Agrarian Structure under Neoliberalism A Case Study of Undivided Andhra Pradesh

Veeraiah Konduri

Ph.D. Scholar, Dr. KR Narayanan Center for Dalit and Minority Studies Jamia Milia Islamia University, Delhi & Central Working Committee Member All India Agricultural Workers Union

Abstract

The country is celebrating silver jubilee of neoliberal economic reforms. One third of independent India's life under the influence of economic reforms. Reforms resulted in drastic changes over different sectors of economy. Sum of these changes are at super structure level where as some at base level. Number of studies attempted to capture these changes at sectoral level. Agrarian sector has also undergone several such changes. Research on agrarian changes confined only to unravel the dynamics of inter–sectoral relations. The chnges within the agrarian economy have been barely capture in this research paper I attempted to capture the structural changes within the agrarian sector particularly the moment of classes. The paper is divided into seven parts. First part explains the brief background of this survey. Second part deals with the discourse on *Class* and its definitions. Third part deals with the key debates on peasant differentiation in India. Fourth refers to the main trends of post independent government policies impact on agrarian structure, and on differentiation Fifth part focuses on different studies on agrarian class structure in Andhra Pradesh. Sixth part presents data from the current survey, lastly conclusions and discussion.

I. Introduction

Agrarian structure is defined as the interrelationship between different constituent elements of agrarian economy in relation to the means of production, the most important being land and the actual producers at a given point in time. By now it is commonly agreed that peasantry is not a homologous entity. Recently the country observed the 25th anniversary of economic reforms and wide variety of commentary appeared in media. The reforms process had a different impact on different sectors of economy and sections of people apart from different states and regions. Several scholars made efforts to study neoliberal economic policy's impact on agriculture. State governments like Karnataka and Maharashtra and also erstwhile Andhra Pradesh commissioned studies to asses the conditions of farmers. But agrarian structure under the reforms era is far from the focus of these studies. This is in this context, the Sundarayya Vignana Kendram initiated Socio-Economic Survey of Villages to understand the changes in agrarian structure, agrarian relations during the reforms period. The survey took place between December 2013 and February 2014. The year 2013 has its historical importance. The year 2013 celebrates the centenary of greatest Marxist leader and the Leader of Opposition in First Parliament, who played a key role in evolving Marxist understanding on agrarian question in Indian context, P. Sundarayya. Also it celebrates 50th anniversary of publication of Irfan Habib's magnum opus, *Agrarian System in Mughal India*, which lifted curtains of historical

research towards path breaking new studies. The paper is divided into seven parts. First part explains the brief background of this survey. Second part deals with the discourse on *Class* and its definitions. Third part deals with the key debates on peasant differentiation in India. Fourth refers to the main trends of post independent government policies impact on agrarian structure, and on differentiation Fifth part focuses on different studies on agrarian class structure in Andhra Pradesh. Sixth part presents data from the current survey, lastly conclusions and discussion.

II. Discourse on *Class*

Marxian class theory centers on how the relationship between men are shaped by their relative positions in the process of production mediating differential access to resources and power. Marx formulates key elements of a rigorous definition of class but nowhere does he defines the same. Let me present here two important occasions where he dealt with characteristic features of *Class.* " In the *18th Brumaire, (sec.VII)* Marx explains what constituted *class* " In so far as millions of families live under economic conditions of existence that separate their mode of life, their interests, and their culture from those of the other classes, and put them in hostile position to the latter, they form a class. In so far as there is merely a local interconnections among these small-holding peasants, and the identity of their interests, begets no community, no national bond, and no political organization among them, they don't form a class. Similarly, in *Poverty of Philosophy*, (Cha. 2, Sec 5): " Economic conditions had in the first place transformed the mass of the people into workers. The domination of capital created the common situation and common interests of this class. Thus this mass is already a class in relation to capital, but not yet a class for itself. In the struggle, of which we have only indicated a few phases, this mass unites and forms itself into a class for itself. The interests which it defends become class interests." [i] There are at least two distinguishing features of Marxist definition of Class. 1. Class are defined in relational rather than gradational terms. That means classes are not understood simply above or below the other classes, rather classes are always defined in terms of their social relation to other class. 2. Social relations that defined classes are primarily analysed in terms of social organization of economic relations rather the technical organization of economic relations.[ii] Lenin further refines the definition making vivid and elaborate as shown below.

The following can be considered as the broad characteristic features of a socio political and economic entity, *class.*

1. Class is an analytic concept and must be distinguished from such descriptive terms such as income group, strata, caste, estate. The analytic value of the concept derives from the fact that it forms part of the theory of social structure, social conflict, historical change.
2. Stratification systems, that is ranking of social groups in scale of higher and lower positions are secondary and derived from fundamental fact of class society.
3. Classes are historical categories and exists in concrete, historically constituted social formations. Classes constitute and define concrete structure of a given

society and also acts as driving force to change the very structures of that society, which gave birth to them. Class is therefore a dynamic, not static concept.

4. Classes are relational. A class exists only in relation to other class or classes, thus forming a class system. The relationship between classes is asymmetrical, antagonistic and dialectical. It is this relationship that defines the nature of classes and helps mold the social structure itself. A class society is inherently unstable because, of the contingent nature of relationship between the classes and tensions between them.

5. Since social classes are not defined by secondary criteria such as status, income, they are not conterminous with the strata arising from division of labour. They are defined by fundamental criteria of their relationship to means of production. It was Lenin who presented with a definition of Class. According to him, " Classes are large groups of people which differ from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation, (in most cases fixed and formulation in law) to the means of production, by their role in social organisation of labour, and consequently, by the dimension and mode of acquiring the share of social wealth which they depose. Classes are group of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy. Control over the means of production is strategic because it enables the minority to compel the others to work and extracts surplus produced by them.

6. The antagonistic relations between the classes manifests at all levels of society, above all in economic and political spheres. Consequently they form into definite politico-economic interest groups with the potential of transforming themselves into political groups engaged in struggle.

7. The most important phase of development of class is class struggle which, in turn, is predicated on the development of class consciousness. Strictly speaking, class, in objective sense in which we have described above, does not yet constitute into a sociological group in that it has no sense of its own identity and no consciousness of its own class interests. It is only a class " in itself" and is incapable of any organised or collective action to change its " class situation" and consequently the social structure. It becomes politically significant when it attains a consciousness of itself as a class, and an awareness of its interests, that is, when it becomes a class " for itself". Class consciousness manifests itself when a class is politically mobilised and organised for a struggle.[iii]

Thus we can sum up, classes formation takes shape in a historical context. They are relational to each other. These relations emerges in a historically determined system of social production. Their relation with means of production determines their location in the system of production. They are dynamic. Classes are not defined by secondary criteria such as income. They are fundamentally defined by their relationship with the means of production. The inequality is socio-economic in nature and its cumulative affect reveals itself with possession or dispossession of the means of production.

III. Discourse on Agrarian Structure in India

History of agrarian structure in India is the history of peasant differentiation too. According to Irfan Habib[iv], DD Kosambi, RS Sharma together with Daniel Thorner

brought peasants into the study of Indian history for the first time. Habib argues that it was in Gangetic plains the first ever formation of agrarian structure can be observed. By the middle of 1st millennium, the agriculture penetrated eastwards resulting in emergence of peasant communities among the tribal societies. Thus the *Janapadas,* a monologus community based habitation transformed into *Mahajanapadas,* an heterogeneous social forms. By 500 BC, further development of agriculture universalized the peasant production and simultaneously created the caste division with in the society. The use of iron made a singular contribution to the expansion of cultivation and that is why *Manusmriti* imposes restrictions on accessing metals including iron by lower castes, there by denying the right to clear forest and began cultivation. This further re-imposes the Gordon Child's theorization that the availability of cheap iron democratized agriculture. The cultivation in ancient India developed with the limited access to iron metal but its democratization process was restricted due to the consolidation of caste system.

The extension and efficiency of agriculture led to dual consequences. Firstly, extraction of ground rent which, was the primary income source for the rulers which further reinforced the expansion of the agriculture. Secondly, with the expansion of agriculture necessitated the primitive manufacturing of instruments which took shape of handicrafts. That is why by the time of Mauryan kingdom, with the cultivation of profitable crops, " began to distinguish the **upper- class villagers** from the **ordinary masses**"[v]. Expansion of agriculture further paved way for the disintegration of exogenous tribal society into endogamous caste based society. The formation of peasant castes furthered growth of the social division of labour demarcating the peasants from artisans. Thus the new full time occupations separated a section of population from peasantry. This is the second most important step in the differentiation of peasantry. During 200 AD – 600 and 600-1200AD number of untouchables increased with the addition of new castes into this category.

Habib also credited that period as the period of great division of population into peasantry and landless labour. Immense demand for labour in certain season led to a situation of conceiving tied labour system which helps the peasantry as constant source of labour supply. [vi] " Cultivation was based on individual peasant farming, and the size of land cultivated by them varied greatly, from the large holdings of the *Khots or* headmen, to the petty plots of the *balahars, or* village menials. Below the peasantry there must have existed a large landless population composed of the menial castes." [vii]. From among the untouchabels, the new section of artisans were carved out who works primarily with implements that are useful and necessary for both economic and cultural living of the upper stratum of the society. Thus they had to move into the main village though as second class citizens but in the process these artisans class established themselves above the untouchables. Untouchables, primary source of surplus labour forces works for wages either in cash or in kind where as the artisans used to have their own share of the produce in *Mirasi* system. Thus the five hundred years before Christ have been most formative periods of Indian history. They moulded the basic contours of the caste system, with peasantry deeply divided into endless endogamous communities and rigorously separated from the artisans as well as menial labourers.[viii] According to Habib, there were sufficient factors for existence or emergence of peasant differentiation. Thus the initial differentiation was said to have been *khots,* who were on the boarderline of rural aristocracy, peasants and wage earners. By the middle of fourteenth century, the changes

in agrarian system reached such a stage that all the rural populace was divided into zamindars, a comprehensive category with all the superior rights on land, and peasants with out land rights[ix].

It was also the period when the country witnessed crop diversification specific to different agrological regions. By the time of Akbar, there were 21 taxable crops in rabi harvest and another 33 crops in kharif harvest in northern India. Thus in an year, agriculture in India was producing 54 crops, which in itself a record of sorts in terms of crop diversification. These were excluded of the 16th century entries into Indian agriculture such as potato, mazie, chilli, tobacco, groundnut, tomato. Peasants possessed varying rights in the land they cultivated and some differences existed between rights of old village inhabitants and outsiders. This varying rights laid foundation for further differentiation among the landed peasants themselves, since small sets of village oligarchs (*panch, muqaddams,* etc) controlled the community mechanism of the village, disposing of vacant lands and exacting services from the villages' customary servants and artisans which are known as service castes. For such collection of land tax, intermediate class of *zamindars* who are not landlords in the modern sense but hereditary local potentates, usually commanding armed followers and enjoying land-holdings of their own. [x]

A quote from *Cambridge Economic History of India Volume 1[xi],* is helpful for improving our understanding which says, "the Indian peasantry was economically highly stratified and that considerable differences existed in the size of holdings, produce obtained and resources of the peasants within the same village." It further says " On the one hand, there were the big peasants, or headmen (*muqaddami)* who organizes *khwud kasht (*cultivation under their own management). They employ labourers as their servants and put them to task of agriculture; and making them plough, sow, reap and draw water out of the well, they pay them their fixed wages, whether in cash or grain while appropriating to themselves the gross produce of cultivation. At the opposite end ,were the small peasants, (*rezariaya)* who as a *farman* issued by Aurangzeb described them, engaged in cultivation but depended wholly upon borrowing for their subsistence and for seed and cattle". [xii] Here we can find that the peasantry is differentiated into at least three strata, self cultivators hiring labourers, peasants, hiring implements of cultivation and the wage labourer / landless labourer by the end of 17th century India. This can be termed as the primary differentiation among peasantry which continued till the advent of colonial rule.

This stratified agrarian structure was consolidated with the entry of East India Company and its land revenue systems. The colonial administration in order to augment their revenues allowed peasantry to clear the forests on large scale which deepened the differentiation among the peasantry. It also undertook expansion of canal irrigation in return of levying water taxes improving its revenues. The people practicing traditional caste based occupations such as weavers, potters, blacksmiths etc, dwindled with the de-industrialisation, which in turn joined the ranks of either tenants or agricultural labourers. This process was furthered by the beginning of commercialization of agriculture and entry of money relations as a norm rather than an exception during the 18th and 19th centuries. By mid of 18th century, both in south and northern parts of India there was a similarity in agrarian structures with the zamindars and jagirdars, the two key expropriators of rural wealth at the helm of affairs and servile labour at the bottom with

most of the tenants cultivating plots varied in size. Lastly the caste groups without any occupancy rights in land – counterparts of modern agricultural labour – was existed. [xiii]

Now let us focus on the debate on agrarian structure in southern India. The agrarian structure in southern India, particularly the delta regions of east coast and west coast, is intertwined with caste structure and in these areas the concentration of untouchables and restrictions on mobility of agricultural workers are stringent. The key aspects of this section have been drawn from Dharma Kumar.[xiv] The agrarian structure in south India during 19th century consists of large landholders, mirasidars, small peasants, tenants and landless labourers. This stratification continued till 1947 with possibility for upward and downward mobility among and between different agrarian classes. Large landholders dominate every practical aspect of village life. *Mirasidars* are individual cultivators. *Inam* lands donated to Brahmans used to be cultivated by others. Next comes small landholders, whose landholding is not even sufficient to absorb the family labour itself. Tenants are of two types, tenants of the same village and outsiders both with varying tenurial security. In the dry regions where the risks of cultivation did not make intensive cultivation worthwhile, even the lower castes could be tenants or small holders, as we could see in today's Rayalaseema region. According to one estimation, by the time of 1850, 600 estates were surrendered to administration on which cultivating rights were distributed among the peasantry[xv].

With the colonial regime returned rayotwari, the right to cultivate conferred on payment of land revenue, as the *zamindari* failed to augments income for colonial administration. Thus by the time of reintroduction of rayotwari in southern states under colonial administration the village consists of agrarian classes, large landholders, whom we can call in today's parlance, land lords, mirasidars, small peasants, tenants with hereditary rights and those without, artisans, non agricultural occupations, agricultural labourers. The pyramid of agrarian structure is more or less similar of today's with large landholders stood on the top followed by rest in gradational order downward. Thus the class of rich peasant in today's parlance does not have its existence during the colonial regime.

The agrarian structure in ceded districts reflects the above classification where as that of Hyderabad varies from ceded districts. Over half of the lands were owned by *Khalsa or Diwani,* directly administered by the state for the purpose of revenue collection. Followed by *Diwani,* a portion of land was classified as *sarf-i-khas* and revenue collections over this land directly goes to Nizam's treasury for his personal usage. These are the additional intermediary classes over the peasants and other classes on the bottom. Between 1855 -1947, the land administration under colonial regime gave way for formation of new class, who gradually evolved into rich peasant. The inam commission which conferred land rights over about 6 million acres played its role in ensuring emergence of such class. The agrarian prosperity between two world wars is attributed to colonial government's requirement of food and commercial crop productions. This was also the time there was much mobility among agricultural labourers and landholding class as well. The rich peasant class which emerged under the auspices of colonialism, using its agraraian surplus, diversified into grain trade, rice mills and other small scale industries. They also extend into money lending.

IV. Agrarian Policies in Post Independent India and Impact on Agrarian Structure

The independent India inherited an agrarian structure with multiple intermediaries who exploited vast layers of peasants and agricultural workers. The forms of exploitation were predominantly wage exploitation, rent exploitation apart from other forms linked to the caste system. Without abolishing the exploitative intermediaries, absentee landlords distributing their land to the tillers, it was felt that the dormant energies of exploited classes could not be materialized. Thus on the eve of independence, the country faced with a sever agrarian question that was the question of providing food security and advancing the industrialization. To achieve this, the historically evolved landlordism needs to be abolished. This was the essence of the Agrarian Reforms Committee under the leadership of JC Kumarappa. That is why land reforms, particularly land distribution became a paramount agenda for national reconstruction. Unfortunately, Nehru who preferred political consolidation rather than consolidation of democracy prevailed over the government which batted for institutional reform in agriculture rather than structural reform. Thus the key elements of Kumarappa committee recommendations were put on back burner.

Another event of historical importance needs to be noted here. Kumarappa committee worked out its report during the same time Constituent Assembly drafted constitution. During the same period the agriculture has been transferred from central list to concurrent list. This pivotal move had impacted the process of land reforms profoundly as it proved in subsequent period. The state governments became the chief arbiters of land administration. The polity at state level / provincial level was still under the domination of feudatories and newly emerging industrial capitalists as well as agrarian bourgeoisie. The same class worked as bulwark against the progressive democratic agrarian reforms that eschewed redistributive justice making the commitment of the State to country's poor into a rhetoric and as a result, redistributive land reforms and variety of other efforts ended up in failure. [xvi]

The process in which the agrarian reforms package was derailed in each state was graphically explained by Daniel Thorner.[xvii]. Instead of structural reforms that shakes the foundations historically evolved feudalism laying foundations for economic rejuvenation, government resorted to institutional reforms spread through the new strategies sponsored by World Bank, US and Ford Foundation. These are the one guided a major shift in policy from institutional reform to technological reforms to the problem of agricultural development. Consequently several new schemes and programmes have been designed such as IADP aiming at increasing production via greater use of fertilizers, pesticides, seeds and technological assistance, IAAP, HYVP design to use scarce resources for the benefit of rich peasants, a section of landlords and in the areas best endowed with irrigation facilities. Thorner classified the country into for zones depending upon the intensity and impact of the land reforms initiated by state governments during 1950s and 1960s. The then state of Hyderabad falls under category of perceptible changes experienced zone where as Andhra state, (recently divided from Madras state) as zone in which drastic changes were experienced. [xviii]

V. Studies in Peasant Differentiation in Andhra Pradesh

Independent India inherited divergent agrarian structures. Regional peculiarities contributed to the different agrarian structures. The state of Andhra Pradesh is divided

into five agro economic zones with varied combinations of agrarian structures. In delta regions where cultivation is profitable, land value gone up, differentiation is sharp and intense over the rest of the regions. In south coastal Andhra Pradesh region, the class and caste fuses into one and becomes ruling class enlivening the MN Srinivas' *dominant caste* theory where as the south Telangana, and land concentration and traditional upper castes witnesses a divergence questioning the same. Before going to deal with the revelations substantiated by our data, it is necessary to understand the role government / state in independent India in shaping the agrarian structure and relations.

Puchalapalli Sundarayya, can be credited as the one who studied agrarian relations constantly during the later period of colonialism as well as in mid 1970s. Writing on agrarian conditions in 1937 in *New Age,* he dealt with the agrarian structure in coastal districts of Andhra Pradesh basing on the revenue records. An unpublished article written in 1959 is the only source to understand the agrarian structure in Andhra Pradesh on the eve of Independence[xix]. Sundarayya classified the peasantry in Andhra Pradesh basing on the 1951 census. The respective proportions of each class stands as shown in the table below. He used the categories as was classified in the Census of India which were occupational categories.

It is clear from his perspective that 84 percent of Andhra Pradesh live on agriculture and allied occupations. Half of those living on agriculture are landless agricultural labourers or tenants-at-wil. About 2.5 percent of this section lives by leasing their lands and another 47.5 percent by cultivating their plots of land[xx].

He once again studied two wetland villages of Guntur district to assess the level of peasant differentiation and class structure in those villages[xxi]. If the study of 1959 was purely based on the secondary data, this study was based on the field study carried out in 1974. According to this study the peasant differentiation stands as follows in the two wetland cultivation villages. It has not only the reference value but also linked to the questions of practicality. Though the labour based categorization is norm, Sundarayya's primary classification of rural families is based on size of landholdings [xxii]. From the both tables given below, it is found that in Ananthavaram, there are 6 components of differentiation where as in Kaza in 7 components.

Around the same time when Sundarayya carried our his monumental field survey to asses the peasant differentiation in Andhra Pradesh, the best minds of the country debated over the changes in agrarian class structure. The debate, popularly known as *mode of production* debate ran for almost a decade. In both these exercises the basic criteria for indentifying the peasant differentiation, the labour based categorization of peasantry was established firmly. The *debate* also focused on the emergence of new capitalist farmer as a result of bourgeoisie agrarian reforms. Utsa Patnaik distinguishes between the exploiting classes – landlords and rich peasants – and exploited classes – poor peasants, and labourers. In the case of big landowners, family members do not perform manual labour in major farm operations. Rich peasants do participates in manual work, but mainly resorts to wage exploitation of hired labourers. Middle peasant is primarily self employed since on the average the resources per capita is just to suffice to employ adequately the family labour and provide a living " at a customary subsistence level." The poor peasant's family must hire out its members for wages or lease in land no matter how high the rent, or combine these two expedients. Typically these families " can not

make their edns meet and have to depress consumption standards below customary levels." The same is true of full time labourers.[xxiii].

Foundation of Agrarian Studies, Bangalore, developed criteria to identify peasant differentiation by applying five indices, a) ownership of the means of production and other assets b) labour ratio defined as the ratio between the sum of number of days of family labour, and the number of days of labouring out of members of the household in agricultural and non agricultural work (in the numerator) and the number of days of labour hired in by the households (in the denominator), c) rent exploitation, that is, rent received or paid by the household, d) Net income of the household,s making separate note of the gross value of output from agriculture and the investments in agriculture per hectare, e) the sources of income of the household, though not revealed the weightages given to each of the factor.[xxiv] Using the five point criteria, the FAS classified population in three villages of undivided Andhra Pradesh in following manner, for the year 2005-06. Table 4 presents class composition in FAS villages.

VI. Findings from Field Survey

Before presenting data from field survey let me focus on the methodology and its qualifications. The survey is designed in two stages, census, kind of house listing and a sample household survey. We at Sundarayya Vignana Kendram organized extensive consultation to frame the questionnaire. Finally came up with a detailed questionnaire covering from the basic information identifying household, demographic details, land ownership / operational land holding and assets. The questionnaire for sample households consists of household identification information to demographic information, land ownership / operational holdings, leased / leased out / shared in / shared out / pledged in / pledged out patters, reasons for opting tenancy, cultivation, implements owned, labour deployed, labour days distributed among various agricultural and non agricultural operations, animal husbandry, details of assets including house and its conditions, debts, savings, and consumption expenditure as we as the migration related information.

Next comes selection of villages. The state is divided into five agro-ecological zones and we tried our best that all the zones are represented through this data. The selection of villages is purposive representing various levels of irrigation facilities. The selected sample villages are based on the following features to reflect the agrological diversity of the undivided state as presented in box 1.The field survey ran into three months from December 2013 to February 2014 and data collected for the reference period 2012-13 crop year. For the purpose of this survey, household is an unit where a set of people are staying under one roof and using one kitchen.

Box 1

Irrigation Type	Land Type	Crop Predominance	Geography
Irrigated	Black Cotton Soil	Commercial Crops	Coastal villages
Mixed Wet cum dry	Red Soil	Food Crops	Villages nearby town
Depended on ground water	Alluvial	Orchards	Dalit concentrated
Rainfed			

Classification of Census Households : We surveyed 19690 households as part of census survey obtaining data on basic details on demography, educational levels, occupational details, land ownership and tenurial status, and household amenities. After completion of census survey, census households were classified into different agrarian and non agrarian classes. Agrarian classes drawn based on landholding either operational or owned as the primary criteria. The non-agrarian classe classified based on self identified occupations by the household. Basing on such self identified occupational categories, we have chosen sample of 10 % in comparison to village households. But some times due to lack of availability, at times due to non cooperation from the selected sample households, the sample size varied from village to village between 8 – 10%. The sample size for undivided AP stands at 8.95 % of total census households we surveyed. Thus the sampling method has its own inbuilt deviations. With these qualifications I am going to present my paper. Some of the procedural limitations I have already outlined at the beginning.

Sampling Method : The simple stratified random sampling method was adopted to indentify the sample households. In this the households were stratified into different primary economic categories basing on the self declared information of land ownership/ operational landholding and self identified occupations. And from each strata of the village households, a 10 percent of random sample was selected.

Selection of Sample Households : Basing on the criteria of self declared operational/owned land holding and self identified occupations informed as part of census, all the census households of the villages had been divided into 14 categories. As all the primary categories were not in equal proportions, priority was given in such as way to accommodate as diverse as possible primary categories from the villages in sample households. Thus these 1682 sample households were identified. While doing so certain categories such small and marginal farmers, agricultural workers, non agricultural workers are under sampled and rich farmer, landlord, absentee landlord were over sampled. Though we came across certain proportion of money lenders in the village census, due to their non cooperation, we were forced to drop them from sample. To study the selected sample households, we canvassed the detailed questionnaire to the sample household. The detailed questionnaire consists of 22 sets of questions starting from demography to land ownership, cropping, wage labour in agriculture, non agricultural operations, animal husbandry, assets, consumption, and remittances. Another important limitation to our survey is that we are going to classify the households basing on the data collected for a particular year. This is not a time scale study that can capture the movement among the classes. Table 5 that more than 70 % of population in survey villages stills depends on cultivation either directly or indirectly, the figure is closer to SECC estimates. If we add non agricultural workers also into this groups that figure reaches to 79.56 %, which flays the neoliberal argument that the large proportion of people are moving out of agriculture.

Let us now consider the typology of villages presented here. Except Rayalaseema, all the villages are relatively endowed with better irrigation facilities. Kattavaripalem of Guntur district and Acharyulagudem of Nalgonda, villages with tail end canal irrigation facility, Renimakulapally, purely rainfed areas, Kothuru of Warangal, fully covered by

tank irrigation, Ampli, partially covered by irrigation network. Coastal villages have highest proportion of agricultural workers followed by Rayalaseema, South Telangana and North Telangana villages. The similarity in the proportionate distribution of small, marginal and middle peasants can be found in South Coastal, and North Telangana villages which are experienced crop diversification and intensive cultivation. The proportion of rich peasant and landlords classes are low, according to census, in coastal districts where as the same stands relatively high in remaining three regions. Thus there are several convergences and divergences in agrarian structure between different agro-climatic regions which needs further probing to unravel the socio-economic and historical factors that contributed for the same. Now let us consider the land concentration among these selection for these same set of villages.

This table presents variations among the composition of the economic classes. We can focus on few classes for the purpose of an explanation. The percentage of agricultural workers are above the state level average in coastal districts where intensive cultivation is there and less than half of state average in South Telangana, which is a point for further probing to elicit reasons behind such peculiar phenomenon. The percentage of middle farmers is higher than that of state average in Rayalaseema, North and South Telangana where as rich farmers proportion is higher than in state average all regions in except Coastal Andhra Pradesh. The percentage of households dependents on traditional occupations (artisans) are double to the state average in north coastal Andhra Pradesh where as half to the state average in Rayalaseema. The proportion of self employed households are minimal in all the regions and confined to meager 2%. Non agricultural workers are almost double to the state average in north coastal Andhra Pradesh and less than half of state average in Rayalaseema region. To capture the diverse composition in each region, let us focus on the selected villages as shown in table 7

We can observe a pattern in all villages in the proportionate land ownership. A village from North Telangana stands out an exception when it comes to the land in the hands of landlord and rich farmer class. Put together these two classes commands almost 50 % of land in Ampili, 31 % in Kattavaripalem, 51 % in Renimakulaplle, 54 % in Acharyulagudem where as in Kothuru the two classes commands only 9 % of village own land, which itself is an underestimation. But as we went by the self declared land details instead of pooling up the data from secondary sources such as village revenue records, this deviation occurred. More over, the lone landlord in kothuru refused to respond to the enumerators leading to non capturing of his land details. Similarly the about the size of land owned by middle farmers. The pattern is discernible. Except in Acharyulagudem, in all villages their share in own land is coming upto 1/3rd of enumerated own land. Similarly classes from marginal and agricultural workers are commanding only around is observed with reasonable variations. This clearly indicates that the prevalence of land concentration among the top two classes.

Let us now consider the respective proportions of household income for the same set of villages. For the purpose of this table, I have grouped various sources of income to make it convenient to the readers. Including government transfers, we have classified 15 sources of earnings for each households. In this table I have regrouped those 15 sources into broad categories of land based income, supplementary income, rural wage income, salaried income, non wage income, income from self employment. Under income from land I have considered income from own cultivation and land rent. Supplementary

income includes income from animal husbandry and rents on implements. Rural wage income includes various types of agricultural wage income and non agricultural wage income. Salaried income includes both income from government as well as private jobs. Non wage income includes remittances and income from other sources. Incomes of artisanal sources, self employment, business and government transfers have been shown separately. Respective proportions of income from each source reflects the standing of that economic category in economic hierarchy of the village. All the major sources of income have been accommodated in the tables below. These tables gives us an idea about the economic category wise proportion of income from each source. Thus this can help us in collate with the proportion of income from land as well as wage labour apart from other sources.

Conclusion and Discussion

From the above discussion, following inferences can be drawn. For the set of selected villages, the income from land for middle farmer, rich farmer and landlord stands above the average income from cultivation and allied activities in that village. The income from cultivation and allied activities for agricultural workers, small and marginal farmers and artisans stands less than half of the average income from cultivation and allied activities of that village. Occasionally, income from this source for small and marginal farmers coming to close to the village average when the same economic category leases in land for cultivation. Other than this exception, the villages are still experiencing the concentration of sources of income at the top of the pyramid. For example, in Ampili the income from cultivation and allied activities is 69.9 % for middle peasant, 78.9% for rich peasant and 100% for landlord where as the same stands at 5.4% for agricultural worker, 0.8% for artisans, 17.2 for marginal peasant and 33.5% for small peasant. Similar polar concentrations reflects the same outcome. Similarly, for agricultural workers, artisans, small and marginal farmers, the wage income stands higher than the village average wage income and also same as the case with non agricultural workers. Regarding the wage income for agricultural workers, artisans, small and marginal farmers, in Kattavariplem, both from wage from agricultural occupations and non agricultural occupations, varies from 73 % to 97% between small farmer, marginal farmer, artisan and agricultural labour. Thus the class position and proportion of income from respective sources are having strong correlation. As the class categorization is primarily based on operational landholding size, this implies, the strong correlation between class position, land and proportionate sources of income. Another important finding is about spread of nonagricultural employment opportunities. As shown in table no 6, in the survey villages, the non agricultural workers as an economic category is around 5% of village households. This is the category which reported themselves as such and also data on labour days and earnings confirms the same. This is the case after two and half decades of economic reforms which bangs on the spurt in non agricultural employment opportunities and migration of workforce from agricultural to non agricultural sectors, which does not hold much water from this data. The non-wage, non land based income also reflects the same trend as that of land based income as the these sources are again concentrating in the hands of upper pyramid of the village. Rarely agricultural workers and small and marginal farmers are having access to this category of income. The final point of inference is that the households could not depend on the single source of income like that of pre-reform period. There is a sharp decline in proportion of

income from a single source in case of small to middle farmers categories. At the same time, the income sources diversification for agricultural workers, which stands at about 30% is limited. Thus, the class of agricultural workers are still tied to the employment in agriculture and allied activities where such diversification is little higher for the rich and landlord families. The ratio of income from salaried occupations exemplifies the fact that the salaried occupations availability in the village setting becoming minuscule. From these inferences we can conclude that two and half decades of neoliberal economic reforms further consolidates the agrarian structure at village level along with consolidation of land and sources of income.

Tables :

Table 1.

Rentiers	Cultivating Owners	Landless Tenants	Cultivating Labourers	Other Rural Labourers	All Landless Labourers	Total Agricultural Population	% of Rural Labourers in Agricultural Population
IV	I	II	III	V&VIII	II,III,V&VIII		
Andhra Pradesh (total population 31.25 million)							
0.63 2%	12.24 40%	2.46 8%	5.76 18%	4.915 16%	13.135 42%	26.005 84%	50%
Seven coastal districts (total population 14.425 million)							
0.35 2%	5.434 38%	1.118 8%	3.29 23%	1.935 14%	6.343 45%	12.127 85%	53%
Four Rayalaseema districts (total population 6.075 million)							
0.145 2%	2.913 48%	0.36 6%	0.824 14%	1.003 17%	2.187 37%	5.243 87%	42%
Nine Telangana districts (total population 10.750 million)							
0.138 2%	3.843 36%	0.987 9%	1.646 15%	1.978 18%	4.612 42%	8.593 79%	54%

Table 2

		Ananthavaram	
Category	No of Families	% of Total No of Families in Village	% of total land owned to the total land in village
Landless	412	50.3	0
0.5 acres and below	94	11.2	2.0

0.5 -2.5 acres	180	22.3	14.7
2.5 – 5 acres	49	6.0	11.0
5 – 10 acres	43	5.2	19.1
10 acres above	40	5.0	53.2
Total	818	100.00	100.0

Table 3

Kaza			
Category	No of Families	% of Total No of Families in Village	% of total land owned to the total land in village
Landless	256	25.0	0
0.5 acres and below	194	18.8	4.4
0.5 to 1.0 acres	161	15.6	8.3
0.5 -2.5 acres	245	23.8	27.0
2.5 – 5 acres	120	11.6	26.5
5 – 10 acres	38	3.7	16.6
10 acres above	16	1.5	17.2
Total	1030	100.0	100.0

Table 4[xxv]

Socio-Economic class	Anathavaram		Bukkacherla		Kothapalli	
	No of Households	%	No of Households	%	No of Households	%
Landlord/Big Capitalist Farmer	11	2	10	3	5	1
Capitalist Farmes/ Rich Peasant	12	2	33	11	33	9
Upper Middle Peasant	24	4	45	15	24	6
Lower Middle Peasant	93	14	39	13	28	7
Poor Peasant	131	20	39	13	20	5
Hired Manual Worker	164	25	59	21	163	44
Artisans and Work at Traditional Caste Calling	28	4	3	1	4	1
Business Activity/ Self Employment	39	6	12	4	30	8
Rents and Money Lending	35	5	12	4	4	1
Salaried Persons	61	9	18	6	42	11
Remittances/ Pensions	58	9	21	7	20	5
Unclassified Households	8	1	0	0	0	0

Total	664	100	289	100	370	100

Table 5:
Census Based Primary Class Strucutre in Andhra Pradesh as on 2013-14 Surveyed Villages.

Indicator	Census	% of Census	Sample	% of Sample
Total Households	19690	100	1763	100
Agricultural Worker	5293	26.88	388	22.01
Marginal Farmer	2106	10.70	139	7.88
Small Farmer	2345	11.91	193	10.95
Middle Farmer	2334	11.85	238	13.50
Rich Farmer	1298	6.59	119	6.75
Landlord	542	2.75	99	5.62
Absentee Landlord	61	0.31	9	0.51
Artisans	665	3.38	77	4.37
Business	494	2.51	99	5.62
Govt.Job	256	1.30	31	1.76
Money Lender	17	0.09	0	0
Non Ag Worker	1021	5.19	173	9.82
Pvt.Job	764	3.88	52	2.95
Self Employed	332	1.69	43	2.44
Others	1934	9.82	103	5.84
NA	228	1.16	0	0

Table 6.
Region wise composition of Different Economic Categories from Census of Survey Villages

Indicator	North Coastal AP	South Coastal AP	Rayalaseema	North Telangana	South Telangana	Total
Total Households	2097	2604	2652	5025	2636	19690
Agricultural Worker	27.28	35.77	22.17	23.76	12.71	26.88
Marginal Farmer	13.50	9.86	12.18	9.73	11.12	10.70
Small Farmer	10.40	9.88	14.06	12.58	15.29	11.91
Middle Farmer	6.06	8.59	15.05	14.65	16.96	11.85
Rich Farmer	1.24	5.41	10.78	6.41	10.24	6.59
Landlord	0.48	2.42	6.00	1.65	4.32	2.75
Absentee	0.10	0.23	0.68	0.28	0.38	0.31

Landlord						
Artisans	7.01	2.58	1.66	4.42	2.43	3.38
Business	2.24	2.42	2.04	3.30	1.93	2.51
Govt.Job	1.96	1.02	0.60	1.43	2.01	1.30
Money Lender	0.10	0.08	0.00	0.16	0.04	0.09
Non Ag Worker	10.40	4.90	2.19	5.31	4.59	5.19
Pvt.Job	5.63	3.68	1.73	3.56	5.80	3.88
Self Employed	2.34	1.68	1.21	2.07	0.95	1.69
Others	10.78	10.36	8.56	9.35	9.75	9.82
NA	0.52	1.13	1.09	1.33	1.48	1.16

Table 7.
Village wise composition of Different Economic Categories in % in Selected Villages

Indicator	North Coastal AP (Ampili)	South Coastal AP (Kattavaripalem)	Rayalaseema (Renimakulapalle)	South Telangana (Acharyulugudem)	North Telangana (Kothuru)
Total Households	305	306	300	321	480
Land Lord	0.33	0.98	2.00	3.115	0.208
Rich Farmer	3.28	3.27	7.67	8.411	1.04
Middle Farmer	9.84	10.13	10.67	11.84	13.51
Small Farmer	10.16	15.69	14.67	12.15	20.17
Marginal Farmer	20.98	16.01	19.00	17.13	27.23
AGL-L	6.56	0.65	4.33	0.935	4.574
AGL-LL	27.54	36.93	25.00	24.3	17.88
Artisans	8.85	1.31	1.67	2.181	1.455
Self Employment	0.66	0.98	1.00	1.246	1.455
Private Job	1.31	1.96	3.00	4.05	1.455
Govt Job	0.98	0.65	0.33	3.115	0.416

Business	1.97	1.96	5.00	2.181	1.04
Money Lender	0.33	5.56	5.67	0.312	6.445
Others	3.28	3.92	2.00	6.542	3.119
Non Ag.Worker	3.93	0.98	7.67	2.492	0.208

Table 8. Inequalities in Land Ownership among Various Classes for Selected Villages in %

Class	North Coastal AP (Ampili)	South Coastal AP (Kattavaripalem)	Rayalaseema (Renimakulapalle)	South Telangana (Acharyulugudem)	North Telangana (Kothuru)
Land Lord	14.36	13.10	16.59	18.6	2.95
Rich Farmer	22.62	17.72	33.68	35.5	6.3
Middle Farmer	28.73	26.05	25.05	18.4	39.3
Small Farmer	15.64	12.35	14.75	9.81	29.6
Marginal Farmer	13.80	9.99	8.82	7.44	17.5
AGL-L	1.41	0.04	0.78	0.28	1.06
AGL-LL	0.47	15.99	0.20	7.55	1.8
Artisans	0.29	0.00	0.00	0	0.16
Self Employment	0.54	0.00	0.00	0	0.25
Private Job	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0
Govt Job	1.08	0.00	NR	1.02	0
Business	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.56	0
Money Lender	0.00	NR	NR	0.19	NR
Others	0.90	4.11	0.00	0.58	0.65
Non Ag.Worker	0.18	0.65	0.13	0	0.49

Table 9 (a)
Proportion of Earnings from Different Sources among Economic Categories in
Ampili

	OL	LO	AH	LI	AW	NAW	TO	Govt Job	Pvt Job	Remittances	OS	Govt Transfer	Business	Self Employed	Per HH Income
Agricultural Labour	1.1	0	2.6	0	45.7	23.2	10.1	0	0	11.5	0	0.5	0	3.7	74780.28571
Artisans	0	0.8	0	0	0	33.8	50.8	0	6.6	0	0	0.3	0	7.6	177650
Business	0	0	0	0	9.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	49.7	39.1	96560
Govt_job	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	70800
Pvt.Job	-13.3	0	10.6	0	2.1	0	0	0	63.3	0	0	1.6	0	35.6	151635
Landlord	88.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	784630
Margnial Farmer	17.2	0	0	0	47.9	34.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78900
Middle Farmer	9.6	0	0	59.9	5.6	24.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72421
Non Ag Worker	0	0.5	0	0	7.4	79.5	0	0	0	11.8	0	0.8	0	0	121768.6
Rich Farmer	72.5	0	1.2	5.2	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19.4	0	161170.6667
Small Farmer	18.1	0	0	0	15.4	66.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49057.5
others	16.1	0	0	26.3	53.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.3	0	0	98137

Table 9(b) Proportion of Earnings from Different Sources among Economic
Categories in Kattavaripalem

Economic category	OL	AH	LI	AW	NAW	TO	Govt Job	Pvt Job	Govt Tr	Business	Self Employed	Per HH Income
Agricultural Labour	0	2.5	0	51.8	45.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	82268.5
Artisans	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16050
Business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	241500
Self Employment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	72000
Landlord	30.6	10	59.1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470664.6667
Marginal Farmer	0	17	5.8	43.9	29.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	120226
Middle Farmer	8.6	-0.6	29.1	7	4.6	0	13.9	14.9	0.2	22.3	0	258153.4
Non Ag Worker	3.6	0	0	3.5	53.8	0	36.7	0	2.4	0	0	122625
Rich Farmer	1.1	0.1	41.2	16.9	39.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	91945.5
Small Farmer	4.2	7.2	6.1	19.2	36.5	17.3	6.3	0	0	3.2	0	126508.3333
Others	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105000

Table 9(c) Proportion of Earnings from Different Sources among Economic
Categories in Renimakulapalle

Economic category	OL	LO	RoI	AH	LI	AW	NAW	TO	Govt Job	Pvt Job	Remittance	Govt Tr	Per HH Income
Agricultural Labour	1.3	0	0	7.1	0	38.6	17.1	0	17.8	0	16	2.1	48109.85714
Artisans	19.5	0	0	0	0	73.5	0	7	0	0	0	0	22770
Business	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95000
Self Employment	54.7	0	17.4	0.8	11.2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	72761.25
Landlord	-7.9	0	2.1	14.3	0	75.8	12.3	0	0	0	0	3.3	62982.75
Marginal Farmer	39.8	0	0.7	14.3	0	16.2	0	22.9	0	0	0	6.1	96098.8
Middle Farmer	0	0	0	0	0	13.7	86.3	0	0	0	0	0	55615
Non Ag Worker	26.5	0	5.2	6.3	19.9	39.7	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	108500
Rich Farmer	1	0	0	-32	21.9	30.1	2.1	0	0	76.6	0	0	31332.66667
Small Farmer	0	0	0	0	0	70.6	6.1	0	0	0	18.8	4.5	26650

Table 9(d) Proportion of Earnings from Different Sources among Economic
Categories in Acharyulagudem

Economic category	OL	AH	LI	AW	NAW	TO	Govt Job	Pvt Job	Govt Tr	Business	Self Employed	Per HH Income
Agricultural Labour	0	6.7	0	78.4	12.2	0	0	0	0	0	2.7	43082.85714
Artisans	0	0	0	36.4	0	57.4	0	0	6.2	0	0	38700
Business	2.8	0	0	11.7	0	0	14.2	0	0	71.2	0	168450
Govt_job	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	300000
Pvt.Job	10.9	-3.5	0	40	52.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	75136
Landlord	88.3	7.8	0	2.7	0	0	0	0	1.3	0	0	189541
Marginal Farmer	7.2	4.3	3.7	21.6	2.4	1.5	0	34.6	1.2	21.7	1.8	109394
Middle Farmer	28.4	22.5	1.5	4.8	1.1	3.1	0	0	2.1	36.5	0	95361
Non Ag Worker	0	0	0	12	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	99755
Rich Farmer	74.3	-0.4	5.9	5.6	0.7	0	0	0	0.9	13.1	0	305596
Small Farmer	23.9	6.1	17.7	15.6	10.5	0	22.5	0	3.8	0	0	88840
Others	0	0	0	1.2	0	0	0	0	98.8	0	0	69200

Table 9(e) Proportion of Earnings from Different Sources among Economic
Categories in Kotturu

Economic category	OL	LO	RoI	AH	LI	AW	NAW	Pvt Job	Remittance	OS	Govt Tr	Business	Self Employed	Per HH Income
Agricultural Labour	0	3.1	0	2.6	0	50.5	22.6	0	4.8	0	3.4	0	2.2	82561.3333
Artisans	4.3	0	0	71.5	0	24.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12733

Business	1.6	0	0	0	0	17.9	38.4	0	0	0	0	42.2	0	7820
Self Employment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	9600
land_lard	9.3	0	0	41.8	0	0	0	0	0	49	0	0	0	31899
marginal_farmer	10.3	1.2	0	17.4	1.5	52.4	15.3	0	0	0	1.8	0	0	6531
middle_farmer	10.7	0	83.8	1	0	3.1	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	36858
non ag worker	4.9	0	0	5.4	0	6.5	53.5	29.7	0	0	0	0	0	8090
others	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45.5	0	54.5	0	0	660
rich_farmer	41.8	0	1.2	5.9	25.1	13.9	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	11.7	85660.8333
small_farmer	32.9	0	0	-0.8	-3.3	24	29	0	0	0	0.9	0	17.4	55121

Abbreviations : OL = Income from Own Land Cultivation, LO= Income from Leased Out Land, RoI= Income from Rent on Implements, AH = Income from Animal Husbandry, LI= Income from Leased In land cultivation, AW = Income from Agricultural Wage, NAW = Income from Non Agricultural Wages, TO= Income from Traditional Occupations, OS = Income from Other Sources, Govt. Tr = Government Transfers.

Notes :
1. NR indicates Not Reported
2. All the economic classes are based on operational landholding size. Hence there will be deviation when we looks only at land ownership table.
3. In Table 6, agricultural workers are considered as single group where as in Table 7 a small portion of land owning agricultural workers are separated from landless. As all the land owning agricultural workers leased out their land, in effect they are categorized as landless agricultural workers.
4. In Table 9, money lender is not found as their sample households refused to cooperate with the survey.
5. In Table 9, all figures are in %.

References

[i] Tom Bottmore, *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought (ed)* Tom Bottmore, Laurance Harris, VG Kiernan, Ralph Miliband.

[ii] Erik Olin Wright, (1980), *Verities of Marxist Conceptions of Class structure,* Politics and Society, Vol.9, Pp. 323-70.

[iii] Joseph Tharamangala (1981), *Agrarian Class Conflict and Political Mobilisation of Agricultural Labourers in Kuttanadu,* University of British Columbia Press.

[iv] Habib, Irfan, (2002) Essays in Indian History – Towards Marxist Perspective, Anthem Press, London.

[v] Irfan Habib (2012), *Post – Mauryan India 200 BC – AD 300 : A Political and Economic History,* A People's History of India 6, Tulika Books, New Delhi. P.99

[vi] Ibid. Pg.106.

[vii] Raychaudhuri, Tapan & Habib, Irfan (1982) (ed) *Cambridge Economic History of India,* Vol. 1, C 1200 – 1750. Orient BlackSwan. Hyderabad. P.48

[viii] Ibid, Pg. 124.

ix Ibid. P58.

x Irfan Habib (2012) *Indian Economy under Early British Rule, 1757-1857,* Tulika Books New Delhi.

xi Ifran Habib (1986) *The System of Agricultural Production : Mughal India,* in Cambridge Economic History of India, Volume 1, 1200 -1750. Orient BlackSwan, Hyderabad. Pp. 214-226

xii Ibid. P221..

xiii Tapan Raychaudhuri, *The mid-eighteenth century background,* The Cambridge Economic History of India, Vol.II; *c.*1757-2003.

xiv Dharma Kumar, *Agrarian Relations in South India,* Ibid. Pp.207-242.

xv Dharma Kumar, *ibid, Pg. 217*

xvi Atul Kohli (2009) *Democracy and Development in India : From Socialism to Pro-Business,* Oxford University Paperbacks, OUP, New Delhi.

xvii Daniel Thorner,(1973) *The Agrarian Prospect in India,* Allied Publishers Limited. Bombay.

xviii Thorner. Ibid. Pp.31-52.

xix P. Sundarayya (1959) *Present Day Agrarian Relations in Andhra Pradesh,* Review of Agrarian Studies, Vol. 3, Issue 1, January – June 2013.

xx Ibid. P 86.

xxi P. Sundarayya ,(1977) *Class Differentiation of the Peasantry : Results of Rural Surveys in Andhra Pradesh,* Vol. 5, No. 8&9, Social Scientist. New Delhi.

xxii Ibid. p.57.

xxiii Utsa Patnaik (1971) *Capitalist Development in Agriculture, A Note,* EPW, September, December, 1971.

xxiv *Socio Economic Surveys of Three Villages in Andhra Pradesh : A Study of Agrarian Relations (2010), Ed.* Ramachandran, VK, Rawal, Vikas, Swaminathan, Mathura, Tulika Books, New Delhi.

xxv Ibid. Pp. 32-33