

PEASANTRY AS A CLASS: SOME QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

ARVIND CHAUHAN

The peasant question has been attempted from a variety of angles in various disciplines. In a sense it could be said that now the status of research on peasant is multidisciplinary in nature. The richness of literature on peasant question on the one hand makes it a more lively question for discussion and research, on the other hand makes the question pretty harder to answer. Broadly speaking the literature on peasant studies originates from three broader areas. Firstly, the peasant question had its roots in the anthropological studies in U.S.A. and elsewhere in the early 1950s. Anthropologists-manily cultural anthropologists who were trying to study "other cultures" when noticed that their subject matter alongwith the concept of "little community" is disappearing fast-both in form as well as in content, they shifted their attention towards the study of "peasant society". This shift could be easily located in the work of Robert Redfield (1956). For cultural anthropologists this was a new area which they had discovered for their studies. Robert Redfield defined peasantry as having three characteristics like: (1) it is a part-society with part-culture, (2) peasantry is related to the outside world through elites and (3) peasants take agriculture as a way of life. Here the emphasis on the "cultural" component of peasantry could be seen. The main question which they discussed was that the cultural whole which was clearly visible in "little community" is now replaced by "part culture" - the other half being located outside peasant society. A number of village studies on this pattern appeared in India too at the same time i.e. at the beginning of 1950 and this trend later continued for at least two decades more. Some of the important studies were: M.N. Srinivas (1952) study of village Rampura in Mysore, S.C. Dube's earlier study (1955) of village shamirpet in Andhra Pradesh, his latter study (Dube 1958) of some villages concerned with Community Development Projects (C.D.P.), B.R. Chauhan's study of Ranawat Ki Sadri in Rajasthan (Chauhan 1967). The trend of a single village study continued although with some different questions and emphasis in Andre Beteille's study of Sripuram village in Tamil

Emerging Trends in Development Research, Vol. I, No. 1 & 2, January-July, 1994.

- Gray, Hugh 1978 "The Problem" in A.R. Desai (ed.) **Rural Sociology in India**, Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
- Hirway, Indira 1978 "A Critique of Target Group Approach". In S.D. Pillai and Chris Backs (ed) **Winners and Losers**, Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
- Nicholas, A., et. al. 1985 "Garibi Hatao: Can IRDP do it?" **Economic and Political Weekly**, March.
- Nicholas, A., et. al. 1984 **The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology**, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Lewis Oscar 1958 **Village Life in Northern India: Studies in a Delhi Village**. Urbana: University of California.
- Maheshwari, S.R. 1985 **Rural Development in India**, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Maithani, B.P. and V.P. Singh 1987 "Implementation of NREP in Arunachal Pradesh: A Case Study", **Journal of Rural Development**, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 366-385.
- Rath, N.K. 1985 "Garibi Hatao: Can IRDP do it?" **Economic and Political Weekly**, February 9, p. 245.
- Singh V.P. 1992 "Planning and Implementation of NREP in Assam". Research paper presented in Seminar on **Social Development and Justice: Policies, Programmes and Strategies**, at BANISS, Mhow.
- 1993 "Rural Development in India: History Recent Trends and Conceptual Issues", paper presented in Seminar on **Rural Development**, Social and Life Sciences Research Society, Bhopal.
- Taylor, Garl, C. 1958 "A Critical Analysis of Indian Community Development Programme", **Rural Sociology**, quoted by A.R. Desai (ed.), 1978, **Rural Sociology in India**, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, p. 615.

At the current status of research on peasantry it would be difficult to say in affirmative or in negation about peasantry being a class or not. But this question could be examined in a more meaningful way by attempting to understand the true nature and content as well as its potential for being a class. For this the concept of peasant or peasantry has to be defined clearly, and its potentialities as a class be examined. As a matter of fact this could be done simultaneously i.e. while defining the contents of peasantry its class-potentialities may also be assessed alongwith it. For academic reasons the original question may be modified as: If peasantry is a class, then to what extent where and under what circumstances does it look like one? Then there is a need to select appropriate methodology to discuss this question. At the moment it seems that the historical-comparative approach would provide the starting point and the contributions made in all relevant disciplines, chiefly anthropology - sociology combine, Marxist studies and economic history could be examined.

Nikolai I. Bukharin (1965) has made an important distinction between peasantry and other social categories which may exist alongwith it in society. From conceptual and analytical view this distinction is important. S.M. Lipset (1983) has made an attempt to put the class-analysis made by Bukharin in a tabular form. In this table it is shown how peasantry is different from other social categories like proletariat and lumpenproletariat and to what extent each one of these could be called a class. In other words the presence or absence of class elements as shown in the table No. 1 given below could become an important criterion in class identification.

Table 1: Bukharin's analysis of class conditions²

	Class properties	Peasantry	Lumpen-Proletariat	Proletariat
1.	Economic exploitation	+	-	+
2.	Political Oppression	+	+	+
3.	Poverty	+	+	+
4.	Productivity	+	-	+
5.	Freedom from Private Property	-	+	+
6.	Condition of Union in production and common labour	-	-	+

A systematic interpretation of the above table could help in understanding the structural location of peasantry vis-a-vis other social categories, of course, at a given time period of a society. It is necessary to interpret this meaningfully for yet another reason. Bukharin's analysis of peasantry vis-a-vis other social categories is supposed to be an improvisation over

Nadu. In between these studies two edited works on single village studies also appeared in which several scholars mainly anthropologists contributed on a village each. The first of these was a collection of village studies edited by McKim Marriott (1955) and the second was edited by M.N. Srinivas (1960). M.N. Srinivas in that collection of village studies maintained that villages should be studied throughout the country, and this should be done before these villages undergo a change. The pace of change was expected to be much more faster after India got national independence. In short, these and some other studies of villages from anthropological perspective were sufficiently rich in material and their contents could be used as data for many more years to come.

Another important breakthrough in peasant studies came from yet another related discipline sociology, although in India the academic developments in anthropology and sociology went hand in hand. The emergence of rural sociology as a discipline in the U.S.A. and later in the Western Europe also contributed a discussion on the peasant question. Alongwith these studies the writings of Marx and Engels also generated favourable conditions for the study of peasant question¹. The question of peasantry within Marxist framework was begun to be studied from the perspective of class. This generated a debate over whether peasantry could be treated as a class or not. Similarly the establishment of socialist societies in the U.S.S.R. and China led scholars like Barrington Moore Jr. (1966) to examine what was really wrong with Marxist scheme as such because societies referred above reached socialism without entering into the capitalist phase. Barrington Moore Jr. started with the assumption that industrialization was not the cause of upsurge and revolutions in U.S.S.R. and China. Alongwith it one argument came from all quarters which was based upon demographic reasons. It was argued in almost every writing that peasants constituted a numerical majority and that must be represented in studies on peasants. There were attempts by scholars like Daniel Thorner who tried to study peasantry from the perspective of economic-history. In this way the peasant question has been attempted broadly from three different angles or say three different approaches namely (1) Anthropology and Sociology (2) Marxist studies and (3) Economic History. The task before the scholar of today is to arrive at a meaningful synthesis. A careful study of the three approaches however, suggests that this has not been done so far. For example if one reads Daniel Thorner it becomes evident that he has not referred to any single village study conducted by anthropologists and sociologists. There is however a strong need to bring these very approaches nearer to each other and arrive at a meaningful synthesis and after that some effort has to be done to see the interaction between this theoretical construct and empirical findings. The present paper discusses the nature of peasantry as a class and raises some basic questions and seek their clarifications in the light of the recent sociological literature.

Marx's treatment of peasantry as a class. S.M. Lipset (1983:299) agreeing with it writes, "His (Bukharin's) analysis based on the events of the early decades of the twentieth century was elaborated beyond that of Marx". Another reason for meaningful interpretation of this table is that the data used by Bukharin might serve as a historical background on which further work is possible. Apart from this, Bukharin's data on Russian peasantry, might also serve as a basis on which it could later be attempted to seek the answer to the question, whether peasantry is a universalistic or particularistic category³.

Bukharin's analysis of class-conditions includes three social categories namely peasantry, lumpenproletariat and proletariat and employ six criteria on the basis of which classes are to be identified. One significant departure in Bukharin's analysis might be noted here. Here an attempt has been made to make a distinction within what we may call the lower strata of society. From this analysis it appears at first that the lower strata of society does not operate as a single identifiable entity. Bukharin identifies proletariat as a class and for him the other two categories namely peasantry and lumpenproletariat do not form classes. A careful look at the table suggests that all the six properties of class are present in proletariat thus qualifying it to make itself a class. Peasantry lacks two characteristics of class i.e. (1) freedom from private property-which means that peasants have private property, and (2) condition of union in production and common labour, which means that neither peasants assemble at a common place of work nor they do collective labour in the process of production. Marx has frequently emphasized on the material conditions of factory where industrial proletariat is in an advantageous position vis-a-vis other exploited categories. Marx puts his position clearly like this: "With the development of industry the proletariat not only increases in number, it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows and it feels that strength more" (Marx 1848: 192). Here Marx's idea almost seem to one like what Durkheim calls it 'moral density'.

Bukharin seems to be in agreement with Marx who saw low potentiality in peasantry to become a class. According to Marx (1852) peasantry constitutes a class in itself as, "in so far millions of families live under economic conditions of existence that separate their mode of life, and put them in hostile opposition to the latter, they form a class". But peasantry is not capable enough to free itself from its oppressors and therefore according to Marx peasantry is not a class for itself. Describing it Marx (1952) writes, "In so far there is merely a local interconnection among these small holding peasants, and the identity of their interests begets no community, no national bond, and no political organization among them, they do not form a class".

Bukharin and Marx seem to agree on one point and i.e. that peasantry is not capable enough to organize itself into a class. It also implies that if

peasants try to bring about a revolution it is likely to be defeated. Frederick Engels (1956) has made an analysis of peasant revolutions that failed to materialize. Another important characteristic of peasantry, "freedom from private property" is absent from it. This means that however limited it might be but peasantry owns some land. According to Bukharin's analysis peasantry is tied up with land in such a way that it structurally separates peasants from one another, thus it is not possible for them to unite for their common cause whether it is their economic and political oppression, poverty or exploitation of their productive labour.

In Bukharin's analysis of class conditions a reference to lumpenproletariat has also been made. Of course they have freedom from private property (which means that they do not have private property) but they lack certain other characteristics of class like economic exploitation, productivity and condition of union in production and common labour and thus lumpenproletariats do not constitute a class. Bukharin's class-analysis scheme provides a break-through in the analysis of peasantry vis-a-vis other social categories. It seems relevant to refer to Marx's notion of "false consciousness" here. In Marx's analysis the lower strata of society, proletariat in particular, might fall in the trap of what he calls it "false consciousness". Likewise, with the tide of economic development the peasantry might also fall in the same trap. The question of false consciousness still requires an examination in the case of peasantry especially in the wake of the introduction of new technology, fertilizers, irrigation facilities, provision of loan and subsidies and the like. Here its mere reference would serve the purpose, but the question of false consciousness could be dealt with a little later.

Marx has referred to yet another aspect of peasantry being a class. Marx's distinction between peasantry as a class in itself and not class for itself might have certain other repercussions. While analysing the historical evolution of bourgeoisie from as a class in itself to class for itself, Marx (1847) said the former period was of a longer duration in comparison to that of the latter period. For bourgeoisie it required a lot of effort for a considerably longer period to establish and struggle when it was class in itself (German ansich) than the period when it became class-conscious and capable of political action to throw away the feudal and monarchic orders. Similarly it could be argued that the struggle of the exploited class might be of a longer duration till it becomes politically class-conscious.

Theoretically speaking till it becomes class for itself (German fursich) peasantry might have to struggle for a considerably longer time in its historical evolution.

Marx while accepting the incapability of peasantry becoming a class and carrying out its own struggle, stated that it could get leadership (class leadership) of their urban industrial counterpart-the proletariat. Speaking on

leadership question, Lenin opined that the leadership might come from certain sections other than the proletariat itself. Lenin (1902) sought the leadership to be drawn from elite sections of society or from what he called the vanguard. Max Weber too opined that it was not possible even for industrial proletariat to reach a stage of consciousness through trade union efforts directed against their employers for minimum wages and against working conditions. From this, it could be safely deduced here that when it was not possible for even urban-industrial proletariat to develop that level of class-consciousness without outside leadership, then peasantry-still a weaker force in itself could not expect any sort of a revolution without outside support and leadership. In other words it means that peasantry has to be led from outside.

In Bukharin's class analysis of peasantry, economic exploitation, political oppression and poverty in general as important characteristics of peasantry could be clubbed together. Teodor Shanin's definition of peasantry includes its 'underdog' position (Shanin 1971: 14-16). Apart from this, Shanin's definition of peasantry includes three other characteristics namely peasant family farm as the basic unit of social organization, land-husbandry as the main source of livelihood and specific traditional culture (Shanin 1971: 14-16). What Bukharin calls the "productivity" of the peasantry, Shanin acknowledges it in the form of family farm being the main productive unit of social organization. But Bukharin and Shanin seem to differ on one significant count i.e. about chances of peasantry taking a revolutionary turn. Bukharin (1965: 299) negates "condition of union in production and common labour among the peasants"; where as Shanin (1971: 15) looks at peasantry as "in some conditions they may turn into the revolutionary proletariat of our times". Both Bukharin as well as Shanin agree on yet another point, for the former peasants are put to "political oppression" and for the latter peasants are structurally located in what he calls it, "the under-dog position-the domination of peasantry by outsiders".

Teodor Shanin in yet another article tries to define peasantry along with its characteristics. According to Shanin "The peasantry consists of small agricultural producers who with the help of simple equipment and the labour of their families, produce mainly for their own consumption and for the fulfillment of obligations to the holders of political and economic power" (Shanin 1971: 240). According to Shanin there are five characteristics associated with peasantry and they have been discussed along with proper references. These characteristics as described by Shanin (1971: 240-45) could be identified as essential components of the definition of peasantry and also its treatment as a class. These characteristics of peasantry are (i) its relationship to land, (ii) the family farm, (iii) its occupation as determinant of social status, (iv) village-structure (and its place in it) (v) peasantry as pre-industrial social entity.

Shanin argues that peasants' relationship to land is important in the sense that it provides the necessary minimum for the peasant and his family to sustain and this saves peasants from other producers (where he could have worked as agricultural labour otherwise) and market forces. This gives rise to some sort of stability to peasant family vis-a-vis his other counterparts working on land. Shanin quotes one Polish scholar Galeski who states that land is "a necessary and generally sufficient condition" to enter the occupation" (Shanin 1971: 240). Shanin has clarified this relationship (between peasantry and land) further: "In actual fact, the legal ownership of peasant land, as seen by a townsman, may lie with the peasant himself, the commune, the landlord or the state; the land being correspondingly a private plot, commune property or a customary lease holding" (Shanin 1971: 240). This way of explaining the relationship between peasant and land of course offers a much wider consideration, peasantry under almost every mode of production may have this sort of a relationship with land. This also brings out a point clearly and i.e. that the peasantry is a transnational as well as a universal-phenomenon. It reminds the statement of Redfield, "Peasant society and culture has something generic about it. It is a kind of arrangement of humanity with some similarities all over the world" (Redfield 1956: 25). but Redfield immediately reminds, "Landlords are not needed to establish the fact of a peasantry" (Redfield 1956: 28). Peasants' relationship with land is although essential but before making any class-analysis of peasantry it would be appropriate to examine: (a) the mode of production or social formation (b) the system by which land has been acquired and (c) the existence of other classes vis-a-vis peasantry.

Teodor Shanin quotes Galeski on the question of family farm also. By acquiring/owning land the peasant along with his family establishes himself in a relatively stable social structure. According to Galeski, the identification of interest of family and farm - holding seems to be a typical characteristic of the traditional peasant family. Teodor Shanin (1971: 243-44) then talks about the occupation of the peasant. Instead of discussing the specific occupation of the peasant, Shanin rather prefers to discuss the entire cluster of occupations. Shanin maintains that the technology that is employed by peasant comes generally from the village itself. Therefore, there seems to be an existence of the rural populace i.e. engaged in non-farming work. Shanin seems to have relied on those interconnections between the two, the peasant and the non-farming populace, both residing in rural areas⁴. Another point regarding the occupation of the peasant and its allies in rural areas has been outlined. Shanin observes that both of these oppose high level mechanization and industrialization, as this part of economic operating from outside the village might lead towards their destruction. At this particular moment of analysis, it appears that Shanin again returns to his earlier position which puts the peasantry in opposition to its urban-industrial counterparts.

This discussion on the peasant economy once again highlights the rural vs. urban question. In the entire approach it seems that not only people working on land are taken as one single category but entire rural populace is being treated as the oppressed entity. The relationship between the peasant and its rural counterpart seems to be "functional" in the analysis of Shanin. The possible follow up may lead to the rural-urban divide type of questions. This again may block our way to make the class analysis of peasantry. Shanin's approach has this weakness as it seems that with that kind of analysis it is not easy to work out internal contradictions and to make a class analysis of peasantry.

Teodor Shanin makes one more characteristic clear and i.e. the village structure and its association with the peasantry. Again the village seems to have been taken as a single entity, neglecting the possibility of internal contradiction. Describing village-structure, Teodor Shanin (1971: 244) writes, "In the setting of village community or peasant commune, the peasant reaches level of nearly total self-sufficiency. This sort of a neglect of internal heterogeneity might lead towards a serious shortcoming while making a class-analysis of peasantry. One last point made by Teodor Shanin about the definition of peasantry being the pre-industrial social entity needs reconsideration. Shanin (1971: 244-45) criticises Marx and Engels for their treatment of peasantry as "relics of the way of production which already belongs to the past". Shanin also disagrees with the notion of "delayed development" of peasantry. Shanin (1971: 244-45) in addition to all this wants to focus on the need to examine the question from the perspective of what he calls "specific features of development (of the peasantry)". Shanin on the other hand seems to have been quite aware of the difficulties that crop up in constructing a concept (here peasantry) and its empirical referents. Shanin (1971: 245) clarifies, "No, concept of a social stratum can be made exactly to coincide with any empirically defined group. Yet the importance and validity of attempting a conceptual definition of peasantry for research seems to us beyond question".

Shanin's approach to conceptualise peasantry has led towards the rural-urban divide type of questions in his final analysis. Not only this, Shanin has also referred to certain "parallel patterns" in urban areas vis-a-vis rural areas. This requires a brief discussion as Shanin puts this divide between rural and urban along three points, in which both areas are treated as contradicting each other. An analysis of this is as the following.

(1) According to Shanin (1971: 249) what he calls it, large-scale, capital intensive and mechanized agriculture, "gradually destroys the small farms". Shanin further states, "Agriculture fully taken over by industrial methods of production becomes merely a branch of industry" (Shanin 1971: 249). Shanin quotes Lenin here to support this argument. Shanin's emphasis on rural-urban divide is clear, although in this analysis there are indications that industrial forces might destroy the peasant economy. The nature of

contradictions in the analysis of Shanin now seems to be between urban industrialised agriculture and rural peasantry. Shanin's analysis has so far not tried to examine the question of the division of peasantry from within and the possible use of the new technology by the upper stratum of the peasantry. An important point for discussion may be that, to examine the relationship between the urban industrial-agricultural forces and rural based section to which peasantry belongs. This question needs further researches in both the areas at theoretical as well as at empirical level. According to Shanin's formulation the relationship between the two seems to be that of contradictions, as it goes along the argument of rural-urban divide.

(2) Teodor Shanin has given yet another count in the definition of peasantry from class perspective. Continuing with the earlier-urban vs. rural debate, Shanin argues that town-centred society creates conditions in favour of what he calls "professional stratum of farmers". It is further argued, "the poorer villagers are increasingly sucked in from the countryside by the expanding urban areas. The same happens to peasant entrepreneurs and to part of the economic surplus in agriculture" (Shanin 1971: 249). Besides, it has been argued that the middle peasants' support rests on two grounds (a) family production unit and (b) an increasing co-operative movement, (to) fight successfully for a place in market society⁵. Another category has been that of worker-peasant which supplements its income by hiring out its labour⁶. From analytical point of view it seems that Teodor Shanin divides peasants into three categories: (a) professional stratum of farmers, (b) middle-peasants and (c) Worker-peasant.

(3) Teodor Shanin (1971: 250) quotes Gunnar Myrdal for the analysis of peasantry in the third world. The basic feature of these societies is the cumulative pauperization of the peasantry. This is followed by certain other typical characteristics like population explosion, deepening market relations and industrial competition with traditional peasant handicrafts, underemployment, agrarian over-population etc. Shanin has also discussed at length about the possibilities of peasantry becoming a class and argued, "how far a peasantry may be regarded as a class is not a clear-cut problem, but should be seen rather as a question of degree and historical period" (Shanin 1971: 253). A reference to peasantry's political capabilities has also made a distinction between independent class action and guided political action has also been made⁷. The discussion by Shanin (1971: 258-60) includes the following points about peasantry (a) being capable of fully spontaneous, amorphous political action-local riots and peasant passivity, (b) a modern conscript army being a nationwide organizations in which peasantry actively participates. Another sort of a peasant action namely guerrilla warfare has also been made.

It seems possible at this moment to argue about the general nature of peasantry as being a class. (i) The first important point is that the mode of production puts peasants in such a structural lock-up that it does not seem

possible for the peasants to unite and take on a class action. The second point follows from the first and i.e. about peasant passivity. (ii) Peasants are not capable enough to lead a movement-a class movement, without the support of the outside forces. In other words the leadership of the peasantry comes from those areas that are not necessarily their own and leader may not be the one who comes from their own people. (iii) Apart from internal contradictions, outside forces also keep on operating and they attempt to destroy the basic fabric of the peasantry. This inside vs. outside dilemma of contradictions and change may also be viewed along agriculture v. industry or better along rural v. urban contradictions. (iv) The peasantry could be divided into three main types, namely (a) professional stratum of farmers, (b) middle peasant and (c) worker-peasant. (v) The strength of the middle peasant lies on two grounds, (a) family production unit and (b) to build up a co-operative movement to seek a place in market economy. (vi) Peasants are structurally located in such a situation that works against their possibilities of becoming a class (for itself). However, barring a few exceptions peasant wars generally turned out to be a few separate isolated outbursts.

However, there is a need to examine and make an analysis of six major wars that were successfully fought mainly with the peasant-support⁸. These six peasant rebellions were (a) the Mexican revolution of 1910, (b) the Russian revolutions of 1905-1917, (c) Chinese revolutions since 1921 onwards and upto 1949, (d) Vietnamese revolution which had its roots in the World War II (e) the Algerian rebellion of 1954 and (f) the Cuban revolution of 1958. There is a need to make an analysis of Russian as well as Chinese revolutions specially to examine the role of peasantry in building up a class movement and, its political outcome, the dictatorship of the left forces⁹.

Class-analysis of peasantry of the Soviet Union needs another look after the contributions of Leszek Kolakowski (1978). He has attempted to locate the contradictions between peasantry and its counterpart the proletariat (Kolakowski 1978: 30-40).¹⁰ The main question was what the state had to offer to the peasants in lieu of their produce. There was another related question as how to tackle that situation if peasants refused to sell their produce as they might not get much out of the economy which was already in the ruined state. Another sharp contradiction between the Bolshevik party and peasants was that the former was not ready to let the economy (and hence power) go in the hands of the latter. Here the significance of the notion of peasant passivity becomes clear even according to the assertions of the Communist Party of Soviet Union. This case of peasant passivity in a socialist society acquires serious dimension in the Marxist theory and praxis of the socialist society. Proletarian dictatorship did not allow the peasantry to share the fruits of the revolution. Bukharin's approach of preferential treatment for peasants although supported by Stalin, was theoretically opposed by some scholars including Preobrazhensky

who argued in favour of a strong centrally controlled industrial base. Socialist state, unlike colonial states, had to develop the industrial infrastructure from their own resources and for that they relied on peasants. L. Kolakowski (1978: 30) writes "State's industry, however, cannot of itself create a sufficient basis of accumulation but must draw upon the resources of small producers i.e. in practice of peasantry". Clarifying it further it has been stated that private holdings must be the object of internal colonization. Preobrazhensky admitted frankly "it was a matter of exploiting the peasant, extracting the maximum amount of surplus value from his labour to increase investment in industry" (Kolakowski 1978: 30). In Soviet Union there were numerous problems in the path to be followed towards socialism. Karl Kautsky did not agree with the position taken by Bernstein that in spite of the concentration of capital (in the hands of the state) the number of middle class is not decreasing, meaning thereby a question mark began to appear on Marx's notion of polarization of the middle class along two camps. Karl Kautsky refuted this by arguing that the people belonging to middle class were not petty bourgeois but men thrown out of work by the concentration of capital. Against this background L. Kolakowski (1978: 44) writes about peasants, "He (Karl Kautsky) admitted that in agriculture the disappearance of small holdings was not proceeding so fast as has been predicted, but here too he thought it was bound to come in time". On the basis of this statement of Karl Kautsky it could be argued that it was not an easy job for the state to do away with peasants-everything against their will, and to proceed smoothly towards large scale collectivisation. Here the significance of peasant resistance against state intervention is clearly visible. But at least one point is very clear and i.e. that even socialist society had witnessed the contradiction between the proletariat (the Bolsheviks) and the peasantry, between urban and its rural counterpart, between state capital and the peasantry. L. Kolakowski at one point has tried to make this contradiction clear when he said, "the contradiction does not lie in the doctrine, but in the interests of the possessing classes" (Kolakowski 1978: 349).

Class-analysis of peasantry has been a subject of long and lengthy debates in the Marxist polemics. Peasantry, was denied any share in the power by the Bolsheviks and had to suffer from various angles-theoretical point of view being the main issue and the target was peasantry. One such theoretical opposition came from a Marxist theoretician K. Kelles-Krauz¹⁰ who argued against peasant interests and the argument he gave was that the collective agriculture was more revolutionary in nature rather than the earlier form of agriculture. K. Kelles-Krauz's mention has been precisely in this way: "He (K. Kelles-Krauz) combated the revisionism of Eduard David on the agricultural question, sharing the orthodox view that a collectivised economy was better for land as well as for industry" (P. 213).

Quite a different and perhaps a more realistic stand on peasantry and peasant problems was taken by Lenin. Clarifying Lenin's position on peasant L. Kolakowski (1978: 405) writes, "Unlike the orthodox Marxist he (Lenin)

perceived the huge revolutionary potential that lie in the peasants' unfulfilled demands, and he (Lenin) urged the party to exploit this even though from a traditional point of view, it might seem to involve a reactionary act'. Thus any attempt to support small holders was considered to be 'reactionary'. Lenin spoke in favour of peasantry perhaps after realising the class potentials of peasantry. Lenin presented his views like the following.

"It is reactionary to support small property because such support is directed against large-scale capitalist economy, and consequently retards social development and obscures and glosses over the class-struggle. In this case, however, we want to support small property not against capitalism but against self-ownership... There are two sides of all things in the world. In the west, the peasant proprietor has already played his part in the democratic movement, and is now defending his position of privilege as compared with the proletariat. In Russia, the peasant proprietor is as yet on the eve of decisive and nation-wide democratic movement with which he cannot but sympathize... In a historic movement like the present, it is our direct duty to support the peasants" (Lenin 1978 : 400).

In this way Lenin had realised the strength of peasantry and also the need to support it. Lenin also reflected on the other side of the coin, but that will be brought into discussion a little bit later. Lenin wanted to support peasant against what he called "self ownership". Examining Lenin's point of view on peasants, L. Kolakowski (1978: 502) writes like this: "At the outset of the revolution Lenin hoped for support not only from the proletariat but from the working peasants as opposed to the Kulaks; but it soon became clear that while the whole of the peasantry supported the revolution against the big landowners they were much less enthusiastic for the next phase". This clarifies that the working peasants were tried to be mobilised in the countryside, on the same ground on which their urban counterpart proletariat made the struggle a revolutionary success. This discussion brings out a point that needs some consideration. Theoretically speaking at least here agriculture (and classes within it) are taken as a (rural) equivalent to (urban) industry. The common thread that binds working peasants and industrial proletariat together was perhaps located in the Marxist principle of exploitation, working peasants exploited by the Kulaks and industrial proletariat by bourgeoisie.

It was therefore thought that from a point of view of praxis as well as strategy working peasant should be the natural ally of industrial proletariat. The question before us is whether it is correct to equate agriculture (and classes within it) with industry. Any analysis which begins with this point, is likely to identify a similar nature of classes working on the similar nature of underlying principle (e.g. here the underlying principle has been exploitation). And if it is done like this, it would mean that two types of class struggles are going on in a one single society-one in the urban areas and the other in the countryside. It raises two important questions at the theoretical plane. These are the following.

(A) If two class-struggles are going on simultaneously one in urban and the other in rural areas then, would it be appropriate to use the Marxist concept of social formation, especially if there is hardly any alignment between the exploited masses.

(B) If we recall Marx's statement "No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is a room in it have been developed; and new, higher relations of productions never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society" (Marx 1849: 68), certain questions could be raised at theoretical level.

From the passage quoted above it could be deduced that one social order based on a particular mode of production is followed by another and the former never disappears before conditions for its destruction have been created by the latter. Once this transition has taken place, then it seems from Marx's statement that the change is fundamental as well as final, meaning thereby, there is no going back. This has been a theoretical stand taken by Marx, but as far as his views on praxis are concerned he continued, "Therefore, mankind always sets itself only such problems as it can solve; since on closer examination, it will always be found that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions necessary for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation". Unfortunately Marx did not talk of mode of production immediately after that. But Marx seems to be certain on one point at least and i.e. that after the next higher social order has been achieved there is no possibility of going back to the society based upon the preceding mode of production. At this state of argument this standpoint could be equated with the stand taken by Thoman S. Kuhn (1970) on paradigm analysis although Kuhn has been skeptical about paradigm-analysis being applied in social sciences as he treats them to be in a pre-paradigm stage. But once there is a break in the paradigm and it has been replaced by another, the change is complete. The difference does not seem to be in approaches to the problem but perhaps in the vocabulary. Kuhn calls it "anomalies", Marx calls it "dialectical materialism" and Engels call it "negation".

It seems proper at the movement to return back to the discussion made prior to raising these two points-about theoretical possibilities of the Marxist concept of "social formation" and about the change of society from one represented by one mode of production to the other and the problems of structural and fundamental nature of change of society. To continue the previous argument, the question before us was the nature of peasantry-exhibiting internal contradictions on the one hand and being exploited as a whole on the other. Lenin who wanted to make use of the internal contradictions of peasantry soon became aware of the nature of unity exhibited by the peasantry. Working peasants no longer opposed the Kulaks but worked unitedly with them. L. Kolakowski makes this point precise like

this: "The Party (Bolshevik) placed its hopes from the beginning on kindling the class struggle in the countryside, and tried to rouse the poor peasants and farm-labourers against the richer peasants, *inter alia*, by the so-called Committees of the Poor. The results were meagre, and it was clear that the common interest of the peasants as a class was generally stronger than the conflict between poor peasants and Kulaks" (Kolakowski 1978: 502).

In this way Lenin as well as Shanin seem to have accepted the unity of interest of the peasantry as a whole. From the point of view of strategy and praxis Lenin thought of "neutralising" peasantry as a whole. At the Tenth party Conference in May 1921 Lenin announced, "We tell the peasants frankly and honestly, without any deception: in order to hold the road to socialism, we are making a number of concessions to you, comrade peasants, but only within the stated limits and to the stated extent; and, of course, we ourselves shall be the judge of the limits and the extent".

This tough posture of Lenin soon made it clear that the dictatorship of the proletariat (and that of needy peasants) was an illusion and a part of the propaganda tactics. It is another question however to examine Marx's view at the theoretical level. But Bolshevik party later admitted openly that it stands against peasantry as a whole. Kolakowski (1978: 503) makes this point precisely, "The Party (Bolsheviks) in due course openly admitted that the dictatorship of the proletariat was exercised over the whole peasantry, which thus had no say in deciding the matters that concerned it most, though it was still an obstacle that had to be taken into account. The situation was indeed obvious from the beginning: as the November elections showed, if the peasants had a share in power the country would have been governed by the S.R.s, with the Bolshevik minority in opposition".

This was how Lenin and the Bolshevik party accepted the unity of the interests of the peasantry as a whole. From the point of view of class analysis of peasantry it is an important point to reckon with on the basis of the analysis of societies based upon capitalist mode of production made by Shanin and the analysis of a society based upon socialist mode of production made by Lenin, it becomes clear that the peasantry had been a loser in both the cases. But one striking feature has been brought out if we look at both the analysis carefully that there is a unity of interests within the peasantry. It seems that although there are internal contradictions within peasantry but more important and relevant point is that it has been exploited by the outside world.

NOTES:

- (1) For a detailed discussion on this point please see Teodard Shanin, "Introduction" in *Pesant and Peasant Societies* (edited), Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, (1971), pp. 11-19.

- (2) Nikolai I. Bukharin, (1965). reproduced as original without any alterations in the table from S.M. Lipset (1983).
- (3) This question would be taken up as a challenge in the area of comparative studies on peasantry.
- (4) Please see Teodard Shanin, (1971), pp. 243-44 for the following discussion as well as reference.
- (5) Teodard Shanin quotes Karl Marx and Otto Bauer here to support his point. These have been seen as the only way for peasantry to develop. Please see pp. 249-251.
- (6) Worker peasant sells out his labour and is able to maintain hardly a subsistence level.
- (7) This point does not need any elaboration as it is followed by some well known examples like peasant conditions of Russia and China and French Bonapartism alongwith Mao's people's army.
- (8) Please see Eric Wolf "On Peasant Rebellions" *International Social Science Journal*, Volume 21, 1969, reproduced in Teodard Shanin, (1971), pp. 264-274.
- (9) For a discussion on this point please see the argument put forward by Barrington Moore Jr. In *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1966.
- (10) For a detailed discussion on the contributions of K. Kelles-Krauz, please see L. Kolakowski, volume 2, (1978), pp. 94 and 213.

REFERENCES

- | | | |
|----------------------|------|--|
| Beteille, Andre | 1965 | <i>Caste, Class and Power; Changing Patterns of Stratification in a Tanjore Village</i> , Berkley: University of California Press. |
| Bukharin, Nikolai I. | 1965 | <i>Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology</i> (Translated from Third Russian Edition (1921), New York: Russell. |
| Chauhan, Brij Raj | 1967 | <i>A Rajasthan Village</i> , New Delhi: Vir Publishing House. |
| Dube, S.C. | 1955 | <i>Indian Village</i> , London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. |
| Engels, Frederick | 1958 | <i>India's Changing Villages</i> , Bombay: Allied Publishers. |
| Kolakowski, Leszek | 1974 | <i>The Peasant War in Germany</i> , Moscow: Progress Publishers. |
| Kuhn, Thomas S. | 1978 | <i>Main Currents of Marxism</i> , (Vol. 1.2 and 3), Oxford: Oxford University Press. |
| | 1970 | <i>The Structure of Scientific Revolutions</i> , Chicago: Chicago University Press (Second Edition). |

TOURISM : AN ALTERNATIVE STRATEGY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF GARHWAL HIMALAYAS

VIJAY KUMAR SISODIA

Today the development of areas in Garhwal Himalayas has become a matter of great concern for social scientists, planners and administrators. The need for developing these areas has been well recognised both at the national and the local level and is being talked about in remote hill villages as well as in the planning commission and the state secretariate. Hill areas form a class by themselves because of their peculiar nature in terms of geographical, economic and ecological conditions. These peculiarities inhibit the process of development of these areas. Any effort aimed towards the development of these areas must take into account the specific problems and characteristics of these areas. Past experiences in the developing of hill areas have shown that all too often plans designed for the country as a whole have been implemented in the hill region too without any regard to their specific requirements. Inevitably the results have fallen short of their goals and the hill areas continue to be in a state of economic backwardness. This slow pace of development and the neglect of the interests and the aspirations of the local people has been causing discontent and a sense of deprivation among them. According to Bahuguna (1985) 'the cold icy mountains have been turning into mountains of warm discontent'. The present paper aims to identify some of the major constraints in the process of development of the hill region of Garhwal and made an attempt to discuss the nature and role of tourism in the socio-economic development of this naturally rich but economically backward region.

Garhwal region forming the north-western corner of the state of Uttar Pradesh consists of five hill districts namely Dehradun, Pauri Garhwal, Tehri Garhwal, Uttarkashi and Chamoli. It lies between 29° 26' and 31° 28' north latitude and 77° 49' and 86° 06' east longitude with an area of 30090 sq. km. The altitude in the region varies from 1000 feet at the foothills to 25500 feet at Nanda Devi which is the highest peak in the region. The region is composed of vast tracts of bare rocks covered with forests offering very little levelled ground for agricultural purposes.

Emerging Trends in Development Research, Vol. I, No. 1 & 2, January-July, 1994.

- 1902 Lenin, V.I. "What is to be done?" *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, Moscow, foreign Languages Publishing House, (1961).
- 1978 Sochinenia (Works) Vol. 6, quoted by L. Kolakowski *Main Currents of Marxism* Vol. 2, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1983 "Stratification, Social" in David Sills (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, pp. 296-316.
- 1955 Village India, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1848 *Manifesto of the Communist Party* quoted by T.B. Bottomore and M. Rubel (eds.) 1984: Karl Marx: *Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- 1852 *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1934.
- 1847 *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1956, quoted by S.M. Lipset in (1983).
- 1849 "Preface", *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, in T.B. Bottomore and M. Rubel (eds.) Karl Marx: *Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1961.
- 1968 *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- 1956 *Peasant Society and Culture*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- 1971 *Peasant and Peasant Societies*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- 1952 *Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India*, Bombay: Asia.
- 1960 *India's Villages*, Bombay: Asia Publishing House (Second Edition).
- 1962 *Land and Land Labour in India*, Bombay, Allied Publishers.
- 1968 *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, Vol. 1 & 2, New York, Bedminster Press (Original Published in 1922).