

**New Agro-Technology and Traditional Rural Family and Rural Power
Structure: A Case Study from Odisha
Niharranjan Mishra**

ABSTRACT

Agriculture holds a pivotal place in the economy of Orissa in terms of both income and employment around which economic privileges and deprivations revolve. For the people of Orissa agriculture is not merely a means of livelihood but a way of life. In this paper an attempt has been made to analyse the impact of new agro technology on the rural social institutions with reference to traditional rural family and power structure in Orissa. The study intend to explore the changing socio-political structure of the rural society. It seems that the agro technology along with other factors like education, westernization and modernization has led not only to an increasing productivity, but also brought about a fundamental change in the structure and function of rural family power structure. The study also revealed that the agro technology raised the class feeling weakening the traditional caste feeling in the village.

Orissa, the tenth largest and eleventh most populous state of India, occupies 5 % of the geographical area (1.56 lakh sqk.m.) and 4% of the population (3.67 crore) of the country (2001 census). Orissa is primarily a rural state. Nearly 87% of the population of the state live rural areas as per the 1991 census. Agriculture is the main economic activity of nearly 72% of the population. They depend on agriculture for their livelihood and employment. Compared to secondary and tertiary sectors, agriculture contributes a sizeable portion of income that is 28.54 % towards the composition of the State Domestic Product (2001 census). So, for the people of Orissa, agriculture is not merely a means of livelihood but as way of life. Hence, any change in the field of agriculture affects the agrarian social structure or agro based rural social institutions.

Since the very inception of First Five Year Plan, huge efforts are being made by the Government of Orissa to reshape agriculture through large-scale irrigation, mechanization, land reform measures and other infrastructural development. The

Government has implemented different policies and plans like Orissa Estate Abolition Act 1951, Orissa Land Reform Act 1960, Consolidation of Land Holding and the Prevention of Fragmentation of Land Act, 1972, State Agricultural Policy, 1996, *Biju Krisak Yojana* 2000, *Panipanchayat* 2001, etc., to create a progressive rural society on the one hand, and to maximize agricultural production on the other. Though the changes in agricultural policies and technology have influenced many rural social institutions and agrarian social structure, especially after 1970s, the mainstream sociological and anthropological literature did not reflect on this to the extent needed. However, some of the social anthropologists like Beteille (1974) and Frankel (1971) have focused on the changing situation of agrarian social structure after the advent of Green Revolution, but their study is confined to some of the states. Even in the case of Orissa, some social anthropologists like Panda (1979) and Mohanty (2000) have done some studies on agrarian relations in the contest of Green Revolution, but their study is not so comprehensive and is also confined to Western Orissa only. The present paper is a modest attempt to see how technological changes in agriculture have their impact on rural social institutions, particularly on traditional family and power structure in coastal Orissa.

Methodology:

This paper is based on the data collected from Jagdalpur village of Bhadrak district in Orissa by means of case studies, interviews and participant observation of everyday life and practices of the villagers. Quantitative information with regard to the technological development, land holding, demographic aspects, cropping patterns, irrigation systems were collected by using household schedules and District statistical hand book. Data concerning agrarian relations and the economic development of the village were recollected from each and every household.

Location and People:

Jagdalpur is situated in the Jagdalpur Panchayat of Bhadrak block in Bhadrak district, about 10 kilometres from district head quarters. It is a multi *jati* village inhabited by 10 *jatis*. Two of these- the *Brahmin*, *Khandayat*-belong to forward *jati* category. Six of these -the *Gouda*, *Kumbhar*, *Kamar*, *Bania*, *Barik*, *Tanti* are backward *jati*. The remaining two- belongs to schedule *jati* category that are *Dhoba* and *Pana*. Although the *Pana* are numerically highest among the 10 *jatis*, the *Khandayat* play a dominant role both

economically and politically. The total population is 639 formed by 102 families. Coming to the land holding pattern of the village it is seen that, out of 102 households, 72 households (70.5%) own land. Among the landless *jati* 63.33% are *pana*. Most of the landowners come under the category of 0-1 and 2.5-5 acre. Whereas 33 households have less than 3 acres of land, 9 households enjoy the status of owning more than 10 acres of land. The *Brahmin* and the *Khandayat* constitute 27% of the total population and acquire 58.2% of total land. The *pana*, who constitute 25% the total population, possess 3.5% of the total land. The village Jagadapur is one of the agriculturally advanced villages of Bhadrak district served by the Salandi canal. The main crops grown are paddy, mustard, black and green gram. Along with efficient water management, the use of HYV, chemical fertiliser and machines have accelerated their desire to cultivate more and more cash crops rather than subsistence crops. There are 2 tractors, 2 power tillers, 20 water pumps, 25 wooden plough, 30 sprayers, 59 pairs bullocks and 68 threshing machines out of which 30 electric machines and rests are manual.

Traditional family and its changing situations:

Family, which is a primary social group, is universally recognised to be the basis of all human endeavours and activities. The concept of family is been found to exist since time immemorial and at all levels of human cultures. However, it has been believed that it would be impossible to conceive progress of man without a family organisation. In social sciences, especially in the field of Anthropology, Westermarck (1891) was the first scholar to emphasize on the supremacy of family. His book “The History of Human Marriage” aroused great interest among the scholars and social scientists about the concepts of marriage and family. The concept of the joint nuclear dichotomy of family is usually based on the mode of family organisation. While the nuclear family is defined as a group consisting of spouses and their unmarried children, the joint family is defined as the nuclear family along with all the kin belonging to either side of the spouses living in one home.

Joint family is one of the most important pillars, upon which, the entire Hindu society is based. It is an age-old system, which is deeply rooted in traditional Hindu culture. Different scholars have defined joint family in different times. According to

Irawati Karve, "A joint family is a group of people who generally live under one roof, who eat food cooked at common hearth, who hold property in common and who participate in common worship and are related to each other as some particular type of kindred"(1953:10).

The joint family system originated in India when the society was agrarian in its character, and acted as a stabilising factor as long as the societal processes remained operative in the agriculture based society. These agro-based families were dependant on their family labourers for their agricultural operation, for which they were staying together under a common roof. But when, along with industrialisation, higher education, urbanisation, and the modernizing process in agriculture entered into the contemporary society, the need for joint family living was gradually felt less (Desai 1961;Mazumdar 1962;Beteille 1964;Wiser 1965;Venkatarayappa 1973;Sharma 1975 and Gupta 1979). However, some of them feel that this is dispersal and not disappearance of joint family altogether (Beteille 1964;Singh 1973;Singh 1984;Mandelbaum 1970).

Changes in the structure of the families:

Before the advent of new technology in agriculture the family system in Jagdalpur village was predominantly joint in nature. During early 80's, out of 69 families, 41 were joint in nature? (Table: 1). During 80's the introduction of mechanization of agriculture in the form of tractor, power tiller and thresher, etc. displaced most of the agricultural labourers from their occupation. This displacement compelled most of the agricultural labourers to leave their joint families and village communities. During early 90's, 3 agricultural labourers migrated along with their wives and children, while 12 labourers temporarily migrated. The manpower released out of this agriculture found employment in the industrial centres scattered over many distant places in India. Since a joint family cannot always be maintained in the towns or cities, because of high cost of urban living and problem of accommodation, these migrated labourers started to live with their wives and unmarried children, leaving their parents at village alone. This labour migration of young earning members of the family brought a social tension among the rest of the family members in the village. In course of time, this displacement of family members

reduced their emotional attachment with other family members and leads to the formation of nuclear families. The family structure of the *Badhei* (carpenter) was not away from the impact of technological change in agriculture. Due to the introduction of tractor, the *Badhei* of the village have lost their traditional occupation and gradually moved to the industrial and urban centers in search of employment. In all the 2 *Badhei* families, except the old man, other youths are working in city. These factors brought about the disintegration of joint family.

Before the onset of multi-cropping system, all the members of the family were free to sit together after their dinner. This post-dinner get-together helped to create an atmosphere of nearness, respect and love for each other. Misunderstandings could be mutually cleared up in this close gathering. But the introduction of multi-cropping system made the family members busy through out the year. It became quite difficult to sit together and share their internal feeling. As a result, it created certain gap among the family members, and also reduced the emotional attachment.

On the other hand, when the economy was predominantly subsistence in nature, all the family members were working together for their survival. But the advent of modern technology and mechanization of agriculture led to individualism. The increased production as a result of technological transformations also resulted in family disputes over its proper distribution. Thus, the joint family system broke down predominantly in farmers' community. The young married couples preferred to stay separate and followed their own way of life.

Before the technological change in agriculture, the production was very less. Especially, the family members of marginal landholders and landless working classes houses were working jointly in order to protect themselves from the natural calamities like drought, cyclone and flood, etc. But the introduction of 'new technology' in the form of fertilisers, HYV seeds, developed irrigation system and mechanization of agriculture raised the crop production. As a result of this, the dependence of family members on each other was reduced. This weakens the social bond among the family members and led to the break down of the joint family.

The introduction of labour displacing machines like tractor and threshers in the field of agriculture compelled most of the agricultural labourers to leave their village. In

later stage, this labour migration posed problems for the landlords to lease out their land. It encouraged sharecropping system. Some of the members of landless lower class families, who had numerically labour power, separated from the original joint family and established nuclear family. They thought that if they got separated, then by taking some land in lease, they could live better.

The analysis of change in the family structure of the present study shows that among 102 families, there are 23.5% joint families and 76.5% nuclear families (Table 1). The incidence of joint or nuclear families varies with the level of status of the family. As far as the class structure is concerned, the study found that joint families are mainly found among the landlords and owner cultivators than the marginal farmers. While the percentage of joint family among the landlords and owner cultivators is 58%, it is only 15% among the marginal farmers, land less agricultural labourers and sharecroppers. Emphasizing on the existence of a strong relationship between class status and family structure, Bose (1978) and Sachchidananda (1970) confirmed that the extended families exist among the land owning classes, and nuclear families are found among the rural marginal farmers and agricultural labourers. The obvious reason for the existence of more joint families in the category of landlord was based on the following facts:

1. Economic purpose, i.e. to manage large fields and new technology - irrigation, fertilization, mechanization of farms and,
2. Social prestige, i.e. through land and joint ness they want to maintain political dominance over other members of the village.

Epstein presented the same kind of reason, for joint family among the larger farmers of Wangla and Dalena in his study in Mysore.

Changes in the Function of the Families:

The structure and function of a society are inter-related. Therefore, whenever the question of structure arises, the question of function comes immediately. The modernization in agriculture not only affected the structure of an institution, but also its function. As the joint family changes into nuclear family, the socialization of children in the family takes a new direction. The child has to grow in a comparatively much smaller social set up. There are not many kin-men to look after the child. The playmates and the members of the child's peer group have also to be selected from out side the family. It

reduces the child's emotional attachment with the members of the family.

The contribution of physical, emotional and psychological security, which was a major function of a traditional family, has been reduced. The introduction of labour displacing machines has compelled most of the landless agricultural labourers and carpenters to leave the village in search of jobs. This migration has raised the social tension among the parents, and sometimes this migration brings psychological and emotional insecurity among the elder members of the family.

Before the advent of modernization members of a family were co-operating each other for better production to protect themselves from the dozer of drought, cyclone, flood, etc. But the rise of nuclear family, has changed their economic conditions. Whereas, in traditional joint family, women were mostly working at home, now-a-days, they work with their male counter parts in the field. But this is not true in the case of every *jati*. It is generally found among the lower *jatis* like *Pana*, *Dhoba* and *Kumbhar*. Even though females in the village perform both farm work and household activities, the caste hierarchy and emerging concepts of status and wealth are the controlling factors of their activities. For example, along with other affluent families, *Brahmin*, *Khandayat jatis* don't allow their female members to work in the field. They are very much cautious of their caste status. With the technological development of the village, female participation in agricultural activities has decreased, and their work is mainly centred round managing household activities. The household duties of both males and females above sixty years of age remain unchanged. These changes in the family structure have brought an impact on the economic institution of the families. The middle class landholding farmers (owner cultivators) have lost more in comparison to landless agricultural labourers. The labourers are able to raise their status by engaging their family labourers in different fields and by taking the land in lease.

The change in traditional (joint) family brings a great loss to the owner cultivators, because it leads to the fragmentation of landholdings, which in turn affects the agricultural production. The break in the joint family necessitates the division of property, and small piece of land owned by the family becomes to be further divided. The small holding makes the farmers it impossible for the owners to use scientific methods of cultivation. This adversity affects agricultural yield, the economic status of the family and

the economic progress of the society. According to table 2, 45% of agriculturalists of the village possess less than 3 acres of land, 35% possess more than 3 acres and less than 7 acres, 8% possess more than 7 acres and less than less than 10 acres. Only 12% of cultivators possess more than 10 acres. Therefore, 12% of cultivators are well off, 8% are fairly well.

The break down of joint family among the higher classes and higher *jati* brings a great loss to them. The land and family members are considered as the main source of the political power and social prestige. Land is generally considered as the measuring rod of political status and power. Through the acquisition of lands, the higher *jati* and class families maintain their power in the village. But the rise of misunderstanding and individualisation among the family members brought down their power in study village. Due to the emergence of nuclear family among these families, the lands got fragmented. And this fragmentation of land holding is the root cause of their loss of power in the village. Due to loss of land, they are losing the power of dominance over others.

Change in intra and inter family relation:

This new technology in agriculture brought about a change in inter and intra family relations. While around 30% of the share croppers among the *Pana* depend upon kin labourers and exchange labourers apart from family labourers, only 5% of the share croppers among others of the village depend on kin and exchange labourers. Most of them depend on family and wage labourers. The changes in economic condition due to change in technology in agriculture have influenced different aspects of their inter and intra family relations. Although some of these aspects are traditional and remain unchanged, other aspects have undergone vast changes reflecting economic progress, urban influences and changing attitudes of the farmers in the village. The responsibilities and contribution of the relatives in the village are gradually being replaced by contract-based services, such as house decoration, preparation, and cooking of food and other organizational matters. It is now very common among the affluent farmers in the village to invite large number of people at the time of functions. The expanded social network of farmers has resulted on a network of diverse set of guests from neighbouring villages and towns, including people from different elite professions. This suggests the changing trend of social network—from traditional-family and kin circle to citywide connection, with a

new eclectic set of people.

The technological transformation has also brought certain effect on intra-family relations. The traditional (joint) family in India was organised around the important relationships between parents and children, husband and wife and siblings. Relationship between father and son in the traditional family was based more upon respect and fear than only on affection. Power and authority in the traditional family based upon generation, sex and relative age, and it was vested principally in males. The patriarch was virtually all powerful. It was he who decided the type of education to be imparted to children, the professions they had to take to, and even the selection of mates for them. He was not obliged to consult the young children on any issues. But in contemporary period, due to agricultural modernization, empowerment, higher education, a lot of change has occurred in intra family relation. The authority is shifting from the patriarch to the father of the children, who consult their youngsters regarding important issues to take any decision. Most of the time, younger males are involved in purchasing items especially electronic items. The family head prefers the ideas of the younger people, since they are more concerned and aware of modern consumable items. Even in some families, the women are taken into consideration while taking any decision. Out of 102 households, the present study found that in 5 households, the grand father is the main authority in the family, in 75 households, father is the main authority, in 22 households, all adult members possess the authority jointly. Even in some *Pana* families, the women are taking the over all charge of the family in the absence of their male counter parts. This shows the shift in the authority from grandfather to the father and then to the mother.

When the labour displacing machine entered into the agriculture, a few male members went out to earn the livelihood. This has affected not only the traditional structure of joint family, but also the relations among the members. On the other hand, these factory employments have made them financially independent; the authority of the head of the household has been weakened further. In the city, in many cases, along with the men their wives also start working and earning. This notion has affected inter-intra family relations to some extent.

Now-a-days children are to some extent free with their parents. Children today

not only discuss their problems with their parents, but they even oppose them when their wishes and ideologies clash with the formalised restraint of their parents.

In spite of all these changes in relations between parents and children, we find that the youngsters yet respect their elders. Their attitude is motivated by respect than by fear. The elders also do not attempt so firmly, to impose the traditional ways on their children.

The relationship between husband and wife in early families was institutionally weak. Wife was considered to be an outsider. But along with the technological change in agriculture, higher education, women empowerments have influenced the age-old relationship between husband and wife. Today, the relations have undergone considerable change. The women have received certain power in decision-making processes. Decisions about entertaining guests, special occasions and religious observances are very often taken by women. Higher literacy and growing number of educated male and female villagers has resulted in a more liberal outlook and equal involvement of both the genders in decision making regarding their children's education. The emergence of nuclear family has brought closeness between husband and wife. The husband is no more suspicious of his wife. In the traditional family, wife was utterly dependant on her husband for her own support and the support of her children. But now, husband no longer regards his wife is inferior to him. It can be said that the technological changes, which enhance the economic condition of the villagers, have created an impact on the involvement of different family members in various aspects of decision-making. In some the affairs, especially in economic matters, the traditional role of family head is still in practice, whereas participation and involvement of kin in matters of health, education and social occasion is gradually decreasing-showing development of individualism in the village.

TRADITIONAL RURAL POLITICAL STRUCTURE AND ITS TRANSFORMATION:

The traditional rural political institution, which is considered as an important social institution plays a vital role in distributing power among different *jati* and maintains social order in rural areas. As a universal aspect of social interaction, social power plays a significant role in shaping affinity among the members of a group (Kar 1998:118). Power

is the ability to get one's wishes carried out in spite of opposition, if any. Max Weber defined power as "the probability, that an actor (individual or group) has within a social relationship in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests". (Reinard 1960) Traditionally, this power revolved around the land in rural India. Beidelman, while working on the *Jajmani* system, mentioned that land, which is the prime determinant of Jajmani system, is also considered as the main source of power (Beidelman, 1959). Land is the prime source of socio political status and power (Beteille, 1965:204; Sarkar 1971:297). It is observed that the landholders not only maintain a better standard of living but also exercise direct control over the land less (ibid: 119; Rudra 1978:999; Sivakumar 1978:766). Political power and economic hegemony in Indian village revolve around land ownership. Traditionally, the landlords belong to the higher *jati*. Suraj Bandopadhyay and Donald Von Eschen in their study "Agricultural failure: caste, class, and power in rural West Bengal", reveals, "Power tends to be very closely associated with class and caste. That is those who feel they have power are generally both wealthy and belong to upper caste" (Gupta 1996). Oscar Lewis and Epstein, in their village studies, have observed that socially influential actors usually stem from higher castes, which are ritually superior and economically better off than the vast majority of middle and lower castes.

In the study village, the available evidence shows that during the early years of the twentieth century, Brahmins owned a considerable quantity of irrigated land. The Brahmins were the first to utilise the new economic opportunities opened to them through Western education, and they gradually moved to towns to enter into the non-agricultural professions. Urban living, and the cost of educating children, which the new economic and education opportunities had brought about, gradually caused the Brahmins to depart from their land. Most of these lands passed to non-Brahmins, especially the *Khandayat*, during the forties. Since independence, the *Khandayat* have been playing a dominant role in Jagdalpur. Except the untouchable *Pana*, the *Khandayat* are the numerically biggest *jati* in the village. The bigger landowners are among the *Khandayat*, and the *Khandayat* together own more land than any other *jati* in the village. The percentage of literacy among the *Khandayat* is 90.14%, which is the highest. The ritual rank of *Khandayat* is not very much low. They belong to Kshyatriya, who occupy second position in *jati*

hierarchy. Till 90's, these *Khandayat* were playing an important role. They used to take all the political decisions in the village. Most of the persons belonged to the *Khandayat*. Patrons from the dominant caste can secure a large number of followers than patrons from non-dominant castes. The rural patrons were vote banks for the politicians and, during elections, they were mobilised for votes. In return, patron expected favours -loans for machine, buses and seats in medical and technological colleges for their kinsfolk. Disputes were referred to the patrons for settlement. Most of the times, the patrons used to give decision in favour of their own *jati people*. There was a sense of "we feeling" among the different *jati*. Irrespective of poor or rich, they helped their own *jati* people. Landlords were in favour of their agricultural labourers. Landlords leased out lands to large number of tenants. This probably helped to consolidate their political power, while increasing their share through the small tenants. Had the land given to a few tenants, the tenants' share would have been more and they would not have depended on landlord for consumption loans, which as a result would have weakened the bond between land lord and tenant. As members of the higher *jati*, the dominant Jajmans used the services of *kamins* to maintain or enhance their prestige for instance, by dissociating themselves explicitly from certain activities or conversely, by laying claim to the help of highly favoured specialists. As Kolenda wrote, basic to the *Jajmani* system is commitment to a royal or Lordly way of life as an ideal (1963:21). The *Khandayat* people were fountain of all matters in the village. Nobody was there to challenge them. But in course of time, since 80's onwards, the advent of modernization in agriculture has brought a change in their position.

The introduction of labour displacing machine (tractor, thresher, power tiller, etc.) in the field of agriculture forced most of the local agricultural labourers to leave the village for an alternative livelihood. But in later stage, this unavailability of agricultural labourers, which the study has discussed earlier, created a problem for the landlords to cultivate their land. As a result, most of the landlords leased out their land and went for some alternative jobs. Some of them started business, while some went for rice mills. During 90's, 5 landlords, who were cultivating some amount of their land, totally leased out it and started different business. Presently they don't have any close and enduring ties with their tenants. These absentee landowners do not generally have either the

opportunities or the interests to maintain control over affairs in the village.

The commercialisation of agriculture transformed the traditional patronage relationship between rich farmers and their dependent poor. Most of the landlords kept formal relation with their labourers. Due to cultivation of cash crops, they did not like to give the *Barsika* (annual payment) in kind to their service *jati*. As their tendency to distribute patronage weakened, their power and influence over tenants and dependents also tended to wane.

Earlier, the landlord had a very close relation with the tenants. Most of the untouchable *pana* had been cultivating the landlords' land for long years. There was no question of change of tenant. But, along with the land reforms in recent years, 'the land to the tiller' slogan has brought a significant change in the existing relationship between the landlords and tenants. Now-a-days, in fear of losing their lands, most of the landlords are not leasing out their land to lower *jati* tenants. If someone gives, he will shift it in every one or two years. This kind of temporary relation has weakened the traditional permanent relation between the landlords and tenants. There is no system of patronage exist within them.

The introduction of consolidation of landholding during 80's has also ruined the traditional relationship between the landlord dominant caste and poor farmers. During the time of introduction of consolidation of land holding, most of the landlords occupied the irrigated and fertile lands of the lower *jati* and class farmers, by taking advantage of their ignorance and illiteracy. But later on, this consolidation of land holding created unity among the lower class farmers. Some of the farmers agitated against the landlords' exploitations. This reduced the traditional relationship between the landlord dominant castes and poor farmers. As a result, the dominant caste lost their support from poor farmers.

Before 80's, *Khandyat* mostly dominated the village committee. Out of 5 members, 3 were *Khandyat* and 2 were *Brahmin*. But the present study shows that, except the chair-man post, the other posts of the village committee are held by non-*Khandayat* of the village. Except *Pana*, all other *jati* are representatives of this committee.

An analysis of certain disputes in the village committee shows that the members of the committee have often thrown their weight in favour of those who belong to their

class rather than to other *jati*. In this respect, a case study has been given below.

In the disputes between Bhagirathi Behera (a rich *Kumbhar*) and Bhaskar Barik (a poor *Gauda*), the village committee member Dhusasan Barik (a rich *Gauda*) openly favoured Bhagirathi. In the year 2000, Bhagirathi Behera (kumbhar) promised to sell a piece of land to Bhaskar Barik (Gauda). Before the deal was finalised, he took Rs.5000/- in two instalments. Subsequently, Bhagirathi requested Bhaskar to hold the land on lease against the amount paid. To this, the latter agreed. The condition was that Bhaskar would enjoy the land as long as the debt remains unpaid. Bhaskar sowed paddy in the leased field. As the crop was about to harvest, Bhagirathi forcibly reaped it. Bhaskar sought the help of the village committee. The committee became indifferent and poor Bhaskar lost his money as well his land (case-1).

Similarly, Sasadhar Sutar (a poor weaver) did not get support from his cousin Baburam Sutar. Once in a summer noon, the cow of Mohendra Samal (a rich *Khandayat*) entered into the paddy land of Sasadhar Sutar. Sasadhar Sutar found that his whole field was trampled upon and paddy plant also lopped off by the cow. Suddenly, he became angry and beat the cow. Then Sasadhar went to the Mahendra's house with his cow and scolded him. After a hot discussion, Sasadhar returned to his home and referred this case to the village committee. The committee found fault with Sasadhar. The committee General Secretary Baburam Sutar strongly opposed his cousin brother's demand. At last, Sasadhar also lost his paddy. He was fined Rs.200/-.

The introduction of land ceiling during 70s also helped some of the land less labourers to get some amount of land. With the introduction of HYV seeds, these farmers are able to produce an adequate amount of paddy for their livelihood. This transformation in agricultural practices has helped the farmer to strengthen their economic position. Now a days they are not depending upon landlords. This reduction of poor farmers has reduced the importance of landlords in the village.

In the traditional system, there were no practices, legislatures, Panchayat union or council through which the individual could have acquired power independent of his position in the class or *Jati* structure. No doubt, the membership in the party, in the legislature, in the Panchayat union council, even today, largely depends upon *Jati* and class. But the relation between *Jati* and class and power has become more complex and

more dynamic in contemporary society and introduction of adult franchise in particular has opened up new avenues for the acquisition of power. The power of the emerging leaders of the village is not only based on land but also on their numerical support within the village and political contact outside it.

Lack of funds is not always a very serious handicap, since the party as well as various agencies could be tapped for money but the presence of wealth is needed to entertain guest from outside. A person who is politically influential has to distribute patronage to his followers. It is not possible for landless labourers or for one whose income is very small and uncertain to meet the demands, which are made by followers.

Conclusion:

From the foregoing analysis it can be concluded that, the villagers are standing in the crossroads of tradition and modernity. While some aspects are adherent to tradition; others incorporate modern influence to show their economic progress. The adoption of agricultural technology not merely ushered the economic change, it has also felt its imprint in the changing structure and function of rural social institutions.

The technological change in agriculture has both directly and indirectly influenced the structure and function of the family. Although still the joint family is continued to dominate among landlords and owner cultivators but its lower existence among the marginal farmers and the lower *jati* in the village shows that a lot of change has occurred in the traditional structure of the family. Although the traditional type of jointness in the village family is yielding place to residential nuclearity, the functional jointness still persists among some families. The emergence of nuclear family out of traditional joint family has brought a change in its traditional functions. The socialization process of children is mostly shifted from the hands of family members to child's peer group and playmates. It has also influenced the physical, psychological and emotional sedulity function of a family.

This advent of new technologies has influenced the inter and intra family relations. Some of the traditional structures are wavering while new ones are emerging. Higher levels of technological complexity have replaced the traditional family labour and exchange labour in different agricultural operation and in other activities with specialised

contractual labour. Families are developing more individualistic attitudes with their emerging status and class concept. The network of farmers in the village has widely expanded. It has reduced the gap between husband and wife, parents and children. In some of the families, women are consulted in decision-making process of the family. The relations between father and son are no more based on fear but on respect and affection. The break down of joint family has brought some loss for higher *jati* and class people in the village, both economically and politically.

The technological change in agricultural has reduced landlords' importance and has strengthened the economic position of lower *Jati* people. Still, to some extent, they are playing a crucial role due to their economic power. Though changes are taking place in the field of agriculture in rural Orissa, the impact of the changes on the low and lower middle *Jati* is not much significant. It is the higher *Jati* who have been benefited by all these process because they have got ample resources at their disposal to have an ascendancy over others even in the changing circumstances. Contrastingly, low status *Jati* finds it difficult to get accesses to local power politic because of less land holding.

The advent of new technology in agriculture has brought certain changes in the age-old traditional and political institutions of the village. In some extent, the higher *jati* (*Khandayat*), who were playing a dominant role in the village, have lost their traditional dominance. The rise of class like interests has affected the age-old equilibrium of the *jati* group to an extent. The members of the village committee have often thrown their weights in favour of those who belong to their class rather than to their *jati*. Traditionally, the land was the main source of power of the village. But along with technological transformation, the emergence of adult franchise, higher educations have opened up new avenues for acquisition of power. The power of the emerging leader of the villges not only based on land but also on their numerical support within the village and political contact outside it. Now a days, lack of funds is not a very serious handicap, since the party as well as various agencies could be trapped for money. Due to loss of patronage, kind of relationship among the landlords and labourers, the landlord, *Khandayat* are loosing their political support from the agricultural labourers and sharecroppers. Along with land reforms, the adult franchise, the higher educations have raised the economic status of the poor *jati*. Still, to some extent the *Khandayat* are playing a crucial role

because of their economic power.

Appendix-1

Table :1: The type of families among different Jati

Jati	1980 - 85			2003		
	Total no. of House holds	No of Nuclear Family	No. of Joint Family	Total no. of House holds	No of Nuclear Family	No. of Joint Family
Brahmin	7	3	4 (57.14)	11	7	4 (36.36)
Khanda-Yat	12	5	7 (58.33)	17	11	6 (35.29)
Kumbhar	7	1	6 (85.71)	9	7	2 (22.22)
Bania	6	4	2 (33.33)	10	9	1 (10)
Kamar	1	1	0	2	1	1 (50)
Tanti	8	3	5 (62.5)	11	9	2 (18.18)
Barika	2	1	1 (50)	3	2	1 (33.33)
Gouda	4	1	3 (75)	5	4	1 (20)
Dhoba	2	1	1 (50)	4	3	1 (25)
Pana	20	8	12 (60)	30	25	5 (10)
Total	69	28	41 (58.2)	102	78	24 (23.52)

Table: 2: Jati-wise land holding pattern of the village

Jati	No. of households	No. Of Landless households	Below 1 acre	>1-3 acre	>3-5 acre	>5-7 acre	>7-10 acre	> 10 and above
Brahmin	11	1	2	1		3		4
Khandayata	17	3	3	3	2		1	5
Kumbhar	9			3	3	1	2	
Bania	10	1	3	2	1	2	1	
Kamar	2			1	1			
Tanti	11	2	1	2	2	2	2	

Barika	3	1		1	1			
Gouda	5	1			2	2		
Dhoba	4	2		2				
Pana	30	19	5	4	1	1		
Total HHs	102	30 (29.41)	14 (13.72)	19 (18.62)	13 (12.74)	11 (10.78)	6 (5.88)	9 (8.82)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beteille, A. (1974), *Studies in Agrarian Social Structure*, Oxford University Press. Delhi.

Beteille, A. (1964), Family and Social Change in India and South Asia, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.XVI, No.5,6 and 7, Pp237-44.

Beteille, A. (1965), *Caste, Class and Power*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Bandhopadhyay, S. and Von (1996), *Agricultural Failure: Caste, Class and power in rural West Bengal, social stratification*, Dipankar Gupta(ed), Oxford Publication, Delhi.

Bedelman, T.O (1959), *A Comparative Analysis of the 'jajman' System*, Monographs for the Association for Asian Studies, VIII, New York.

Desai,A.R (1961),*Rural India in Transition*, Popular Prakashan,Bombay.

Frankel, F.R (1971), *India's Green Revolution: Economic Grains and Political Casts*, Princeton University Press.

Gupta, R.K (1979), *Essay in Economic Anthropology*, Institute of Social Research and Applied Anthropology, Calcutta.

Kar, P.K. (1998), *Indian Society*, Kalyani Publisher, Cuttack.

Mandelbaum, D.G (1970), *Society in India*, Vols.1 and 2, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Mazumdar, D.N (1962), *Caste and Communication in an Indian Village*, Asia, Bombay.

Mohanty, B. B (2000), Agriculture Modernization in Rural Orissa: Land Transfer and Ownership Pattern, *Sociological Bulletin*, Vol.49, No.1, Pp63-90.

Panda, p. (1979), Land Ownership and Certain Aspects of Power Structure in a West Orissa Village, *Man in India*, vol.59, No.4.

Rudra, A (1978), Class relation in Indian Agriculture, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.XIII, No.24 Pp998-1004.

Sharma, K.N (1975), *Institution Network and Social Change*, Indian Institute of Advance study, Simla.

Sarkar, R.M (1971), faction situation in a Bengal Village, *The Eastern Anthropologist*, Vol.24, No.3, Page 295-308.

Singh, Y (1973), *Modernization of Indian Tradition*, Thomson Press, Faridabad.

Singh, R.A.P.,(1984) The Joint Family in The Agrarian Setting, *The Eastern Anthropologist*, Vol.37, No.1, Page 49-55.

Sivakumar, S. S. (1979), Class and Jati at Ajthapuram and Kanthapuram, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.14, Pp263-286.

Sivakumar, S. S. (1978), Aspects of Agrarian Economy in Tamil Nadu:A study of two villages, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.XIII,No.18, Pp762-770.

Venkatarayappa, KN (1973), *Rural Society and Social Change*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay.

Economics Survey, 2001-02, Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Planning and Co-Ordination Dept. of Orissa.