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In Haryana, technological changes in agriculture have been apparent and agriculture, being the main stay of people, is bound to influence the traditional agrarian relationships specifically of agrarian categories intimately involved in adoption and use of modern technological inputs leading to Green Revolution. Thus, from sociological point of view, it is necessary to study the changes in agrarian relations, under the forces of technological innovations in this region for future planning. Earlier studies have not given due emphasised on the pure agrarian categories which have given rise to various forms. Therefore, the present study has specifically focussed on these agrarian categories, and technological inputs and changes in agriculture, in relation to these categories, for discerning changes in their relationships. Following are the specific objectives of the study:

Objectives of the study

1. To discern the traditional agrarian categories and nature of their relationships.

2. To examine the impact of Green Revolution on agrarian categories.

3. To know the emerging trends in agrarian relations.

Agrarian structure is understood to mean the institutional framework of agriculture, which basically includes the distribution of ownership in land; the forms of land tenure and the forms of agriculture employment; and the organisations such as
cooperatives, agricultural societies, trade union, credit or advisory services. It is, primarily, the relationships between different groups of people involved in the pursuit of cultivation.

There is no consensus on agrarian categories/classes as given by Lenin (1920), Mao (1930), Thorner (1956), Mukherjee (1957), Shah (1969), Tariq Ali (1972), Patnaik (1972), Alexander (1973), Oommen (1974), Pai (1979), Bhakta (1981), Mukhopadhyay (1984), Saxena (1988) and Hamid (1989) discussed in review of literature. Invariably the ownership of land and cultivation status are the main elements, and modes and motives of production are influenced by technological development in agriculture. Therefore, landownership, its cultivation and use of new agricultural technology are of much relevance in studying agrarian relations. A study of the nature and type of these relationships would require, firstly, identification of the main agrarian categories, i.e., landowners, tenants and labourers. Secondly, it would demand an examination of inter-relationship of the various classes under the new technological developments in agriculture.

There were three main categories of interest in land, i.e., landowners, tenants, and landless agricultural labourers, related with each other with certain socially defined and well accepted rights, duties and obligations.

Different approaches have been used to understand agrarian structure and agrarian relations, i.e., the evolutionary approach given by Baden-Powell and Henry Maine
does not provide a dialectical point of view, for the Indian agrarian situation. However, Irfan Habib's approach to land relations is quite useful in understanding land relations in Mughal India. Habib's analysis not only explains the land relations from the dialectical point of view but also focuses upon the nature of exploitation, deprivation and agrarian class relations.

Marxist approach is given by Sen and Desai. They divide the entire rural society into two classes, i.e., "The haves" and "have-nots". All relations could be deduced from this division of rural people. Joshi has made his analysis more sociological as he feels that the deprivation of rural people is also a creation of certain new government policies, i.e., Community Development Programme, Green Revolution and other such innovations. Thorner has put emphasis on the use of nativistic categories, i.e., Malik, Kisan and Mazdoor for analysing class relations. However, like Joshi, he also observes that some of the government policies have resulted in creating new problems for agrarian classes.

Beteille's analysis of agrarian relations is primarily from structural-functional approach and is of the view that agrarian relations could be understood from caste point of view. According to him, the sociological perspective is essentially relational. One should identify persistent groups and then examine their relationships in terms of socially defined rights, duties and obligations. This approach seems to be
relatively more viable in understanding changing agrarian relations.

Different approaches have their own advantages and limitations, but, in the context of Haryana state, traditionally having peasant proprietorship, none of the approach applies as such. Therefore, present study was designed to explore the present situation in relation to traditional agrarian relations with specific focus on the phenomenon of Green Revolution.

This empirical study was conducted in Haryana state during the period of 1991-92. All the twelve district were arranged in descending order on the basis of degree of use of the elements of Green Revolution. Kurukshetra district categorically ranked as highest Green Revolutionised district and was, therefore, selected, hence hereafter zone A. Similarly, Bhiwani district categorically ranked the lowest and was selected as the non-Green Revolutionised district, hereafter called zone B. From Kurukshetra district, Thanesar and Pehowa blocks were selected purposively as they were adjudged to be using highest quantum of elements of Green Revolution. Similarly, Sewani block from Bhiwani district was purposively selected having the lowest use of elements of Green Revolution. Out of Sewani block, i.e., the lowest Green Revolutionised, village, i.e., Jhupha Kalan and Jhupha Khurd were selected with lottery method. Similar procedure was adopted to select the village Barna from Thanesar block and Sarsa from Pehowa block among most Green Revolutionised villages. The main focus of the
study was on pure agrarian categories, i.e., non-cultivating owner, pure-self-cultivator, pure-tenant and agricultural labourer. Therefore, a sample of 25 respondents from each category from each village was selected with lottery method. This resulted into a sample of 50 households of each category from each zone. Thus, four hundred households with one hundred of each category were selected for the study. Functional head of the selected household was selected for the interview.

Respondent schedules containing questions, statements of ideological orientation and battery of relationship pertaining to the research objectives were prepared and administered personally.

Since, it is an exploratory study, the qualitative aspects of data and observations were given much emphasis. Simple statistical analysis was used wherever considered necessary. Application of the findings in planning, policy making and development is limited to the locale of the study.

In ancient times, there were three types of land, i.e., (1) land of the king; (2) land of the nobility and (3) land of the village chief. The revenue was given to king both in kind and cash, because of protection he provided. Generally, the share of kind was 1/6th, but it could be increased with increase in expenditure of administration or royal luxuries and keeping in view various conditions such as type of soil, nature of crops or use of irrigation. It is pertinent to say that ownership of land was given to some privileged castes and some persons who brought land under cultivation.
In medieval period particularly in Mughal India, the revenue was collected by three agencies, i.e., the King, the Jagirdar and Madad-Maash, from the Khalisa land, Jagirdari land and Madad-Maash land, respectively. Though the basic relations between the subject and king remained almost the same under different kings, yet efforts were made to bring more and more land under cultivation to increase the revenue specially under the kingship of Akbar. Expansion of Jagirs created large number of intermediaries between the cultivators and the king. Royal lands were also given different titles and rate of revenue also differed from king to king and area to area. Emergence of three agrarian categories, i.e., the jagirdars, intermediaries and cultivators was conspicuously noticed during the Mughal period. Agricultural labourers and artisans were in the fabric of jajmani system. The rent was generally collected in cash or kind.

The Britishers propagated three revenue systems, i.e., zamindari, ryotwari and mahalwari. Out of these only ryotwari and mahalwari systems were prevalent in this region (present Haryana). Due to their economic interests, the Britisher tried to develop land through different settlements to extract more revenue and encourage specific crops to meet the raw material demands in Britain, without affecting the autonomy of village communities but tried to develop their supremacy in land revenue collection. Lambardar was their official agent to collect revenue as well as to propagate their power. Introduction of proprietorship in land and payment of land
revenue in cash pushed peasantry in the clutches of sahukars/moneylenders. Tenancy was secured to the extent that a tenant was given his land even if he returned after 20 years. Payment of land revenue was main difficulty with peasant in later eighties and large majority of the ryot/peasant mortgaged then land to sahukars. Though Britishers putforth some legislations to improve the condition of peasantry, they could not be implemented in right perspective. Faulty policies of the British Government and exploitative nature of Indian higher caste resulted into bankruptcy of the peasantry. But unionist party passed certain legislations which revived the peasant proprietorship which was the main form of landownership. Occupancy tenants, tenants at will and agricultural labourers (which only emerge in the era) emerged main agrarian categories, as result of British policy regarding land. In addition to these agrarian categories, in social-texture, jajmani system was the basis of socio-economic relations in village communities.

The analysis of socio-economic profile indicated that majority of agricultural labourers (64%) belonged to young age group. Similarly, majority of tenants was also in the young and middle age group. Among self-cultivators majority belonged to middle and above middle age group and were closer to non-cultivating owners. The Green Revolution has made no impact on the age composition. Most of the non-cultivating owners and the self-cultivators were from higher caste, the tenants from backward and scheduled castes and the agricultural labourers
from scheduled castes. Among the landed agrarian categories, there were relatively more number of joint families than the landless agricultural labourers. Majority of agricultural labourers and non-cultivating owners had family size with member upto 5. Whereas, majority of self-cultivators and tenants was having family size from 6 to 8. Green Revolution has not affected the size of family.

Educationally, agricultural labourers were at the bottom which also increased with the increase in their ladder. Zonewise, there was no significant difference in education of different agrarian categories. The size of landholding was larger in zone B as compared to zone A. Per capita annual income decreased with decreased ownership of land and was the lowest among agricultural labourers. Green Revolution has benefitted economically all the agrarian categories.

Generally, social participation was higher among non-cultivating owners and self cultivators as compared to agricultural labourers and tenants. Social participation was higher among the tenants and agricultural labourers in zone B as compared to zone A. Exposure through urban contact and mass media was higher among the landowning agrarian categories than the landless. Green Revolution has enhanced this aspect relatively more among the agricultural labourers and tenants primarily due to better economic position.

The large majority of the non-cultivating owners was from higher caste and had higher per capita income. This class belonged to educated persons having better exposure to outer
world and social participation. This category was composed of two types of landowners, namely resident non-cultivating owners and non-resident non-cultivating owners. The large majority of those who were big landowners as well as small landowners residing in the villages were engaged in non-agricultural pursuits. Another group consisted of only one-fifth of the absentee-non-cultivating owners and they were defence personnel, professionals, traders, serviceman, etc.

Majority of them leased out land for more than 5 years. The tenure of leasing out land was distinctly smaller in zone A as compared to zone B. Only 24 per cent preferred to leased out land to their own kin-groups. Whereas, in zone A, preference to lease out land was given to those who gave more cash rent and in zone B to those who gave more produce share. Majority of them had not made any written agreement. Such agreement was not found at all in zone B. However, it was only in 10 cases in zone A, because of the fact that they lease out land on cash rent for one year. Majority of them opined that they must have an organisation to protect their interest. But in practice, it did not exist. There was no difference over this issue zone-wise. A large majority of them did not report any conflict with tenant, except in a few cases in zone B because in this zone share cropping system was prevalent. The practice of advancing loan to the tenants by landowner was greater to zone B as compared to zone A. Most of them did not have any loan. Those who procured loan from institution resources used it for non-
agricultural purposes. Green Revolution had not affected their ideological orientation significantly.

The analysis of the statements sought from them indicating change showed that landowners were interested in retaining the ownership of land rather than self-cultivation. But they felt insecure under tenants, who might seek ownership through legislations. They were relatively conservative in retaining the traditional norms and values as compared to the tenants.

Self-cultivators were the principal landowners and mainly belonged to higher agricultural castes. About half of them were illiterate, in abject poverty and from nuclear families having relatively larger size.

It was found that there were smaller holdings in zone A and larger landholdings in zone B. The principal crops in zone A were wheat and rice whereas in zone B, the principal crop were gram and bajra. High yielding varieties of seeds, fertilizers, agro-chemical and farm mechanisation were used by the large majority of the respondents in zone A, whereas, in zone B, they used them rarely. Possession of draft power and agricultural implements was found greater in zone A as compared to zone B. Self-cultivator of zone B, perceived different elements of Green Revolution as risky due to non-availability of irrigation. Farm machinery was perceived risky in the same manner in both the zones due to higher probability of accidents. In zone A, the larger majority of them had employed hired labour whereas, equal percentage in zone B, did not
employ. It was observed that there was hired labour based system of production and family labour based system of production in respective zones. It was also found that number of man-days employed was higher in zone A as compared to zone B.

The motives of production was to meet family need in zone B and to earn profit from surplus produce for the market in zone A. Most of them favoured kisan union to protect their interest. The correspondence percentage was higher in zone A. Majority of the self-cultivators were not having sufficient finance for investment in agriculture in zone B, whereas relative percentage was smaller in zone B. Institutional, rather than moneylenders had been a major source of loan for self-cultivators. Through further probing, it was found that some of them were also benefitted by the exemption policy of government.

Ideological orientation pertaining to theory of karma, inevitability of inequality, luxuries and miseries by the law of nature and other statements reflecting communist ideology about the exploitation, revolution, equality and rights sought from them revealed the fact, that respondents of zone A were more radical than those of zone B. The cultivators seemed to be more conservative and the labourers more radical in their relations. Cultivators were willing to retain their traditional status in dealing with labourers. Green Revolution had also contributed and brought about changes in respect of working
hours, wages, bargaining capacity and consciousness about status among the agricultural labourers. The magnitude of change was somewhat higher in zone A than zone B.

Tenant cultivators were mainly from backward and scheduled castes. Majority of them (67%) was illiterate and in abject poverty (71%). Their social participation and exposure, was poor.

Majority of them had been found working as tenants for more than five years. Size of lease in land, was longer in zone B than in zone A. Different elements of Green Revolution were largely used in zone A, whereas, rarely in zone B. Security of tenants regarding their tenancy period was less assured in zone A. They were not sure to get the same land next year in both the zones, made no efforts to improve the fertility of that land. The motive of production of the majority of them were surplus maximisation in zone A and meeting family needs in zone B. Hired labour, more abundantly used in zone A, whereas, it was reverse in zone B. Possession of agricultural implements and draft power were more in zone A as compared to zone B. Cash rent system was in vogue among the tenants in zone A and crop share in zone B. Conflict with the landowners was not reported by the tenants in both the zones, yet it was observed slightly in zone B. Decision making pattern clearly reveals that in zone A, overwhelming majority of the tenants decides themselves about the crops to be grown, the varieties of the crop, fertilizer to be applied, agro-chemical to be used, etc.,
whereas in zone B, the correspondence percentage was smaller. The difference was because of tenancy pattern they followed. Most of the landowners were residing in the villages in both the zones. But the tenants preferred to lease in land of absentee non-cultivating owners. Traditionally, tenants took loans from the landlords/moneylenders, but now they have started taking loan from institution too. None of them took loan amounting to more than fifty thousand. Risk regarding use of elements of Green Revolution, i.e., high yielding varieties of seed, fertilizers, agro-chemical and farm mechanization was more distinctly perceived by respondents of zone B.

Ideologically, tenants of zone A, were more radical as compared to those of zone B in respect of land to the tiller, inevitability of inequality, exploitation and social values. Legislative measures, awareness of rights and obligations, changed mode of rent payment, weakening of the traditional jajmani system and social value of caste hierarchy have brought about changes in their relations with landowners. Socially accepted inequalities were being challenged and losing grip. The trend is moving toward egalitarian relationship.

Most of the agricultural labourers (75%) were illiterates with nuclear families (80%), and living in abject poverty (82%). Their exposure to mass media and social participation was almost negligible.

It was observed that there were two types of agricultural labourers, i.e., permanent labourers and casual labourers. In zone A, permanent labourer was called naukar. It was also
probed that the number of permanent labourer were more in the past. They were paid their wages annually in advance, alongwith daily meals and clothing in zone A. Whereas, in zone B, majority of them was under debt of landowners and their wages involved in the payment of the debts. Green Revolution had increased their bargaining capacity in zone A. Casual labourers were employed for a short duration. In both the zones there was a trend of employing labourer on day to day basis rather than on yearly basis. Large majority of them find employment directly by contacting the actual employer.

The number of mandays for the labourers employed were more in zone A as compared to zone B, this was mainly due to Green Revolution in zone A. The mode of payment seemed to have changed from kind to cash. Mode of payment to casual and permanent labourers in zone A was higher in amount of cash and kind. Majority of them reported good behaviour of employer. The conflict with landowner was reported more in zone B (36%) as compared to zone A (18%). This marked difference was primarily due to mode of payment and nature of contract.

Traditionally, the main source of credit for the agricultural labourers were moneylender and landlord. But, now they have started taking loan from institutions (46%). They had heavily depended on institutional finance not for cultivation purposes, but for meeting the domestic need. Their amount of
loan was not more than rupee ten thousand. However, landlord in zone B advanced loan to them to keep their dominance and in zone A, to insure the availability of the labour. Large majority of them in both the zones, was willing to shift from agriculture to industrial sector. Whereas corresponding percentage was more in zone B. Main reason of such shift was security of employment and regular payments.

It was found that they were more radical than the other agrarian categories. Agricultural labourers of zone A, were more radical than those of zone B. Traditional relation of informality, intimacy and cordiality between the labourers and the cultivators have considerably undergone a change. Consciousness of their rights and status, bargaining capacity, legislations, was more conspicuous. Vivid changes were somewhat more discernible in Green Revolution zone.

Traditionally, the agricultural economy was organised in jajmani system which was a blend of economic and social aspects of rural life. Caste, the governing factors, determined occupation and tied the individuals to the web of jajmani system. A khati was to repair the agricultural implements made of wood and lohar those of iron implements. Nai cut hair and performed many social functions. Chamar helped in farming and shoe-making. Chura assisted in agricultural operations and carried out cleaning work. But now a days, ties between jajmans and kamins is weakening. The old ties of patronage are losing their significance for both landlords and labourers for different reasons. Landlords prefer a more contractual type of
arrangement and they find the traditional obligations economically burdensome. Labourers on the other hand find the demands by their masters oppressive and exploitative. Only a few families of khati and lohar were providing jajmani services and Nai and Brahmin performing ritual services in both the zones. Jajmani services were found lesser in zone A as compared to zone B. This was because of the Green Revolution in zone A, where the khati and lohar were not able to meet the requirement of modern agriculture. The traditional jajman system may be a thing of the past in agriculture sector.

It has been minutely observed in the present study that the changes in agrarian relations have occurred due to the impact of Green Revolution and consequently some trends in agrarian relations are likely to emerge. The elements of Green Revolution, i.e., high yielding varieties of seeds, fertilizers agro-chemical and farm mechanization may increase with increase in the facilities of irrigation. It has reduced the rural poverty by benefitting different section differently but at the same time increased the income inequalities among different agrarian categories, benefitting the medium and large farm cultivators more than small and marginal cultivators, tenants and labourers. These inequalities has also contributed to social tension in rural society.

With the advent of Green Revolution capital investment has become an integral part of modern agriculture which has transformed the mode of production from family labour based to hired labour and, the motive of production from meeting family
requirements to marketable surplus. The emerging mode and motive of production are likely to make agrarian relations more formal, contractual and mutually satisfying.

Three main interest groups, i.e., the input and service supplying agencies, the farm product producer and the agricultural labourers are expected to prevail on the agrarian scene. Political patronage to these may influence the political power.

The traditional jajmani system may not be much operative in agricultural sector, except that the Brahmin and the Nai may be required only at religious and ceremonial occasions.

Size of landholding may decrease due to exogenous and endogenous factors and marginal holdings may be viable in respect of only commercial crops. A large number of marginal farmers with unsustainable landholdings may be displaced and join the rank of labourers. This may also lead to reverse tenancy under changing circumstances. The following categories of self-cultivators: supervisory-cultivators; part-time self-cultivator; partial self-cultivators; self cultivator-cum-tenant and; self-cultivators cum labourer may emerge.

As size of landholding decreases and profitability increases, this disguised agrarian category, i.e., tenants may dwindle because more and more landowners may resume self cultivation. The motive of production of the remaining tenants may be to get optimum profit, while mode of production may be capitalistic under the cash rent payment system. Tenants may constitute include higher castes also.
With the Green Revolution and commercialisation of agriculture a new category of enterprising pure tenants may emerge, though the tenancy period may be short, but their financial position and credibility may be sound. Purely contractual relations may dominate their relations.

With the advent of Green Revolution wage rates may also increase irrespective of its proportion to profitability of the farmers and, trained agricultural labourers may be required in different semi-skilled and skilled operations. Contractual terms and conditions, regulation of wages by labour law, eradication of bonded labour and begar, may start their upcoming with the passage of time.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the present study following conclusions are drawn:

Traditionally, there were cultivators, tenants and agricultural labourers whose relations are guided by socially defined rights, duties and obligations. Inequalities were socially accepted, hence there was social harmony.

Irrigation is the life line of modern agriculture which is pre-requisite for the cultivation of High Yielding Varieties and use of chemical fertilizers. Thus, assured irrigation leads to Green Revolution.

Green Revolution demands an entirely different kind of work pattern for its success which the traditional rural groups do not provide. This decreases the utility of jajmani system in agriculture.
Technological changes lead to changes in mode of production which depend more on capital investment and hired labour for timely performance of agricultural operations. Credit relations between landowner and tenant and between cultivator and labourer are no more obligatory but contractual. Institutional finance is to sustain the Green Revolution.

Green Revolution maximises the surplus for market to meet capital requirements. This changes the motive of production for meeting the family requirements only.

Mode and motive of production influence relationships among different agrarian categories. This changes agriculture as a way of life to commercial pursuit. Obligatory, sentimental and interdependent relationships are changing into contractual relations.

Farm mechanization develops confidence and capability to perform agricultural operation in time. Thereby, it decreases interdependence of different social groups in rural community. This changes community values to individual values.

Green Revolution benefits economically to all agrarian categories but more to those owning the factors of production. Labourers receive much lesser benefits which accentuates the inequalities leading to social tensions and conflicts when flared by other vested groups and circumstances. Cultivators are dependent on labourers than the vice-versa.

Timely performance of agricultural operations coupled with higher use of labour increases the bargaining power of
labourers. This lead to their feeling for organisation and more radical orientation.

Proliferation of Green Revolution brings in the commercial interest groups which changes the folk values.

Elements of value inequalities reflected in practice of untouchability, begar, deprivation, exploitation and dependency for tenants and agricultural labourers are diminishing under the impact of Green Revolution, besides other factors. Changing social composition of agrarian categories also contributes to egalitarian social relationship among them.

Assured higher security of profitability in the wake of Green Revolution alters tenurial relations by replacing land rent payment system from crop produce share to cash rent and, reducing tenancy period to a crop or a year. Relations between tenant cultivator and landowner are secular, formal, contractual and monetised.