CHAPTER ONE
Broadly speaking, the literature on migration in the Third world developing countries particularly India, is though not vast, yet quite extensive. The studies — rural vs rural, rural vs urban and vice versa — taken together reveal by and large the dominant influence of functionalist school. But, unfortunately, very few, of course not a full length studies are found on the marxist line of thought. Since a decade and half past, the emerging Marxist scholars and social scientists have shown some concern for this glaring problem while analysing the facets of development and under-development regions and production process at large. The main purpose behind the curtain here is not only to review the existing literature but also to yarn out the thread of argument in the spider's net of thought processes, categorising the whole gamut into several compartments and see, how logically the Marxist interpretation on structuralist approach can be used as a tool analysing and comprehending the agrarian structure and process of out migration.

For better organisation, the present chapter is divided into three sections. The first section discusses the line of argument highlighted by functionalist school. The second section deals with the analytical framework of Marxist school of thought analysing the process of migration. The third section discusses the ongoing debate on modes of
production in Indian agriculture and the relevance of Marxist approach answering the process of migration in Indian agrarian structure.

I

Much of the research on migration implicitly or explicitly advocates the domination of 'Rural Push' and 'Rural Pull' theory. But however, a specific type of migration i.e., seasonal migration which occurs very frequently in the rural scenario, though occupy an important place in migration studies, has received scanty attention. A section of economists analyse migration on the line of 'Cost Investment' and 'Benefit' while Leplay entered into the debate propagating system analysis. To him, migration acts as 'Donor-Sub System' and 'Receipient Sub-System.' On the contrary, it is often argued at length that the flow of migration depends largely on the differential level of economic development of different regions. The process of decision making is stimulated through various socio-cultural factors. Besides, economic factors play a predominant role in the process of rural to rural and rural to urban migration. The factors they include landlessness, skewed land control i.e., a few people owning large acres of land while majority deprived of it, unemployment, underemployment, disguised unemployment and growth of rural population and its pressure on land accompanied with income differential in agricultural scenario. Evidence from village studies conducted in the Nizamabad district of Andhra Pradesh reveals that on an average a labourer gets 158 labour days in a year.
with annual income of Rs. 1861 and Rs. 1776 respectively in both the villages. Some studies conducted in India and Latin America suggest a positive co-relation between higher rate of rural out migration and unequal distribution of land. Furthermore, it is observed, "the more the individual is poor, Landless and socio-economically deprived, the greater the chance of his migration from rural to urban areas." Besides, a good number of studies on overseas and internal migration reveal how overall meagre income causes migration.

In several studies it has been found that the acceleration of migration from rural areas is largely due to backwardness of concerned region, lack of irrigation facilities, dryness of land, low fertility and low productivity of land and casual failure of crops. Contrary to the facts, Alexanders recent studies in irrigated and non-irrigated areas of two different backward states that both the areas considerably send a large number of migrants despite of their relative development. Among the other vital dimensions in the agrarian economy which create condition for out migration of agricultural labourers, the rural indebtedness is a significant one.

In retrospect to the general view on backwardness of agriculture, a good deal of studies completed in different pockets of the country emphasise that natural calamities like flood, cyclone, draught, famine and vagaries of weather and their frequent occurrences shamble the economic condition of rural peasantry and in turn force them to lead a life full of
utter penury and destitution. Added to this, the non-availability of additional means of livelihood, the economic pressure of worst kind and the gradual decay of home based small scale art industries by the penetration of machine products have further ruined the economic condition of the artisan castes, which had added much to the flow of out migration.\textsuperscript{15} A study conducted in the earstwhile five villages of Uttar Pradesh reveals that majority of rural migrants belong to artisan castes followed by servicing castes. The main clue behind such migration process is decline of village handicrafts followed by the customary payment being stopped to the servicing castes.\textsuperscript{16} Besides, the improvement in transport and communication, and development of educational facilities have accelerated the migration process in the recent years.\textsuperscript{17}

With regard to income differentials a bimodal pattern of migration is conceived with the poor migrating for economic reasons while the rich for better economic pursuits. Nevertheless, quite a large number of studies advocates an availability of opportunity, wage differential and higher earnings as the main clue behind the rural-urban migration.\textsuperscript{18}

A similar observation is echoed from a study in a South Gujarat village. It contends that the magnitude and rate of migration is directly related to available opportunities elsewhere.\textsuperscript{19} However, another study on migrants to Dandeli in Maharashtra provides a little different picture from the central foci of argument. It contends, depending upon the economic
opportunity, only persons having distinctive socio-cultural background migrate. Similarly a good number of studies highlight that persons belonging to upper stratum of society with higher education and balanced economic position tend to maintain higher propensity of migration from rural to urban areas. Contrary to the views, Brigg maintains that educated migrants are primarily forced by 'Pull factor' at the place of destination, whereas illiterate migrants are forced by 'Push factor' at the place of origin.

Some studies suggest that migration from rural to urban sector is mainly dominated by agricultural labourers, lower middle class, Peasant economic background and constituted mainly by low class. Thus this Pattern of Migration is most closely bounded up with the capitalist development in rural areas. The flow of seasonal migration are different type i.e., Jobber and Banta. In this type migrants virtually fall under severe exploitation in the hands of the recruiting agents variously named as contractor, gang leader, Jobber, mistry etc. Further, the seasonal migration squeezes the chance of employment avenues available to the reserve local labourforce. It also adversely affects to the local level labour organisation.

In contrast, Houghton maintains that, migration of labourers entirely depends upon their free will and they are not forced to leave their home. Thus the migration process has acted as a boon in reducing population pressure in rural
areas and agriculture. Due to shortage of labour supply, the wage has gone up in the village. In fact another study conducted in Punjab reveals that, the exodus migration of Punjabis to different parts of the world has created acute labour shortage which has been filled up by cheap migrant labour from different parts of the country. Such an exodus migration of male left the villages with females only. Moreover, to have sufficient amount of money for the passage, in many cases it has been reported selling the land and family valuables. But others who did not dispose up the land, and nor even look after it, leased out to their near relatives to have a share of subsistence.

Caste constitutes one of the important dimensions determining the process of migration. Many research findings suggest that the propensity of migration is higher among the higher castes than the lower castes. It has been pointed out that the socio-cultural barriers restricted the mobility of untouchables. But several recent reports refute the views and significantly show that there is increasing trend of migration among the low castes. Due to tradition old socio-cultural discrimination, the low caste untouchable migrants generally prefer to stay in slum areas chiefly to avoid such discrimination and atrocities committed on them by the caste hierarchy.

The continued urbanward migration is augmented on the line of caste, kinship, friendship, linguistic and strong bond
of regional feelings. It acts as a bridgehead in facilitating the entry of those who remain in the villages. However, the importance of gang leader, contractor, Jobber and other intermediaries in the labour recruitment process to the industries, construction sites and other allied organised and unorganised sectors, who draft several thousands of labourers cannot be easily ignored. The flow of migration on these lines would continue as long as there is no serious blow to this process. The reason behind such exodus migration process is previous migrants work as a motivation by supplying the new migrants food, shelter, security of job, and other necessaries at the very initial stage.

Age is one of the vital factors deciding the flow of migration. Persons in their teens, twenties, and early thirties are more prone to migrate than other groups. Among the migrants illiteracy is widespread. While other views that considerably migrants hail from literate group. Most of the migration is short distance oriented. While long distance migration is mostly dominated by male. However, during the recent past, there seems to be a shift towards long distance migration - inter district and inter-state and international migration - among the females.

Rural to urban migration increases with the distance within the district while rural to urban migration increases sharply between districts and states, mostly dominated by males, which is highly selective. Many research findings
support that the migrants are mostly married. This may be due to the traditional early marriage practiced in the village social milieu coupled with belief that unless one is not married as per the choice of parents, he may on his own, marry, someone else far away from the caste and culture.

It has been observed that certain castes and communities have a tradition of migrating without their female folk and children. The Hindi speaking migrants of Uttar Pradesh and Oriya speaking migrants of Orissa, have demonstrated a tendency of migration without their female folk to the cities of Bombay and Calcutta respectively. Economic factor hinders the migrants to move along with family particularly in long distance migration. Thus, the male migrates first for employment purposes, and being secured of a job carry his family members latter.

Some studies have asserted special significance of migration in the context of developing societies which are in the process of reinnovating their social structure and thus various aspects of life are undergoing transformation. Modern technology, industrialization and urban growth are undoubtedly the pivotal instrument of change in these societies. A close examination of these conditions obtained by these societies would show that much of the urban growth is the result of migration of people from villages to cities. The rapid development of industrial and urban economy in the erstwhile rural hinterlands, particularly after 1940's has expanded
employment opportunities in wide scale which in turn pulled the rural masses.59

Many researchers have observed that, the migration process - rural to rural, rural to urban and overseas migration - has brought a dynamic change in the economic structure of rural areas. It has helped increase in per capita income, thereby it has brought development in the living condition of people and rapid development of rural areas at large. Besides it has acted as a broker in the field of linguistics and culture.60

In this developing Third World Several Studies show that ethnicity has important role to play in migration. It helps in identifying the people with their broader culture. Besides, it generates the spontaneous development of consciousness of 'we' feeling among the migrants on the base of cultural homogeneity. Here, it can be referred the ongoing ethnic war between sinhalese and migrant Tamil minority in Sri Lanka. Migrants, hailing from different castes, communities, linguistic and cultural areas by and large tend to live together in a clustered fashion in a particular neighbourhood in the city. The clustered fashion of living is also noticed among the tribal migrants. During the period of stay, they forget the sub-caste differences and develop a sensitive feeling among themselves, which bind them to protect from external threat.61 Madan's study highlights some interesting facts. Migrants who take up job in urban areas seem to
abandon most of their caste restrictions while on the work site. Similarly research on overseas migration to South Asia, Africa, British, United States, Canada and Gulf countries reflect widely on the issue of cultural adjustment, bounded by inter-ethnic relations. They also maintain strong bond of relations with the host relatives.

It has been noticed, that besides economic development, the rural-urban migration has a wider impact on power politics in the rural areas. In many occasions, it has helped in a bigger way to snatch out power being hold and utilised by the dominant castes. Describing the pattern of migration over 50 years in a South Gujarat village, I.P. contends that while migration has occurred from both the castes, higher and lower, and has resulted in a dynamic change in the village power structures. Similar observation has been noticed in other studies.

Now almost all Third World Countries, particularly India, is experiencing uneven and unplanned slum development in her city pockets. This is mainly due to the exodus migration of both skilled and unskilled workers from villages which had led to the urban congestion, pollution, unhealthy housing condition and crime too. Thus needless to say the life in slum which is most precarious. Mostly they live in a small room prepared out of mud and covered by palm leaves or
They live a life highly deprived of basic civic amenities such as water, road, drainage, lavatories and even electricity. And particularly, the living condition in rainy season is beyond imagination. In such deprived and neglected life, the slumlord never show any amount of sympathy while deciding the rent. The slumlord collects heavy amount of rent from Rs. 70 to Rs. 100/- each invariably the size of the rented hutment.

These settlements spread over the city help intensifying the extended kinship relations beyond what might normally be expected to occur in the villages. Although the rural migrants live in close fashion, strongly based on kinship network in the city, the joint families are very rarely found among the migrant. In fact 90 per cent of the families in the busties studied were basically nuclear in structure.

Several studies have revealed that migrants send, sizable amount of income on a regular basis to the families in the villages. They send either in their wives name or to the elder/responsible family members. But over a period of time the amount gradually gets reduced depending upon the longivity of the stay. Whatever amount they send, is by and large meant for family consumption and to a little extent invest in luxurious commodities like radio, watch, house construction etc. Only a handful of them who are free from the basic difficulties, could invest in land and agriculture. Salavas study on Kutch villages of Gujarat shows a strong co-relation between per-capita income and increase in income resulting from remittances. The higher caste migrants tend to send back savings and have increased their wealth and power in the villages. Furthermore, the feedback effect of overseas migration is quite significant. The migrants continue to maintain regular contacts with their
family at the native state and unceasingly send large sum of money. The foreign remittances are productively invested in buying machines, equipments, automobiles, land and luxurious houses and conspicuous consumption. However, it is worth noticing that the foreign remittances is partly responsible for the 'green revolution' in Punjab and Haryana and 'white revolution' in Gujarat. But in Kerala, the investment of remittances show altogether a different trend. The Gulf Money has been invested in conspicuous consumption, luxury goods like magnificent buildings with all modern facilities etc. Besides a considerable percentage of foreign money has been invested in trade and commerce which has improved upon its structure.

With regard to home visits some noticed it very frequent, while others found it annual. The frequency of home visit go down on the length of stay in the city. However, most of them continue letter correspondence with the family at village.

All the above studies covering wide spectrum of variables, explicitly or implicitly, have tried to analyse the phenomena of migration process heavily based upon economic factor as the main criteria. Besides they have also tried to link and balance the pattern of migration on the parameter of rural 'push' and urban 'pull' theory. Such an angle of understanding the phenomena, only reveals some trends, simply at an impressionistic level. It never tries to
understand the hard core of the problem, why there is migration from agricultural sector, inspite of its development. That means, it requires a thorough analysis of agrarian structure, mode of production and history at various time dimensions. This seems to be more accurate and convincing approach to understand the phenomena. In other words, the penetration of capitalist mode of production into the rural hinterlands, albeit slowly, i.e., commodity production and the use of developed sophisticated technology in agriculture creating unemployment and underemployment need to be brought into the framework of migration studies.

II

In this section, our analysis will be of limited context. It seeks to explore and logically understand the relevance of marxist approach, the modes of production, its impact on peasant and agricultural labour and labour out-migration in different historical epoch. Although the number of such researches have remained very limited and inadequate, nevertheless, it may serve a useful purpose classifying and understanding the issue at hand, particularly in Indian context.

In contrast to micro-economic model i.e., incorporated in the sectional school, the historical-structural perspective assumes that explanation for population movement must be
probed deeply into the pressures and counter pressures, that led to a change in the organisation of production relations. Nevertheless, the approach tends to emphasise mechanism by which social-economic and political forces directly or indirectly encourage demand for labour and associated forms of labour recruitment and wages etc. In a slight different way, Standing in his study on flow of migration in different historical periods emphasised, in pre-capitalist relations of production how the process of migration was controlled and how it was favourable and augmented with the transition to capitalist relations of production. His main thesis is that the process of migration can only be explained with reference to social relations of production, forms of property particularly the land tenure, underlying those relations and the limits to the development of productive forces within specific social formations.

Analysis from historic specific, in primitive communalism, the mode of production notably pastoralism, the mobility constituted the most inevitable form of life of the people. Marx called this form of life, "the first form of mode of existence." This mode of existence involved both hunting and gathering, of group mobility based on mutual co-operation and distribution of "balance reciprocity." At this level of development of the productive forces, the survival of individuals depended entirely on their belonging to a group who mostly wandered from one region to another in research of food, and such mode of life continued
probably for innumerable generations. In primitive communality, the social appropriation of surplus was in simple form of redistribution which restricted the productive forces by rudimentary division of labour. But over a generation this mode of existence changed, when nomadic way of life was overtaken by more settled life with the ownership of communal property. With the growth of population, along with more refined form of division of labour, a more complex distribution system emerged. As a result a group of unproductive elder members were produced who received surplus as chiefs or head of the clan or tribe, created condition and paved the way for the emergence of feudal and other hierarchical relations of production. The feudal forms of mode of exploitation amounted to the process of immobilization of producer to a great extent, of course depending upon the population density. In extreme sparsely populated areas the feudal relations were maintained indirectly by the state officials, who used to collect taxes and tributes employing harsh methods and help drawing the cultivators into the nexus of feudal economy. On the contrary, the feudal relation was altogether different in the densely populated areas. Since it contained settled peasantry, the feudal control was relatively loose and indirect. And thus, the monopolisation of labour through coercion; and erosion of traditional livelihood was sufficient enough to induce peasants into a position of 'dependent security' on the landlord's estate. The mechanism resulted in dragging large scale peasants into feudal relations who in turn rendered
service in protection to live in penury and destitution. Also in sparsely populated areas, where shifting cultivation, hunting and gathering continued simultaneously, the imposition of feudalties would be more direct, typically involving serfdom or the widespread formalisation of labour service. The institutionalised mechanism of slavery and serfdom in fact restricted the mobility of a bigger section of peasants.

Despite the fact of rigid feudal system and monopsony power of feudal lords, it is vague to argue that there was absolutely no migration in the whole period of feudalism. Characterising the colonial migration in India, OmWedt argues, it would be superficial to explain migration only in terms of expansion of capitalism in agriculture with a consequent growth of free labour and in terms of demographic expansion. Even the colonial migration, particularly in India, migration was primarily a feudal product. And the places to which these migrants were recruited, the mines, plantation, and the factories, were in the sense that the worker sold their labour power to capital. And more particularly, the migration from feudal belt was augmented at the instance of colonial authority to meet the Chronic labour shortage in the plantation territories and partly depended on the tyranny and oppression committed by the landlords on the peasants. Thus the colonial migrants not necessarily belonged to 'free' wage labour who readily sold their labour power but in several instances these migrants were released by the contractors from feudallords to meet the labour labour scarcity in plantation economy. Despite the facts, colonial labour migration
indeed acted as a modernising force "weakening the bonds of semi-serfdom*. or as patnaik argues, "Migration probably did more to modify the severe forms of agrestic servitude than any amount of legislation".

Besides, direct control several other indirect mechanisms were used which restricted mobility in the whole of the feudal period that deserves attention.

(a) In feudalism, the independent peasants who own and maintain small patch of land, not being tied to landlords, in this case temptation for migration would be much more. But, however, the possession of land would directly discourage permanent migration, thereby the peasants would continue to remain much attached to land and rural villages.

(b) In case of tenancies, who neither enjoy privilege nor even able to generate surplus for himself but live in constantly destitution and exploited, can hardly think of migrating out from such bad bonds. Besides, his migration would immediately ask him to surrender the right of possession of patch of land to the landlord, which would cause double way loss (a) losing the land, (b) inviting more economic hardship to the family.

(c) In sharecropping system, it is definite that the amount of exploitation is less in comparison to tenanted system. And very likely, a share cropper
use to retain always more amount of the produce as share that whatever amount he pays as tax to feudal lord. And moreover, during the favourable monsoon, the sharecropper has a freehand to retain the harvested surplus without consultation with the feudallord, once the tax is paid. Nevertheless, the nature of sharecropping system is as such, the sharecropper always maintains a very weak and short durable ties with the land and lord, instability being the chronic feature.\textsuperscript{92} In India for example, the sharecropper is "a tenant at will" and can be dismissed at any moment with a short notice if the landlord wishes.\textsuperscript{93} Thus, propensity of migration would be considerably greater than that of service tenants.

Even in the case of peasants involved in paying fixed money rent for the use of a specific patch of land for a negotiated period, will allow one or more family members to migrate either seasonally or for longer, as the landlord does not enjoy any direct or indirect control over the family.

However, "the landlord dominated social formations have been characterised by high concentration of land ownership, co-existing with chronic under utilization of the land and the peasantry compressed to a small, often fragmented holdings. The land monopolization, sometimes including the locking up the land by the state through such devices as crown land legislation, has forced peasants into such small plots that they have no margin to cover the risk of harvest failure or personal mishap. That has induced them to behave servilely, so as to have a moral claim on the landlords benevolence in
the times of crisis. Correspondingly, by restricting access to strategic means of production landlords have been able to intensify exploitation, simply by increasing peasants insecurity and dependence.  

Furthermore, Coercion and paternalism, the twin mechanism were used to subordinate the peasants in feudal social formations. Coercive power included physical assault for minor and major offenses committed, or failed to attend moral obligation in latter's palace. Even in many instances, the peasant had to undergo social boycott and other hardships, like denial of water facility both for drinking and for irrigation; footpaths to the fields, bridges etc. and even, the permission was needed for temporary or permanent leave from an estate. Thus, a peasant was always bound in the bond of dependent insecurity and left completely at the landlords good will. As a consequence, the webs of paternalistic practices including the fictive kinship ties, the peasant remained attached to landlord, not merely for a patch of land, but for the protection against the constant threat of destitution. And thereby, the mechanism directly or indirectly induced the peasants to reciprocate through servility, to provide labour and to remain on the land.

Paternalism and the vagueness of social relations allowed the landlord to exploit and to extract surplus amount safely. That means, the landlord could tactly prevent any accumulation of wealth and left the peasants on the borderline of subsistence and destitution. Infact, it has reduced income
differentiation among them. This is partly because, peasants have relied on some network of "balance reciprocity" evolved to ensure the simple reproduction of peasant families and kiship group.97 Besides, the peasants living in bare subsistence and destitution, very often had face some adversity such as harvest failure, illness, conspicuous consumption or increase of tax, for which they infrequently fall into debt and penury. In feudal society, the indebtedness, usury had been used as a means of intensifying exploitation, dispossessing peasants from ownership of land or control of means of production, help binding them to the land, rural poverty and obligation to estate.98 Once the labourer entered into such credit nexus transaction, based on compound interest, or even more, utterly failed to repay the debt at year end. Thus the internal mechanism involved in the process was to bind him, making him vulnerable, ready to render service for the year and next, year after year, Which run into intergenerational bondage, Commonly known as 'Bonded Labour' in India, till the debt is not paid. A recent preliminary report of 1977-78 indicates that, there are nearly 8,25,239 bonded labourers still living in the pitch darkness of fatal bond.99 The system of bonded labour persists in the large parts of the country, mostly in the backward regions coupled with illiteracy and ignorance and submissive resignation of people.100 This restricts the mobility of the people not partially but fully.

Often and while, landlords have adopted other instruments to tie down the landowning small peasants by renting out agricultural implements, which inturn knotted them into
permanent debt. This phenomena has been vigorously observed in Mexico as a result of ejido landreforms ‘Patrons in capital’ replaced ‘Patrons in land’. Similarly, in Iraq in 1964, the Sheikhs, having had their land expropriated, still managed to take up to 90 percent of the crops of former tribesmen in payment as rent for mechanical equipment.

Notwithstanding the above facts, the moneylenders and kulakas to a certain extent aggravated the condition of peasants further obstructing their chance of mobility. Furthermore, the near absence of developed communication, and transport facilities followed by decentralization of political power through legal and extra legal restrictions - a cluster of villages ruled by landlord or small group of officials who assumed supreme local administration and judiciary introduced restriction on free movement of people from one territory to another. That means extra legal restrictions were implied for checking migration.

In the feudal societies, the role of central government remained more passive and non intervention. The custom, power and patronage utilised by feudal lords continued undistrubed, who enjoyed full authority and support from the government. The whole feudal period never witnessed any change in labour relation and the peasants lived in perpetuating conditions.

Besides judicial and legal control, landlords did not mind to impose often and while arbitrary local taxes which have been extremely complex by nature and burdensome. For instance, in Rajasthan, there were not less than 86 different
taxes which custom had sanctioned. It is a pertinent question as to, why there should be such a complex system of tax where the great majority of the peasants live in utter destitution and penury condition. The answer is quite simple and obvious that 'landlord' or 'tax lord' wanted to extract as much as possible indirectly leaving the peasants in chronic debt, squeezing their power of protest and deterred their mobility (leaving the village) altogether. That means for any attempt for commission of violation, the landlord dominated court would impose heavy fine and other penalties. In the feudal social formation, several modus operandi of hard mechanisms were used both directly and indirectly by the dominant class which restricted the flow of migration.

In most social formations penetrated by capital through colonialism or imperialism, it is best known that pre-capitalist social relations, have been preserved in the interest of capital. In semifeudal social formation, 'feudal' mechanisms were extensively used to control wage and peasants were rigorously vulnerable to indebtedness to the employer. Although this period embarked upon a slow process of commoditisation of the produce, the peasant - workers mostly produced for self use than exchange. Inspite of that, the subject to indebtedness continued unceasingly, and the employers trapped the labourer in the guise of moneylenders and shop owners.

The most distinguishable feature between the feudal and capitalist mode is that, in the case of former the rising productivity reduces the rate of exploitation because, rent tends to be fixed; thus it will help the peasant to accumulate
surplus whatever, once the rent has been paid. The inherent character of the feudal production process involves that it will generate interest in developing forces for production. But in capitalism, the income of a worker is always fixed and thus higher production leads to super exploitation of labour. Interestingly semi-feudal social formation encompasses the elements, of course disproportionately of both the production relations. Thus in semi-feudalism, the surplus was extracted in the form of feudal rent, but however, the peasant was permitted to retain any amount of surplus leftover after the deduction of rent. 106

The above characteristics were distinctly found both in land scarce and land surplus areas, where instrument of production comprised primitive technologies, heavily utilising the uncommitted unskill labour reserve. It is expected that the rate of migration could be comparatively greater than in purely feudal mode of exploitation. The first and foremost point, is semi-feudal system carries more coercion than customary, in societies characterised by paternalistic landlord peasant relations. Besides, with semi-feudal relations, the exploiting class is more interested on enhancing accumulation which direct them to involve in production process. As a result, the peasant workers are made relatively free not only from the bondage, dependent insecurity, but also from the village. Moreover, those peasants owning only small patches of land produce subsistence insufficient to meet the family requirement, have less attachment to the land than the small
cultivators, of course less than the landless labourers. This condition in fact induce a greater propensity for migration.

In semi-feudal relations of production, the rural transport and communication network marked considerable improvement than the former period. It helped in easy passage. Along with, the need of market, for exchange received priority in rural hinterlands and urban pockets. This helped widening the rural workers' knowledge on labour market and opportunities available elsewhere. Thus it seems, in semi-feudal relations of production, migration of labourers would be more than purely feudal mode. Nevertheless, the role of kinship not-work and primordial loyalties have further activated the process, widening the scope for expanded migration.

Besides, the pattern of urbanisation and the development of export oriented economy in some of the central places, have had some definite influence on rural out migration. The case of Indian labour migration to the plantation economies of Malaya, Burma, Ceylon, Nepal, Fiji and others during the middle of 19th century of colonial period - the transitional phase - was an unique phenomenon in Indian history. The migration during the period involved both long distance and longer period of stay. It had definite contribution to the growth of urban economy associated with congestion, health hazard and horrific life. In a nut shell, it is definite that migration of labour would be much more in semi-feudal relations of production than in the pure feudal mode.
Then the poignant question seems to arise, what would be the pattern of migration if the agricultural structure under goes transformation, if not fully, towards the growth of capitalism. The available literature on the topic is abundant and valuable also. Our limited intention here is, not to search for an exhaustive literature but to link the thread of arguments within the context.

According to Dobb, the growth of capitalism can be attributed to the relative inefficiency of feudal mode of production and emphasised motivational importance of growing need of ruling class for revenue. Following closely, Hilton argued that the struggle for rent was the prime mover in the East European transition. Besides, these tendencies, demographic expansion to a great extent, influenced a change favourable to the growth of capitalist relations of production. In fact, such a shift, changed the form of exploitation and helped further in consolidating class differentiation. That means, the system involved in producing large scale of itinerant cheap labour whose movement from one place to other was encouraged and tolerated. However, at the initial stage of formation, it does not totally dissolve the feudal mode of exploitation, but it created conditions suitable to the growth of capitalism.

The increasing class differentiation necessitates the emergence of a domestic market for commodities. And, if the controls are relaxed, with an undifferentiated middle peasantry the class differentiation tend to polarise into two groups - the Kulaks and the weaker peasants. The former having motivation of augmenting higher production purchase more subsistence
by active participation in the commodity market and exploit systematically the weaker peasants by renting them land, equipment, advancing cash or even food and employing them as wage labour. In the long run process these weaker peasants turn vulnerable to victims being thrown out from their land (alienation) whatever little they had and solely depend upon selling the only commodity all time available with them, the labour power, they possess. The ongoing class differentiation produced vast scale of rural proletariat who never can think of keeping their body and soul together unless they move. Thus peasant differentiation is a powerful stimulus to commoditisation. But in some phases of a transition, it appears that class differentiation never gets polarised to the expected quantum, because of growth of number of peasants who involved in petty cultivation. Often and while, the trends is misleading, for differentiation may involve an increase in those for whom petty cultivation is an auxiliary occupation. The increasing amount of impoverishment involved in capitalism forces them to diversify their activities such as lingering on to work for longer, gardening and so on. Nevertheless, these are some of the ingredients which helped in widening the scope of class differentiation and growth of rural proletariat, who in turn had to depend on mobile living.

Though class differentiation marked a phase of transition, the development of agrarian capitalism emerged in several forms. Standing has classified them into three broad categories. The first is the classical model associated with England in which landlords with the support of state displace
peasants, replacing them with tenant farmers - a few capitalist farmer alongside with a growing army of landless laboures. In this formation, rent takes the form of capitalist ground rent and tenant farmers form the nucleus of agrarian bourgeoisie. The second type agrarian capitalist formation is identified by Lenin as "Junker Form". To Lenin this formation retains a great deal of feudal features, or taking a more 'revolutionary' character of which 'revolution starts below' involving a transformation of the patriarchal peasants into a bourgeois farmer. The third type of formation is 'American route' which involved naked capitalist development. The prevailing Indian agricultural situation by and large coincide with the 'Junker' type of capitalist formation (the opinion in this regard is still contradictory) encompassing the feudal character and culture.

As observed above, the process of capitalist transformation has differently emerged and thus failed to project a unique and homogenous character. More interestingly, the 'Junker type' of formation retains the elements of semi-feudal control and maintain deep ties with rural areas, involving the feudal mode of labour control and exploitation. Thus, rural emigration in this formation will be very restricted than any other capitalist formations. However, it is certain and definite that rural emigration would be much more in all these three formations disproportionately and heterogeneously (ofcourse with unequal intensity) than the pure feudal and semi-feudal modes of production. Needless to emphasise again that the pattern and extent of migration would always depend upon the nature of transition.
The rate of migration seems to increase phenomenally with the commercialisation of agriculture, which transforms the relation of production producing large scale rural proletariat who moves from place to place in search of job. Such trend has been observed in the case of Brazil by Lopes, for Mexico by Bartra and for Peru by Greaves. In Indian context, Unni’s findings on Nair families migrated to the towns to become factory workers, cooks and waiters in restaurants, when left with no other alternatives, except agricultural labour. They preferred to migrate long distance where they can conceal their identity.

In commodity production, the possible migration of small peasants was not sealed totally. The small peasants owning small patches of land, being not tied with the landlords, their potentiality for migration would increase favourable to seasonal migration. But however, it would discourage permanent migration. In patterns of share-cropping, a more flexible exploitation involved. Share-croppers relatively maintain very weak links to land, instability of tenure being associated, a chronic feature of share-cropping system. In case of India, share-croppers constitute a tenant-at-will, who can be dismissed at a moment of course with a short-notice by the landlord had created condition for the increase of their migration. Before analysing the impact of migration, the role of trade and urbanisation process which have some definite bearing on agricultural revolution and process of migration need to be examined inside the framework.
Merchant capital contains both progressive and reactionary character. It is progressive when it comes independent of pre-capitalist forces of production and is reactionary when it develops in an independent form to feudal set-up. Further Marx observed that capital,... worsens the condition of the direct producer, turns them into mere wage workers and proletarians under conditions worse than those under the immediate control of capital. That means, merchant capital by syphoning off surplus, and destroying the village handicrafts impoverish the peasantry and artisans and thus forced them to lead a life of poverty and destitution. The independent merchant capital induces greater degree of migration to urban centres which have a relatively free access in an unfreeing society. Compatible with, urban growth is a correlate of capitalist industrialisation. The expansion of industries invite huge concentration of labour forces, as it is based on division of labour and specialisation in which the development of productive forces rest. But, industrial capital can only expand provided with supply of cheap mobile labour. That means agrarian relations must be transformed, so that surplus population available, will move to industry. In other words, for industrial capital, the worker should be made 'free'. As Marx said, "Capitalist wage labour implies free wage labourers." The commodity of labour power had not merely to exist. It had to be available in abundance in the places wherever needed and thus mobility
of the labouring class was an essential condition. Furthermore, the growth of industrial capital revolutionise agriculture to ensure surplus of food for the urban army of labour; to keep down industrial wage rate i.e. the cost of reproducing labour power. In a nut shell, the industrial growth normally depends upon the creation of three agricultural surpluses - a surplus for urban investment, a surplus of food for urban consumption, and a surplus population for urban employment at a low wages to facilitate higher accumulation.¹²⁵

The pertinent question then arise, is, what role the migration in general and rural urban migration in particular played for the development of industrial capitalism. That means, for the growth of industrial capital the worker should be made 'free' in double sense - the worker should be free from means of production and free to sell their labour power as wage labours. In other words, the first sense of freedom implies creation of alienated surplus population in agriculture and the second meaning connotes that these surplus population had to mobile to industrial sectors whereever necessary, as a part of economic compulsion. Thus migration represents major component, the most important component of industrial labour reserve. Surplus population plays three functions: (a) it holds down wages; (b) it provides a 'pull' of workers who can be absorbed in industrial occupation without hindering agricultural production (c) it acts as a disciplinary element contributing to increase proletarianisation.¹²⁶ Thus Marx described, "the
migrants as the light infantry of industrial capital.\textsuperscript{127}

In Indian context, the origin of working class is explained by the fact that "Millions of agricultural labourers rendered surplus by the decaying of agrarian economy which formed the supply of labour for this developing industry.\textsuperscript{128} According to Mahajan\textsuperscript{129} about 47 per cent of workers in agriculture were estimated as surplus and about 20 to 25 per cent in the category of farmers, cultivators and share-croppers and about 55 per cent of labourers do not get full employment.\textsuperscript{130} The growth of population pressure on land and instability to meet landlords demand will induce short term or seasonal migration of one or more family members leaving others to produce family subsistence to relieve the short term or permanent economic hardship.

Further rural-ruban migration helps in intensifying class differentiation in rural areas. That means, the more 'fortunate' migrants invest a large share of the earnings in agriculture thereby help in intensification of commodity production with the application of modern technologies. Inordinately, it helps in further growth and consolidation of capitalism in rural sectors and help destorying other dominant modes of production. Others, who were depending upon the small units and home made produce now find difficult to live due to development of market and heavy commodification of produce. Thus in this paradoxical situation, the poor peasant families who wish to migrate more securely lease-out their small un-economic plots either on crop share basis or on yearly fixed money share to his near relatives or dear
villagers either. Further the high insecurity of industrial employment (in case of individual), ties them to their under-developed home and forces them to preserve their uneconomic holding at any cost and asks them to return consistently to help during the harvest campaigns. Thus Meillassoux regarded these migrants as super exploited. To him, the difference between the wage and the cost of reproducing labour power, he regarded as interest, the migrant being paid just enable to survive for the period of wage labour. As long as the migrant is insecure and maintains tie with the rural home the duration of migration and continued, super exploitation has no limits and no bounds either.

The most striking and entirely a new feature has emerged in the recent migration studies of various countries. Within class differentiation, the extent of migration has occurred enormously among the middle peasants. The reasons on the phenomenon are wide and which vary from country to country. It may be explained by the tendency of this group to experience most a sense of decremental deprivation. Instead of sink into rural semi-proletariat, they feel free to migrate to avoid such deprivation. On the contrary, the small peasants aspire to improve upon their living conditions but ill afford to migrate on several grounds like ignorance, debt-boundage etc.

Within rural differentiation, the rural emigration accelerated the growth of industrial capital, and acted
simultaneously as a change agent in rural areas. It helped in insurmountable way decaying the feudal practice of customary obligations, age-old injustice and exploitation. As Kautsky remarked Migrant... while they constitute backward elements in the towns, often acting as strike breakers, or impending unionism, they are tremendous agents of progress in their own villages.... it is often these elements who become agitators and instigators of class discontent and class hatred in their home villages." In short, migration helped in the decay of and set-free the peasants from the traditional ties of feudal bondage to improve economically and to learn modern social customs and habits.

Further, exodus emigration reduced population pressure on land and in turn, helped in increase of wage due to paucity of labour force. Another important resultant of migration is that it helps in mechanisation of agriculture followed with division of labour which will excessively relay upon wage labour for operation.

On the other hand, many studies have noted that rural migrants have been disproportionately concentrated in the urban low paid and low status jobs. They have been depicted as "Lumpen proletariat" or 'Marginal Mass' and lack motivation of formal integration into urban society and very feebly exhibit revolutionary element as emerging working class. They hang over with the job either temporary or semi-permanent for years together and rationalise the paltry urban wage with the rural unemployment and wage while maintaining strong ties with
The main reason behind the issue is that in a developed capitalist economy, the small peasants would unhesitantly sell their small economic plot and migrate to cities which would absorb them into industrial and commercial complex. But in India, selling land amounts to selling employment itself and hence the small holder is forced to retain ownership even though it is uneconomical[^138] and visits consistently to work in harvest campaigns. Thus migrants form an important segment of labour reserve and their role in holding down urban wage display theoretically strong[^139].

III

The passages of Indian socio-economic formations reveals no more different to the facts already discussed above[^140]. That means Indian society has definitely passed through the successive phases primitive communism, tribal and feudal mode of production before it entered into the phase of capitalism. Even then, there is no unanimous agreement neither among the historians nor even among the political economists determining the extreme line of periodisation of each successive phases of development. For example, the evolution of Indian feudalism and its decay[^141]. Despite of the contradictory views, it is definite that India had a feudal practice of lords and serfs persisted for several centuries. With the advent of British and its tactical 'divide and rule policy' subjugated as many as weak feudal pockets and preserved and protected the interest of those who challenged the empire supremacy.
constantly. In turn, these lords enjoyed full sovereignty of their independent kingdom with an annual fixed revenue. Thus it is clear that British had a double mission in India to annihilate the old Asiatic Society and to lay the material foundation of Western Society. By the mid of 19th century, India was linked with the international capital market through the developed network of modern transport and communication. Evidently, this marked a phase of transition from purely feudal mode to semi-feudal mode of production or alternatively the penetration of nascent capitalism. The transition acted as catalyst for further growth of capitalism in India. During this period precisely two new classes emerged the bourgeois and the proletariat both in towns and countryside. Unfortunately, we do not have quantitative informations in primitive and purely feudal socio-economic formations. However, we have some extensive quantitative informations on pre and post colonial periods and afterwards which have been elaborately covered immediate to this chapter. This will help us in articulating the problem for in-depth analytical understanding.

During the last couple of years the developments in Indian agriculture seems to have created intellectual platform for rigorous debate on Modes of Production to determine and characterise the on-going production relation more precisely and accurately. For the first time Daniel Thorner, a famous Indologist set the tone on the emergence of capitalism
in the 'green revolution' pockets of the country. He identified the farming based upon excessive use of hired labour, increased commodity production and reinvestment of a substantial portion of agricultural surplus for augmenting agricultural production. But, Rudra strongly refuted the thesis of Thorner, by his diachronic research based quantitative material on big farmers on Punjab. To him, capitalist farming has not appeared in the agricultural scenario of India. The statement of Rudra provoked several others who cross examined the phenomena at various pockets and agreed entirely with the thesis of Thorner. Within this contradictory views, others maintained the domination of semi-feudal relations of production whilst, the politbureau of two communist parties of India i.e., C.P.I. and C.P.M. contained altogether different stand. Alavi and Banaji propagates a total different theoretical approach. According to them Indian agriculture can only be understood through Colonial Mode of production which has a tremendous impact on shaping the agrarian structure. In India, the situation is much more complex as both pre-capitalist and capitalist socio-economic formations co-exist along with their numerous contradictions. Hence it is no easy job to arrive at a generalised paradigm of the structure of migration, ironically or because of historical reasons. However, we have very little research on migration particularly from this perspective. The present exercise is an humble attempt in the direction. The closely following chapter will cover the political economy of the
district, relevant methodology and empirical evidences gathered from the field to support the arguments highlighted above. Needless to repeat the limitation in which the study revolves round.
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