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A) Concepts:

An attempt has been made in this chapter to conceptualise certain aspects of rural society in order to facilitate the ongoing discussion on farmers' unrest. This discussion is restricted to only four concepts which are germane to our thesis. The first concept is 'Peasant'. This term is variously used. We also need to define three other concepts viz., farmer 'Peasant Movement' and 'Peasant organisation'.

Many studies on peasantry have been made by various historians, sociologists, economists, anthropologists and other social scientists in different places and periods. These social scientists have used a wide variety of definitions and concepts while studying peasant societies. Some scholars have used the term "Peasant" to characterize entire societies while others have dealt with the peasantry as a part society within a larger whole.

According to the Oxford Dictionary, a 'Peasant' is defined as one who lives in the country and works on the land either as a small farmer or as a labourer. In the Encyclopedia Britannica, 'Peasant' has been defined as a countryman, either working for others or owning or renting and cultivating by his own labour, a small plot of ground.
The chambers' Twentieth Century Dictionary describes a peasant as "a countryman: a rustic: one whose occupation is rural labour, and peasantry as 'the body of peasants or tillers of the soil, rustics, labourers'.

The following definitions are also, more or less, in the same tone

Webster's Third New International Dictionary describes the peasant as being of a class 'that tills the soil as small, free land owners or hired labourers'.

An additional meaning is given to the peasant as being a rather uneducated, uncouth person in the low income 'group'.

Andre Beteille in his book Six Essays in Comparative Sociology (1976, p.43) says that the superficial understanding of the term peasant has several closely related characteristics. Firstly, the peasant is attached to the land. He is not only dependent on the land but by his labour makes the land fruitful source of income. He further says that the peasant might be having different legal relations with the land. In the sense he might be an owner, a tenant or in the limiting case, a labourer without any right of ownership or occupancy; but in all cases he earns his livelihood by labour. Within this frame work one might give a broader or narrower connotation to the term peasant. Some would limit it to owner-cultivators while others would include tenants and landless labourers. Again some would restrict it to tillers of the
of the land while others would include in addition all those who live by 
the various forms of labour which are associated with a community of 
tillers.

Secondly, in most of the societies peasants are understood as 
having low position. Even those who accept and admire the peasant 
qualities of hard work, thrift and simplicity agree that their actual 
position in society is not high.

The third connotation of the peasant stems from the language of 
political debate. The peasants are considered as the counterparts of 
workers. The words 'Peasant and Worker' are viewed in the same sense 
in all Asian countries. This brings out the oppression and exploitation 
suffered by the peasants at the hands of various classes. It assumes a 
clear line of demarcation between the exploited peasantry and their 
exploiters.

In the light of above definitions we can define 'Peasant' as an 
agricultural labourer who tills and cultivates the land in the rural side 
either as the owner of the land or by just working for a landlord. In 
a way he is a farmer working on the agricultural farm and living on it 
or within the proximity. Sometimes agricultural serfs cluster around 
great manors and marginal farmers in small village and live in 
 juxtaposition to towns. The Encyclopedia of the social sciences discusses 
the peasants in this sense. (Von Dietze 1934: 48-53)
Daniel Thorner, (1968:503) has used the term peasant in a very broad way. He has used this term to characterize entire rural society, irrespective of categories like landlords, tenants or agricultural labourers. He has used the term 'Peasant' to refer, primarily, to settled agriculturists employing low-level technology.

Like Daniel Thorner, S.M.Pandey has also used the term peasant in a broad way. He writes, that the concept of "Peasants" is generally defined as one who is an "owner cultivator", i.e., who owns the land, shares in the actual work on his land, and is, therefore, close to it. (S.M.Pande, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.7, No.1, 1971 60-61).

But he opines that this is a narrow definition. In developing agricultural economies like India many people occupy simultaneously the statuses of a "Cultivator", "tenant", "Sharecropper", and "agricultural labourer". Therefore, we need to adopt the broader definition of the term.

However, the authors like Teodor Shanin (1976:240) have used the term 'Peasant' in a very limited sense. According to him "The peasantry consists of small agricultural producers, who with the help of simple equipment and the labour of their families produce mainly for their own consumption and for the fulfilment of obligations to holders of political and economic power". He clarifies the implication of this definition in the following words:
"Such a definition implies a specific relation to land, the peasant family farm and the peasant village community as the basic units of social interaction, a specific occupational structure and particular influence of past history and specific patterns of development". (Op.cit.).

The Regional Experts Workshop organised jointly by EFS, FAO and ILO at Bangkok in 1974 has also defined the term peasant in a very restricted sense. It has defined a peasant as "a tenant, share cropper, small farmer not regularly employing hired labour and landless laboures".

Kathleen Gough (1974:1391) defines peasants as "People who engage in agriculture or related production with primitive means and who surrender part of their produce to landlords or to agents of state".

This definition reveals the underdog position of peasantry. It clearly brings out subordinate relation of peasantry to the intermediary landlords. In India the intermediary landlords comprise the class of rajas, talukdars and zamindars, who form a distinct category separate from the category of peasant.

A.N. Seth in his book 'Peasant organisations in India' (1984:XXXV) defines a peasant in the following way:

"In India's conditions, a peasant may be defined as a person who lives in a rural area, works predominantly in agriculture, wholly or in
part, on others lands for his livelihood, such as agricultural labourer, share-cropper and tenant and marginal/small owner farmer. Peasants would also include most rural artisans who generally work part-time in agriculture. A peasant so defined would mean 'a rural worker', as defined in ILO's convention and recommendation adopted in 1975".

Thus some scholars have used the term 'peasant' in a very broad sense i.e., to describe the whole rural society but some others have given the term a more restricted meaning.

Karl Marx views peasantry as a class and says that the small holding peasants form a vast mass, the members of which live in similar conditions but without entering into manifold relations with one another. Their mode of production isolates them from one another instead of bringing them into mutual intercourse. Their field of production, the small-holding admits of no division of labour in its cultivation, no application of science and, therefore, no diversity of development, no variety of talent, no wealth of social relationships. Each individual peasant family is almost self-sufficient. It produces the major part of its consumption items. Therefore, it procures means of life more through exchange with nature than in intercourse with society. Some peasant families with small holdings make up a village. A few such villages together make up a region. Millions of families live under economic conditions of existence. These separate them in their mode of living, interests and culture from other classes. This puts them in positive opposition to others and finally they form a class.
Thus according to Karl Marx, the peasants form an economic class and not a political or social class. Marx opines that, there is merely a local interconnection among the small holding peasants. The identity of their interest will not give birth to community, national bond and political organisation. Therefore they do not form a class. (C.F. Shanin (ed), 1971:230).

Engels, a close associate of Karl Marx had a more balanced view of the peasantry. He has identified primarily three classes in peasant community. They are, the 'Peasant proprietors', 'tenant-farmers' and 'farm-labourers'. According to him, the peasant-proprietors, though live in villages, are opposed to revolution. The Second class consisting of tenant-farmers and small farmers do not bring revolution. In Engels' opinion, only the landless agricultural labourers with the ally of urban-industrial proletariat can bring a revolution. Thus, to Engels, the 'farm-labourers' rather than 'tenant-farmers' or 'Peasant-proprietors' were the most natural ally of the urban-industrial proletariat. (F. Engels, 1969:14-16).

In the opinion of Engels, peasants cannot bring revolution on their own. He has given three reasons for this. Firstly, peasants are divided among themselves in terms of peasant proprietors, small farmers, tenant-farmers, landless agricultural labourers etc. Secondly, is the lack of organisation among peasants. Thirdly, they are politically important. Thus Engels viewed the peasantry as internally split,
unorganised and politically important unless mobilised by the organised working class. (Ibid., p.16).

Engels corroborates Mark's views by saying "In the total class structure of society the peasants are at the lowest strata". (Engels, 1974:188-190).

Lenin, a leader of Russian Revolution has a different opinion. Unlike Marks and Engels, Lenin organised both peasants and labourers and fought for their cause. According to Lenin, peasants are as revolutionary as urban-industrial proletariat. However, Lenin agrees with both Marx's and Engels in considering the peasants as the lowest strata in the class structure. According to him, this lowest strata is the major part of the peasantry. He maintains that there are "Rich, middle and poor peasants and their different life styles" (Lenin, 1936:178).

This opinion of Lenin is further carried by Stalin. He looks at peasantry not only classwise but also nation wise. He writes, "The peasantry in the Soviet Union must not be confused with the peasantry in the West". (Stalin, 1953: 137-138). He makes this distinction in view of the peasantry's participation in three revolutions. Shanin who has commented on the Russian Marxist's understanding of the peasantry opines, the "Peasantry was a class to Stalin, 'a petit bourgeois mass' to Kritsman and 'not a class but a nation' to Plekhanov" (Shanin, 1976:251).
Mao Tse Tung identified the revolutionary potential of peasants both theoretically and practically. The peasantry which played a decisive role in the Chinese revolution of 1949 under the leadership of Mao Tse Tung dispelled Marx's doubt about the revolutionary potentiality of peasants. Mao, who studied all historical Chinese peasant movements, realised that given the ideology and strong leadership Chinese peasants are capable of launching a strong movement. Therefore, he only took the responsibility of providing ideology and leadership.

Mao Tse Tung in his report on Human March noted that in China during 1927, the poor peasants comprised 70%, middle peasants 20% and rich peasants only 10%. Referring to the peasant uprising in China the report further says: "The peasant torrent is coming so fast in China that every comrade has only three choices: to march at their head and lead them or to stand in their way and oppose them. Every Chinese is free to choose, but events will force you to make the choice quickly". (Cf. Murhari Naik:p.4).

Franz Fannon, who studied all these opinions and arguments and also peasant revolutions occurred in Mexico, Algeria, Cuba and Vietnam observes that "In the colonial countries peasants alone are revolutionary, for they have nothing to lose and everything to gain. The starving peasant, outside the class system, is the first among the exploited to discover that only violence pays. For him there is no compromise, no possible coming to terms; colonization and decolonization
are simply a question of relative strength". (Cf. D.N. Dhanagare, 1983: 3).

According to Barrington Moore (1967:459) it is the power structure which determines the parameters of radical change and modernization. He does not deny the revolutionary potential of the peasants but opines that the manifestations of this revolutionary potential depends largely on the structure of power alignments and class alliances in a given society at a particular time.

With reference to the Indian peasantry, Barrington Moore has explained the lack of revolutionary potential partly in terms of the traditionally docile and passive character of the Indian peasantry and partly with reference to the structural peculiarities of the village social organisation; caste sanctions and religious ethical precepts that dominate peasant life in India. According to Moore, these social factors have more or less remained unchanged over the past centuries. Therefore, these factors have prevented peasant discontent from developing into the extreme forms of class conflicts. However, this has been disputed by many scholars.

Thus number of social scientists belonging to different faculties of knowledge offer a variety of definitions of the term 'peasant' and 'Peasant societies'. Faller maintains that "Peasant societies are those societies whose primarily constituent units are semi-autonomous local communities in the semi-autonomous culture". (Cf. M. Naik, 1989:4).
Raymond Firth has used the term peasant for "a socio-economic category". He has applied this term only to non-cultivators. He states that, "Peasantry is a system of small scale producers with non-industrial technology relying primarily on what they produce for their subsistence". In this way he has included in this category small scale producers other than cultivators who share the "same kind of simple economic organisation". However, in a later statement about "Peasant" economics, Firth extends the term to "Other (non-agricultural) 'Countrymen' also, who share the social life and values of the cultivators...", because "they are part of the Social System" (Cf. Joan P. Mencher; 1983:10).

Krober defines the peasant in a cultural perspective. According to him peasants are those who "Constitute" part societies with a part culture, definitely rural yet live in relation to a market town, they form a class segment of large population which usually contains urban centres, sometimes in metropolitan capitals, those who lack the isolation, political autonomy, and self-sufficiency of a tribal population, yet their local units maintain much of their identity, integration and attachment to the soil". (Krober, 1953:284).

Redfield's views on the peasantry are more or less same as that of Krober's. He opines, "A peasant is a person who is in effective control of a piece of land to which he has long been attached by ties of traditions and sentiments. The land and he are parts of one thing, one old established body of relationship". (Redfield, 1971: 5-6)
Foster introduced the concept of peasant with a "structural" definition. The structural relationship that was his primary criterion for defining peasant society was that between the village and the city. Foster agrees with Redfield about the existence of "Part society" and maintains that these part societies exist midway between the tribal and the industrial urban society. He further says that peasants are communities which "have grown up in a symbiotic spatial-temporal relationship with the more complex components of their greater society i.e., the pre-industrial market and administrative city" (Foster, 1973:323).

A careful study of above views reveals that different scholars have defined peasants from different angles. They have looked at peasants in their own perspective. Some have viewed peasant as a person, like Redfield, some others as a class like Karl Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Fannon etc., a few others as a community like Fallers and Foster. Baily views it as a culture and Thorner as an economy.

For the purpose of our analysis in this work, we accept the broader definition of peasants like that of Daniel Thorner. We use the term peasant to describe the entire rural society irrespective of categories like landlords, rich peasants, tenants, agricultural labourers etc.

We have also used here the term 'Agrarian' in the place of the term 'Peasant', since the term 'agrarian' represents a larger category of humanity. The convenience with this usage is that it engulfs all those strata of society that are somehow or the other concerned with agriculture.

Here we need to clarify the implications of the concepts "Peasant" and "Farmer". From the quotations of authorities cited above, it is indicated that, the terms "Peasant" and "Farmer" have been used more
or less interchangeably. Both 'peasant' and 'farmer' possess some similar characteristics. Therefore, it is impossible to say that certain attributes of a peasant do not belong to a farmer or vice versa. Normally, the life of both peasant and farmer revolves round the land. That is, the essence of their occupation has depended on the element of land and his tilling the land. Their legal relation to the land also varies. In the sense, land may be owned or may not be owned. Similarly, he may stay on the land or may not stay on the land. Their economic position also differs. Among the peasants or farmers there are very rich and also very poor. In the Indian context, and in the context of Karnataka in particular, the words "Peasant" and "farmer" can be used more or less in the same sense. In India, peasants and farmers may own land or may not own land. Moreover, by and large, the peasants or farmers stay outside the land, in the villages nearby. (M.Naik, 1989: 9).

As far as the economic position is concerned, those who are poor are, generally, the landless labourers or very poor, small holding farmers or tenant cultivators. They are backward in the social and scientific sense. On the contrary, there are also farmers who own abundant land. They carry on a large-scale cultivation by making use of modern machines and techniques, improved seeds, insecticides and pesticides and better marketing methods. The word "farmer" is used, usually, to describe such a category. The word 'Peasant' is not generally used to describe this group.
Eric Wolf observes that both the farmer and the peasant are different categories in the sense that both have different approaches towards production and returns. A farmer, usually, exploits alternative factors of productions, he is always in search of maximum returns and subjected to minimum risks. On the other extreme, except for the rich and middle peasantry, the other categories distance themselves from the market competitions and are constantly struggling in their subsistence level. Hence, a peasantry operate and lives in a restricted market. In general, a change from the peasantry to farmers is not only a change in the psychological orientation but also found in institutional relation, etc. (Eric Wolf, 1966: XVIII-XIX).

In our work the terms "Peasant" and "farmer" are used in the related sense. While the two terms are not identical, they have been used in a cognate sense. The Government agencies, legislatures, political leaders, and the agitators have been using both these words in an interchangeable sense. Therefore, we have no option but to follow the words used by all these parties.

We can now consider the other concept; that is, 'Peasant Movement'. D.N.Dhanagare defines the term peasant movement in the following words:

"The term 'Peasant Movement' and 'agrarian movement' as blanket terms refer to all kinds of collective attempts of different strata of the peasantry either to change the system which, they felt, was
exploitative, or to seek redress of particular grievances without necessarily aiming at overthrowing the system. The two terms used interchangeably thus refer to all kinds of resistance movements, violent or non-violent, organised or spasmodic, pre-political or political". (D.N.Dhanagare, 1983:19).

Another definition of a peasant movement has been given by Singh who brought out not only the characteristics but also offers an explanation as to why a movement comes into existence. According to Singh a peasant movement is "a relatively organised and continuous collective action involving violence, or the threat of violence, for securing more share in the control or ownership of land and its produce and to abolish injustices which have arisen thereof, and which involves kisan (Peasants) and Khetidar mazdoors (agricultural labourers)" (Rajendra Singh in M.S.A.Rao, 1979:96).

In a broad sense, the term peasant movement has been defined as any collective reaction of the peasants to their low status. (A.Landsberger (ed), 1969:8). The apparent aim of such movements is to bring about a change in the existing institutions to mitigate or minimise the problems associated with low economic and political statuses which are commonly found to be present simultaneously.

Of these definitions, the first definition given by Dr.D.N.Dhanagare is accepted here.
The last concept is peasant organisation. We have used here the term 'Peasant' to describe entire rural society. Therefore we refer the term peasant organisation to "any organisation formed by any section or all sections of the peasantry as a peasant organisation".

Here the term 'Peasant insurrection, 'Peasant movement', and 'Agrarian movement' are used as blanket terms. These terms are used inter-changeably and, as noted earlier, refer to all kinds of resistance movements, violent and non-violent, organised or spasmodic, non-political or political uprisings. Similarly the words, 'agitations', 'uprising', 'unrest', 'rebellion', 'revolution', 'insurrection', 'revolt', etc have been used synonymously.

B. **Theory: Social Movements and Organisation:**

In recent years social scientists belonging to diverse intellectual pursuits have turned their attention towards the study of social movements in general and peasant movements in particular. Sociologists are no exception to this. Most of the studies on social movements are recent, published after the mid-sixties.

As the study of social movements is comparatively a new field of study, it is beset with some problems of conceptualisation. Social scientists look at the social movements in their own perspective and according to the objectives of their own studies. They have defined social movements in many ways. Only a few Social Scientists in India
made a systematic attempt to define the concept of social movement in the Indian context.

M.S.A. Rao defines social movement as an organised attempt on the part of a section of society to bring about either partial or total change in society through collective mobilization based on an ideology (1979:2).

In this definition he has brought out three characteristics of social movements. They are: collective mobilisation, ideology and orientation to change.

Pushpendra Surana has given a very broad definition of social movement. He writes: a social movement is a collective action of human beings to change or stabilise or resist the social or the cultural order based on shared common values of its participants, either borrowed or developed by themselves. All such actions are characterised by a goal, an ideology, communication, leadership, strategy and a wide range participation. The movements may occur through already established organisations or may develop their own organisation during their life cycle. Thus the movements refer to the will of the people to look at themselves in a desired perspective (at a given time and place) in a continuous process (Emerging Sociology, Vol.1, 1979:37).

Here P. Surana has pooled together many definitions and formulated his own definition. This definition brings out most of the characteristics of social movement.
Daniel Hebding and Leonard Glick define social movement as "a collectivity acting with some continuity to promote or resist a change in the society or group of which it is a part". (1976:380). They opine that social movement is a collective activity having continuity. This activity is carried out either to promote or resist change in the society. They further argue that social movements which are organised to resist change within the society do not require much attention. But social movements organised to bring about societal change need much attention. This they attribute to the fact that social movements desire some significant degree of change in the basic institutional structures of society. According to them social movements pass through four basic stages. The first is the stage of social unrest. This stage is characterised by growing dis-satisfaction among many people with respect to social or cultural developments. At this level, people become dissatisfied, restless and alienated due to social inequalities, frustrations, and insecurities.

The second stage is the "excitement stage". At this stage those people who are dissatisfied with social or cultural developments develop an awareness or consciousness of commonness. They then develop an attitude or feeling that something should directly be done to eliminate these adverse conditions.

The third stage is the "formalised organisation" state. Here the members of the movement are formalised. The direction and goals of the movement are set, ideologies are formulated, and a formal organisational structure is developed.
The final stage of social movement is "Institutionalisation." At this stage, the society accepts the goals of the movement. The social movement becomes part of society. The social movement becomes successful when the programme and the goals of the movement become institutionalised.

In a similar manner, Baldridge (1975:298) comments thus: "A social movement is a form of collective behaviour in which a dedicated group of people organise to promote or to resist change". He further says that a movement will have definite goals, organisational structure and a clear change oriented ideology. A movement consciously and purposefully promotes the policies it desires, usually through political or educational activities.

John Wilson (1973:8) has also given more or less similar definition but with one difference. He states that a social movement is "a conscious, collective, organised attempt to bring about or resist large-scale change in the social order by non-institutionalised means".

John Wilson argues that social movements usually use uninstitutionalised means to achieve their objectives. Social movements are much more inclined to use unconventional methods to make themselves heard and to bring pressure upon those who have the power to effect change. It might resort to unorthodox and also illegal tactics on several grounds. The movement may discard traditional methods of advocacy and representation as part of its total rejection of the status quo. It may have tried to use the old methods without success or,
anticipating failure, decide not to even try to use them. In this way social movements have more uninstitutionalised aspects than other organised collectivities.

Bertram (1958:349) is of the opinion that when inequalities, insecurities or frustrations reach the climax of withstanding capacity of an exploited group, a social movement ensues. He says "when inequalities, insecurities or frustrations increase beyond the withstanding capacity of a people they make a collective attempt to change the unsatisfactory conditions. Then a social movement is in the making."

Tylor, more or less refers to the social movements in a same tone. He writes "a movement is a collective behaviour by means of which some large segment of a society attempts to accomplish adjustment of conditions in its economy or culture which it thinks are in maladjustment" (Tylor, 1953:1). Dressler and Wills (1973:415) largely adhere to the opinion of Tylor. They state that, "a social movement is a deliberate attempt made by a large number of people to bring about a change through group efforts."

In this way these and many other scholars have given definitions of social movements in their own perspective and way. But no definition is without difficulties. The social scientists are still not well equipped with a precise definition of the term 'Social movement'. Some scholars have laid much stress on the determinant variables of
movements while some others have given importance to characteristics of movements.

In this background, Paul Wilkinson (1971:27) has given the working concept of 'Social movement': It runs thus:

1. A social movement is a deliberate collective endeavour to promote change in any direction and by any means, not excluding violence, inequality, revolution or withdrawal into 'Utopian' community. Social movements are thus clearly different from historical movements, tendencies or trends. It is important to note, however, that such tendencies and trends, and the influence of the unconscious or irrational factors in human behaviour, may be of crucial importance in illuminating the problems of interpreting and explaining a social movement.

2. A social movement must evince a minimal degree of organisation, though this may range from a loose, informal or partial level of organisation to the highly institutionalised and bureaucratised movement and the corporate group. Indeed, it will be shown that much of the literature of social movements has been concerned with natural histories, models or theories of movement development. Such models have attempted to simulate changes in movement structure and organisation ranging from
states of initial social unrest and excitement and the emergence of a charismatic leadership, to a revolutionary movement's seizure of power.

3. A social movement's commitment to change and the raison d'être of its organisation are founded upon the conscious volition, normative commitment to the movement's aims or beliefs and active participation on the part of the followers or members. This particular characterisation of social movement in terms of volition and normative commitment is endorsed by something approaching a consensus among leading scholars in this field. Heberle, for example, conceives of these belief-systems as an expression of the collective will of the people among whom they are accepted. He is emphatic that it is the element of volition that makes the beliefs socially effective. It is the conscious volition of individuals acting collectively that brings about the embodiment of ideologies in social movements.

However, this definition, too, is not without difficulties. This working concept does not provide a precise definition. It is too broad as it includes both collective action through legal means within the boundaries of the institutions and also violent extra-institutional collective action. It also poses another difficulty by making 'minimum degree of organisation' a basic necessity for a social movement. It becomes very difficult to define precisely what a 'minimum degree' is.
Whether the social movement begins with setting up an organisation with committed members, or does the organisation evolve in the course of time as the movement develops. Such a definition might lead to exclusion of protests and agitations which may not have an organisation to begin with. But despite all these difficulties, Wilkinson's working concept has a heuristic value (Ghanshyam Shah, 1990:17).

With this understanding let us consider some important characteristics of social movements to obtain a greater insight into movements.

Social movements basically involve collective action. However, collective action can be called a movement only when it is somewhat sustained. This collective action should also be characterised by some degree of organisation. The extent and sophistication of the organisation may vary but there should be some division of labour and some recognised hierarchy of rights and responsibilities evolved by the participants. (John Wilson, 1973:8). It means the organisation might range from a loose informal or partial level to the highly institutionalised and bureaucratised movement and the corporate group but there should be some form of organisation (Paul Wilkinson, Op.cit.,p.16). As observed by M.S.A.Rao (1972:2), a social movement essentially involves sustained collective mobilisation through either formal or informal organisation.

Social movements are generally organised to bring about a change, either partial or total, in the existing system of relationship,
values and norms. However, sometimes there are also social movements organised to resist change. These are the counter attempts which are defensive and restorative rather than innovative and initiating change (M.S.A.Rao, *Op.cit.*, p.2). However, social movements oriented towards resisting change do not require much attention, because of the fact that social movements desire some significant degree of change in the basic institutional structures of society (Daniel Hebding and Leonard Glick, 1976: 380). Hence social movements are conscious, purposive attempts to bring about change (John Wilson, *Op.cit.*, p.11).

Ideology is also considered as an important component of a social movement. It helps to distinguish social movement from other general category of movements, involving collective mobilisation and orientation towards change. A workers' strike, for instance, involves collective mobilisation and is oriented towards change. But if it lacks an ideology it becomes an individual and isolated event and not a movement. However, if a strike is organised by a workers organisation with a defined ideology, it becomes an event in that workers movement. (M.S.A.Rao, 1979:2). Stockdale has considered ideology as a precondition of a social movement. Ideology is a system of values and beliefs which support and justify proposed actions. (Hebding and Glick, *Op.cit.*, p.382).

Ghanshyam Shah (1990:18) opines that objectives, ideology, programmes, leadership, and organisation are important components of social movements. These components are interdependent and influence each other.
There are many factors which give rise to a movement. Blumer states that social movements "have their inception in a condition of unrest and derive their motive power on one hand from dissatisfaction with the current form of life, and on the other hand, from wishes and hopes for a new scheme or system of living" (A.M. Lee (ed.), 1951:562). Social discontent stems from unrest and dissatisfaction and this very often leads to social movement.

The strain theory put forth by Smelser suggests the structural strain as an important cause of social movement. The widespread dissatisfaction in a society is the result of structural strain within the system itself. Such a structural strain may be derived from various areas of the society. It may arise out of "situational facilities". It may also arise at the level of social norms. That is, the strain might appear when the rules that govern behaviour appear to prevent rather than promote the fulfillment of human needs and individual aspirations. There may even be a strain at the level of values when the most basic ideas and ideals by which people have been accustomed to live no longer seem appropriate to the realities of their lives. This structural strain occurs at different level of norms, values, mobilisation and situational facilities. Smelser analyses the causes of social movement in the structural-functional framework. He treats strain as the impairment of relations among parts of a system leading to the malfunctioning of the system (M.S.A. Rao, 1979:5).

Here, frustration and dissatisfaction increases due to structural blockage. In a society the discontented people make efforts to remove
the sources of their discontentment in order to improve their condition. But their efforts are hindered or impaired by barriers in the social structure. This very often leads to social movement. (Hedding and Glick, 1976: 381).

Relative deprivation is another theory which explains the causes that give rise to a movement. It contends that the most likely groups to launch a social movement are not the most disadvantaged sections of the society, but those who are rather better off, but still not satisfied. This theory argues that people become discontented not because of the absolute conditions of their situation but because they compare their actual condition with what they believe it could and should be. This theory is basically developed by Marx and Aberle. In this theory they have emphasised the element of conflict. Marx opines that the working class could become better off as capitalism advanced, but that the gap between owners and workers would widen and produce among the workers deepening feelings of comparative disadvantage. This sense of relative deprivation i.e., a gap between what people actually have and what they have come to expect and feel to be their just due gives rise to social movement. (J.W. Vander Zanden, 1986: 391-393).

Aberle has defined relative deprivation as a negative discrepancy between legitimate expectations and actuality. He has analysed relative deprivation in the context of material possession, status, behaviour and worth. (M.S.A. Rao, Op. cit., 0.4).
Gurr (1970) has defined relative deprivation as a gap between expectations and perceived capabilities involving three general sets of values: economic conditions, political power and social status. According to him a gap between expectations and perceived capabilities might result from decremental deprivation, progressive deprivation and aspirational deprivation. The decremental deprivation arises when expectations remain stable but capabilities decline. Progressive deprivation is a situation wherein expectations rise but capabilities decline. Aspirational deprivation is the result of rise in expectations but capabilities remain stable.

In conclusion we can say that relative deprivation theory has made an attempt to bring home the fact that the most disadvantaged groups of a society are not usually as discontented as those groups who have made some gains. Such groups expect more improvements. The groups having such expectations provide the most support for social movements. But relative deprivation itself is not sufficient to generate a movement. It just creates a necessary condition for a movement. (M.S.A. Rao, Op. cit., 5). To generate a movement, a belief in the real possibility of better conditions is also must. The development of a generalised conviction something both must be done and can be done that is must to bring about a social movement. (Richard L. Roe, 1970:482).

The revitalisation theory is yet another attempt to explain the forces that give rise to movement. Wallace states that social movements develop out of a deliberate, organised and conscious effort on the part of members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture for
themselves. (M.S.A.Rao, Op.cit., p.5). The period of cultural stability, period of increased individual stress, period of cultural distortion and consequent disillusionment, and period of revitalisation are the four stages at which Wallace has analysed the dynamics of revitalisation movements.

The revitalisation theory maintains that adaptive processes are used to balance the situations. The social movements aim at two things although they develop a positive programme of action. They express dissatisfaction, dissent and protest against existing conditions but at the same time, they offer solutions to the problems.

Another favourable condition to the genesis of social movement is the failure of an established Government to maintain order and to solve persistent social problems. Due to this people lose confidence in the established Government and they became susceptible to the appeal of movements that promise to bring back normalcy or improve conditions.

Thus different scholars have given different causes leading to social movement. The unrest, caused by different factors, equipped with belief in the real possibility of better conditions, leadership and some form of organisation leads to social movement.

Most of the scholars who have done study on social movement have considered organisation as an important component of a movement. Peasant movements are not exception to this. Some form of organisation,
Whether formal or informal, is necessary if not indispensable for the success of any movement. This does not mean that there should be an organisation in the beginning of a movement itself. It might develop in the course of the movement also. However, the movements having organisation at hand have a better chances of success and effective. By saying so, it is not claimed that organisation is everything in a movement. Yet in a movement, organisation plays a very important role which cannot be neglected.

Coming to peasant movement, organisation is very much necessary for the mobilisation of the peasants participation and motivating them towards action. However, the success of a farmers movement also depends upon how far the farmers are successful in organising themselves. Sometimes an organisation may emerge on the initial enthusiasm of the farmers but somewhere along the way it may lack a proper ideology or a proper commitment on the part of the leaders and this reflects on the farmer's movement. The movement then falters and cannot claim to satisfy the aspirations of the farmers nor can it articulate the demands of the farmers effectively. Therefore, unshattered commitment and strong ideology are a must for any organisation to be effective.

If farmers are to obtain any real benefit it is necessary that they form an organisation. Logically, therefore, just as the industrial labour has obtained benefits through collective bargaining, the farmers, too, can make use of this instrument. Farmers in India are only recently beginning to realise this possibility.
A farmers organisation is essential to motivate the dormant feelings of the farmers. (K.C. Alexander, 1981:13). An organisation is able to provide the insecure peasant with confidence and opportunity to participate with confidence as well as provide the resources to take risks. A farmers organisation can also act as a pressure group from below to induce the government to implement agrarian reform. An Ex-Minister of West Bengal, once remarked "no land reform measure can be implemented, if it is left to officials only, if co-operation of organised peasants' movement is not taken..." (Theodor Bergmann, 1984:187). A certain degree of politicisation of the poor peasantry on militant lines is a pre-requisite for any successful legislative administrative action for conferring rights and privileges on them..." (T. Bergmann, Ibid., 186).

Further, such organisations can also help in breaking up the hold of feudal landlords over the peasants in the villages who are tied not only to economic ties, but also to emotional ties of patronage of landlords. (A.N. Seth 1984:XXXVII). Of crucial importance to a farmers' movement is the association of farmers because it provides a network of social relationship and channels of communications which can reach out to the rural people (J. Allen, 1957:295).

Peasant organisations can also play significant role in planning and implementation of rural development programmes. Because rural development does not start with goods but it starts with the education, organisation and discipline of the people. Therefore, Owen and Shaw
argue that "first step in development is to organise mass of the people..." (Niranjan Pant and R K.Verma, 1983:19). Gerrit Huizer has expressed the need to protect and support peasants' leaders. He maintains that Government officials should perform such function. The peasants have a ability to organise themselves but what they need is help whenever they have any problem. This kind of strategy will help to resolve conflicts between the poor peasants and the landlords and the rich peasants. Consequently poor peasants will be benefitted as it leads to smooth implementation of development programmes. (Gerrit Huizer, Development policy and administrative review, Vol.III No.1, Jan/June, 1977:14). Some scholars also opine that farmers organisation can promote better management. Mass viewed that so as to succeed in good water management for a long time and to control the amount of land placed under irrigation and to deal with other problems, farmers must develop self-discipline and a high level of communit organisation (N.Pant and R.K.Verma, Op.cit., p.19).

It has been pointed out that many of the farmers organisations have urban/educated leaders. They have proved to be a modernising influence (G.Huizer, 1980:26).

Basically four functions have been listed to highlight the importance of a farmers' organisation in the success of a farmers movement. These are:

a) efforts to recognise the price structure and related problems,
b) act as pressure groups, for political activity,

c) they provide a meeting ground for farmers, visiting leaders, hold discussions etc.,

d) social functions, such as developing an identity for the farmers (J. Allen, 1957:297).

If we compare the organisational situation with the success and failure of the movement, we find that the movements developing their own organisations have been more prone to success as compared to those movements that did not develop an organisational base before their beginning. For instance, the Santhal peasants movement remained without any formal organisation. Comparatively, the movement was one of the least successful ones in terms of realisation of its objectives. On the contrary, the Telengana, Eka and Bijolian, Bardoli movements were more successful as they developed a good number of regional organisations and got support from the political organisations of national importance (P. Surana, Emerging sociology, Vol.1, 1979:40). This helped them in the effective running of those movements. Similar is the case, with peasant movements that have occurred in recent years. They were much effective and successful in terms of achievement of their objectives as they were well organised and led by strong leaders.

Thus, we find some kind of relationship between organisation and movement. In other words, there is an organisational link between
grievances and the capability to act on them. Because, however aggressive, hostile, or angry the people may be, they can not be magically mobilised for an action. Therefore, some kind of organisation on hand is necessary to orchestrate the discontentment and convert it into collective action. Otherwise the "unhappy merely breed passively on the sidelines" (James C. Scott, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 29, No. 3, July 1987:418).

In the same line of thinking Michael Cernea (Misra, R.P. and D. Nguyen Tri (ed), 1986:243) writes about the importance of organisation in these words: "... before collecting any pollen or starting to produce honey, the bees busy themselves with building their honeycomb... in order to produce, start first by building a structure for the productive activities. Without such a structure no productive activity can be carried out." The bees co-operatively work for the construction of hexagonal chambers. After the completion of construction of delicate, strong and indispensable structure, they start producing and accumulating honey. By citing this example Michael Cernea has tried to bring out the role of an organisation and the significance of team-work in an organisation.

This review brings home the point that some sort of organisation is necessary for a movement to be effective and successful. No doubt organisation itself is not everything in a movement but we can not afford to lose sight of its significance in a movement. Peasant organisation can play, as noted above, varied role in the society.
Organisation will not come into existence on its own. It will not originate in a vacuum. It cannot develop from without. Certain factors thus play an important role in the origin and development of an organisation.

Where individual action is not considered meaningful, people come together in a movement to form themselves in groups or organisations to fulfill their aspirations. But to form an organisation, a feeling of commonness among the people is essential. Again, however, a mere feeling of commonness is not consciousness, as the feeling may remain dormant in individual hearts for years together without a motivating force for action. Therefore it often needs leadership to mobilise consciousness into action.

Often too much emphasis has been laid on the peasants' backwardness, apathy, passivity and resistance to change as factors coming in the way of peasant movement. But this has been falsified in recent years by Karnataka farmers particularly with the emergence of Karnataka Rajya raitha Sangha. It has been noticed in recent years that there has been a surprising amount of consciousness developed in the countryside due to the efforts made by the Rajya Raitha Sangha. A number of villages have identified themselves with the Sangha by putting up green boards and small flags warning Government Officials not to enter the village without prior permission of the villagers. It is said that, a subdued, often castigated farmer of a largely non-irrigated state has now awoken. A green turban or a green towel - worn on the
shoulder is the most visible symbol of this movement in the state. The movement led by Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha has demonstrated largely all the characteristics of a social movement. It had an organisation, leadership, ideology, aims and objectives etc., which are considered as important components of social movement.

C) Scope and Objectives:

In recent years, the social movements of varied kinds are on the increase. They have spread throughout the length and breadth of the country. The peasant movements are on the forefront of these social movements. Now for more than a decade, India has been witnessing a powerful peasant movement. These recent peasant movements are termed as 'new peasant movement'. They have completely ruled out the traditional understanding of peasantry as docile, simple, passive, backward, apathy and so on. They have not only put an open challenge to this position but marked the beginning of a new epoch in the history of peasant movements. The numbers that came into the open in these movements were unprecedented. Events that took place were not known to happen. All this was possible due to the emergence of peasant organisations in many states of the country. The peasant movements of recent years were dominated by these non-political peasant organisations. Of course, some of them have entered politics very recently.

The state of Karnataka, which was otherwise free from visible agrarian unrest, is not exception to this. Earlier agrarian conflicts...
were few and far between which gave the state a picture of political stability. But for the last one decade or so this picture has been changing. Karnataka has witnessed unprecedented peasant movements principally led by Karnataka Rajya Raitha Santha in recent years. The origins of the Sangha and the circumstances leading to its emergence have already been dealt with earlier.

Such a situation has elicited considerable interest in the minds of researchers in recent years. The problem of agrarian unrest is complex involving many questions. In the Indian context the problem assumes considerable importance as agriculture continues to be the basic occupation of majority of people. In India the rural population is about 76.6 per cent and the people engaged in cultivation and allied occupations constitute over 70 per cent. But the rural society in general and agriculture in particular appears to be in a state of crisis. Many of the problems of the rural society have remained unsolved. Our plans and policies of rural development have not only failed to a great extent to yield the desired results but also have adversely affected the poor peasantry in particular. As a result, rural India in general is simmering with discontent, unrest and dissatisfaction. Hence, in order to understand the complex problem of agrarian unrest a systematic study of the various problems faced by peasants, their causes, the consequences and the role of peasant organisation in redressal of their grievances etc., becomes very essential. The Question of peasants is always haunting the minds of social researchers and scholars.
Studies on agrarian unrest in India are of recent origin. Most of the studies have been published after the mid-seventies. Most of the literature is concerned with the explanation of peasant movements belonging to different periods, causes, consequences etc. But there are very few studies on peasant organisations which play a significant role in transforming discontent or unrest into action.

Hence, the present study, which is an attempt to understand the influence of caste, religion, income etc. on the emergence of Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha, its organisational structure, its success in the mobilisation of peasantry, its role in peasant movements etc., assumes importance.

The study is restricted to the unrest which is evident in agrarian sphere in Karnataka state in general and Dharwad taluk in particular. This deals with the study of the plans and policies of KRRS and reasons for its popularity in Dharwad taluk. The successes and failures of KRRS in peasant mobilisation also constitutes the part of the study.

The present work is confined to the study of 360 peasants belonging to 12 villages of Dharwad taluk. The field of investigation was restricted to the Dharwad taluk, because of the limited resources and time available to an individual researcher.

Objectives of the Study:

The present study takes into account the various problems faced by the peasants leading to unrest. It makes an attempt to probe how...
this unrest was culminated into action by KRRS. It tries to probe into the questions like what made the KRRS so popular in Dharwad taluk? How far did it succeeded in mobilising the peasantry? What are its plans and policies? What is its success in identity formation? and so on.

The following are some of the major aims of the present study.

1. To study the agrarian unrest with special reference to Dharwad taluk,
2. To study the organisational structure of KRRS,
3. To assess the plans and policies of the KRRS,
4. To examine the role of KRRS in transforming unrest into a movement,
5. To assess the role of KRRS in identity formation,
6. To examine its failure and success in redressal of the grievances of the peasants,
7. To examine the influence of different factor like caste, religion, income, landholding etc.

D) Hypothesis:

The following hypothesis are framed in order to test them in the light of the findings of the present study:

1. Peasant movement led by KRRS is not a movement of only of rich farmers but it is a united front of land owning peasants i.e. Marginal, small, medium and big,
2. Agrarian unrest was prevalent but there was lack of organisation and leadership. This vacuum was filled by KRRS.

3. The aims and objectives and demands (like loan waiver) of the KRRS appealed the most to the peasant.

4. It has succeeded to a great extent in identity formation.

5. It has failed to mobilise the peasants belonging to lower castes and landless agricultural labourers.

E) Data Collection:

As mentioned earlier the present study is an attempt to explain the causes of agrarian unrest, the role of KRRS in transforming this unrest of peasants into movement, the reasons for popularity of KRRS, its successes and failures in peasant mobilisation, identity formation, etc., and also the implications of caste, income, religion, land holding on peasant movement and KRRS. The requisite data is obtained through the interview method with the help of a structured interview schedule. The interview method is considered as the basic field technique through which the peasants were approached and the responses received from them were recorded in the field itself. Observation method was also used to know the responses of peasants towards KRRS.
The Researcher had to face a few difficulties during the field work. Most of the villages selected were far off without proper transport facility. The peasants were available only in the morning from 8.00 a.m. to 10.30 a.m. and in the evening after 7.00 p.m. since that was harvesting and sowing season. Therefore, the respondent had no other way than to remain in the villages till late night and sleep in the temples. But the villagers were kind enough to provide food.

Since the Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha has recently turned into a political party, the peasants would look upon the researcher with suspicion. Some of them even thought that researcher was an agent of some political party. Also, some of them appeared to have lost faith in such research works. They felt that many come and collect data on various matters but life in villages has not changed nor improved. They stated that their grievances, problems and life of toil has remained unchanged inspite of all such studies.

However, the researcher could overcome such difficulties soon with a little explanation and confidence. Afterwards a good rapport was established with the respondents in particular, and the villagers in general.

The Interview:

In the sociological investigations the interview is accepted as a reliable field technique for the collection of data. The present
investigation is based on the primary data, consisting of the responses received from the respondents to the schedule, collected through the personal interview method. The interviews were conducted at the respondents' residence. The normal duration of an interview was about 30-35 minutes. Questions were asked by the researcher in the regional language (Kannada) and the relevant responses were recorded by him in the schedule. The researcher followed the free conversation in the regional language in order to elicit answers to the questions. Information regarding the various aspects of peasants' life, their perspective towards rural problems, government etc., was also collected through discussion and observation. Most of the respondents were cooperative and spent their valuable time to answer the questions and in the discussions. The researcher used to listen patiently to every kind of experience which the peasants narrated while the interview was conducted. A good rapport was first established with the respondents so that they could feel that the researcher was there not only to ask questions but also to share some of their personal experiences. By and large, this procedure was effective and useful.

Pilot Study:

A pilot study was conducted in a non-sample area before the main interview schedule was finalised. This was done in order to ensure the suitability of the questions, and to locate the ambiguity and redundancy of questions included in the schedule. This pilot study included the interview of 60 peasants belonging to different castes, religions, class and landholding. This was conducted in Mummigatti village which is
30 kms away from Dharwad city. The pilot study helped the researcher to make necessary corrections.

It proved very useful not only to point the irrelevant questions but also to include a few more questions that could help in collecting the necessary data. Thus the final interview schedule was drawn up after making necessary corrections.

**Interview Schedule:**

A tentatively prepared schedule was finalised after making necessary corrections with the help of a pilot study. This final schedule was largely pre-coded. And partially open ended. This schedule was used as the principal instrument for the collection of data. With the help of this interview schedule each of the respondents was interviewed in their respective houses. The schedule was broadly divided under the following sections.

1. **General Information or Background Characteristics of the peasants:**

   In this section information was obtained about the socio-economic background of the respondents. Information was collected about their age, caste, religion, level of education, type and size of the family, number of people involved in agriculture, family income, type of house, livestock, resource position and so on.
2. **Particulars About Land Holding:**

Under this head, relevant information was obtained as regards the total land owned both irrigated and unirrigated, nature of land ownership, income from land, etc. On the basis of this attempt was made to classify the respondents in one of the categories of the class hierarchy on the basis of holdings. Information regarding cropping pattern, whether cash crops or food crops were generally raised pertinent questions were also asked about land reforms and information was collected. From landless labourers information was collected about the wage, type of treatment by the land owners etc.

3. **Peasants Discontent or Dissatisfaction:**

Under this head, relevant questions were asked of the respondents as to access the amount of discontent or dissatisfaction, causes, consequences and also their perspective of rural problems and outlook towards Government etc.

4. **Peasant and Peasant Organisation:**

In this section, pertinent questions were included to know about the membership of KRRS, reasons for becoming or not becoming member, their participation and nature of participation in peasant movements, women, member participation, their orientation and attitude towards the KRRS, their opinion about the entry of KRRS into politics
and the like. Questions were also asked to know the achievements of KRRS in solving the problems of the peasants.

5. **General Consciousness:**

Under this head questions were included to assess the success of KRRS in creating consciousness among the peasants. Relevant questions were asked to ascertain the extent of awareness among the peasants about their leaders, green towel, greenboard, and demands of KRRS etc.

Questions were also asked to ascertain information from the respondents about their suggestion for solving the problems of rural society in general and of peasants in particular.

A separate interview schedule was prepared and administered to the officials of the peasant organisations at the village level. Here information was collected regarding the socio-economic profile of the leaders, the problems they faced while building up organisations at village level, activities taken up by them to solve the problems of the villagers, structure and financial position of organisations and so on.

F) **Sampling:**

1. **Selection of the Area:**

As noted earlier the main thrust of this study is to understand the evident agrarian unrest with special reference to Dharwad taluk, the
role of KRRS in triggering off this discontent into movement, reasons for its popularity in this taluk, its success in creating consciousness among the peasants, and plans and policies, attitude of peasants towards KRRS. It has been noticed in recent times that there has been a surprising amount of consciousness in the countryside in Karnataka in general and the Dharwad taluk in particular. This has been attributed to the efforts of KRRS.

The sample study area chosen by the researcher is the Dharwad Taluk. This region also happens to coincide with the boundaries of a political constituency which elects its representative to the State Legislative Assembly for a period of five years.

In Dharwad taluk except a few all the other villages have identified themselves with the Sangha by putting up green boards and small green flags (Green being the colour of the Sangha) warning officials not to enter the village without prior permission of the villagers. The Green towels and turbans have become commonly noticeable and most popular in villages. This sight has become common even in Dharwad city as the peasants come to the city with green towel/turban for varied purposes. This increased consciousness of peasants and popularity of KRRS became clearly visible when the peasants of Dharwad taluk elected KRRS candidates for legislative assembly twice. In the last Assembly Elections Shri. Babagouda Patil, a well known peasant leader, contested from Kittur constituency of Beigau district and the Dharwad rural constituency. He was elected from both
these constituencies with a considerable lead. Later he vacated the Dharwad (Rural) constituency in favour of KRRS secretary Prof. Nanjundaswamy. Prof. Nanjundaswamy was also elected from this constituency who had lost his seat elsewhere. While Shri Babagouda Patil got elected with a total vote of 35,497, Prof. Nanjundaswamy was elected with a total vote of 34,376. Earlier this Dharwad rural Assembly constituency was a popular strong hold of the Congress (I). The Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha's consistent win twice, not only indicates the acceptance of policies and programmes of KRRS but also failure of the earlier government to solve the problems of the peasants.

The entire Dharwad taluk constitutes the Dharwad Rural Assembly constituency. Hence we have selected the Dharwad taluk for our field work, which also happens to be a constituency.

Since this is an area study enough care was taken to represent fairly the entire Dharwad taluk. In the selection of areas, for purposes of geographical stratification, the Dharwad taluk was sub-divided into four zones by drawing a vertical and horizontal line intersecting approximately at the centre of the Dharwad taluk. On the basis of simple random method four clusters consisting of three villages each were selected from each one of these zones. The names of villages falling in each cluster are as below:
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Table showing the villages coming under each cluster and zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Name of village</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>1. Mugali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bogur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Dubbanmardi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>1. Uppin Betgeri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pudukalkatti</td>
<td>North - East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Karadigudd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1. Mandihal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mugad</td>
<td>South - West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Kyarkoppa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>1. Somapur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Maradagi</td>
<td>South - East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Shivalll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sampling Procedure:

The present study is confined to the study of 360 peasants belonging to above 12 villages of Dharwad taluk. In each village 30 samples belonging to different classes, castes, religion etc. were taken for the purpose of study. These samples were drawn on the basis of simple random technique. The sample or respondents were classified
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into five categories. Since ownership of land is the most appropriate method of classification, the respondents were classified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Land holding (acres)</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Above - 15</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 - 9.39</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Below - 5</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No land</td>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates that the number of respondents has gone on increasing as the land holding decreases. This was done as the number of households in the villages goes on decreasing as the landholding goes on increasing and vice-versa. This is the case not only in the Indian context but also in the area under study. The respondents belonging to each class were selected on random basis. However, with the given objectives of the study adequate care was taken to select a sample in such a way as to ensure adequate representation of various variables like religion, caste, age, education etc.

Thus the total number of respondents selected from each category or class was as below:
The classification of farmers as marginal, small, medium, and big landholders depends upon the number of acres of land owned by the peasants. However, this classification varies upon the purpose for which the classification is made. It also differ from one area to another depending upon the nature of soil, irrigated or rainfed and also the socio-cultural circumstances of an area. The above classification was adopted for the sample area by the Government for various purposes. The same classification was accepted for the study by the researcher.

Variables for Study:

The important variables used in the present study are -

1. Independent variables = caste, age, income, education and landholding,
2. Dependent variables = membership and participation

1. **Caste:**

Depending on the caste, peasants are broadly classified as (i) Hindu high caste, (ii) Hindu intermediate caste, and (iii) Hindu lower caste.

2. **Age:**

Based on the age, the peasants are classified into four groups such as, 0-30 years; 30-39 years; 40-49 years; 50-above years.

3. **Income:**

Depending on the level of income, peasants are classified into 8 groups.

4. **Land Holding:**

Depending on the area, nature of land and government records, the landholding is classified into five categories such as, landless, marginal, small, medium and big.