

Studies on Peasant Communities: Changing Time and Context*

Satyabrata Chakrabarti

Respected Chairman, Prof. Siva Prasad Ramvatla, the Secretary, Office-bearers of the Executive Council and the Members of the Kolkata Society for Asian Studies, the Advisory Board Members and other Committee Members, its well wishers, Prof. Kumkum Srivastava, wife of late Prof. Vinoy Kumar Srivastava and friends, let me at the outset express my heartfelt gratitude to the organizers for initiating this First Memorial Lecture in honour of late Prof. Vinoy Kumar Srivastava, as well as for bestowing on me this difficult assignment by reposing their faith in me for this task. Personally I feel myself extremely inadequate and unequal to the given responsibility. Friends, before the havoc of the prevailing pandemic situation set in, sometimes in March, 2020, in a massive way, Prof. Vinoy Kumar Srivastava, the then Director of the Anthropological Survey of India and a very loveable friend of mine, one day hinted to me that the Foundation Day Oration of the Survey for the year 2020 will have to be delivered by me. In the remotest imagination it did never occur to me that this encouraging proposal will ever turn into a painful proposition by way of this Memorial Lecture on him, due to the cruel infliction of COVID-19, which snatched his ever vibrant life, little prematurely, bringing gloom to a person like me who stands clearly ten years elder to him. Therefore, notwithstanding my academic limitations, I accepted the request of the Kolkata Society for Asian Studies where both of us got associated since few years back. The task became obviously challenging to me for more than one reasons—first, choosing a topic and next doing justice to that. Vinay in our generation was one of the brilliant and foremost scholars—both as a dedicated teacher as well as an ardent researcher in anthropology, specially social/cultural anthropology. He had a versatile interest in the subject, particularly focused in theoretical and methodological issues, based on various cotemporary field situations. It would be eloquent from the list of his publications—professional as well as popular¹. His meticulous and critical touch in any presentation—either in print or in public communication—even in private discussions were so lucid and immensely attractive.

In the context of what I have narrated so far, let me pick up a broad theme based on my personal research engagements in Cultural Anthropology for the last several years. My special area of interest has been the study of peasant communities², by and large. This interest got initially rooted in my thought when as part of the post-graduate curriculum, we had to carry out a brief field work for about two weeks during mid 1960s. During our term we were taken into a Midnapur village (now Medinipur), near Kharagpur, West Bengal. My assignment was to study some Munda families in a

*First Prof. Vinay Kumar Srivastava Memorial Lecture delivered on 20.11.2021 in virtual mode, organized by the Kolkata Society for Asian Studies.

village with special focus on their economic activities. Incidentally, that was a time when the Mundas were deeply involved in a festival (*Sohrai*), related to the agricultural practices. Another requirement in the said curriculum was a special field for those who opted for Cultural Anthropology. This time my assignment was to study kinship pattern and behaviour among the Santals in a village situated near Belpahari, Midnapur district, West Bengal. In this case also I could observe how this kinship network played an important role in their primary productive activities, that is agricultural practices. This preliminary apprenticeship induced me to get fully involved at a later stage to study socio-economic and cultural aspects of agricultural production in some villages of West Bengal and followed up through other related research programmes carried out in some villages of South India, North-East India and Andaman Islands. In the backdrop of my academic interest mentioned above, I conducted a field work between 1971-73 centering around a village in the district of Burdwan (now Bardhaman), West Bengal. The village is situated in the agriculturally advanced region of the district known as the rice bowl which was by then exposed to the modern inputs such as irrigation water (through canal, deep and shallow tubewell) high yielding variety (H.Y.V.) of seeds, chemical fertilizers and insecticides and so on. The region was covered under Intensive Agricultural District Programme (I.A.D.P.)³ since early 1960s, in other words, the prime time of the green revolution.

Let me just mention in passing that the management of natural, mechanical and manual water supply play significant role in specific elevation of contiguous plots of land among different categories of land owners. This itself is a separate subject of discussion. Meanwhile, I have quickly reviewed a number of available village studies as well as studies broadly on peasants, communities at that point of time. What haunted me most was that even though agriculture continues to be the primary source of livelihood of the largest number of rural population, there was hardly a detailed account of its socio-cultural context which sustained this major productive activities. I framed initially two questions to go about it—one, whether technology alone could help us understand the intricacies of this major organization of production for livelihood activities of a majority of rural population or one was required to probe into other related socio-cultural parameters affecting the prevailing agricultural practices in specific field situations even in the face of emergent techno-economic inputs, and two, in spite of a given inequality in the prevailing socio-economic structure in the agrarian productive base, how did the people still manage to continue with an apparent, cohesive feeling of a moral community, mutually sharing many common cultural traits among themselves? A special focus of enquiry obviously remained in the centre which was the cognitive aspect of the peoples' perception centering around the cultivation of land and management of its inputs—both in traditional as well as in the evolved agrarian milieu⁴.

Looking back, in order to capture the historicity of these question posed above, may I bring here some observations made by Charles Metcalfe in 1832 as to the perpetuation of the village communities in India, which, in other words, were the peasant communities in India. I quote, "The village communities are little republics, having nearly everything they want within themselves, and almost independent of any foreign relations. They seem to last where nothing else lasts. Dynasty after dynasty tumbles down; revolution succeeds revolution...but the village community remains the same...This union of village communities, each one forming a separate little state in itself, has, I conceive contributed more than any other cause to the preservation of the people of India, through all the revolutions and changes, which they have suffered, and is in a high degree conducive to their

happiness, and enjoy of a great portion of freedom and independence.”⁵ Karl Marx⁶, while indicating on the economic stagnation of India observed that this source of stagnation lay in the isolated character of the Indian villages which were known also for the apparent economic self-sufficiency. Prof. Nirmal Kumar Bose⁷, a Gandhian scholar and renowned anthropologist, in his various studies on the peculiarities of the caste mode of production in agriculture primarily based his arguments in favour of a minimum social and economic security in the system, this was fortified by the cultural and religious autonomy by the respective participants as a formidable group in this major productive enterprise, that is agricultural practices throughout the country side. I may quickly take up a brief look into the survey on the village/peasant studies in India prior to and after independence. It is already known that Sir Thomas Munro⁸, Karl Marx⁹, Henry Main¹⁰ and Baden Powell¹¹, brought into limelight in the world about the importance of the Indian villages during the early to late 19th century. P.C. Joshi’s¹² review in 1975 in Land Reforms in India covered in details of this survey during pre and post independence period in India, done not only by the scholars but even by the administrators, litterateurs, social and political thinkers and so on. The academic stimulations in social science research in this country reached through various sources from abroad. Systematic village studies specially in the field of sociology and cultural anthropology got a kick start in the early 1950s onward. Mckim Marriott¹³, M.N. Srinivas¹⁴, S.C. Dube’s¹⁵, village studies came out in 1955 followed by F.G. Bailey¹⁶, Ramkrishna Mukherjee¹⁷ in 1957 and Oscar Lewis¹⁸ in 1958. These studies were commissioned at a time when most of the scholars in Sociology/Anthropology were engaged with the issues of family, caste kinship, ritual etc. Even in the village studies just mentioned these aspects were reflected primarily including a bit on economic life. But some scholars in the 1960s and 1970s maintained a definite shift of emphasis subsequently on economic and political issues of rural India. For example, T.S. Epstein¹⁹, Andre Beteille²⁰, Dharma Kumar²¹, Kathleen Gough²², Joan Mencher²³ and others. Indian Census Organisation conducted nearly 500 village surveys during 1961 onward, and typified them based on variant demographic and socio-economic structures. A number of Agro-Economic Research Centres in the country conducted farm management studies in terms of relationship between input-output ratio. The National Sample Survey also covered a good ground on the problems of land holding pattern, live stock position, level of rural poverty, the condition of rural labourers and so on and so forth in their different rounds in the 1970s. The National Institute of Community Development (later renamed as National Institute of Rural Development), continued its interest in village studies mainly in terms of these innovative characteristics of the progressive farmers. In the collection of two thousand village studies conducted by Village Studies Programme (VSP) of the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, England nearly half of the total studies account for India. The mode of production in Indian agriculture became a major concern for the scholars in economics, history, political science, sociology and anthropology during the 1970s and 1980s. Later on peasant movements had registered as another academic engagement of the scholars across many academic disciplines.

Before entering into other substantial aspects of my field observations, let me just point out to one very important issue in the theoretic discourses on village studies. A vital debate started with a question whether the village is a myth or a reality posed by Louis Dumont and D. Pocock²⁴ in 1957 in the journal, Contributions to Indian Sociology. This argument, among others, got around the criticality on village solidarity. Their emphasis was that the caste was the social reality in a village situation. M.N. Srinivas²⁵ took a position in this context and emphasized that the village was the unit

as observation centre, where one could study in detail the social processes and problems occurring in larger parts of the country, if not in the greater part of the world. He mentioned, and I quote “the village is not only the architectural and demographic entity, but also a social entity, in that, the villagers have some loyalty to it. Rural Indians live in a system of complex loyalties, each loyalty survives in a particular context”. One may like to juxtapose the similar expressions made earlier on the village/village life, propounded by our visionaries like Mahatma Gandhi²⁶, Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay²⁷ or Rabindranath Tagore²⁸ in this context.

In the backdrop of this broad framework on village/peasant studies, I decided to probe into the initial questions that were proposed for my empirical study in an agriculturally developed multicaste village in the Burdwan district, West Bengal, which was already exposed to various development programmes related to the cultivation of paddy mainly (summer and winter variety) substantiated by other crops like potato, jute, wheat, mustard and other types of vegetables etc. I began by employing the existing tools of research, such as structured questionnaire, case studies, free observations, group interviews and the like. I emphasized on the notional or perceptual ideas of the cultivators that is, the cognitive aspect regarding each step/stage of cultivation, starting from preparing the land upto the harvest and storing of the product. The organization of production technology involved, technical inputs used were the points of enquiry including the management of land, its ownership pattern, market factors affecting the production and distribution and so on and so forth. Finally, the ritual complex around the entire agricultural universe covering the management of livestock, handling of the seasonal climatic variations etc. was noted in details. While comprehending the entire set of phenomena during the cultivation, it appeared that the panorama of agriculture was embedded in an unique situation. This could be easily divided into three major domains, namely, technological, socio-economic and cultural. These three sets again may be broken into six operative parts, such as day to day field strategy, management of input, pattern of land management, organization of production, ritual obligations and notional/cognitive base. These dimensions are clearly observable in a micro situation. In addition to that there are other vital aspects related to the agrarian system and they are basically historical and politico-economic in nature and are operative in the macro-situation beyond the village. Put together these endogenous and exogenous factors make the entire agrarian social set up with an all India dimension on the one hand and regional/local context on the other.

Over the years, I tried to understand more and more about the existing realities in the agricultural production in the specific context of my village studies in certain other areas also as mentioned in the beginning of my presentation. Eventually, by and large, I noted that the majority of the cultivators managed to continue to a great extent their traditional agro-oriented moral and emotional living in spite of the massive technological changes due to mechanization of agricultural production as well as commercialization of its produce. The practitioners in this pursuit, call them cultivator, peasant or farmer, even though are variously placed in the local social hierarchy and are differentially affected by all the emergent factors of modernization, still share some common cultural traits in their ideas and practices. Therefore, in the same agro-ecological setting they are apparently divided into two distinct categories or clusters. One is internally encapsulated in a set of micro-socio-cultural parameters including their use of traditional technological know-how, and characterized by labour intensive production, self-consumption and internal re-distribution of produce for a meaningful and somewhat manageable living. The other, comparatively less in number than the earlier category, is

externally impacted by a set of macro-economic parameters including the management of modern techno-innovative inputs and characterized by capital intensive production, surplus generation and marketization of produce for emergent and adaptive living. It may also be mentioned here that there is but a small number of cultivators who could be placed between these two distinct clusters for their tendentious behaviour while adopting the modern inputs in a limited way. But on the whole, in a given village situation, all these groups individually as well as collectively tend to share a common agro-climatic environment and a common cumulative cultural value-orientation inherent to the cultivation of land and its related other management practices. Their belief systems, ritual observances, use of local proverbial utterances and many folk cultural usages, put together help them building up a moral community of cultivators—whether landowners, share-croppers and marginal agricultural labourers and the like. In a sense they live and work under a natural and a super-natural cultural milieu enmeshed in an age-old social complex of agrarian spectrum. Perhaps, there is an innate impulse and also an imperative urge on their part to maintain this mutually co-operative and emotive living in spite of all the perennial contradictions inbuilt in the existing agrarian situation in the areas under study. Though some of them, because of various outside exposures, have to a certain extent absorbed certain urban behavioral characteristics in their otherwise long drawn rural pattern of living, yet they have not been fully internalized in the core of their inherited peasant culture. On the other hand, the majority of the cultivators in the face of the aggressive modernization in agriculture feel virtually threatened and helpless by the increasing financial constraints for managing the modern inputs required for the new cultivation. This condition has been thrust upon them exogenously. They find no option also to suddenly withdraw themselves from the existing systems which has put them at the receiving end. This is the praxis as well as the predicament of the whole agrarian network²⁹.

Let us now turn our attention to some macro factors affecting the agrarian structure and the agrarian system. The foremost among them is the land reforms in India. Since the independence various land reforms measures have been announced and implemented, both at the level of central and state governments, such as abolishing the Zamindari system, introducing the land ceiling measures on the one hand and initiating various palliative measures, specially focusing on the relatively under privileged sections of the rural population engaged in the cultivation of land on the other. The result so far has been less than satisfactory, notwithstanding the introduction of various schemes for specific target groups under various Five Year Plan periods. I am not elaborating them here. I have primarily summarized my observations from my direct field-based experiences in different locations of the country as already mentioned in the beginning. While my initial focus was on the socio-cultural context of farming, yet my studies eventually touched upon the conditions of the marginal farmers, share-croppers and the agricultural labourers in all studied locations. In the overall context of these studies there appear some common findings, so far the conditions of the so called rural poor are concerned. Though the system of share-cropping has been pronounced by its demise in capitalist countries, it has been still playing a very formidable role in a transitional multiplex agrarian system, such as in India. They are variously known as *bataidar*, *sajehadar*, in the north; *varamtar*, *shiknider* in the south; *bargadar*, *adhiar* in the east and *halapoti* in the west. The agricultural labourers also exist in all parts of the country in different names and identities. This follows beyond doubt that the question of poverty in India is basically characterized by the status of its rural population who visibly remain below the poverty line as well as belong to the social categories of scheduled castes, scheduled

tribes, other backward castes etc.; share-cropping as a regular practice prevails in spite of the promulgated laws in different states abolishing it on paper; the number of agricultural labourers is not only increasing but more often than not they are deprived of the officially declared agricultural wages; the pace of the increasing rate of production has not been commensurate with the target of judicial re-distribution of food grains to the poor; non-farm job opportunities have remained inadequate for suitably absorbing the surplus labourers from the field in other alternative engagements and so on. This scenario exists almost commonly in all the studied locations so far, in spite of the massive investment made and periodic monitoring done. It appears unambiguously that at the height of liberalization, globalization and privatization the conditions of the so called rural poor and marginal peasants have remained at a precarious level due to the lack of responsive politico-economic structure of governance in the country³⁰.

I will now proceed towards the end of my present discourse. As most of you might be aware that my friend Vinoy was very keen in discussing theoretical context of any presentation. It was his passion in teaching as well as in research in cultural anthropology. It will be eloquent from his valuable publications – both in the form of papers or books which constitute a huge volume. I am not entering into that now. The Anthropological Survey of India perhaps could organize such discussion as a fitting tribute to his memory. However, let me reflect in brief as a synoptic summary on some theoretical postulates prevailing in the context of the studies on peasants and its relevance in the changing time. P.C. Joshi (ibid) in his brilliant survey on the studies on agrarian aspects with reference to India in a small book mentioned earlier brought out in historical perspective the importance of the subject. He had mentioned the major trends of research on agrarian situation – before and after independence, citing references from across different academic disciplines. It established that this very subject was not an exclusive preserve of any particular discipline. Therefore, lot of scholars from various academic backgrounds took interest in this particular area of study and contributed different ideas and concepts – some of which moved towards a probable theoretical construct. A few of them still holds good so far the existing reality is concerned. For example, Karl Marx's "mode of production"³¹ has been very critically reviewed specially by a group of historians and economists for a long time. Apart from any other sources the Economic and Political Weekly and the Journal of Peasant Studies together brought out many important papers with original insight or critically analytical contributions for the last several years. Karl Polanyi's 'reciprocity re-distribution and market exchange'³² were embedded in the concept of economy being a socially instituted process. This led to a serious debate among the anthropologists who were divided into the 'substantivist' and 'formalist' school of thought³³. A.V. Chayanov's 'peasant mode of production'³⁴, Daniel Thorner's 'peasant economy'³⁵, Marshall Sahlins's 'domestic mode of production'³⁶, were some of the other approaches to the study of peasant communities. Marx's 'Asiatic Mode of Production' (AMP)³⁷ highlighted certain salient features where classical Indian village as a referent came to fit well; for example, self-sufficiency in agriculture and handicraft, the absence of surplus, little circulation of money, strong sentimental connection between village and the village community as obligated by the prevailing customary laws, weak formation of private property and capital and so on. The village community occupied a central place in the concept of the Asiatic Mode of Production.

If one probes singularly into the analytical/conceptual contributions of the anthropologists alone, one would meet with a number of such insights with regard to the studies either on village/village

communities or interchangeably on the peasant communities. From Robert Redfield's 'folk culture' or 'peasant culture'³⁸ to Eric Wolf's³⁹ 'peasant rebellions', anthropological literatures are replete with such focal directions having some theoretical implications. I am not going into other elaborations right at the moment on the citations of earlier periods. Much later, scholars like Michael Lipton⁴⁰, T.J. Byress⁴¹, Henry Burnstein⁴² brought some newer angles into the study on the peasant communities or agrarian questions. The Village Studies Unit of the Institute of Development Studies, Sussex University, England at one point of time gave a lead in this direction. T.J. Byress's seminal essay entitled "The Agrarian Question and Differing Forms of Capitalist Agrarian Transition: An Essay with Reference to Asia" is a reference in point. He had a special fascination for India as a case study. In Indian context the village/peasant studies, in other words, the changing agrarian relations over time were very intimately carried out combining both micro and macro milieu by T.S. Epstein, Kathleen Gough, Joan P. Menchar, M.N. Srinivas, Ramkrishna Mukherjee, Andre Bettle, F.G. Bailey, to name only a few (ibid). They had focused on various social, cultural, economic and political issues mainly addressing the questions of social and economic inequality, factors of cultural cohesion or integrity and political polarization within the ambit of villages or village communities and beyond. Simultaneously, some historians, economists and sociologists like R.S. Sharma⁴³, Irfan Habib⁴⁴, Harbans Mukhia⁴⁵, Daniel Thorner⁴⁶, A.R. Desai⁴⁷, Dharma Kumar⁴⁸ to mention only a few, made profound attempts in understanding the particular mode of production in Indian rural economy in historical as well as in contemporary context.

Edmund Leach⁴⁹, a renowned anthropologist, once mentioned that organized cultivation started about ten to twelve thousand years back. Archaeologists demonstrated that drainage and irrigation were associated with some of the very earliest forms of horticulture. It connects us with K. Witfogel's⁵⁰ 'hydraulic civilization' much later. Thus, it has been a long human history since then combining the factors in economy, culture and polity along with the variety of historical social formations. In order to understand the agrarian performance, one needs to consider the agrarian systems along with the agrarian laws, agrarian programmes, various reports of the committees or commissions such as M.S. Swaminathan Commission Report of 2006⁵¹, Arjun Sengupta Commission Report of 2007⁵², Radha Krishna Commission Report of 2008⁵³ and so on.

Finally, the interplay of capital vis-à-vis the management of environment has of late been another changing dimension of studying the problematics of agrarian transition. In the core of it the question of food security has been a central concern. The later part of twentieth century has been marked by the huge number of cases of farmers' suicides in our country vis-à-vis substantial amount of farmers' subsidy in the United States. The latest World Conference on Environment, COP 26⁵⁴, could only indicate the direction for searching out the appropriate answers to these disturbing questions. I stop here by mentioning only the latest and the long struggle of the peasants/farmers in our country and its victorious end would bring back the importance of the agrarian issues responsible for the overall development of our future.

To conclude my presentation of this evening, let me once more reiterate that the micro-level field situation which present the unique phenomena of socio-economic intricacies and interactions among different sections of rural cultivators in different agro-ecological regions, may perhaps suggest to study with greater clarity of the more wider macro-dimensional agrarian questions such as the major

mode of productions and their many regional varieties in Indian agriculture in contemporary changing context as well as in the changing time frame.

Endnote:

1. Prof. Vinay Kumar Srivastava's biodata including a detailed list of publications available at Anthropological Survey of India, Kolkata.
2. For a ready reference see 1971. *Peasants and Peasant Societies*, (Ed.) Teodor Shanin, Penguin Books.
3. Intensive Agricultural District Programmes were initiated in the early 1960s, in Burdwan District, West Bengal, for popularizing the use of high yielding varieties of rice mainly.
4. See *Around the Plough* by S.B. Chakrabarti, Anthropological Survey of India, Calcutta, 1986, p6.
5. Quoted from M.N. Srinivas, 1955 Introduction in India's villages, Calcutta, Govt. of West Bengal Pubn.
6. Marx, K. and Engels, F. 1950. *Selected Works*, London. Lawrence and Wishart,
7. Nirmal Kumar Bose, 'Caste in India', *Man in India*, 31:107-123.
8. Dumont Louis, 1966 "The Village Community from Munro to Maine", in *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 9:67-89.
9. Karl Marx, *ibid*.
10. Henry S. Maine, 1871. *Village Communities in the East and West*, London, John Murray.
11. B.H. Baden-Powell, 1972 *The Indian Village Community*, Cosmo Publications, Delhi, (originally published in 1896).
12. P.C. Joshi, 1975 *Land Reforms in India*, Bombay, Allied Publishers.
13. McKim Marriott, (Ed.) 1956. *Village India*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
14. M.N. Srinivas, (Ed.) 1955. *India's Villages*, Calcutta, Govt. of West Bengal Press.
15. S.C. Dube, 1955. *Indian Village*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
16. F.G. Bailey, 1957. *Caste and the Economic Frontier*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.
17. Ramkrishna Mukherjee, 1957 *The Dynamics of a Rural Society*, Berlin, Akademik Verlags.
18. Oscar Lewis, 1958. *Village Life in Northern India*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
19. T.S. Epstein, 1962. *Economic Development and Social Change in South India*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
20. Andre Beteille, 1966. *Caste, Class and Power*, Bombay: Oxford University Press.
21. Dharma Kumar, *Land and Caste in South India*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
22. Kathleen Gough, 1977 "Agrarian Change in Thanjavur", in *Society and Change*, K.S. Krishnaswamy et al, Oxford University Press.
23. Joan Mencher, 1978. *Agriculture and Social Structure in Tamil Nadu*, Bombay, Allied Publishers.
24. Louis Dumont and D. Pocock, 1957. "For a Sociology of India", in *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, No. 1, Paris, Mouton and Co. The Hague.
25. M.N. Srinivas, 1955. "Village Studies and their Significance", *Eastern Anthropologist*, 8: 215-228.
- 26-28. References are replete in their respective *Collected Essays* and other writings.
29. S.B. Chakrabarti, 1985. "Peasants Environment and Planners' Enigma: A Paradigmatic Approach", in *Agrarian Situation in India*, Vol. II, Calcutta, Anthropological Survey of India, pp181-184.
30. S.B. Chakrabarti, 2014 "The Context of Anthropological Knowledge and the Future of Humankind: Some Speculative Arguments", in *Anthropology and the Future of Humankind*, INCAA and IGRMS, pp 153-165.
31. Karl Marx, *ibid*.
32. Karl Polanyi, 1957. "The Economy as Instituted Process", in *Trade and Market in Early Empire*, K. Polanyi et al, Glencoe, the Free Press.
33. George Dalton, (Ed.) 1981. *Research in Economic Anthropology*, London, JAI Press Inc.
34. A.V. Chayanov, A.V., 1931. "The Socio-Economic Nature of Peasant Farm Economy", in *A Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology*, P.A. Sorokin et al, Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press.
35. Thorner D, 1956 *The Agrarian Prospect in India*, Delhi, Delhi University Press.
36. Marshall, Sahlins, *Stone Age Economies*, London, Tavistock Publications.
37. Karl Marx, see Lawrence Krader, 1975. *The Asiatic Mode of Production*, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum and Co.
38. Robert Redfield, 1956. *Peasant Society and Culture*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
39. Eric Wolf, 1966. *Peasants*, New York, Prentice-Hall.
40. Michael Lipton, 1977. *Why Poor People Stay Poor: Urban Bias in World Development*, Canberra, Australian National University Press.

Studies on Peasant Communities: Changing Time and Context

41. T. J. Byress, 1977. "Agrarian Transition and Agrarian Question", in *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol.4, No. 3.
42. Henry Bernstein and Tom Brass, 1996-97. "Questioning the Agrarians: The Work of T.J. Byress", in *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 24, Nos. 1-2.
43. R.S. Sharma, 1965. *Indian Feudalism (Century 300-1200)*, Calcutta, University of Calcutta.
44. Irfan Habib, 1985. "Classifying Pre-Colonial India", *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 12, 2013, pp 44-53.
45. Harbans, Mukhia, 1981. "Was there feudalism in Indian history"? *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 3 pp 273-310,
46. Daniel Thorner, "Peasant Economy as a Category of Economic History", in *The Economic Weekly*, Special No., July 1963.
47. A.R. Desai, 1961. *Rural Sociology in India*, Bombay.
48. Dharma Kumar, *ibid*.
49. Edmund Leach, 1961. *Pul Eliya: A Village in Ceylon*, Cambridge University Press, 1961.
50. K.A. Wittfogel, *Oriental Despotism*, London, Oxford University Press.
- 51-53. For a synoptic review see Arjun Sen Gupta et al, "India's Common People: Who Are They? How Many Are They? And How Do They Live?" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XLIII, No. II, pp 49-63, 2008.
54. COP-26, United Nations Climate Change Conference (Conference of the Parties), was held at Glasgow, Scotland, U.K. from 31.10.2021 to 13.11.2021.

Bio Profile of the Author

President: Kolkata Society for Asian Studies.

General Secretary: The Asiatic Society, Kolkata

Former Deputy Director, Anthropological Survey of India, Government of India