) situation, and (3) process. The first (group) refers to the nature of factions and their activities, and outlines a paradigm for a systematic study of the activities of the factions. The second (situation) seeks to encompass the details of conflict with a set of analytic categories.

68. Lok Parishad was the first most popular political movement in Jodhpur state. The objectives of the movement were concerned with the propagation of social and political ideas and changes in the traditional polity. The creation of representative government under the aegis of the Maharaja, the promotion of civil liberties within the state, the identification with nationalist symbols and the aspirations of the Indian National Congress, and the eventual merger of the state into the Union of India were the major programmes undertaken by the Lok Parishad.

The third (process) refers to the dynamics of the phenomenon. Rastogi defines "faction" as relatively unstable, temporary and loose alignment of individuals within a group. The associational character of individuals is dominant in faction formation, that is, individuals pursuing the common ends would come together, hence faction is a quasi-group. Hence, group or faction solidarity depends upon the fulfilment of these common ends. Whenever individuals and their groups deviate from norms and values due to unequal distribution of power and resources, tension, discord and conflict tend to come on surface. Thus, randomness, contingency and discord are the bases of faction formation. These cannot become permanent features of a given society. Interest configuration and developmental schemes are closely related to these bases of faction. Faction can not be a group as the latter would not have randomness, contingency and discord as its core features.

Rastogi talks about "factional strategy" which depends upon the types of interests over which clash occurs. He analyses the conflict situation in the Indian Congress Party (1966-69) using three-fold mode of analysis (group, situation and process). Factionalism is a response of human groups which may prove to have adaptive as well as maladaptive. These aspects are examined at three successive levels of modalities of conflict resolution that are primarily related to the introduction of change measures in
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the group environment (supra-system), the group (system), and the individual (system constituent), respectively. The modalities of conflict resolution may then be usefully exposed to beneficial consequences and also simultaneously to remove the adverse consequences. Rastogi has given an exhaustive description of all the concepts using different models and paradigms in his study. He follows more of deductive method which has limitations as it is not adequately supported by empirical facts. The theoretical scheme as formulated by Rastogi flows out of inadequate data. It evidently seems an application of a neat cybernetic model on empirical social reality which indeed is always highly complex. That is why it always eludes the apriori quantitative formulation of its characteristics.

Rastogi is indeed a bit ambitious about the theoretical formulation of his present contribution. He says that the formulation presented can be applied to understand the factional phenomena at different levels such as group, community, nation, grouping of nations. Factions are not a matter of deduction but they represent a reality related to bifurcation, division and segmentation of social groups. The nature of these "divisions" depends upon the context in which factions are analysed. It would thus be naive to maintain that the international conflicts
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at which various nations participate have the same sociological attributes as an intercaste conflict which finds expression at the village level. A large number of factors such as political, historical, economic, ideological and geographical also matter to a large extent. So, with a view to facilitate prediction about the nature of factions, we have to take a note not merely of the rural economic features, but also, and more importantly so, of the sociological contents of a particular given context.

Landownership and Factions

First to be discussed is Baljit Singh's study entitled as

Next Step in Village India: A Study of Land Reform and Group Dynamics. The study was conducted in Uttar Pradesh in 1956. According to Singh the village community is complex and basically faction-ridden. The factions are created largely because of the individual land rights and conflicting claims over landownership. Singh observes that village life and its economy should run along co-operative lines and replace individual family cultivation by joint family holdings in view of grave social dangers on account of the tensions and conflicts over landownership. Such conflicts lead to perpetuation of a stagnant agricultural economy with little or no respect for meeting the demands of a growing population. Singh suggests a solution. He says: "Perhaps in the economic field large capitalistic farmers or state farming may be an alternative, although a poor one, to a joint cultivation by peasant families. But these offer no solution to the social

problem of the faction ridden society for which equality of land rights and cooperative organization are the only answer. 74 A lack of cohesiveness and 'we-feeling' in the village community is responsible for the creation of factional society.

It is obvious that land ownership and factionalism are related. A change in the land tenure system heightened factionalism. In other words, feudalism and factionalism are related. Feudalism and land tenurial systems implied bifurcation, division and rivalry among feudal kinsmen, between feudals and their tenants and between the tenants. Baljit Singh does not clearly draw such a conclusion from his data. But such an inference should not be difficult as it could be said on the basis of historical evidence as well. Out of the 64 factional splits that were studied in detail by Singh, 24 could be accounted for as a result of disputes over land, 9 due to quarrels over marriage and marriage ceremonies, caste taboos and rites, 7 due to an entire caste or community suffering from a sense of injury or denial, 3 due to rivalry among share-cropping households, and the rest by issues such as Jajmani rights. 75

The main role of a faction is to support its members in litigations, disputes and fights. This gives rise to a continuous stream of litigations and acts of violence against persons and property on one hand, and leads to the disintegration of the village society on the other.

75. Ibid., pp. 108-109.
Nicholas' study of factions in West Bengal villages shows that factions are formed on the basis of caste, economic dependency, kinship and territory. Nicholas makes a comparative study of factions in the villages of Govindpur, Radhanagar and Chandipur. The study was carried out in 1960. In Radhanagar and Govindpur, factions are comparatively small in size and numerous. In Chandipur, where the power of the headman is enormous, there are only two factions. Political party affiliations as Nicholas discovers are determined by the nature of factional associations. The headmen in all the three villages are supporters of Congress Party. In Radhanagar and Govindpur, factions opposed to the headman and his allies get united in support of Communist Party at the time of elections. From this case study and several other studies Nicholas arrives at the following five attributes of factions.

i) Factions are conflict groups,
ii) Factions are political groups,
iii) Factions are not corporate groups,
iv) Faction members are recruited by a leader, and
v) Faction members are recruited on diverse principles.77

Factional conflicts in the rural society, according to Baljit Singh, centre around the existing systems of individual
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land ownership. He does not hesitate to make a 'value-loaded' statement because he feels that this is the single factor most responsible for low rate of development of rural society. A large number of disputes studied by him were discovered to be related to land disputes. But the questions such as what are the mechanics of faction formation in the case of several other types of disputes mentioned by him, and what are the bases of factional recruitment of members of factions are not satisfactorily answered by Nicholas. In view of his major hypothesis that faction formation is a function of existing system of land ownership, he dichotomises the entire village society into two categories, namely, (1) those owning major portion of the village land, and (2) those who are landless. Corresponding to these, he also visualises two types of factions, that is, (1) the 'elite', and (2) the 'subordinate'. In certain situations some members of both the 'elite' and the 'subordinate' factions join together. But the question arises: on what basis some of the 'subordinate' factions align themselves with some particular 'elite' factions?

According to Nicholas' findings factions have both structural attributes such as caste and kinship, and economic dependency. These caste-based factions act as 'power-groups' in local politics and give the impression that they make an impact on the national level politics. The mode of factional...

78. Singh, Baljit, op.cit., pp. 94-95.
politics according to him is influenced strongly by the strength or the weakness of the village headman, who more often than not represents the party in power at the national or state level. First three of five attributes of factions as indicated by Nicholas correspond to those mentioned in the macro-studies. Again, the fifth attribute that factional recruitment is based on diversity of principles, also comes under this classification. In brief, his notion of faction is that of a caste-based faction whose membership is not enduring so as to have the corporateness of a group. But how this could happen when the basis of formation is enduring and the membership is temporary.

Studies of Factions and Structural Linkages

The relationship between social structure and factionalism has been analysed in several studies. Some of these studies, we have referred in the first chapter. However, we will make a reference to recent studies conducted in Maharashtra. Carras defines Indian politics in terms of a rational pattern. He provides evidence to show that the factional behaviour of political actors correspond with rational (or calculable) economic interest. Factional behaviour is not determined by 'irrational' (that is, emotional) and often unpredictable personal loyalties.

which may be based on feelings of awe, respect or devotion to a leader, or on feelings of loyalty to caste or community ties by family links. Carras claims that ideological preferences rather than personal gain play a role in political behaviour in so far as they are interlinked with the consideration of personal interest. Carras does not make a distinction between 'realistic' and 'idealist' considerations as mutually exclusive determinants of political behaviour. He considers the two as complimentary to each other and advocates for an adequate understanding of an multidimensional nature of human behaviour. No, in the context of his own study Carras maintains that both ideology and economic 'material' conditions and interests combine in an interactive pattern, to influence behaviour. Thus, Carras adopts a 'synthesis' approach, not only analytically but also empirically. However, Carras has not defined the whole range of concepts of the ideological and structural perspectives, and the relevant concepts extracted from the two approaches to form the third one. Carter in his comparative study of two Maharashtra villages, defines an "alliance" as a kind of exchange or transaction involving decisions to extend or withhold, support or patronage. Carter uses the term 'alliance' for the term "faction". It has two aspects, namely, transactional and decision-
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The governmental and administrative institutions are the arenas within which political alliances are made. Carter refers to the concept of constraints which includes kinship, caste, class and the administrative and governmental institutions. These factors lead to the formation of a political class from among the land owning Vetalantar Marathas, the Brahmins and the Jains. Carter refers to vertical alliances based on economic dependence which could be seen prominently during the time of elections. The vertical alliance refers to the relationship between the political leaders and the non-political voters. The horizontal alliances are found within the political class between the leaders, they are always changing as they are generally based on principles of strategies. According to Carter the elite politics of India is not completely caste oriented and hence static. The political advantages are more crucial in alliance formation, therefore, an alliance is never permanent. Just on the basis of structural constraints like caste and kinship etc. one cannot infer the nature of alliances. In fact, Carter's study is more relevant for the understanding of political stratification.

These two recent studies are basically indicative of the departure compared to the studies of factions as the basis of

analysis of social structure and organization. We have analyzed the studies of Oscar Lewis and some others in this chapter.

Our own study of factions was planned empirically at three levels, namely, district, Panchayat Samiti and village. By a comparative study of factionalism at these three levels, we have analyzed the nature of factions in the Congress Party in detail and in the other parties to some extent in Rajasthan. To analyze factionalism at these three levels, Bailey's concept of Bridge-action is found quite helpful. Bailey has used the concept of Bridge-action to understand the change in social structure. It is not used antithetical idea of structure. He has found it specially useful in examining a series of disputes and conflicts, which have diagnostic value for the study of social change. According to Bailey, conflict, dispute and competition are to be seen not only in terms of change but also in terms of the relationship. Bailey observes: "These bridge-actions which occur in situations of conflict, may be divided into two kinds: those which are symptomatic of social change, and are the process through which change takes place, and those which are not. When the rivals are equal, the interaction between them may not bring about change. He refers this as "bridge exchange." Such actions are not symptomatic of social change. Thus Bridge action is used for understanding
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of alignments. When the realignment takes place or the new alignments emerge the bridge action becomes symptomatic of social change. Bailey writes: "A bridge action may change when the appeal is from one system of social relations to another to which contradicts it." Bridge-action leads to structural change only when they are usually successful, and when the actor by directing his allegiance elsewhere gains his end.

Bailey's model of *Tribe, Caste and Nation* refers to three different political alignments, that is, three forms of allocating of state's resources, and uniting to compete for those resources. These are three different kinds of groups. The three systems can be placed in a temporal order. The caste system preceded the national system and was itself preceded by the tribal system: This is the direction in which political society is changing. These three systems are still in existence and effective political action can be taken by making use of ties in all of them and by *adroit* bridge-action from one system to another.

Bailey refers to the outside alignments which are found effective in the context of the Kond village studied by him. These are: (1) relationship with the Konds within or without the village; (2) relationship with the local chiefs and headmen; and (3) the use can be made of the administrative and

86. Ibid., p. 252
87. Ibid., pp. 269-270.
judicial system. Bailey refers to four cleavages among the Konds. These are: (1) individual against individual, faction against the faction within the village; (2) Kond clan against the class; (3) clan or group of clans against an Orriya village and its chief; and (4) Orriya chief against one another. The first cleavage continues today, the third also continues but tends to draw upon wider alignments. It is being transferred to larger arenas. The second and fourth are no longer important. Bailey's model of Tribe, Caste and Nation is explicated by using the concept of Bridge-action which explains not only the structure of these three arenas of activities but also the process of change and their connexions between these arenas.

This approach to the structure of a given society seems to be quite relevant for our study of factions at three levels, namely, village, Panchayat Samiti and district, and indirectly also in the understanding of state and national level factions and factionalism. Factions are structures as well as processes. They are of equal as well as unequal positions.

The Present Perspective

Analytically factions could be discussed in terms of the following points:

1) Issues and interests.
2) Organisation.
3) Recruitment.
4) Loyalty.

---
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Issues and Interests:

Issues and interests give rise to various factions. In cases issues and interests get sorted out or fulfilled, the factions are formed. On these issues/interests also wipe out. However, with the emergence of new issues/interests, new factions are bound to be formed.

Factions at micro-level are based upon rivalry among the members of the same clan, caste and the kin groups and between the members of the different clans, castes and kin groups. They attend to a variety of issues — from social and ritual to political and economic interests. These factions take up various issues affecting the overall interests of their members. A number of studies show that factions at macro-level are more directly concerned with the acquisition of political power and furtherance of economic interests of its members by mobilizing the primordial ties. A majority of issues permeating factional relationships include disputes related to ownership of land and differences at the time of elections.

Baljit Singh's study of factions\(^{90}\) shows that factions are rooted in the unequal distribution of land. He observes that by changing the existing system of land ownership in favour of more egalitarian system, most of these factions would cease to exist. The most common manifestation of the land disputes is litigation which rages one faction against the other. However, Myron Weiner's\(^ {91}\) observation like that of Oscar Lewis\(^ {92}\) and others is somewhat different. All factions are oriented mainly to one issue, viz., the acquisition of political power. Some of these factions are also oriented towards bargaining with the political parties for power.

\(^{90}\) Singh, Baljit, op.cit.
\(^{91}\) Weiner, Myron (1965), op.cit.
\(^{92}\) Lewis, Oscar (1958), op.cit.
Orsaniootiona

levi observes that factions are organized at micro-level, that is, they center around caste, kinship and lineage etc. and exist as enduring structural entities. In fact, being 'structural segments, and being 'enduring' in nature, are two sides of the same phenomena. Whenever a faction becomes multi-caste in terms of membership, it ceases to be a 'faction', rather it becomes a power group. We have mentioned that factions as "organized groups" are formed primarily around certain issues, and therefore, they are drawn from several castes and kin groups. An issue becomes a rallying point and persons from several castes feel that they can realize their interests better if they unite as groups. An issue such as land dispute has a snowballing reaction on the community in question and divides it in various groups as contending factions. As soon as the issue in question gets solved, new factions are formed around new issues.

According to Baljit Singh, the organizing principle for factions is the system of land ownership which permanently creates a division between the land owning and the landless people. In other words, the class character of a given society determines the formation of factions. As such factions are not intra-segmental in terms of internal divisions of primordial groups. However, class distinctions could be transmitted from generation to generation as well created by some structural factors such as legislation, technology, education and world market situation etc.

---
In general, in the villages the operative norm of functioning of factions is the principle of exploitation of the landless by the rich land-owning sections, who encourage factional alignments for furtherance of their own interests.

Singh does not use Marxist concepts and categories in his analysis of factions, however, the findings of his studies resemble with the Marxist interpretation of factionalism. Class-conflict and class cleavages could be seen on the surface even by an enactment of the new land legislation after the Independence. Factionalism could be understood by a comprehensive frame which would include its theory or ideology, organisation or structure of factions, and the process or change in factions. The ideology refers to norms of distribution of advantages and a lack of consensus about the norms of distributions. 'Structure' refers to typology and levels of factionalism, and 'process' refers to the problems of change in these factions.

(3) Recruitment:

Factions are formed with a view to acquire political power to further the interests of their members. However, the role of particularistic criteria such as caste and kinship is not completely ruled out. Caste plays an important 'organizing' role in functioning of factions at the village level. Factions at the district and regional levels comprise members from several castes. Further, in case of inter-factional fight, Singh observes that a faction which utilizes the solitary support of one caste as
against the support of dispersed fragments of many castes has comparatively less chances of success, as generally faction leadership is drawn from richer and well-to-do sections of the rural communities. This dichotomises factions into 'elites' and the 'masses.' Another feature which buttresses the elite position of the leaders is that factional leadership provides them a basis to consolidate their political and economic position. Thus, recruitment on the basis of particularistic criteria leads to continuity of inequality and inequal resourcefulness of the members. Most factions emerge as they want maximal resources for their members. This leads to vertical factional divisions of society having leaders as patrons at various levels within the factions.

(4) **Loyalty:**

It has been found that factions show loyalty to the primordial institutions such as caste, kin group and village, however, the village is the field where concrete operationalisation of those factional alliances and attached loyalties can be discerned. However, such loyalties become diffused and diverse in the factions at district, state and national levels. Supra-village loyalties are also found along with factional alliances. Factions at these levels (district, state) cannot be homogenous and united as the support base itself is diverse. Interests and issues dominate rather than ascriptive solidarities.

Factions are an inseparable part of a political system. The functioning of a sub-system, namely, a political party,
generally implies existence of factions. As such we may say that factions constitute the dynamic principle of socio-political relations. But it could also be stated that there is an obverse relationship between the goals of a sub-system and that of a faction within the sub-system. That is why, a faction tries to bend the sources of the sub-system to which it belongs for the welfare of its own members.

The studies on factions as discussed above have not taken into consideration the role of factions as agents of change in the sub-structures of society, namely, neighbourhood, sub-caste, political party etc. As a result of introduction of schemes of rural development and Panchayati Raj institutions in place of traditional micro-structural factions new factions based on divergent membership have emerged on the rural scene reflecting the dynamism of the people as well as the forces of change.

The traditional factors such as caste and kinship have become more adaptive than before due to these constraints of rural development and people's requirement to cope up with these innovative schemes. This is what we call 'resilience' theory of caste, hence caste remains to be a significant determinant of factional alliances. Further, factions cannot be categorised just in terms of their endurability or lack of it. One should think in terms of historicity of factions and that too in terms of a particular type of factions. However, a researcher should think of a continuum in terms of most enduring and most ephemeral having several others in between these two poles.
To think of factions as being led by authoritarian leaders is also not a correct view. This would have several implications regarding the issues and/or interests, organisation, recruitment and loyalty, the four basic aspects of studying factions. Can we think of factions without authoritarian leaders in the situation where certain innovations in political and economic arenas are being carried out? How would we view the resilience theory of caste? What about the intra-faction differences on several counts? These are some of the limitations of the studies which we have discussed in this chapter. The questions which have been raised are dealt with in our study.

Plan of the Study

(The present study is an attempt to examine empirically the phenomena of factions in the Udaipur district of Rajasthan. We assume that the emergence of factions at different levels of social structure and organization reflects the nature of economic development and political modernization taking place in India.) Our study aims at the analysis of events and issues of post-independent era. However, factions and factionalism cannot be tied strictly to time as by doing so proper sociological analysis cannot be had. They are rather perennial and could be analysed in terms of their historicity.

Taxonomically, the emergence of factions in the post-independence India could be linked with the values related to economic and political development. The traditional social bases
of formation of factions have now given way to new economic and political bases. The social structural base of factions has itself changed to a large extent. Earlier, it was more socio-cultural, acquisitive and primordial, whereas now it is more politico-economic, achievement-oriented and rational-legalistic in nature. Such a dichotomy of factions corresponds with classical distinctions such as community v/s society, sacred v/s profane, informal v/s formal and status v/s contract types of societies/social relations. Such a typology of factions corresponding with general typology of society is referred here to facilitate understanding of factions over a period of time. Factions based on traditional bases also had economic and political foundations and the factions in the present setting have primordial connexions and linkages. However, factions represent different types of groups and individuals who constitute a particular society or community. These interest-groups (factions) are largely shaped by both ascriptive and non-ascriptive factors, ascriptive factors operate more at local level, whereas non-ascriptive (economic and political) factors operate at the district and state levels. The members of these factions have heterogenous social background, but they claim to organize themselves around common interests. Therefore, we have made our analysis in terms of the role of caste and kin, economic and political interests, and situational factors in faction formation.
The objective of the present study is to understand faction formation at the district level. How factions spring up at the district level from the village factions? In what way they get transformed from their nativistic structure to more diffused and diverse antagonistic party alliances and class relations? Further, in what way these district level factions get integrated with the state level politics, and particularly in the case of Congress Party? Thus our study is different from most of other studies of factions and power-politics.

I have been more informed about Rajasthan than my own state of Madhya Pradesh as I had all my education in Rajasthan and particularly at Udaipur town, hence Rajasthan as the universe of my doctoral research work. This is a non-academic consideration in the selection of the field of study. Rajasthan, and particularly Udaipur, suited most to the requirements of a study of factions and factionalism. Rajasthan represented feudalism in its archaic form, and today politics and development have clearly its stamp. Therefore, we cannot ignore the role of feudalism in politics, factionalism and development. Besides this pre-independence historical legacy of Rajasthan, from 1954 to 1977, the Congress leaders of Udaipur division, particularly Mohanlal Sukhadia and Hari Doo Joshi were at the helm of administration as Chief Ministers. Joshi took over after Barkathulla Khan's death as Khan had succeeded Sukhadia in 1971. Thus, with a short interlude of Chief Ministership of Khan, upto June 1977 Udaipur was the citadel of politics. With the patronage of state
leaders Udaipur received maximum attention for its development. It had all the potentialities for factionalism, but they never became apparent. However, factionalism within the Congress Party in Udaipur division was very much prevalent, but Sakhadia did not allow it to come on the surface as it would have adversely affected his leadership in other parts of Rajasthan. He extended support and patronage to his rivals as well as admirers. This became inevitable for him to counter the Jat dominance within the Congress Party.

The purpose of this study is to understand the invisible factionalism, suppression of factional rivalries by extending patronage, and keeping the people of entire region satisfied by opening new vistas of development. Further, we would analyse the role of such a unity in suppressing the emergence of Jat leadership, and ensuring a broader unity of the 'dvij' leaders within the Congress Party against the Jats and other peasant communities.

Thus, keeping in view some of these criteria I decided to conduct a study of factionalism in relation to social structure and development of Udaipur district. To make it a comprehensive study of factions at district level, I selected one Panchayat Samiti and two of its villages to relate the factions found at the village level with Panchayat Samiti and then with the district. The factions found at the district level have been linked with the factions found at the state level. The details about the
two villages, the Panchayat Samiti and the district would be
given in the second chapter.

Most village studies of factions have a synchronic bias without having any diachronic analysis. Further, these studies of village factions are based on certain structural criteria such as caste, kinship and lineage at the exclusion of economic factors and interests (class variables). There are no studies in which both variables class and other structural variables such as caste and kinship have been taken into account.

Also, there are some studies in which emphasis is more on specific issues and disputes rather than on grounds and sub-groups that are engaged in there. As a result, primacy is attributed more to the issues than to certain characteristics of the factions themselves. This is apriori assumption, hence be avoided.

To overcome the above lacunae, discrete studies of factions at block, district and state levels are also inadequate because they fail to bring out the inter-linkages between factional phenomena at various levels. These studies consider factions as "quasi-groups" or "interest-groups" without analysing the social-structure base of the membership of the factions. Particular factions may vanish, change, align or realign but factions as a phenomenon of social structure remain a permanent feature. Generally, the change occurs in the causes of factions rather than factions as a reality of social life.

The predominant complexion of Indian society being "rural" it is here that the phenomena of factions can be grasped
comprehensively. The precise nature of factional groupings vis-a-vis various other groupings such as caste, family, lineage etc. needs to be thoroughly probed. It needs to be investigate as what role various structural elements of rural social organization play in faction-formation and its functioning. This would facilitate examining of some basic questions. These are: in what specific sense factions as mode of social groupings differ from traditional social groupings? If factions differ from these social groupings, in what way caste, clan or lineage contribute to the emergence of factions? How factions are a perennial phenomenon?

The fundamental assumption in our study is that factions at different levels do not constitute independent and insulated phenomena. There are always certain linkages at various levels, such as village, block, district and state. This would mean that we should identify these linkages and spell out continuities of various phenomena such as caste, kinship and landownership at these levels. It is also necessary to examine continuity/discontinuity of dominance wielded by various groups. In other words, it could be hypothesized that there is congruence of power among factions at various levels, namely, national, state, district, Panchayat Samiti and village. Situations of incongruence have been short-lived. Why congruence or incongruence at all the levels? To examine this we have analysed factions at district level and compared with factions at the state and local levels, namely, Panchayat Samiti and Village Panchayat.
Data were collected on social, economic and political aspects of factions through Interview Schedule and Observation. Through interviews we collected information about the political career and participation of the leaders concerned and their respective factions. The gathered information was cross-checked also. We also conducted a detailed census and enumeration of the two villages, and all the leaders of the Panchayat Samiti, Zila Parishad and the leaders of political parties. We tried to establish leader-follower linkages through these interviews and observations of certain situations. The national leaders have their followers at the state level, the latter have their followers at the district level.