



ISSN Print: 2394-7500  
ISSN Online: 2394-5869  
Impact Factor: 5.2  
IJAR 2019; 5(8): 478-480  
www.allresearchjournal.com  
Received: 12-06-2019  
Accepted: 14-07-2019

**Pritam Kumar**  
Research Scholar, Department  
of Geography, J.P. University,  
Chapra, Bihar, India

## A study of caste and agrarian economic structure of rural Bihar

**Pritam Kumar**

### Abstract

This paper presents an exact investigation of the agrarian powers and relations of creation regarding station in four Bhojpuri-speaking villages of Buxar District. It contends that agrarian financial structure comprises the components of entrepreneur method of creation. The responsibility for powers of creation, for example, land, work vehicles, harvesters, pumpsets, reapers, and so forth is profoundly inconsistent regarding rank. Besides, positions likewise vary as respects the utilization of the powers of creation in horticulture. It is likewise discovered that, not at all like the classification of 'Booked Castes', the classes of 'In reverse Castes' and 'Forward Castes' are heterogeneous in monetary terms.

**Keywords:** Rural Bihar, caste and agrarian economic

### Introduction

In this paper I have attempted to dissect the idea of agrarian financial structure of rustic Bihar as far as an all-inescapable classification of station in the light of information gathered from four villages of Buxar District. The class of standing has been utilized here to draw out the basic financial imbalance existing among the different ranks of the villages just as the monetary idea of the classifications of 'Planned Castes', 'In reverse Castes' and 'Forward Castes'. Following the Marxist, I view agrarian monetary structure as an unpredictable entire comprising of powers of creation and relations of creation. Powers of creation allude to (a) work power or beneficial resources of delivering specialists, for example, laborers and workers or ranchers, and (b) methods for creation, for example, land, agri-social apparatus, crude materials and compost. Relations of creation allude to the possession and utilization of work force and methods for creation. In like manner, I have managed such factors as the proprietorship and utilization of land, farming apparatus and compound manures, purchasing and selling work power for horticultural work, and taking area on rent and renting it out for development (sharecropping) by the different stations.

### Mode of production debate: An Overview

In sociologies in India, investigations of the moment sort might be seen as a commitment to the 'method of creation banter' which started in the mid 1970s with Rudra's (1970) guarantee that the idea of the method of creation in rustic India is pre-industrialist or primitive. Following this, few social researchers completed exact examinations on the Indian agrarian economy with 'method of creation' as their logical core interest. As opposed to Rudra's position, Chattopadhyay, Gough, Banaji, Omved, Harriss and Breman contend that the Indian agrarian economy is described by components of the industrialist method of creation. These components are self-development, monetization, automation of agribusiness, efficiency direction, inclination revenue driven, private responsibility for of creation, free pay work, interest in farming, increment in extraction of relative overflow esteem, summed up ware creation and the presence of an unrestricted economy.

Patnaik presents an alternate comprehension of the idea of the Indian agrarian monetary structure. She sees that while it shows a few highlights of private enterprise and comprises a little yet developing class of industrialists, its fundamental nature is as yet pre-entrepreneur for certain reasons: First, there is no aggregation of excess incentive for venture and reinvestment in horticulture. Second, there is an unreasonable utilization of capital in the circle of cash loaning or usury and exchange.

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Pritam Kumar**  
Research Scholar, Department  
of Geography, J.P. University,  
Chapra, Bihar, India

Third, there is absolute desperation of a bigger extent of compensation work. What's more, fourth, there is customized connection of reliance between farming compensation work and its managers.

Different researchers, as Bhaduri, Prasad, Chandra and Sau, contend that the Indian agrarian monetary structure is semi-medieval. This is on the grounds that it is portrayed by sharecropping, interminable obligation of the rustic occupants, concentration of usury and land possession in the possession of a similar class, absence of availability to the market, presence of little laborers, non-adapted pay and market relations, power-situated perspectives of the exploitative privileged, non-use of assets for financial turn of events, and absence of gathering of capital for interest in farming. For them, the semi-medieval method of creation shares all the more practically speaking with the primitive method of creation than the industrialist one.

Subsequently, there are profound differences among social researchers over the idea of agrarian monetary structure or method of creation in India. Notwithstanding, they have improved our comprehension of the issue by investigating it from different measurements. Among them, Prasad has introduced an investigation of the monetary structure of rustic Bihar. In view of the information from 2,000 family units in an example of villages in Purnea, Saharsa and Monghyr Districts, gathered during 1970-71 through study strategy, he contends that the personality of financial structure of rustic Bihar is dominantly semi-medieval. Aside from Prasad, researchers like Jha] Das and Bose have made critical commitments to the comprehension of country Bihar. My work contrasts from these examinations, incorporating those in the class of 'method of creation banter', in at any rate two significant ways: It depends on concentrated hands on work, and it presents an investigation of the agrarian monetary structure as far as station. As it has been contemplated, an experimental investigation of 'interests' (economy) and 'thoughts' (position) together is significant for the advancement of Indian humanism (see Bêteille 1974) [3].

### The Field

This paper depends on the information gathered from four Bhojpuri-speaking villages of Buxar District of Bihar during 1991-93 by methods for talk with timetable and perception of financial acts of the residents. These information have been refreshed by a field excursion to these villages in 2000. These villages, obviously, are fundamentally agrarian, for, aside from farming barely some other monetary action is there. The greater part of their offfarm financial exercises are additionally identified with horticulture, as they include either purchasing or selling of farming produce.

The four villages chose for this investigation are: Unwas, Basantpur, Bishrampur and Bharchakia. Despite the fact that there are a few likenesses among them, the villages are different in numerous regards. Two of these villages, Unwas and Basantpur, are exceptionally old, while the other two, Bishrampur and Bharchakia, were set up after Independence. Before Independence, Basantpur was under the Zamindari framework, though Unwas was under Royatwari framework. The villages likewise contrast in their standing organization: In Unwas and Basantpur there are numerous ranks, while Bishrampur and Bharchakia are occupied by less stations. The 'Forward Castes' rule Unwas and Basantpur monetarily, while Bishrampur and

Bharchakia are financially overwhelmed by the 'Regressive Castes'.

Bishrampur and Bharchakia are spatially partitioned based on positions, while Unwas and Basantpur are not all that flawlessly separated. Unwas is arranged adjacent to a metalled street, while the other three villages are connected by mud streets. The villages additionally vary regarding the degree of schooling, the quantity of strict places of worship and the festival of social celebrations. The villages, taking all things together, have 24 positions. Five of them - Bhumihaar, Brahmin, Kayastha, Mahabrahman and Rajput - having a place with the 'Forward Castes' classification, together comprise 75 family units. Fifteen of them - Bania, Bari, Bhar, Bind, Gond, Kamkar, Koeri, Kohar, Lohar, Nau, Nonia, Paneri, Rajbhar, Sonar and Yadav - are 'In reverse Castes', and 299 family units have a place with these ranks. The excess four ranks - Chamar, Dhobi, Dom and Dusadh - have a place with the 'Booked Castes' classification, and record for 99 family units. In Unwas there are seven family units of the Muslim people group, and there are no Muslims in the other three villages.

### Caste and Land

Since the villages under examination are transcendently agrarian, the main methods for creation is land. Land in these villages is prolific and the dirt is alluvial. The responsibility for is profoundly inconsistent: Of the 483 family units in these villages, 184 (or 38.1 percent) are landless and 87 (18 percent) families own just a single section of land or less. In this way, the greater part of the families (56.1 percent) are either landless or very near a landless circumstance. Then again, 39 (8.1 percent) families own almost a large portion of the complete 1529.7 sections of land of land, and none of them own under 12 sections of land. Between these two classes of families, there are 173 families which show a huge variety as respects the sum or size of land possessed by them: 65 (13.5 percent) family units own more than one section of land however not multiple sections of land, 73 (15.27 percent) family units own multiple sections of land yet not in excess of seven sections of land, and the leftover 35 (7.2 percent) households own in excess of seven sections of land yet not in excess of 12 sections of land.

Along these lines, in the villages the vast majority of the family units scarcely own property, and a large portion of the land is possessed by couple of families. Nonetheless, there are no enormous landowners or property managers. There are just 22 family units which own in excess of 15 sections of land of land. Out of them, three family units own 30-40 sections of land. Practically all the families which own in excess of 15 sections of land are enormous in their size. In the event that they are isolated into little or atomic units, there will scarcely be a family left in the villages claiming in excess of 15 sections of land of land. It implies that in the villages the measure of land (1529.7 sections of land) is very restricted corresponding to the quantity of family units (483). No big surprise, land is the most important and searched after methods for creation in these villages.

Table presents the information on the responsibility for by the different ranks in the villages under investigation. Out of 24 standings and the Muslim people group, five stations - the Brahmin, Rajput, Yadav, Koeri and Bania in the entirety of own 1340.8 sections of land (87.7 percent) of land. Of

these five positions, the Brahmins alone own at the very least 33% of the all out land, trailed by the Koeris, Yadavs, Rajputs and Baniyas, in a specific order. The Brahmins and

Rajputs have a place with the 'Forward Castes' classification, though the Yadavs, Koeris and Baniyas have a place with the 'Regressive Castes' classification.

**Table 1:** Caste and ownership of the means of production

Caste	No. of households	Land in acres	No. of pumpsets	No. of threshers	No. of tractors
Koeri	86 (17.8)	322.2 (21.1)	37 (25.9)	20 (40.8)	2 (10)
Chamar	81 (16.8)	34.9 (2.3)	18 (12.6)	1 (2.0)	0
Brahmin	50 (10.4)	535.7 (35.2)	27 (18.9)	9 (18.4)	6 (30)
Yadav	47 (9.7)	212.8 (13.9)	26 (18.2)	2 (4.1)	2 (10)
Nonia	47 (9.7)	13.7 (1)	3 (2.1)	2 (4.1)	1 (5)
Bania	30 (6.2)	96.4 (6.3)	9 (6.3)	9 (18.4)	6 (30)
Bhar	22 (4.6)	4.1 (0.3)	2 (1.4)	0	0
Kamkar	16 (3.3)	17.3 (1.1)	0	0	0
Rajput	16 (3.3)	173.7 (11.4)	14 (9.8)	2 (4.1)	2 (10)
Dhobi	10 (2.1)	1.2 (0.1)	0	0	0
Gond	10 (2.1)	0	0	0	0
Kohar	9 (1.9)	7.5 (0.5)	0	0	0
Nau	8 (1.7)	11.9 (0.8)	0	0	0
Lohar	8 (1.7)	4.3 (0.3)	0	1 (2.0)	0
Kayastha	7 (1.4)	32.5 (2.1)	0	1 (2.0)	1 (5)
Dusadh	7 (1.4)	5 (0.3)	3 (2.1)	1 (2.0)	0
Paneri	6 (1.2)	0	0	0	0
Rajbhar	5 (1.0)	11.9 (0.8)	1 (0.7)	1 (2.0)	0
Mahabrahman	3 (0.6)	16.9 (10.1)	1 (0.7)	0	0
Bhumihar	2 (0.4)	18.7 (1.2)	2 (1.4)	0	0
Bari	2 (0.4)	0	0	0	0
Sonar	2 (0.4)	0.6 (0.04)	0	0	0
Bind	1 (0.2)	0	0	0	0
Dom	1 (0.2)	0	0	0	0
Muslim	7 (1.4)	8.5 (0.6)	0	0	0
Total	483 (100)	1529 (100)	143 (100)	49 (100)	20 (100)

Five castes - the Bind, Gond, Bari, Paneri and Dom - own no land at all, and the Dhobis and Sonars, are nearly landless. Of these seven castes, the Dhobis and Doms are 'Scheduled Castes' and the others belong to the 'Backward Castes' category.

In terms of the percentage of households belonging to various castes and their ownership of land, the story is not different. The Brahmin (10.4 percent), Rajput (3.3 percent), Yadav (9.7 percent), Koeri (17.8 percent) and Bania (6.2 percent) households respectively own 35.2 percent, 11.4 percent, 13.9 percent, 21 percent, and 6.3 percent of the total land. In other words, the 229 households of these five castes, constituting only 47.4 percent of the total households, own 87.7 percent of the total land. Besides these five castes, the Kayasthas and Bhumihars, belonging to the 'Forward Castes' category, own more land in percentage terms than the percentage of households they represent. The Kayasthas (1.4 percent) and Bhumihars (0.4 percent) own 2.1 percent and 1.2 percent of the total land respectively. Thus, all the 'Forward Castes', except the Mahabrahmans, own more land in percentage terms than the percentage of households they represent. Among the 'Backward Castes', the Koeris, Yadavs and Baniyas own more land in percentage terms than the percentage of households they represent. None of the 'Scheduled Castes' belongs to such a grouping.

## Conclusion

The way that the Brahmins are the greatest landholding station ought not to be interpreted to imply that all Brahmin family units own property. Six Brahmin families are either landless or very near a landless circumstance. Also, other enormous landholding positions like the Yadavs, Koeris and Baniyas, as well, have a sizeable number of family units which are either landless or very near being landless. The Rajputs, Kayasthas and Bhumihars are the main ranks without a landless family unit and these case stations have a place with the 'Advances Castes' classification.

## References

1. Jha, Hetukar. Social structures of Indian villages: A study of rural Bihar. New Delhi: Sage Publications 1991.
2. Chandra, Niramal K. 'Farm efficiency under semi-feudalism: A critique of marginalist theories and some Marxist formulations', Economic and political weekly, 1974;9(32-34):1309-12.
3. Béteille, André. Studies in agrarian social structure. Delhi: Oxford University Press 1974.
4. Rudra, Ashok. In search of the capitalist farmer, Economic and political weekly 1970;5(26):A85-87.
5. Omvedt, Gail. Capitalist agriculture and rural classes in India, Economic and political weekly 1981;16(52):A140-59.