CHAPTER V

THE COMPARISON OF THE TWO VILLAGES

Having analysed the power distribution and its relationship with the social structure of the two villages i.e. Pamnavali, the Rajput village and Ghatayan (South), the Jat village; a broad comparison between the villages, can be worked out to bring out the similarities and the differences in the power distribution pattern, bases of power, action-set and factions in the two villages with reference to their social structure.

Social structure can be compared in respect of caste. Both villages can be called multi-caste with one exception that castewise in one village the Jat enjoy the majority and in another the Rajput. The village Ghatayan (South) consists of seventeen castes or caste like groups ' (Caste-like group' has been used for Muslim minority community) while Pamnavali has eleven such groups; though the majority i.e. 38.83% belongs to only one caste namely Jat in Ghatayan (South) and in Pamnavali about 43% Rajput caste. That means that the Rajputs constitute a little less than half of the total population of the village.

In village Ghatayan (South), Chamars form the second largest group in numerical strength i.e. 23.77% of the total
population. No other caste or group is comparable to these two with regard to voter strength.

In village Pamnavali, out of the eleven castes or caste like groups, Rajput caste is followed by Saini caste which constitutes 20% of the total voter population i.e. is the second largest group in the village. Chamar caste is at the third place, but Rajput caste is far above other castes in numerical strength.

To sum up, the caste composition of the two villages, both Pamnavali and Ghatayan (South) come close to each other when we count the number of castes or caste like groups but differ in one respect that in Pamnavali Rajput caste enjoys the numerical superiority followed by Saini caste while in Ghatayan (South) it is the Jat caste which is the largest group followed by the Chamar caste which substantially outnumber all the other castes.

Land-owing:

The land owning pattern reveals that the maximum percentage of the land in both villages is concentrated in the numerically superior castes namely the Rajput caste in Pamnavali and the Jat caste in Ghatayan (South).

In Ghatayan (South) the total cultivated land approximates
5392 Kuchcha bighas, out of which 4398 bighas is under the cultivation of Jat caste, meaning thereby that 81.56% of the total village land is with Jats.

The total cultivated land in village Pamnavali is about 4500 Kuchcha bighas out of which 3795 bighas is owned by the Rajput caste alone i.e. 84.33% of the total land is with them. Distribution of land in other castes is not noteworthy in both the villages. However, it is interesting to note that out of the total land about 800 bighas of land is possessed by a single family in Pamnavali whereas this pattern does not exist in Ghatayan (S).

Age:

Age composition of voters in the two villages show quite a dissimilar pattern. In Ghatayan (S) the categories 21-30 and 31-40 consist of almost equal number of voters respectively 34.17% and 27.64%. But in Pamnavali the maximum number of voters i.e. 44.42% belong to 21-30 age group and about 21% to 31-40 age group. It means that comparatively younger voters are in majority in Pamnavali if we take 30 years as the upper limit of young. But if 40 years is taken as the upper limit of young age the strength goes upto about 65% in Pamnavali and there remains almost no difference from Ghatayan (South) for about 61% voters fall in this category there.
Secondly, out of the total population of voters, the persons falling in age bracket 60 to 90 in village Pamnavali is 55 i.e. 5.6% whereas in Ghatayan (S) out of the total number, voters within this bracket is 248 i.e. 20.14%.

Thus by any measure the old aged or mature population is more in village Ghatayan (S) than in village Pamnavali.

Education:

In terms of education Ghatayan (S) and Pamnavali both villages show more or less the same pattern. The numerically dominant castes are ahead of all other castes in education as well.

But the percentage of educated voters differs in the two castes. In Ghatayan (S) 50% Jats are educated and only Brahmins supersede them in education, their literacy rate being 53.92%. In Pamnavali only 23.72% Rajput voters are educated and even Brahmins trail behind the Rajputs, their literacy rate being only 20%. With regard to other castes the case is similar in both villages. Only nominal education is found among them.

Reason of more education in Ghatayan (S) can be traced to the presence of a middle school there as early as 1920
and a primary school even before 1920. While the reason of low literacy in Pamnavali in comparison to Ghatayan (S) may be the fact that even a primary school here was established after independence. Thus education came earlier in Ghatayan (S) than Pamnavali for Ghatayan (North and South) and had the first middle school in the whole area.

Sex:

In both the villages a considerable percentage of voters belong to female sex. In Ghatayan (S) their percentage is 43.95% and in Pamnavali it is 45.87%. Male population is 56.05% and 54.13% respectively.

Panchayat Elections:

In both the villages only one caste had been the power position holder, in the case of Ghatayan (S) it is the Jat caste that won in all the contests and in Pamnavali, it is the Rajput caste. Except this similarity in the concentration of power in a single caste the two villages differ widely in the pattern of elections of village Panchayat. In Ghatayan (S) all the elections were contested except the 1st and 2nd while in Pamnavali only 1982 election was contested. This has been summarised in the Table-5.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elections</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>No.of contestants</th>
<th>Caste-wise contestants</th>
<th>Winners castes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghatayan(S)</td>
<td>Pamnavali</td>
<td>Ghatayan</td>
<td>Pamnavali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Unanimous</td>
<td>Unanimous</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Contested</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Contested</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both the villages Ghatayan (South) and Pamnavali in the 1st and 2nd elections i.e. in 1949 and 1955, there were unanimously elected Pradhans of village Panchayat. In 1961, Ghatayan (S) saw the first contest in village Panchayat Elections but Pamnavali had unanimity. In 1972, again there was a contest for the position of Pradhan in Ghatayan (S) but there was no contest in Pamnavali. In 1982, however, the Panchayat Pradhan position was contested in both Ghatayan (S) and Pamnavali.

Figure 5.1 shows the number of contestants in both the villages.
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Age of the Contestants and Winners:

In 1949, the unanimously elected Pradhans of village Panchayat in Ghatayan (S) and Pamnavali were about 35 and 40 years of age respectively. In 1955, Ghatayan (S) and Pamnavali again had unanimously elected Pradhans and their age were 45 years in both the villages. In 1961 Ghatayan (S) saw a contest among three candidates. Their ages were 42, 45 and 40 respectively. The first aged 42 years was the winner, whereas in Pamnavali the unanimously elected Pradhan was about 35 years of age. In 1972, there was a contest in Ghatayan (S) among three candidates whose age were 45, 44 and 48 years and the first person of 45 years won the election. In Pamnavali unanimity continued and the sitting Pradhan was again unanimously chosen. In 1982, both villages saw contests. There were seven contestants in village Ghatayan (S), Main aga was 81 years old. In village Ghatayan (S), their age were was 54, 50, 60, 40, 34, 31 and 36 years respectively. The winner was 54 years old. In village Pamnavali the two candidates were respectively 55 and 40 years of age. The winner was of 55 years.

Education of the Contestants and Winners:

In 1949, in village Ghatayan (S), the Pradhan elect was educated upto middle class. In 1955 he was only literate.
In 1961, out of the three contestants, the first was an Intermediate and he was the winner. The second was High School and the third literate.

In 1972 the first candidate the winner was illiterate, the second was M.Com. and the third also an illiterate.

In 1982, out of the seven candidates one was M.Com. who was the winner and the sitting Pradhan now, four were educated up to Primary level, one was literate and another a High School.

In village Panavali, the unanimously elected Pradhan of village Panchayat in 1949 and 1955 was educated up to Middle level and after him in 1961 and 1972 the village Panchayat Pradhan had been a high school. In 1982, there was a contest between the candidates, the first was the same i.e. High School educated and the second was educated up to primary level. The first won.

**Occupation of the Contestants and Winners:**

In 1949 and 1955, the Pradhans in village Ghatayan (S) were agriculturists. In 1961 all the contestants were again agriculturists. In 1972, one of the three contestants was a Lecturer in an Intermediate College besides being an agriculturist and the other two were agriculturists.
In 1982, again the same lecturer was the only candidate who had an occupation other than agriculture.

In village Pamnavali all the Pradhans in 1949, 1955, 1961, 1972 and 1982 were agriculturists occupationally. The only contestant in 1982 election who lost was also an agriculturist.

Sex of the Contestants and Winners:

In all the elections whether unanimous or contested, males were the only contestants and position holders.

Bases of Power:

(1) Land Ownership:

In both the villages land ownership is clearly the most important base of power because in Pamnavali Rajput caste owns 84.33% of the total village land and in Ghatayan (S), Jat caste shares 81.56% of the total. These land owning castes hold power positions in both the villages.

All those who have either contested or won the power positions belong to families which have been owners and cultivators of land ranging from 20 bighas to 250 bighas in Village Ghatayan (S). This is true in case of Chamar, Brahmin, or Jat contestants alike.
In Pamnavali, the families of the two contestants in 1982 elections have been the owner and cultivators of the land up to the size of about 800 bighas in the case of the first candidate, the winner and 250 bighas in the case of the second candidate, the loser. In all the previous elections, persons from the same dominant family having about 800 bighas of land have been the power position holders.

(ii) Caste:

Numerical strength of caste was one of the significant basis of power in both the village communities. In village Ghatayan (8), it were only the Jats who had been in power in all the Panchayat elections held so far. It can be explained by the major share of Jats (38.83%) in the village population.

It is true in case of Pamnavali also. The Rajput caste had been in power in all the elections and it was also true that Rajputs in this village had a lion's share i.e. 43% in the total population of this village.

(iii) Kinship:

Kinship is another significant basis of power. Kinship is..."a structured system of relationships in which individuals are bound, one to another by complex inter-
locking and ramifying ties". (Murdock, 1949: 92).

In village Ghatayan (South) all the contestants and winners of Panchayat Pradhan position had at least 10 to 30 kinsmen in the village as voters.

In village Pamnavali, the hitherto powerful families which held the position of panchayat Pradhan from 1949 to 1982, had 40 kinsmen as voters in the village which was about 5% of the total voter population.

(iv) Family:

Family size is considered an important basis of power. From the data it becomes obvious that in village Pamnavali, the family which had been contesting and winning in all the elections is the largest one, when compared to the other families of Rajput caste as well as of other castes. The family has approximately one hundred members.

The person who contested against the family in 1982 also had sufficiently large family consisting of about 30 members.

In Ghatayan (South) each of the power seeker and the power position holder belonged to a large family. In 1949 the Pradhan had 12 members in the family. In 1955,
the Pradhan had six sons and the total members were 15 in his family. In 1961, the three contestants had 12, 10 and 6 members in their families and the first won. In 1972, the winner candidate had 10 members in his family and the other Jat had 8 members while the Chamar had 6 members in his family. In 1982, the winner had 8 members. The five losers of Jat caste had 6 to 8 members in their families, and the Chamar had 5 members in his family. Thus family size is an important factor for seeking and winning power in villages.

(v) **Outside Links:**

Linkages with outside world and the positions held at the block, district or state level also form an important basis of power.

In village Pamnavali, the most powerful family which has enjoyed all the power-positions in the village is well placed in its links with outside world through marriage, politics and positions. One or the other member of this family had been director of Cane Cooperative Society till 1965. One of the six brothers had been member of Zila Parishad, member of Khatauli Municipal Board, member of District Cane Council, Sarpanch of Nyay Panchayat, Chairman of District Cooperative Bank and Director of Cane Cooperative Society and Uttar Pradesh
Cane Federation. Similarly other two brothers have occupied positions one of them still occupies positions in institutions, outside the village even at the state level. Thus the family has its power in village as well as outside.

As regards their political links, two of them have fought Assembly elections at different times. The family members have primary membership of Congress (I).

The family's marital links are also with wealthy, prominent families of Rajputs in atleast three districts of U.P. and Haryana and Delhi. The brother-in-law of one of the brothers was a Police Inspector while another's brother-in-law was Block Pramukh. The father-in-law of one of the daughters was a M.L.A. and another daughter's father-in-law is a sitting M.L.A. The father-in-law of one of the sons is an Ex M.L.A. and a Principal of Intermediate College.

Links with outside world are not so distinct in Ghatayan (S) as in Purnavali. No person occupies any important position outside the village. The maternal cousin of the Pradhan in 1961 lived at the district headquarters and was related to Congress party. The sitting Pradhan is a Lecturer himself. Pt. Vidhya Bhushan
had been a delegate in the Cane Co-operative Society.

Thus, in this respect village Pamnavali is far ahead in comparison to village Ghatayan (S). There is no such family of any position holder present or past which can be said to be so rich in its links whether economic, political or marital as the particular family of Rajputs in village Pamnavali, the members of which had always been the power position holders and are still among the most powerful ones.

**Action-Set:**

While comparing the two villages in the type of action-sets formed during the Panchayat elections it was found that village Ghatayan (S) had seen three contested elections out of the five panchayat elections and the action-set of the contesting candidates were invariably based on self-interest or community interest especially in the case of minority community and scheduled castes and caste and family in general. Village Pamnavali has seen only one contest in 1982 panchayat elections and the action-sets of the two contesting candidates were based on kinship, economic linkages and interests, no ideologies were involved.
(a) **Bases of Linkages Between the Ego and the Supporters:**

The word ego has been taken from Mayer's study (1966). In village Pamnavali the linkages between the first candidate in 1982 and his supporters were mostly traditional loyalties, family relationship, kinship, past obligations and above all the awe of the power exercised by the family in the past. Since it has been an established family and the Pradhan being its member, it was sufficient for getting respect of his supporters. The candidate had prestige of both wealth and birth.

Economy formed the most important base of the new contestant's action-set. The emerging leader's image of a kind-hearted, helping man helped to form his links with the voters. Most of these links had been economic linkages (employer-employee and borrower-money lender type), for the new leader gave easy loans to the villagers. He was the owner of a brick-kiln in the village and obliged people by distributing bricks on easy credit. Whosoever wanted money, he lend and even postponed payments of loan if someone showed his inability to pay at the fixed time and donated freely in the marriages of poor person's daughters. Moreover, factional alliances also formed the basis of his action-set.
Actually the ways of the old and the new leader differed a lot. The old did not mix up with the commons while the new was more hospitable. The old had nothing to do with the lot of the poor, while the new readily lent them money in cash or articles on credit basis as lending of bricks on easy loan. He knew how to win the hearts of the people. The task was moreover easy for him as the opposite family was reported to be hard task masters. Thus economy and pragmatic skills remains the basis of linkages between the second candidate and his supporters. Everything was on give and take basis.

Thus in case of the old leader, the first contestant and the winner, status, prestige and family relationships for while/second - the new emerging leader, economy has played an important role.

In Ghatayan (S) transactional ties, family and self-interest form the basis of the action sets of various contestants. Most of the contestants were from one caste hence caste loyalties had nothing to do with the support of a particular candidate. However, caste and community interests played an important role in making one join the action-set of a particular candidate. Promises for future help in the form of allotment of plots or sanctioning of loans were also important bases of linkages between the ego and the alter. Support depended mostly on immediate
self-interests or factional alliances and kinship. In 1982, it was found that a particular candidate's action-set had ideological elements. He declared in his manifesto that the poor will be given justice, no body will exploit them and so on i.e. some socialistic ideas were involved in his manifesto.

Thus the two villages reveal that transactional basis of action-set and prestige of wealth as well as birth in a reputed family, play an important part in forming the various links between the ego and the alter.

(b) Capabilities of the Intermediaries between the Contestant and the Voter:

Two type of functions were de-legated to the intermediaries between the contestant and the voter namely brokerage and patronage. In village Chhatayan (S) both the functions were reported to be performed by the candidates themselves. Sometimes the intermediaries only worked to take promises from a particular candidate for the interest of their caste or community and thus may be called brokers between the candidate and the voters. The candidates mobilized the voters through making promises most of which were related to economy. Candidates in 1982 were seen to have evolved strategies of different kinds in order to win. For example getting dummy candidates file their nominations and controlling the voters through
promises. The factional leaders of different castes work as intermediaries and their support is based on transactional or give and take theory. Credibility of such intermediaries had always been doubtful in the village. It was reported that in 1972 the whole minority community changed sides over night when their leader who performed a function of brokerage for them got a promise from another candidate and left the previously assured candidate in the lurch. The moment the other candidate assured them that he would allow them to build mosque in the village, they changed their loyalties. Hence it is the capabilities of the candidate himself which are more meaningful for getting success in the village. However, the distribution of liquor among the lower caste voters is done through intermediaries. Most of the candidates were not directly involved though they paid for it.

A comparison between the action-sets in these two villages reveals that in a village i.e. in village Chatayan (8) where economic disparities were less distinct kinship, friendship and affiliations to particular factions were the basis of linkages between the ego and the members of his action-set, whereas in case of Pannavalli, where the economic disparities were apparent, loyalties towards the old, established, wealthy family, past obligations,
money transactions - borrower - money lender relationships had been prominent bases of linkages. It is worth mentioning here that the new faction which had a very short history in Pamnavali and was being led by a young person had purely economic base. Economic transactions have proved to be the most significant basis of linkages. These transactions were reflected in the new faction leader's activities such as advancing loan to followers on easy instalment basis and on no or nominal interest rate and soft recovery basis and selling bricks on easy credit. Since the family which has already been described in details as the old power-holders in the village had shown oppressive behaviour on several occasions towards its own caste and the landless castes, this became the basis of withdrawal of support by many in the village and particularly those who had improved their economic status. The young man on the other hand who was the emerging power seeker had been a sympathetic listener to all. This had paid him well in securing the support of the masses.

In village Pamnavali, in the first ever contest in 1982, the intermediaries performed the brokerage function in the case of the first candidate. The intermediaries became a via media for transmitting promises to the voters, for distributing liquor, money and sweets to the voters
and for getting firm assurance of voters in return. In the case of the second candidate the intermediaries performed both the brokerage and the patronage functions. As there were many Rajputs who had become antagonistic towards this particular family, they tried to get support for the rival candidate. They did not require any promises to give on behalf of the candidate - a general discontentment with the prevailing situation was enough for their purpose. Their mere word of opposition for the family was enough for many voters to think of them as their patrons. Moreover, there were some, through whom the candidate provided free liquor and sweets to the voters. Thus intermediaries were important in the village.

People were mobilized in both the villages through making promises like solution of the immediate problems of the voters or helping the voters to get loans and entertaining people with food, sweets and above all with liquor. This mode of mobilization was common in both villages and has been done to all castes and communities alike. The intermediaries played the role of brokers in this respect.

**Power-pool:**

Besides these panchayat potions an effort was made to identify power-pool through reputational and decision-
making techniques in both the villages. In Chatayan (S) there were twenty five powerful persons identified. Out of twenty five twelve are Jats, five Brahmins, one a Badahi, four Chamars, one Bhangi, one a Dhiwar and one is a Muslim. Persons from seven castes and Muslim community including upper castes, lower and lowest caste have been identified as powerful persons. Economically all but two are landholders; their land ranging from 4 to 250 bighas. In respect of age, the range is between 30 to 78 years, which indicates that age is not crucial for power in this village. Among the powerful persons 6 are illiterate, 4 literate and 15 are educated from primary to post graduate level.

In village Pannavali a set of nineteen persons forms the power-pool. Among them nine are Rajputs, one a Brahmin, one a Bania, three Sainis, four Chamars and one a Muslim (Luhar). All the powerful persons except the Muslim (Luhar) are landowners. Three Rajputs belong to the family which owns more than 800 bighas of land. The other six Rajputs own and cultivate land ranging from 50 to 250 bighas. The Brahmin owns 80 bighas, the Bania 50 bighas, the four Chamars powerful persons own between 2.5 to 20 bighas, while the three Sainis' land range between 6 to 20 bighas.
From the point of view of education two of the Rajput powerful persons are educated upto primary level, one is a graduate, one a post graduate and L.L.B., one a high school and the other are illiterate. The Brahmin is educated upto middle while the Bania is illiterate. Two Sainis and four Chamars are illiterate and one Saini is educated upto primary level. The only Muslim is illiterate. Education, thus is not a crucial factor for power.

A comparison of power pool in the two villages reveals that while in Ghatayan (8) skills in settling disputes, character, initiative in collective activity are contributory to power, the case is not similar in village Pamnawalii. Here the family background i.e. size of the family, landownership of the family and resourcefulness of the family are the major factors contributory to power in the village.

Factions:

In village Pamnawalii, factions became overt in 1982 panchayat elections. They were two and within the Rajput caste.

Issues for the Emergence of Factions:

Economic development and politicization account for
the emergence of factions. Economic development is reflected in the rise of income of the person in particular who contested the Panchayat Pradhan position in 1982. He became a brick-kiln owner and ran a coal depot in Khatauli town for sometime. The acceptance of new technology i.e. tractor, modern irrigation facilities like tubewell pumping set and thrashing machine etc. added to his income after the consolidation of land in the village. He became richer and richer by dint of his hard labour. His brothers got higher education. Thus the whole family rose in wealth and education. The family also bought some more land and with the help of high yielding varieties of seeds increased their production. Besides this family some seven or eight other families improved economically and they combined to form a group.

Politicization is another cause of faction formation in the village. The village had already seen four panchayat elections and a number of general assembly and parliamentary elections. The fruits of power enjoyed by a particular family were not hidden from the eyes of the villagers. The new emerging leader also became desirous of benefits accruing from power. This in turn led to the formation of a group or faction against the powerful family and the covert dissatisfaction with the ways of the past became overt in the form of an rival faction.
In village Ghatayan (S) equal economic status of several families within the Jat caste and rivalry seems to be the most important cause of factions in the village. The quantity and quality of land has been an important issue of dispute in an agricultural caste like Jats. In this village there are at least ten families which own land ranging from 100 to 200 bighas but the quality of their land is not the same and here lies the cause of dissatisfaction with the present state. Atleast three Khandans can be named which are divided into three factions due to the difference in the quantity and quality of their land. The Bawale Khandan has the highest quantity of land 250 bighas and the quality of their land is also the best. The Kaliwale Khandan owns a landholding of 180 bighas which is at the second place and the Kuawale Khandan owns 140 bighas of land, the quality of land belonging to these two is not so good as that of Bawale Khandan. Hence the Kuawale Khandan had been envious to Bawale Khandan as well as the Kaliwale for being big land owners. The leaders of the three factions belong to these three Khandans. The enemity continues still and is seen clearly in the panchayat elections. Thus, land is the major issue on which factions had been formed in this village.
The formation of two factions in the Brahmin caste was also based on economy. The Brahmin faction of Jhallimar Khandan is envied by the other Pahlwan faction because of the more land ownership of this Khandan. Economic status, thus remains the main issue for emergence of Brahmin factions.

Similarly land has divided the Chamar caste into two factions - which are named after the site of their residence. Bharawale and Matawale.

It is interesting to note that the Brahmin, Jat and Chamar factions which own more land mostly support each other in the time of elections or some crisis and the factions, the members of which own less land support a similar faction in the other caste. Thus the basis of multi-caste alliance is also land or economic status.

More and more politicization of the villagers has also led to the faction formations in the village. The factional leaders use different tactics for making their faction more and more powerful in order to capture the power position in the village.

Leaders of the Faction:

In Ghatayan (South), out of three Jat factions, one is
led by the sitting Pradhan, second by the Kuawale family head and the third by a Jat candidate of Kaliwale Khandan who contested the 1982 election and later on tried to conduct a signature campaign against the sitting Pradhan and filed a petition against his election.

The two Brahmin factions are led by Pt. Brij Bhushan and Pt. Mool Chand Sharma.

The two Chamar factions Matawale and Bharawale are led respectively by Master Phool Singh (Headmaster, Primary school, Chhatayan (North)) and Mamraj Singh.

In Pamnavali, the two factions belong to Rajput leaders. One of the two is led by the particular powerful family head and the other by the candidate who contested for the panchayat Pradhan position in 1982. The socio-economic characteristic of these leaders have been mentioned earlier.

Functions and Dysfunction of the Factions:

It is observed that factions work as a check over the Panchayat Pradhan in both villages.

In Pamnavali, where factions are a comparatively new phenomenon, factions have led the Panchayat Pradhan to
surrender before the village all his hitherto autonomous powers. It is reported that the new Pradhan of village Pamnavali usually says "Do whatever you like" and also consults village people in all matters concerned with the Panchayat. Thus faction building by another Rajput has served the purpose of an opposition party in the village.

In village Ghatayan (South) the function of factions is not only to check the activities of the Pradhan but to pull him down somehow or other. They say that factional leaders keep in their mind, "If the other factional leader suffers a loss that is gain for them". Pulling each other's legs seems to be a favourite pursuit of the factional leaders of village Ghatayan (South). Filing a petition against the Pradhan elect and conducting a signature campaign against the Pradhan are their past time. Power balancing function is performed somewhat distortingly in the village. However, these kinds of activities can be considered functional for the factions themselves but they prove dysfunctional for the village as a whole and lack of collective activities is seen in the village.

In case of village Pamnavali, no dysfunctions have been reported. This may be explained in terms of more unity among
elites in Pamnavali and less unity in Ghatayan (S).

Significant differences in the factions of two villages are (1) Factions were hostile during Panchayat election whereas the hostility continued in Ghatayan (S) and was given up in village Pamnavali.

(2) Factions in Ghatayan (S) are old whereas factions in Pamnavali are new. Although it may be noted here that covertly factions existed in both the villages.

(3) IN Ghatayan (S) three Jat factions, two Chamar factions and two Brahmin factions are there whereas in Pamnavali there are only two Rajput factions.

(4) The leadership of factions within the Rajput and others is clearly distinct in Pamnavali and it is less distinct in Ghatayan (S).

(5) The factions in Ghatayan (S) have been detrimental to the developmental activities in the village whereas in Pamnavali it has not been so.

The variations in respect of factions in the two villages can be accounted for to structural characteristics of the two villages. They may be mentioned as -
(1) In village Pamnavali the economic disparities are extreme whereas in Ghatayan(S) no such extreme disparities exist. This is particularly, in case of distribution of land.

(2) Demographically the younger generation in Ghatayan(S) is less and old aged people are relatively more than the village Pamnavali.

To sum up, the political system of a village can be understood by taking into account the environment within and around it. Village Ghatayan(S) which is a Jat village is surrounded by many villages of the same caste. Within the economically preponderant Jat caste, sharp economic inequalities do not exist, whereas Pamnavali which is a Rajput village is surrounded by non-Rajput villages. The numerically preponderant Rajput caste is characterised by sharp economic inequalities. As a consequence, there has been more contest for power in the former village and less contest in the latter. The Rajputs consider themselves insecure and therefore, tend to be united whereas in case of Ghatayan(S) the Jats do not feel much challenge from outside, thus they can afford to remain disunited. The Rajputs are strategical in their approach to power whereas Jats believe in trial and physical strength.