

CHAPTER-VI: EMERGING RURAL LEADERS IN COOCHBEHAR: A MICRO ANALYSIS.

The characteristics of the three-tier Panchayat leaders in Cooch Behar district have been analysed in the preceding chapter. The position of the leaders in the social hierarchy has also been examined there. In fact, the elected members of Panchayats are not the only elite group in the rural nexus. Therefore, the question of examining other types of leaders comes to the fore in order to understand the profile and characteristics of rural leaders in their totality. To speak in terms of V. Pareto, that the Panchayats can best be termed as 'Governing elites' and hence it becomes the task of researcher to find out the 'Non-Governing elites', who at any time, can shift their position as 'Governing elites'. The present chapter examines in detail the characteristics of rural elites (elected, defeated and informal leaders) based on the relevant data collected from three selected Gram Panchayats (of which one is dominated by CPI(M), one is by Forward Bloc and another by Congress(I)) with a view to identify the differential characteristics, if any, between the leaders belonging to different political parties.

For an incisive analysis, the chapter has been subdivided into three sections: 1) demographic characteristics of rural leaders, 2) economic position of the rural leaders and 3) relational aspect of the rural leadership. In the first two subsections,

TABLE 6.1 : DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF LEADERS ACCORDING TO CASTE AND PARTY AFFILIATION

Type of Leaders	Congress [I]			CPI [M]			Forward Bloc			Others			Total		
	S.C.	GEN.	TOTAL	S.C.	GEN.	TOTAL	S.C.	GEN.	TOTAL	S.C.	GEN.	TOTAL	S.C.	GEN.	TOTAL
Formal	10 [71.4] [58.82]	4[28.6] [80.00]	14[100.0] [63.64]	6[75.00] [54.55]	2[25] [20.00]	8[100.0] [38.1]	12[92.3] [88.71]	1[7.7] [12.5]	13[100.0] [59.09]	- [-]	- [-]	- [-]	28[80.0] [65.12]	7[20.0] [29.17]	35[100.0] [52.24]
Defeated	7[100.0] 41.18	- [-]	7[100.0] [31.82]	3[50.0] [27.27]	3[50.0] [30.00]	6[100.0] [28.57]	2[33.3] [14.29]	4[66.7] [50.00]	6[100.0] [27.27]	- [-]	1[100.0] [100.00]	1[100.0] [50.00]	12[60.0] [27.9]	8[40] [33.33]	20[100.0] [29.85]
Informal	- [-]	1[100.0] [20.00]	1[100.0] [4.54]	2[28.6] [18.18]	5[71.4] [50.00]	7[100.0] [33.33]	- [-]	3[100.0] [37.5]	3[100.0] [13.64]	1[100.0] [100.00]	- [-]	1[100.0] [50.00]	3[25.0] [6.98]	9[75.0] [37.5]	12[100.0] [17.91]
TOTAL	17[77.3]	5[22.7]	22[100.0]	11[52.4]	10[47.6]	21[100.0]	14[63.6]	8[36.4]	22[100.0]	1[50.0]	1[50.0]	2[100.0]	43[64.18]	27[35.82]	67[100.0]

N.B. : [1] S.C. denotes Scheduled Castes.

[2] Gen. denotes General Castes.

[3] Figures in lower brackets indicate percentages of column total.

an effort has been made to present comparison between leaders and general people (i.e. non-leaders) on some important socio-economic parameters.

6.1: Demographic characteristics of rural leaders:

Keeping in line with the democratic tradition of Indian polity the Government of West Bengal permitted filing nominations along the party lines since the 1978 Panchayat Election. As a consequence, the panchayat body in the State has become the true replica of the State Legislature. The panchayat set-up has therefore been of considerable interest to the political parties of the State. This section examines some important demographic characteristics of various types of leaders and their families with an objective to identify their distinguishing features.

6.1.1: Leaders- Castes and Nature of Party Organisation:

Distribution of different types of leaders according to caste and party affiliation is presented in table 6.1. It is revealed from the table that a little over 64 percent of total leaders belonged to the Scheduled Castes. It is also reported that the leaders (formal + non-formal) under S.C. group were mostly of Rajbanshi community. A notable variation in proportion of leaders under S.C. group was, however, observed between the parties, the highest was recorded for Congress(I) (77.7 percent) and lowest for CPI(M) (52.4 percent). But higher proportion of leaders under S.C. (80 percent) was visualised while comparing it with respect to party under formal category - the proportion of S.C. leaders varying from 92.3 percent under Forward

TABLE 6.2 : PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LEADERS ACCORDING TO AGE AND PARTY AFFILIATION.

Types of Leaders	Congress [I]			CPI [M]			Forward Bloc			Others			All Parties Combined			Total
	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	
Normal	14.27 [100.0]	71.46 [62.5]	14.27 [50.00]	- [-]	50.00 [30.77]	50.00 [66.66]	- [-]	84.63 [61.11]	15.37 [66.67]	- [-]	- [-]	- [-]	5.71 [40.00]	71.43 [51.02]	22.86 [61.54]	100.00 [52.24]
Created	- [-]	85.71 [37.5]	14.29 [25.00]	- [-]	83.33 [38.46]	16.67 [16.67]	- [-]	100.00 [33.33]	- [-]	- [-]	100.00 [50.00]	- [-]	- [-]	90.00 [36.73]	10.00 [15.38]	100.00 [29.85]
Normal	- [-]	- [-]	100.00 [25.00]	28.58 [100.00]	57.14 [30.77]	14.28 [16.67]	33.33 [100.00]	33.33 [5.55]	33.34 [3.33]	- [-]	100.00 [50.00]	- [-]	25.00 [60.00]	50.00 [12.25]	25.00 [23.08]	100.00 [17.91]
Value	9.07 2	72.72 16	18.21 4	9.51 2	61.9 13	28.59 6	4.54 1	81.82 18	13.64 3	- -	100.00 2	- -	7.47 5	73.13 49	19.4 13	100.00 67

1] Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

2] N=67

Bloc (F.B.) to 71.4 under Congress(I). Among the defeated leaders, proportion of S.C. leaders was found to be 60 percent.

Above facts, therefore, established that the caste factor have been duly considered by all parties while giving nomination to their candidates. On the other hand, the informal leaders, who were principally engaged in building party organisation, were dominated by general castes. Moreover, the proportion of informal leaders was noted to be significantly higher in CPI(M) (33.33 percent) as compared to that of other political parties - 13.64 percent in Forward Bloc and 4.54 percent in Congress(I). On the basis of this observation, one may lead to the conclusion that rural organisation of both the Forward Bloc and Congress(I) have been highly election oriented than that of the CPI(M).

6.1.2: Age and Education:

The age-group of different types of leaders is cited in table 6.2. The table shows that the age-group '30 to 50' was found to be most common with respect to both types of leaders and their party belongingness. However, distribution of CPI(M) leaders according to age was observed to be more skewed towards higher age-group than that of other two parties. Relatively high proportion of CPI(M) leaders to higher age-groups was more pronounced for formal leaders (defeated CPI(M) leaders also display similar age-distribution pattern) which implies that the CPI(M) generally offered nomination to the candidates of relatively higher age-group. Neither CPI(M)

TABLE 6.3 : PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LEADERS ACCORDING TO AGE AND EDUCATION.

Education Classes	Formal			Defeated			Informal			All categories of leaders			TOTAL
	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	
Upto Class-V	12.5 [50.00]	50.00 [16.00]	37.5 [37.5]	- [-]	100.00 [11.11]	- [-]	- [-]	50.00 [16.67]	50.00 [33.33]	8.33 [20.00]	58.33 [14.28]	33.34 [30.77]	100.00 [14.91]
Class- VI to Class-X	7.7 [50.00]	69.2 [36.00]	23.1 [37.5]	- [-]	77.8 [38.89]	22.2 [100.00]	33.3 [33.34]	- [-]	66.7 [66.67]	8.00 [40.00]	64.00 [32.65]	28.00 [53.85]	100.00 [37.31]
Matric/HS Madhyamik	- [-]	84.6 [44.00]	15.4 [25.00]	- [-]	100.00 [44.44]	- [-]	25.00 [33.33]	75.00 [50.00]	- [-]	4.00 [20.00]	88.00 [44.9]	8.00 [15.38]	100.00 [37.31]
Graduation and Above	- [-]	100.00 [4.00]	- [-]	- [-]	100.00 [5.56]	- [-]	33.3 [33.33]	66.7 [33.33]	- [-]	20.00 [20.00]	80.00 [8.17]	- [-]	100.00 [7.47]
TOTAL	5.7	71.4	22.9	-	90.00	10.00	25.00	50.00	25.00	7.47	73.13	19.40	100.00
N Value	2	25	8	-	18	2	3	6	3	5	49	13	67

N.B. : [1] Figures in brackets indicate percentage on column total.
[2] Horizontal percentages given on each category and classification total.

TABLE 6.4 : PERCENTAGE OF LEADERS ACCORDING TO AGE, EDUCATION AND PARTY AFFILIATION

Educational Classes	Congress [I]			CPI[M]			Forward Bloc			Others			All parties combined			Total
	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	Below 30	30 to 50	Above 50	
Upto Class-V	- [-]	66.67 [12.5]	33.33 [25.00]	- [-]	40.00 [15.38]	60.00 [50.00]	- [-]	75.00 [16.67]	25.00 [33.33]	- [-]	- [-]	- [-]	- [-]	58.33 [14.29]	41.67 [38.46]	100.00 [17.91]
Class-VI to Class-X	20.00 [100.00]	60.00 [37.5]	20.00 [50.00]	16.67 [50.00]	66.66 [30.77]	16.67 [16.67]	- [-]	77.78 [38.89]	22.22 [66.67]	- [-]	- [-]	- [-]	12.00 [60.00]	68.00 [34.69]	20.00 [38.46]	100.00 [37.31]
Matric/HS/Madhyamik	- [-]	88.89 [50.00]	11.11 [25.00]	11.11 [50.00]	67.67 [46.15]	22.22 [33.33]	- [-]	100.00 [33.33]	- [-]	- [-]	100.00 [50.00]	- [-]	4.00 [20.00]	84.00 [42.86]	12.00 [23.08]	100.00 [37.31]
Graduation and above	- [-]	- [-]	- [-]	- [-]	100.00 [7.7]	- [-]	33.33 [100.00]	66.67 [11.11]	- [-]	- [-]	100.00 [50.00]	- [-]	20.00 [20.00]	80.00 [8.16]	- [-]	100.00 [7.47]
Total N Values	9.08 2	72.72 16	18.2 4	9.51 2	61.9 13	28.59 6	4.54 1	81.82 18	13.64 3	-	100.00 2	-	7.46 5	73.13 49	19.5 13	100.00 67

N.B : Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

Table 6.5 : Educational pattern of leaders and their family members vi-a-vis the general people in three Gram Panchayats.

Name of the Gram Panchayat	No. of Leaders	No. of total family members		Illiterates (including minors)		Upto Class-V		Class-VI to Class-X		Matric/H.S./ Madhyamik		Graduate and above		Total literates	
		L & FM	Gen.	L & FM	Gen.	L & FM	Gen.	L & FM	Gen.	L & FM	Gen.	L & FM	Gen.	L & FM	Gen.
Bhetaguri-I G.P.	34 (50.75)	225 (100.00)	813 (100.0)	40 (17.78)	350 (43.05)	68 (30.22)	171 (21.03)	73 (32.44)	179 (22.01)	29 (12.89)	80 (9.84)	15 (6.67)	33 (4.06)	185 (82.22)	463 (56.95)
Andaranfulbari - I G.P.	14 (20.9)	112 (100.00)	297 (100.0)	19 (16.96)	180 (60.6)	31 (27.68)	80 (26.94)	37 (33.03)	28 (9.43)	20 (17.86)	7 (2.36)	5 (4.46)	2 (0.46)	93 (83.03)	117 (39.4)
Bagdogra-Fulkadbari G.P.	19 (28.35)	144 (100.00)	213 (100.0)	47 (32.64)	146 (68.54)	50 (34.72)	55 (25.82)	36 (25.00)	12 (5.63)	9 (6.25)	- (-)	2 (1.39)	- (-)	97 (67.36)	67 (31.46)
TOTAL	67 (100.00)	481 (100.00)	1323 (100.0)	106 (22.04)	676 (51.10)	149 (30.98)	306 (23.13)	146 (30.35)	219 (16.55)	58 (12.06)	87 (6.58)	22 (4.57)	35 (2.64)	375 (77.96)	647 (48.9)

- N.B. : 1) Figures in brackets indicate percentages of respective total members.
 2) L & FM is the abbreviation of the term ' Leaders and their family members's'.
 3) Gen. denotes ' General people' .

nor Forward Bloc leaders generally preferred candidates having below 30 years of age as revealed from table 6.2.

Percentage distribution of different types of leaders according to age and education is presented in table 6.3 . It is shown from the table that about 45 percent of leaders belonging to '30 to 50 'age group had their minimum educational qualification as Matriculation / Madhyamic or H.S. . In other two age groups, more qualified leaders were recorded to be relatively less as envisaged by table 6.3 . The revelation of higher qualified leaders to '30 to 50' age-group was also valid in case of formal, defeated, and informal leaders. It may be worthwhile to examine the educational qualification of leaders in relation to their belongings to different age-group and party which has been highlighted in table 6.4 . Relatively high concentration of qualified leaders to age-group '30 to 50' as revealed for different categories of rural leaders (table 6.3) appeared to be congruous while the leaders were classified according to their party affiliation by considering age and qualification (table 6.4). In view of the above, one may plausibly assert that a young generation of educated leaders have emerged in rural Cooch Behar. To examine the educational background of leaders' families vis-a-vis that of general people , table 6.5 is prepared . The literacy rate of the leaders' families of the three selected Gram Panchayats was noted 78 percent as against only 49 percent for general people. Besides, in every qualification class proportion registered for leaders' family members was noted to be significantly higher than that of general people as visualised in table 6.5 . It is conspicuous from the above that the

educational background of the rural elite families was notably higher than that of non-leader families .

From the foregoing discussion one may lead to the following conclusion :

- 1) The rural leaders in Cooch Behar District was predominated by Scheduled Castes, degree of predominance was noted to be least in CPI(M). The caste factor appears to have been duly considered by all parties while selecting candidates for election contest.
- 2) The informal leaders engaged solely for looking after party organisation was found significantly lower for Congress(I) and Forward Bloc while that for CPI(M) was recorded at quite high level (33.33 percent). The stronger organisational set-up of CPI(M) and the leadership pattern of both Congress(I) and Forward Bloc was more election oriented than that of CPI(M) have been reflected from this finding.
- 3) Younger generation of rural leaders with better educational background of themselves and their families have emerged in rural areas of Cooch Behar.
- 4) The leaders and their family members had better educational background than that of general people .

6.2: Economic Position of Rural Leaders :

To comprehend economic position of rural leaders , it is important to examine the occupational and landholding pattern of rural leadership as both these factors are assumed to have direct influence on their economic position. This section purports to

TABLE 6.6 : PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LRADERS ACCORDING TO HOLDING SIZE AND PARTY AFFILIATION.

Land Holding Classes	Political Parties				TOTAL	NValue
	Congrss [I]	CPI [M]	Forward Bloc	Others		
Landless	- [-]	- [-]	100.00 [1.59]	- [-]	100.00 [1.59]	1
Upto Acres	9.09 [4.54]	63.64 [33.33]	18.18 [9.09]	9.09 [50.00]	100.00 [16.42]	11
1 to 3 Acres	22.23 [9.09]	33.33 [14.29]	33.33 [13.64]	11.11 [50.00]	100.00 [13.43]	9
3 to 5 Acres	29.41 [22.73]	47.06 [38.1]	23.53 [18.18]	- [-]	100.00 [25.37]	17
5 to 7 Acres	44.45 [18.18]	22.22 [9.52]	33.33 [13.64]	- [-]	100.00 [13.43]	9
7 to 10Acres	55.56 [22.73]	- [-]	44.44 [18.18]	- [-]	100.00 [13.43]	9
Above 10 Acres	45.45 [22.73]	9.10 [4.76]	45.45 [22.73]	- [-]	100.00 [16.42]	11
T O T A L	32.84 [100.00]	31.34 [100.00]	32.84 [100.00]	- [-]	100.00 [100.00]	
N Value	22	21	22	2	67	

N. B. : Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

analyse in detail the occupational, landholding and income pattern of different types of leaders belonging to different political parties with an objective of identifying the score of variation, if any therein, between the leaders of different types and parties. The occupational, income and landholding patterns of the general peoples are also analysed with a view to ascertain the position of the rural leaders in the rural nexus in comparison with that of the general people .

6.2.1: Landholding pattern of the rural leaders :

In economically backward district like Cooch Behar, the size of holding may plausibly be considered as a single-most important determinant of economic status of rural families. In view of this, landholding pattern of rural leaders' families has been analysed in this sub-section. The percentage distribution of leaders according to size-group of holding and party belongingness is presented in table 6.6.

About 30 percent of rural leaders at the bottom and 30 percent at the top holding land less than 3 acres and more than 7 acres respectively were evidenced by table 6.6. Comparing landholding pattern of rural leaders with respect to party belongingness, it is noticed that the percentage of leaders possessing landholding upto 3 acres was 47.6 for CPI(M), 22.7 for Forward Bloc and only 13.6 for Congress(I). In two upper size groups (7 acres or above), the respective percentage was found to be 45.5 percent for Congress(I), 40.9 percent for Forward Bloc and only 4.8 percent for CPI(M).

Thus, the Congress(I) leaders were placed at the top and the CPI(M) leaders at the

Table 6.7 : Percentage distribution of leaders according to holding size, income of family and party affiliation.

Holding Size	Upto Rs. 10,000/-					Rs. 10,001/- to Rs. 20,000/-					Rs. 20,001/- to 30,000/-					More than Rs. 30,000/-					
	Cong (I)	CPI (M)	Forward Bloc	Others	Total	Cong (I)	CPI (M)	Forward Bloc	Others	Total	Cong (I)	CPI (M)	Forward Bloc	Others	Total	Cong (I)	CPI (M)	Forward Bloc	Others	Total	
Landless	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	100.00 (11.11)	- (-)	100.00 (3.7)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)
Upto 1 acre	- (-)	9.09 (50.0)	9.09 (33.33)	- (-)	18.18 (28.57)	- (-)	18.18 (28.57)	- (-)	- (-)	18.18 (7.41)	- (-)	27.28 (50.0)	9.09 (25.00)	9.09 (100.0)	45.46 (35.72)	9.09 (16.67)	9.09 (16.67)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	18.18 (10.53)
1 to 3 acre	- (-)	11.11 (50.01)	11.11 (33.33)	- (-)	22.22 (28.57)	22.23 (18.18)	- (-)	11.11 (11.11)	- (-)	33.33 (11.11)	- (-)	22.23 (33.33)	11.11 (25.00)	- (-)	33.34 (21.43)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	11.11 (100.0)	11.11 (5.26)	
3 to 5 acre	11.76 (100.0)	- (-)	5.88 (33.34)	- (-)	17.64 (42.86)	5.88 (9.09)	23.53 (57.14)	11.76 (22.23)	- (-)	41.17 (25.93)	5.88 (33.34)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	5.88 (7.14)	5.88 (16.66)	23.53 (66.66)	5.88 (16.67)	- (-)	- (-)	35.29 (31.58)
5 to 7 acre	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	44.45 (36.37)	11.11 (14.29)	22.22 (22.22)	- (-)	77.78 (25.93)	- (-)	11.11 (16.67)	- (-)	- (-)	11.11 (7.14)	- (-)	- (-)	11.11 (16.67)	- (-)	- (-)	11.11 (5.26)
7 to 10 acre	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	33.34 (27.27)	- (-)	22.22 (22.22)	- (-)	55.56 (18.51)	11.11 (33.33)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	11.11 (7.14)	11.11 (17.67)	- (-)	22.22 (33.33)	- (-)	- (-)	33.33 (15.79)
Abov 10 acre	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	9.09 (9.09)	- (-)	9.09 (9.09)	- (-)	18.18 (7.41)	9.09 (33.33)	- (-)	18.18 (50.00)	- (-)	27.27 (21.43)	27.28 (50.00)	9.09 (16.67)	18.18 (33.33)	- (-)	- (-)	54.55 (31.58)
TOTAL	2.99	2.98	4.48	-	10.45	16.42	10.45	13.43	-	4.03	4.48	8.95	5.97	1.49	20.39	8.96	8.96	8.96	1.49	28.37	
N Value	2	2	3	-	7	11	7	9	-	27	3	6	4	1	14	6	6	6	1	19	

184

N.B.: Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

bottom in the social hierarchy in regard to holding landed property in rural CoochBehar, The Forward Bloc leaders were placed in between. To quote Lieten, "The class background of the FB candidates is situated somewhere between those of CPI(M) and the INC."²

Now, the question comes in as to what degree the landholding pattern is related with income pattern . Table 6.7 shows the distribution of leaders of different parties according to size group of landholding and family income . It may be mentioned here that since no leader families were found to be below Rs.4,800/- (Poverty line), the classification starts from 'upto Rs.10,000/-' group. Combining all parties, it is visualised that the families pertaining to lowest income groups were distributed over the first three lower landholding classes. With the increase in family income, i.e., a movement from second to third income group, revealed an increase in percentage of families belonging to the first three holding classes (from 44.4 to 64.3 percent). With further increase in income, i.e., transition from third to the highest income group, the proportion of families pertaining to the first three holding classes declined from 64.3 percent to 47.4 percent. It establishes the contention that the correspondence between size of holding and income of the leaders, if any therein, appeared to be very feeble. A careful examination of table 6.7 also unveils the same revelation for the families with respect to their party. About 9 percent of Congress(I) leaders' families under lowest size-class exhibited to fall under second income group and none in the highest income group. Half of the Congress(I) leaders' families under third size group

TABLE 6.8 : OCCUPATIONAL PATTERN OF LEADERS.

Types of Leaders	Congress [I]			CPI [M]			Forward Bloc			Others			All leaders combined			TOTAL
	Agril.	Business	Service	Agril.	Business	Service	Agril.	Business	Service	Agril.	Business	Service	Agril.	Business	Service	
Formal	64.28 [60.00]	14.29 [100.00]	21.43 [60.00]	37.50 [33.33]	12.50 [33.34]	50.00 [44.45]	69.23 [60.00]	7.69 [50.00]	23.08 [60.00]	- [-]	- [-]	- [-]	60.00 [53.85]	11.43 [57.14]	28.57 [47.62]	100.00 [52.24]
Defeated	71.43 [33.33]	- [-]	28.57 [40.00]	50.00 [33.34]	16.67 [33.33]	33.33 [22.22]	66.67 [26.67]	16.67 [50.00]	16.66 [20.00]	- [-]	- [-]	100.00 [50.00]	60.00 [30.77]	10.00 [28.57]	30.00 [28.57]	100.00 [29.85]
Informal	100.00 [6.67]	- [-]	- [-]	42.86 [33.33]	14.28 [33.33]	42.86 [33.33]	66.67 [13.33]	- [-]	33.33 [20.00]	- [-]	- [-]	100.00 [50.00]	50.00 [15.38]	8.33 [14.29]	41.67 [23.81]	100.00 [17.91]
TOTAL	68.18	9.09	22.73	42.86	14.28	42.86	68.18	9.09	22.73	-	-	100.00	58.21	10.45	31.34	100.00
N Value	15	2	5	9	3	9	15	2	5	-	-	2	39	7	21	67

N. B. : Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

belonged to first two income-groups. Similar findings were also revealed in case of families of other two parties. From the above analysis one may reasonably lead to the contention that the factor other than land might have been acted upon in determining the family income of rural leaders. This entails to examine in detail the occupational pattern of rural leaders' families.

6.2.2: Occupational pattern of rural leaders and their families:

Classification of leaders' families according to main occupations^s is shown in table 6.8. In totality, a little over 58 percent of leaders were found to have agriculture as the main occupation followed by service and business on which 31.3 and 10.4 percent of leaders were dependent respectively. Most of the leaders reported to have agriculture as the main occupation were, however, engaged in agriculture principally for supervisory works. The variation in main occupational structure was, however, observed between different types of leaders and between the leaders of different party belongingness. Relatively high proportion of informal leaders were observed to have their dependence on service as compared to formal and defeated leaders (table 6.8). Analogously, proportion of CPI(M) leaders dependent on service was noticed to be considerably higher than the Congress(I) and Forward Bloc. Proportion of CPI(M) leaders principally dependent on business was also recorded to be higher than that of other two parties. Non-agricultural occupation as the main source of earning was reported to be significantly higher among the CPI(M) leaders (57 percent) as

Table 6.9 : Percentage distribution of leaders' families according to their occupational status, party affiliation and type of leaders.

Name of party/type of leaders	Exclusively dependent on agriculture	Exclusively dependent on business	Exclusively dependent on service	Dependent on agril. and business	Dependent on agril. and service	Dependent on business and service	Dependent on agril., business and service	Total
Congress (I)	40.9 (45.00)	- (-)	4.55 (20.00)	18.18 (33.33)	27.27 (40.00)	- (-)	9.1 (18.18)	100.00 (32.84)
CPI(M)	19.05 (20.00)	4.76 (50.00)	14.29 (60.00)	14.29 (25.00)	23.8 (33.33)	9.25 (100.00)	14.29 (27.27)	100.00 (31.34)
Forward Block	31.82 (35.00)	4.55 (50.00)	4.55 (20.00)	22.72 (41.67)	13.64 (20.00)	- (-)	22.72 (45.45)	100.00 (32.84)
Others	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	50.00 (6.67)	- (-)	50.00 (9.1)	100.00 (2.98)
Total	29.85 (100.00)	2.98 (100.00)	7.46 (100.00)	17.91 (100.00)	22.40 (100.00)	2.98 (100.00)	16.42 (100.00)	100.00 (100.00)

Formal	40.00 (70.00)	- (-)	8.57 (60.00)	14.29 (41.67)	17.14 (40.00)	5.71 (100.00)	14.29 (45.46)	100.00 (52.24)
Defeated	20.00 (20.00)	5.00 (50.00)	5.00 (20.00)	25.00 (41.67)	25.00 (33.33)	- (-)	20.00 (36.36)	100.00 (29.85)
Informal	16.67 (10.00)	8.33 (50.00)	8.33 (20.00)	16.67 (16.66)	33.33 (26.67)	- (-)	16.67 (18.18)	100.00 (17.91)
Total	29.85 (100.00)	2.98 (100.00)	7.46 (100.00)	17.91 (100.00)	22.40 (100.00)	2.98 (100.00)	16.42 (100.00)	100.00 (100.00)
N Value	20	2	5	12	15	2	11	67

N.B. : Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

TABLE 6.10 : PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LEADERS' FAMILIES ACCORDING TO OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AND INCOME.

Income Ranges	Exclusively dep. on Agriculture	Exclusively dep. on Business	Exclusively dep. on Service	Dep. oAgril. & Business	Dep. on Agril. Service	Dep.on Business & Service	Dep. on Agril. Business & Service	Occupational Classes combined				
								Cong [I]	CPI [M]	Ford. Bloc.	Other	Total
Upto Rs. 10000/-	20.00	50.00	-	8.33	-	-	9.09	9.09	9.52	13.64	-	10.45
Rs. 10001 to 20000	65.00	50.00	-	58.34	26.67	50.00	9.09	50.00	33.33	40.91	-	40.30
Rs. 20001 to 30000	10.00	-	60.00	-	40.00	50.00	18.18	13.64	28.57	18.18	50.0	20.89
More than 30000	5.00	-	40.00	33.33	33.33	-	63.64	27.27	28.58	27.27	50.0	28.36
N Value	20	2	5	12	15	2	11	22	21	22	2	67

compared to that of leaders belonging to other two parties (31.8 percent). The occupational pattern of the leaders' families is furnished in table 6.9. On the whole, nearly 30 percent of leaders' families were absolutely dependent on agriculture. If the leaders' families having source of earning agriculture in combination with other occupations taken into consideration, the proportion of leaders' families related with agricultural occupation was recorded to be as high as 86.6 percent (table 6.9). Relatively less proportion of CPI(M) leaders dependent on agriculture either wholly or partially (19 and 71.4 percent respectively) also leads to the conclusion that the CPI(M) leaders' families were less dependent on agriculture. Relatively less dependence of families of informal leaders on agriculture has also been highlighted from table 6.9. Percentage distribution of leaders' families according to occupational status and income is furnished in table 6.10.

Combining all occupational categories, it is visualised from Table 6.10 that a little over 49 percent of leaders' families belonged to the higher income of 'Rs.20,000/- and above'. Thus, one may contend that lower be the dependence on agriculture, higher will be their level of income and the leaders who depended exclusively in service have better chance of remaining in the higher strata of income. It is also established that the leader who depended on more than one occupation had a better chance of remaining in the higher strata of income. It is also seen (table 6.9) that the CPI(M) leaders' families having less dependence on agriculture were placed in relatively higher income category (table 6.7) as compared to their counterpart in Forward Bloc

TABLE 6.11 : PERCENTAGE OF DEPENDENCE OF LEADERS FAMILIES ON AGRICULTURE AND AVERAGE PER CAPITA INCOME.

Name of the Gram Panchayet	Percentage of dependence of Leaders Families on Agriculture.	Per capita per annum income of Elite Families.
Andaranfulbari-I Gram Panchayet	57.14	Rs. 4177.86
Bhetaguri-I Gram Panchayet	76.46	Rs. 3347.02
Bagdokra-fulkadabri Gram Panchayet	100.00	Rs. 2960.03

TABLE 6.12 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LEADERS BY FAMILY SIZE AND PARTY AFFILIATION

Party Affiliation	Family Size				Total	Average Size of the family
	Upto 4	5 to 8	9 to 12	13 and above		
Congress [I]	4.55 [16.67]	54.54 [30.00]	36.36 [44.44]	4.55 [33.33]	100.00 [32.84]	7.59
C P I [M]	19.05 [66.66]	52.38 [27.5]	19.05 [22.22]	9.52 [66.67]	100.00 [31.34]	6.90
Forward Block	4.55 [16.67]	72.72 [40.00]	22.73 [27.78]	- [-]	100.00 [32.84]	7.05
Others	- [-]	50.00 [2.50]	50.00 [5.56]	- [-]	100.00 [2.98]	8.00
TOTAL	8.96 [100.00]	59.7 [100.00]	26.86 [100.00]	4.48 [100.00]	100.00 [100.00]	7.21
N Value	6	40	18	3	67	

N. B. : Figures in brackets indicate percentages in column total.

and Congress(I) in the selected areas under study. A close examination of percentage distribution of families according to occupational dependence and income group (table 6.10) further reveals that the business as the non-agricultural source generated low income as against the service generating high income. Thus, the business activities with which the leaders' families related were quite petty in nature.

In the rural areas, the dependence on a single profession is now gradually being reduced and the families now have more than one source of income. This phenomenon weakens the dominance of agriculture as a profession in rural areas and the leaders, in order to keep their socio-economic dominance, were generally depending more on other occupations.

The correspondence between the degree of dependence on agriculture and per capita income of leaders' families can be examined in this context. The table 6.11 confirms the earlier contention that more the dependence on agriculture, less be the per capita per annum income. Relatively small average size of CPI(M) leaders' families as observed in table 6.12 also strengthens the earlier findings that the CPI(M) families were placed in a relatively higher income hierarchy even if their income was compared on per capita basis. Higher per capita income of CPI(M) leaders families has also been conspicuous from the distributional pattern of leaders' families on the basis of per capita income as displayed by table 6.13.

TABLE 6.13 : PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LEADERS' FAMILIES ACCORDING TO PER CAPITA INCOME GROUP.

Name of the Party	Per capita income-classes				Total
	Below Rs. 1000/-	Rs. 1000/- to 3000/-	Rs. 3000/- to 5000/-	Above Rs. 5000/-	
Congress [I]	1.49	16.42	10.45	4.48	32.84
CPI [M]	2.99	7.46	17.91	2.98	31.34
Forward Bloc	1.49	16.42	8.96	5.97	32.84
Others	-	1.49	-	1.49	2.98
Total	5.97	41.79	37.32	14.92	100.00
N Value	4	28	25	10	67

TABLE 6.14 : PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NON-LEADERS' FAMILIES OF THREE SELECTED GRAM PANCHAYETS ACCORDING TO HOLDING SIZE.

Name of the Gram Panchayat Area	Landholding Classes							TOTAL
	Landless	Upto 1 Acre	1 to 3 Acre	3 to 5 Acre	5 to 7 Acre	7 to 10 Acre	Above 10 Acre	
Andaranfulbari-I Gram Panchayat	22.81 [23.22]	28.07 [17.98]	40.36 [34.85]	1.75 [5.88]	5.26 [23.08]	1.75 [16.67]	- [-]	100.00 [22.80]
Bhetaguri-I Gram Panchayat	22.22 [60.71]	40.52 [69.66]	22.88 [53.03]	9.15 [82.35]	1.96 [23.08]	1.31 [33.33]	1.96 [100.00]	100.00 [61.20]
Bagdokra-fulkadabri Gram Panchayat	22.50 [16.07]	27.50 [12.36]	20.00 [12.12]	5.00 [11.77]	17.50 [53.84]	7.50 [50.00]	- [-]	100.00 [16.00]
TOTAL	22.40	35.60	26.40	6.80	5.20	2.40	1.20	100.00
N Value	56	89	66	17	13	6	3	250

N. B. : 1] N=250.

2] Figures in brackets indicate percentages of respective total.

6.2.3.: Comparing Economic Position of Leaders' Families vis-a-vis that of the Non-Leaders.

The economic position of the leaders' families can best be understood if the economic position of the general people is analysed with an eye to make some comparison between the two. One ward from each of the selected Gram Panchayats was selected at random and the relevant information from all non-leader households of the selected wards were collected for the purpose of this comparison. In totality, 250 non-leader households were enumerated of which 57 households belonged to the Andaran Fulbari-I, 40 to the Bagdokra Fulkadabri and 153 to the Bhetaguri-I Gram Panchayat. To start with, the landholding pattern of the non-leaders may be taken into account. A glaring difference of landholding pattern between the leaders' and the non-leaders' families was noted. Among the non-leaders' families 22.4 percent families were found to be landless (table 6.14). The proportion of non-leaders' families holding less than 3 acers of land was recorded to be 62 percent (table 6.6) while that for leaders' families was only about 30 percent. On the other hand, only 3.6 percent of non-leaders' families were recorded to have land more than seven acres as against 30 percent for leaders' families. A notable difference in the distributional pattern of landholding among the non-leader' families of the selected Gram Panchayats was, however, observed (table 6.14). One may safely affirm through a careful examination of table 6.14 and table 6.6 that the non-leaders, in general, were relatively poor in respect of holding of landed property as compared to that of their

TABLE 6.15 : PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NON-LEADERS FAMILIES ACCORDING TO OCCUPATIONAL PATTERN.

Name of the Gram Panchayat Area	Solely Labour hiring out	Self-cultivation-cum-labour hrg. out	Self Cultivation only	Business only	Services only	Agril. & Business	Agril. & Service	Business & Service	Agril. , Service & Business	TOTAL
Andaranfbari-I Gram Panchayat	45.61 (33.33)	10.53 (21.43)	35.09 (29.41)	- [-]	1.75 (5.88)	7.02 (26.67)	- [-]	- [-]	- [-]	100.00 (22.80)
Bhetaguri-I Gram Panchayat	18.95 (37.18)	13.07 (71.43)	24.18 (54.41)	17.65 (100.00)	10.46 (94.12)	6.54 (66.67)	5.23 (72.73)	3.27 (100.00)	0.65 (100.00)	100.00 (61.20)
Bagdokra-fulkadabri Gram Panchayat	57.50 (29.49)	5.00 (7.14)	27.50 (16.18)	- [-]	- [-]	2.50 (6.66)	7.50 (27.27)	- [-]	- [-]	100.00 (16.00)
TOTAL	31.20 (100.00)	11.20 (100.00)	27.20 (100.00)	10.80 (100.00)	6.80 (100.00)	6.00 (100.00)	4.40 (100.00)	2.00 (100.00)	0.40 (100.00)	100.00 (100.00)
N Value	78	28	68	27	17	15	11	5	1	250

N. B. : 1] N=250

2] Figures in brackets indicate percentage of column total.

541

Table 6.16 : Percentage distribution of non-leaders' families according to family income class.

Name of the Gram Panchyat area	Below Rs.10000/-	Rs.10001/- to Rs.20000/-	Rs.20001/- to Rs.30000/-	Above Rs.30000/-	TOTAL
Andaranfulbari -I Gram Panchayat	54.39 (18.02)	35.09 (33.33)	5.26 (27.27)	5.26 (42.86)	100.00 (22.80)
Bhetaguri - I Gram Panchayat	73.20 (65.12)	18.95 (48.33)	5.23 (72.73)	2.62 (57.14)	100.00 (61.20)
Bagdokra-fulkadabari Gram Panchayat	72.50 (16.86)	27.50 (18.34)	- (-)	- (-)	100.00 (16.00)
TOTAL	68.80	24.00	4.40	2.80	100.00
N Value	172	60	11	7	250.00

N.B. : 1) N=250

2) Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

Table 6.17 :Percentage distribution of non-leaders' families according to percapita income class.

Name of the Gram Panchayat area	Below Rs.1000/-	Rs.1001/- to Rs.3000/-	Rs.300/- to Rs.5000/-	Above Rs.5000/-	TOTAL
Andaranfulbari - I Gram Panchyat	24.56 (16.09)	61.40 (25.00)	8.78 (41.67)	5.26 (27.27)	100.00 (22.80)
Bhetaguri -I Gram Panchyat	37.91 (66.67)	52.94 (57.86)	3.92 (50.00)	4.23 (72.73)	100.00 (61.20)
Bagdokra - fulkadabri Gram Panchyat	37.50 (14.24)	60.00 (17.14)	2.50 (8.33)	- (-)	100.00 (16.00)
T O T A L	34.80 (100.00)	56.00 (100.00)	4.80 (100.00)	4.40 (100.00)	100.00 (100.00)
N Value	87	140	12	11	250

- N.B.: 1) N=250
2) Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

leaders.

A notable difference in occupational pattern between the non-leaders' and the leaders' families is also visualised. In contrast to the leaders' families, a little over 31 percent of non-leaders' families belonged to the category of labourers, and 11 percent to the category of self-cultivation cum labourer as revealed by table 6.15 . A little over 27 percent of the non-leaders' families cultivated their own land by engaging family labour. So, if the first three categories are totalled, livelihood of almost 70 percent of the non-leaders' families depended on utilising their own family labour which is a clear departure from the occupational pattern of the leaders' families as shown by table 6.9.

A comparison of the distribution pattern of the families of non-leaders based on family income (table 6.16) and per capita income (table 6.17) with those of leaders' families (table 6.10 and table 6.13 respectively) establishes the contention that the non-leaders' families were poorer than the leaders' families. Keeping aside comparing each per capita income class between leaders' and the non-leaders' families, it can only be said that whereas 5.97 percent of the leaders' families had per capita income 'Below Rs.1000/-' while proportion of non-leaders' families falling in the same income group was recorded as high as 34.8 percent. Thus, comparing the economic position of leaders, it can be said easily that leaders emanated from the economically advantageous groups of the rural populace. "Power has yet to travel down to lower levels,... In some G.P.s we visited, survey conducted to identify IRDP beneficiaries

Table 6.18 : Percentage distribution of leaders according to perceived class, party affiliation and type of leaders.

Party affiliation / Type of leaders	Poor	Lower - middle	Upper - middle	T O T A L
Congress (I)	27.27 (28.57)	59.09 (31.71)	13.64 (60.00)	100.00 (32.84)
CPI (M)	33.33 (33.33)	61.9 (31.71)	4.77 (20.00)	100.00 (31.34)
Forward Bloc	36.36 (38.10)	59.09 (31.71)	4.55 (20.00)	100.00 (32.84)
Others	- (-)	100.00 (4.87)	- (-)	100.00 (2.98)
T O T A L	31.34 (100.00)	61.20 (100.00)	7.46 (100.00)	100.00 (100.00)
Formal	31.43 (52.38)	60.00 (51.22)	8.57 (60.00)	100.00 (52.24)
Defeated	30.00 (28.57)	65.00 (31.71)	5.00 (20.00)	100.00 (29.85)
Informal	33.33 (19.05)	54.34 (17.07)	8.33 (20.00)	100.00 (17.91)
T O T A L	31.34 (100.00)	61.20 (100.00)	7.46 (100.00)	100.00 (100.00)
N value	21	41	5	67

N.B. : Figures in brackets indicate percentages of respective total.

Table 6.19 : Percentage distribution of leaders according to income and perceived class.

Income	Poor				Lower Middle Class				Upper Middle Class				GRAND TOTAL
	Formal	Defeated	Informal	Total	Formal	Defeated	Informal	Total	Formal	Defeated	Informal	Total	
Upto Rs. 4800/-	- (-)	100.00 (20.00)	- (-)	100.00 (4.76)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	100.00 (1.49)
Rs. 4800/- to Rs. 10000/-	33.33 (16.67)	16.67 (20.00)	16.67 (25.00)	66.67 (19.05)	33.33 (10.00)	- (-)	- (-)	33.33 (4.87)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	100.00 (8.96)
Rs. 10,001/- to Rs. 20000/-	29.63 (66.66)	11.11 (60.00)	7.41 (50.00)	48.15 (61.91)	14.81 (20.00)	29.63 (57.14)	7.41 (28.57)	51.85 (34.15)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	100.00 (40.00)
Rs. 20,001/- to Rs. 30000/-	14.29 (16.67)	- (-)	- (-)	14.29 (9.52)	35.71 (25.00)	28.57 (28.57)	14.29 (28.57)	78.57 (26.83)	7.14 (33.33)	- (-)	- (-)	7.14 (20.00)	100.00 (20.9)
Above Rs. 30,000/-	- (-)	- (-)	5.26 (25.00)	5.26 (4.76)	47.37 (45.00)	10.53 (14.29)	15.79 (42.86)	73.69 (34.15)	10.53 (66.67)	5.26 (100.00)	5.26 (100.00)	21.05 (80.00)	100.00 (28.36)
TOTAL	17.91 (100.00)	7.46 (100.00)	5.97 (100.00)	31.34 (100.00)	29.85 (100.00)	20.9 (100.00)	10.45 (100.00)	61.2 (100.00)	4.48 (100.00)	1.49 (100.00)	1.49 (100.00)	7.46 (100.00)	100.00
N Value	12	5	4	21	20	14	7	41	3	1	1	5	67

N.B.: Figures in brackets indicate percentage of column total.

150

show that the people below the povertyline constitute 45 to 55 percent of the population in the panchayats. But there is hardly any representation from this section at all levels and none at all in key positions. The Middle category, as it looks, remain in firm control of the Panchayats."⁴

6.2.4: Financial hierarchy of the leaders' families and the perceived class.

To comprehend the financial position of the leaders and their mental make-up, it may be relevant to discuss the views of the leaders about themselves - in which class they perceive to belong. For this, four options were given to them namely, Poor, Lower Middle Class, Upper Middle Class and Rich. It is interesting to note that no leader perceived himself to belong to 'Rich' class. The distribution of leaders according to economic class they perceived to belong is shown in table 6.18. It is revealed from the table 6.18 that a good percentage of leaders perceived themselves to belong to poor and lower middle class. The issue becomes more interesting while the varying family income is compared with perceived class position. The table 6.19 is prepared for this purpose. A notable difference in the income structure and leaders perception of their class position is visualised from the table 6.19. Leaders, in general, displayed a under estimation of their class position in comparison with their actual income position. Though no leader perceived himself in the 'Rich' group, a considerable percentage of leaders were noted to belong to be the highest income group which one may reasonably call to be rich. The leaders were mostly interested

Table 6.20 : Percentage distribution of leaders according to methods of farming.

Methods of Cultivation	Parties				Type of leaders			TOTAL
	Congress(I)	CPI(M)	Forward Bloc	Others	Formal	Defeated	Informal	
Traditional	43.48 (45.45)	21.73 (35.71)	34.78 (40.00)	- (-)	73.91 (54.84)	8.69 (11.11)	17.39 (44.45)	100.00 (39.66)
Mixed	40.91 (40.91)	18.1 (28.57)	36.36 (40.00)	4.54 (50.00)	40.9 (29.03)	45.45 (55.56)	13.64 (33.33)	100.00 (37.93)
Modern	23.07 (13.64)	38.45 (35.71)	30.76 (20.00)	7.69 (50.00)	38.45 (16.13)	46.16 (33.33)	15.39 (22.22)	100.00 (22.41)
TOTAL	37.92 (100.00) (N=22)	24.14 (100.00) (N=14)	34.48 (100.00) (N=20)	3.44 (100.00) (N=2)	53.44 (100.00) (N=31)	31.03 (100.00) (N=18)	15.52 (100.00) (N=9)	100.00 (100.00) (N=58)

N.B. : Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

to perceive themselves to be 'Lower middle class' as observed in table 6.18.

6.2.4: Leaders and the methods of farming:

As the rural leaders in West Bengal are upheld as the forerunners of rural development, it may be useful to probe into the aspect of adaptation of the method of cultivation by the leaders and their families. For this purpose, the leaders' families were classified into three types, i.e., traditional, mixed and modern, on the basis of their position in the continuum of growing high-yielding varieties of paddy and vegetables for commercial purposes. The families which did not grow any of these two were termed as traditional, the families following any one of these two were termed as mixed and the families following both of these were termed as modern. The table 6.20 is cited to show the distribution of leaders, with respect to party and type of agriculture. It is revealed from the table 6.20 that a considerable percentage of leaders' families (almost 40 percent) followed traditional cultivation, almost 38 percent followed mixed method of cultivation and the proportion of families following modern methods of cultivation were recorded to be very meagre. Another interesting point is that though, CPI(M) leaders' families were less related with agriculture as compared to Congress(I) and Forward Bloc leaders' families, nevertheless, their adoption of the modern methods of cultivation appeared to be higher than that of other leaders' families. On the contrary, Congress(I) leaders' families were more related with agriculture, but they were less adaptive to modern

cultivation. So, it is observed from the table 6.20 that the majority of the leaders of both Congress(I) and CPI(M) occupied two different ends of the continuum and the Forward Bloc leaders occupied the middle position between the two. It also aspires that the majority of formal leaders' families followed traditional methods of cultivation.

To sum up the discussion on the economic position of the leaders' families, it may be contended that the Congress(I) and the Forward Bloc leaders' families were better placed in regard to possession of land and income status with larger family size. They were more tied with agriculture as a profession and follow traditional methods of cultivation in contrary to that of CPI(M) leaders. Keeping in mind the difference in the landholding pattern and occupational pattern, Congress(I) and Forward Bloc leaders' families were more reluctant to follow modern cultivation and CPI(M) leaders' families, having relatively less land, mostly followed modern methods of cultivation.

6.3: Relational aspects of leadership in rural Cooch Behar:

In this section an attempt has been made understand the many facets of social contact which the rural leaders in Cooch Behar require to maintain. Efforts are also made to elicit the socio-cultural set-up from which leaders emerged.

Outside contact is considered to be a very important aspect in leadership studies. On the basis of the preferences given by the leaders at the time of interview, the table

Table 6.21: Percentage distribution of leaders by the extent of outside contact.

Place of Contact	Extent of outside contact																GRAND TOTAL
	Frequently				Often				Rare				Never				
	Formal	Defeted	Informal	Total	Formal	Defeted	Informal	Total	Formal	Defeted	Informal	Total	Formal	Defeted	Informal	Total	
Delhi	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	5.97 (11.43)	1.49 (5.00)	5.97 (33.33)	13.43	46.27 (88.57)	28.36 (95.00)	11.94 (66.67)	86.57	100.00
Calcutta	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	4.48 (8.57)	1.49 (5.00)	4.48 (25.00)	10.45	38.81 (74.28)	16.42 (55.00)	11.94 (66.67)	67.17	8.95 (17.14)	11.94 (40.00)	1.49 (8.33)	22.38	100.00
District Town	5.97 (11.43)	- (-)	2.98 (16.67)	8.95	32.84 (62.86)	17.19 (60.00)	10.45 (58.33)	61.20	13.43 (25.71)	11.94 (40.00)	4.48 (25.00)	29.65	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	-	100.00
Sub Divisional Town	40.31 (77.14)	16.42 (55.00)	8.95 (50.00)	65.68	11.94 (22.86)	8.95 (30.00)	8.95 (50.00)	29.84	- (-)	4.48 (15.00)	- (-)	4.48	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	-	100.00
Nearest Town	40.31 (77.14)	16.42 (55.00)	8.95 (50.00)	65.68	11.94 (22.86)	8.95 (30.00)	8.95 (50.00)	29.84	- (-)	4.48 (15.00)	- (-)	4.48	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	-	100.00
Nearest Bandar Market	47.76 (91.43)	25.37 (85.00)	14.93 (83.33)	88.06	4.48 (8.57)	4.48 (15.00)	2.98 (16.67)	11.94	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	-	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	-	100.00
Block Office	7.46 (14.28)	1.49 (5.00)	- (-)	8.95	29.86 (57.14)	7.46 (25.00)	5.97 (33.33)	43.29	14.93 (28.57)	17.91 (60.00)	5.97 (33.33)	38.81	- (-)	2.98 (10.00)	5.97 (33.33)	8.95	100.00
Gram Panchayat Office	28.36 (54.28)	2.98 (10.00)	- (-)	31.34	14.93 (28.57)	2.98 (10.00)	7.46 (41.67)	25.36	8.96 (17.14)	14.93 (50.00)	8.96 (50.00)	32.84	- (-)	8.95 (30.00)	1.49 (8.33)	10.44	100.00

N.B.: Figures in brackets indicate percentaged of their respective group total.

155

Table 6.22: Percentage distribution of leaders by the extent of outside contact.

Extent of outside contact	Extent of outside contact																			
	Frequently					Often					Rare					Never				
	Cong (I)	CPI (M)	F.Bloc	Others	Total	Cong (I)	CPI (M)	F.Bloc	Others	Total	Cong (I)	CPI (M)	F.Bloc	Others	Total	Cong (I)	CPI (M)	F.Bloc	Others	Total
Delhi	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	4.48 (13.64)	1.49 (4.76)	7.46 (22.73)	- (-)	13.43	28.36 (86.36)	29.85 (95.24)	25.38 (77.27)	2.98 (100.00)	86.57
Delhi - cutta	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	1.49 (4.55)	1.49 (4.76)	7.46 (22.73)	- (-)	10.44	20.9 (63.64)	26.86 (85.71)	16.42 (50.00)	2.98 (100.00)	67.16	10.46 (31.82)	2.98 (9.52)	8.96 (27.27)	- (-)	22.40
Delhi - District Village	1.49 (4.55)	2.98 (9.52)	4.48 (13.64)	- (-)	8.95	17.91 (54.54)	23.88 (76.91)	16.43 (50.00)	2.98 (100.00)	61.20	13.43 (40.91)	4.48 (14.28)	11.94 (36.36)	- (-)	29.85	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)
Delhi - District Village Town	17.91 (54.55)	25.38 (80.95)	22.39 (68.18)	- (-)	65.68	41.94 (36.36)	5.97 (19.04)	8.96 (27.27)	2.98 (100.00)	29.85	2.98 (9.09)	- (-)	1.49 (4.55)	- (-)	4.47	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)
Delhi - District Village Town	17.91 (54.55)	25.38 (80.95)	22.39 (68.18)	- (-)	65.68	11.94 (36.36)	5.97 (19.04)	8.96 (27.27)	2.98 (100.00)	29.85	2.98 (9.09)	- (-)	1.49 (4.55)	- (-)	4.47	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)
Delhi - District Village Town Mandya	26.87 (81.82)	26.87 (85.71)	31.34 (95.45)	2.98 (100.00)	88.06	5.97 (18.18)	4.40 (14.28)	1.49 (4.55)	- (-)	11.94	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)
Delhi - District Office	4.48 (13.64)	2.98 (9.52)	1.49 (4.55)	- (-)	8.95	16.42 (50.00)	14.93 (47.62)	11.94 (36.36)	1.49 (100.00)	44.78	10.45 (31.82)	11.94 (38.09)	14.93 (45.45)	1.49 (50.00)	38.81	1.49 (4.55)	1.49	4.48 (13.64)	- (-)	7.46
Delhi - District Office	11.94 (36.36)	10.45 (33.33)	8.96 (27.27)	- (-)	31.35	7.45 (22.73)	8.98 (28.57)	7.46 (22.73)	1.49 (50.00)	25.36	8.96 (27.27)	10.45 (33.33)	13.43 (40.91)	- (-)	32.84	4.84 (13.64)	1.49	2.98 (9.09)	1.49 (50.00)	10.44

156

3. Figure in brackets indicate percentages of each political - group total.

6.21 has been worked out. A close examination of the table 6.21 shows that the leaders maintained close outside contact within the district. But their contact with places outside the district was very feeble. It is also evident from the table that the formal leaders were more agile in keeping outside contact within the district. Surprisingly, the leaders (excluding formal leaders) in general were less interested in keeping contact with Block and Gram Panchayat Offices. The partywise distribution of leaders maintaining outside contact is furnished in table 6.22. It is revealed from the table 6.22 that partywise difference in keeping outside contacts virtually does not exist and trends of keeping outside contacts by party leaders were almost the same in all spheres.

The other facets of keeping outside contact is personal relations with outsiders, i.e., the resource persons outside the village. The table 6.23 shows that the formal leaders were most versatile in keeping personal relations with outsiders. It also shows that the leaders, in general, were most interested in keeping personal relations with Bank Officials and Block Development Officer (the instance of the Krishi Prajukti Sahayak (K.P.S.) may be excluded as he was the next door neighbour of the leaders). It also points to the fact that the leaders extended their personal relations to the resource persons outside the Block level. In other words, it may be said that the power and influence of the rural leaders generated at the rural nexus have now been extended beyond rural areas.

Table 6.23 : Percentage distribution of leaders by personal contact with outsiders.

Name of the outsider	Formal		Defeated		Informal		Total		GRAND TOTAL
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
State Minister	25.37 (48.57)	26.86 (51.43)	13.43 (45.00)	16.42 (55.00)	8.96 (50.00)	8.96 (50.00)	47.76	52.24	100.00 (N=67)
District Magistrate	4.48 (8.57)	47.76 (91.43)	- (-)	29.85 (100.00)	- (-)	17.91 (100.00)	4.48	95.52	100.00 (N=67)
Other District Level Officer	26.87 (51.43)	25.37 (48.57)	7.46 (25.00)	22.39 (75.00)	1.49 (8.33)	16.42 (91.67)	35.82	64.18	100.00 (N=67)
Block Development Officer	47.76 (91.43)	4.48 (8.57)	13.43 (45.00)	16.42 (55.00)	7.46 (41.67)	10.45 (58.33)	68.66	31.34	100.00 (N=67)
Bank Officials	50.75 (97.14)	1.49 (2.86)	25.37 (85.00)	4.48 (15.00)	10.45 (58.33)	7.46 (41.67)	86.57	13.43	100.00 (N=67)
Agriculture Development Officer	38.81 (74.28)	13.43 (25.72)	13.43 (45.00)	16.42 (55.00)	7.46 (41.67)	10.45 (58.33)	59.7	40.3	100.00 (N=67)
Krishi Prajukti Sahayak	52.24 (100.00)	- (-)	23.88 (80.00)	5.97 (20.00)	16.92 (91.67)	1.49 (8.33)	92.58	7.46	100.00 (N=67)

N.B. : Figures in brackets indicate percentages of each leader - type total.

Table 6.24 : Percentage distribution of leaders by involvement in different public activities and public relations.

Public activity	Leader Groups							
	Formal	Defeated	Informal	Congress(I)	CPI(M)	Forward Block	Others	Total
Local Self Government	52.24 (100.00)	13.42 (45.00)	5.96 (33.33)	28.36 (86.36)	17.9 (57.14)	25.36 (77.27)	- (-)	71.62
Co-operative Societies	23.88 (45.71)	20.9 (70.00)	4.96 (33.33)	16.42 (50.00)	19.4 (61.9)	13.43 (40.91)	1.49 (50.00)	50.74
Educational Institution	37.3 (71.43)	14.92 (55.00)	14.92 (83.33)	17.9 (54.55)	25.4 (80.95)	20.89 (60.64)	2.98 (100.00)	67.14
Party Organisation	52.24 (100.00)	29.86 (100.00)	17.9 (100.00)	32.84 (100.00)	31.34 (100.00)	32.84 (100.00)	2.98 (100.00)	100.00
Farmer /Labourer Organisation	37.31 (71.43)	14.92 (50.00)	14.93 (83.33)	13.44 (40.91)	29.85 (95.24)	22.38 (68.18)	1.49 (50.00)	67.16
Social Welfare Activities	5.96 (11.43)	2.98 (10.00)	5.96 (33.33)	2.98 (9.09)	4.47 (14.29)	5.96 (18.18)	1.49 (50.00)	14.9
Caste/ Community Religious organ.	13.44 (25.71)	2.98 (10.00)	1.49 (8.33)	5.97 (18.18)	- (-)	11.94 (36.36)	- (-)	17.91
Youth Club	23.88 (45.71)	13.42 (45.00)	8.95 (58.33)	10.45 (31.82)	16.41 (52.38)	17.9 (54.54)	1.49 (50.00)	46.25
Any Other	4.47 (8.57)	4.47 (15.00)	1.49 (8.33)	5.96 (18.18)	- (-)	4.47 (13.64)	- (-)	10.43
Total (N) of each column	35 (100.00)	20 (100.00)	12 (100.00)	22 (100.00)	21 (100.00)	22 (100.00)	2 (100.00)	67 (100.00)

N.B. : Figures in brackets indicate percentages of respective leader-group.

The above discussion leads to the conclusion that:

- i) The leaders were more interested in keeping outside contacts within the district level.
- ii) The formal leaders were much ahead in keeping outside contacts within the district level as compared to other types of leaders.
- iii) The leaders (excepting formal leaders) were not much interested in keeping touch with Block and Gram Panchayat office.
- iv) There was no partywise discrimination in keeping outside contacts.
- v) The leaders in general and formal leaders in particular were most interested in keeping personal relations with Bank Officials and Block Development Officer.

6.3.2: Involvement of leaders in different public activity and public relations:

To ascertain the extent of public relations of the leaders, it is imperative to look into their involvement in different organisations and public activity. The table 6.24 has been designed for this purpose. It shows that all leaders were involved with party activity. The next activity of interest was found to be the participations in self-government (71.62 percent). Involvement in 'educational institutions' and 'farmer/labour organisations' both came next to them (almost 67 percent) The table 6.24 also shows that the 'Youth Club' and the 'Co-operative Societies' also occupied considerable (46.25 and 50.74 percent respectively) attention of the leaders in their

charter of public activity. It is conspicuous from the table 6.24 that the formal leaders were mostly interested with 'educational institutions' (83.33 percent) and 'farmer/labourer organisations'(83.33 percent). The reason for this may be ascribed to the fact that the CPI(M) leaders were the majority among informal leaders, and they were keenly interested with the above two activities as seen in the table 6.24. Another noteworthy fact is that though a considerable percentage of Congress(I) and Forward Bloc leaders took interest in 'caste/ community /religious organisation', no CPI(M) leader was interested and involved in them. A careful examination of table 6.24 and above discussion keeping in view, it may be concluded that:

- i) All leaders were involved in their party organisation.
- ii) The leaders, in general, took considerable interest in local self-governments, educational institutions and farmer/ labourer organisation.
- iii) The involvement of leaders in co-operative societies were far below the satisfactory level (excepting CPI(M) leaders to some extent).
- iv) A qualitative difference between leaders of CPI(M) and others existed in involvement in different public activities in the sense that the CPI(M) leaders took keen interest in educational institutions and farmer / labourer organisations in order to strengthen their mass base but did not take any interest with caste, community and religious organisations and youth clubs in which other other party leaders were interested.

Table 6.25 : Percentage distribution of leaders according to factors influencing their entry into politics.

Type of leaders	Preferences	Factors of entry into politics						Total
		Personal Influence	Particular Problem/event	Voluntary Organisation	Newspaper / Books	Family Tradition	Others	
FORMAL	1st Preference	28.57	14.29	5.71	2.86	25.71	22.86	100.00(N=35)
	2nd Preference	41.18	-	5.58	-	17.65	35.29	100.00(N=17)
	3rd Preference	-	25.00	25.00	-	25.00	25.00	100.00(N=4)
DEFEATED	1st Preference	30.00	20.00	5.00	5.00	20.00	20.00	100.00(N=20)
	2nd Preference	22.22	11.11	-	-	22.22	44.45	100.00(N=9)
	3rd Preference	50.00	-	50.00	-	-	-	100.00(N=2)
INFORMAL	1st Preference	33.33	8.34	-	8.33	33.33	16.67	100.00(N=12)
	2nd Preference	22.22	22.22	22.22	-	11.11	22.23	100.00(N=9)
	3rd Preference	-	-	100.00	-	-	-	100.00(N=1)
TOTAL	1st Preference	29.85	14.92	4.48	4.48	25.37	20.9	100.00(N=67)
	2nd Preference	44.00	12.00	12.00	-	24.00	8.00	100.00(N=25)
	3rd Preference	14.29	14.29	42.87	-	14.29	14.29	100.00(N=7)

Table 6.26 : Percentage distribution of leaders by the perceived factors contributing to attain leadership status.

Factors	Type of Leaders			
	Formal	Defeated	Informal	Total
Education	- (-)	100.00 (15.00)	- (-)	100.00 (4.48)
Party Position	58.33 (40.00)	16.67 (20.00)	25.00 (50.00)	100.00 (35.00)
Social Services	54.55 (17.14)	27.27 (15.00)	18.18 (16.67)	100.00 (16.42)
Social Status	69.23 (25.72)	23.08 (15.00)	7.69 (8.33)	100.00 (19.4)
Economic Position	- (-)	100.00 (5.00)	- (-)	100.00 (1.49)
Caste	100.00 (2.86)	- (-)	- (-)	100.00 (1.49)
Others	35.71 (14.28)	42.86 (30.00)	21.43 (25.00)	100.00 (20.00)
T O T A L	52.24 (100.00)	29.85 (100.00)	17.91 (100.00)	100.00 (100.00)
N Value	35	20	12	67

N.B.: Figures in brackets indicate percentages of respective column total.

6.3.3: Significant factors for making of a leader:

The leaders, while interviewing, were asked on to identify serially the factors which influence them towards joining politics. The responses of leaders are summarised in table 6.25. As none of the leaders reported to participate in cooperative movements, this factor has been excluded from table 6.25. A close look at the factors it reveals that the existing leaders were mostly selected in politics by the factors 'personal influence' and 'family tradition'. The factors like activity in voluntary organisation occupied the third position in order of priority. Surprisingly, it is seen that the considerable percentage of leaders were influenced by a particular event/problem which inspired them to join politics. Thus the option of entering into politics judged by rationality seems to be unfounded as most of the leaders entered in politics were influenced by non-rational factors.

The leaders were also given seven options⁵ of the factors which apparently helped them to obtain leadership status after entering into politics. On the basis of their reply, the table 6.26 has been framed. It is clear from the table that the leaders considered 'party position' as the most significant factor. The factors like 'social service' and 'social status' were also reported to carry considerable importance to obtain leadership. They did not accord any priority to the factors 'education' and 'economic position' in achieving leadership status despite the fact elicited from earlier discussion that the leaders were having better backgrounds in education (social factor) and economic position than the non-leaders.

Table 6.27 : Percentage distribution of leaders by familial influence and background.

Type of Leaders	Leader of first generation					Leader of Second / Third generation					GRAND
	Cong (I)	CPI (M)	F.Bloc	Others	Total	Cong (I)	CPI (M)	F.Bloc	Others	Total	TOTAL
FORMAL	25.71 (40.91)	20.00 (33.33)	25.71 (40.91)	- (-)	71.4 (37.32)	14.28 (22.73)	2.87 (4.76)	11.43 (18.18)	- (-)	28.58 (14.92)	100.00 (N=35)
DEFEATED	25.00 (22.73)	15.00 (14.29)	20.00 (18.18)	5.00 (50.00)	65.00 (19.4)	10.00 (9.09)	15.00 (14.28)	10.00 (9.09)	- (-)	35.00 (10.45)	100.00 (N=20)
INFORMAL	8.33 (4.55)	16.67 (9.52)	- (-)	- (-)	25.00 (4.48)	- (-)	41.67 (23.81)	25.00 (13.64)	8.33 (50.00)	75.00 (13.43)	100.00 (N=12)
TOTAL	22.40 (68.18)	17.91 (57.14)	19.4 (59.09)	1.49 (50.00)	61.20 (61.20)	10.45 (31.82)	13.43 (42.86)	13.43 (40.91)	1.49 (50.00)	38.80 (38.80)	100.00 (N=67)

- N.B. :
- 1) Figures in brackets indicate percentage of column total.
 - 2) Cong (I) denotes Congress (I).
 - 3) CPI (M) denotes Communist Party of India (Marxist).
 - 4) F.Bloc denotes Forward Bloc.

165

Table 6.28 : Percentage distribution of leaders by migration background.

Party affiliation	Leader with migration background				GRAND TOTAL
	Formal	Defeated	Informal	Total	
CONGRESS (I)	27.27	13.64	-	40.91	100.00 (N=22)
CPI (M)	33.33	14.29	19.05	66.67	100.00 (N=21)
FORWARD BLOC	27.27	22.72	9.08	59.09	100.00 (N=22)
OTHERS	-	50.00	-	50.00	100.00 (N=2)
TOTAL	28.36 (54.28)	17.91 (60.00)	8.96 (50.00)	55.22	100.00 (N=67)
N VALUE	35	20	12	67	

N.B. : Figures in brackets indicate percentages of the respective group total.

The leaders conceded that the factor 'family tradition' plays a vital role in helping them entering politics (table 6.25). But in actuality, this was not so. To judge the factor more closely, the table 6.27 is framed. It is seen from the table 6.27 that 61.2 percent of leaders reported marking themselves as first 'generation leaders'. None of their family members was leader in the immediate past. Percentage of 'first generation' leaders was recorded significantly higher among the formal and defeated leaders (71.42 and 65 percent respectively). The proportion was observed to be very low for informal leaders (25 percent). So, the family tradition definitely played a key role in the perception of informal leaders and influenced by degree the factor around which the types of leadership varied significantly.

The another facet of family tradition - the migration background of leadership may also be taken into account in this respect. The table 6.28 has been presented for this purpose. From the table 6.28 it is noticed that 55.22 percent of the leaders were having migration background. Two-thirds of the CPI(M) leaders having their migration background occupied the top position in this respect as against Congress(I) placed at the bottom. This table also suggests that the migrated people were most interested as well as apt to take the leadership.

To summarise the above discussion, it may be said that:

- i) Though the leaders pointed out family tradition as the main driving factor towards joining politics, in actuality majority of leaders had no family tradition in this respect.

- ii) The leaders were considerably influenced by the non-rational factors like personal influence to join politics.
- iii) The all encompassing position of the party in making leadership was highlighted.
- iv) The leaders failed to recognise the factors like education and economic position in the leadership building process.
- v) The aspect of migration background of leaders may duly be considered in making leaders.

6.3.4: Leaders, political aspirations and political undertones in the family:

The action of a group of people to get entrance into the politics and prove themselves as leader in a political system can be termed, following Max Weber,⁶ a Zweckrational action, or a rational action in relation to a goal. Their goals may be extended further with the aspiration of going at higher leadership level. For the maintenance of the system, the existence of goal and aspirations including desire to maintain their present position are very much necessary. In the schedule for interviewing the leaders, there has been a provision⁷ to tap this aspect quite well, and on the basis of it, table 6.29 is framed. It emerges from the table that only 22.39 percent of the leaders aspired to enhance their present leadership position. The political aspiration among the CPI(M) leaders was noted relatively high (38.09 percent) as compared to that of others. On the basis of the reported information

summarised in table 6.29, one may lead to the contention that the political aspiration did not grow so much among the rural leaders.

Table 6.29: Percentage distribution of leaders by political aspiration (i.e. their positiveness towards political aspiration).

YES						
Type of Leaders	Cong(I)	CPI(M)	Forward Block	Others	Total	Grand Total
Formal	2.86 (4.55)	8.57 (14.28)	8.57 (13.64)	--	20.00 (10.45)	100.00 (52.24)
Defeated	5.00 (4.55)	20.00 (19.05)	10.00 (9.09)	--	35.00 (10.45)	100.00 (29.85)
Informal	--	8.33 (4.76)	--	--	8.33 (1.45)	100.00 (17.91)
TOTAL	2.98 (9.09)	11.94 (38.09)	7.47 (22.73)	--	22.39 (22.39)	100.00 (100.0)

N.B.: Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

To probe the above contention from the view point of election contested by the leaders, table 6.30 has been prepared. The table shows that only 10.45 percent of leaders never contested for any panchayat election, whereas 52.24 percent leaders contested for more than once and 37.31 percent contested once. To see the aspect in respect of party, 4.55 percent of Forward Bloc leaders and 23.81 percent CPI(M) leaders never contested the election; though all Congress(I) leaders had reportedly taken part in the panchayat election. This findings corroborates with the previous contention that Congress(I) and Forward Bloc leadership was more or less election oriented and contrarily the CPI(M) leadership was more broadbased in the sense that

Table 6.30 : Percentage distribution of leaders in accordance with the number of times the leaders in the Panchyat General Election.

Type of Leaders	ONCE					MORE THAN ONCE					NEVER					GRAND TOTAL
	Cong (I)	CPI (M)	F.BLOC	Others	TOTAL	CONG (I)	CPI (M)	F.BLOC	Others	Total	CONG (I)	CPI (M)	F.BLOC	Others	TOTAL	
FORMAL	17.14 (27.27)	2.86 (4.76)	14.28 (22.72)	- (-)	34.28 (17.91)	22.86 (36.36)	20.00 (33.33)	22.86 (36.36)	- (-)	65.72 (34.33)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	100.00 (52.24)
DEFEATED	5.00 (4.55)	20.00 (19.05)	20.00 (18.18)	5.00 (50.00)	50.00 (14.93)	30.00 (27.27)	10.00 (9.52)	10.00 (9.09)	- (-)	50.00 (14.93)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	100.00 (29.85)
INFORMAL	8.33 (4.55)	8.33 (4.76)	8.34 (4.55)	- (-)	25.00 (4.47)	- (-)	8.33 (4.76)	8.34 (4.55)	- (-)	16.67 (2.98)	- (-)	41.67 (23.81)	8.33 (4.55)	8.33 (50.00)	58.33 (10.45)	100.00 (17.91)
TOTAL	11.94 (36.37)	8.96 (28.57)	14.92 (45.45)	1.49 (50.00)	37.31 (37.31)	20.9 (63.63)	14.92 (47.62)	16.42 (50.00)	- (-)	52.24 (52.24)	- (-)	7.47 (23.81)	1.49 (4.55)	1.49 (50.00)	10.45 (10.45)	100.00 (100.00)

N.B. : Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

170

Table 6.31: Percentage distribution of leaders as per their view about participation of their children in politics.

Party Affiliation	YES				NO				NO COMMENT				GRAND TOTAL
	FORMAL	DEFEATED	INFORMAL	TOTAL	FORMAL	DEFEATED	INFORMAL	TOTAL	FORMAL	DEFEATED	INFORMAL	TOTAL	
CONGRESS(I)	31.81 (20.00)	18.18 (20.00)	4.55 (8.33)	54.54 (17.91)	27.27 (17.14)	4.55 (5.00)	- (-)	31.82 (10.45)	4.55 (2.86)	9.09 (10.00)	- (-)	13.64 (4.48)	100.00 (32.84)
CPI (M)	19.05 (11.43)	14.29 (15.00)	23.81 (41.67)	57.15 (17.91)	14.29 (8.57)	9.52 (10.00)	9.52 (16.67)	33.33 (10.45)	4.76 (2.86)	4.76 (5.00)	- (-)	9.52 (2.98)	100.00 (31.34)
FORWARD BLOC	45.45 (28.57)	18.18 (20.00)	- (-)	63.63 (20.9)	13.64 (8.57)	9.09 (10.00)	13.64 (25.00)	36.37 (11.94)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	100.00 (32.84)
OTHERS	- (-)	50.00 (5.00)	- (-)	50.00 (5.00)	- (-)	- (-)	50.00 (8.33)	50.00 (1.49)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	100.00 (2.98)
T O T A L	31.34 (60.00)	17.91 (60.00)	8.96 (50.00)	58.21 (58.21)	17.91 (34.28)	7.46 (25.00)	8.96 (50.00)	34.33 (34.33)	2.98 (5.72)	4.48 (15.00)	- (-)	7.46 (7.46)	100.00 (100.00)

N.B.: Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

Table 6.32 : Percentage distribution of leaders as per their view about political discussion in the family.

Party Affiliation	YES				GRAND TOTAL
	FORMAL	DEFEATED	INFORMAL	TOTAL	
CONGRESS (I)	22.73 (14.29)	18.18 (20.00)	- (-)	40.91 (13.43)	100.00 (32.84)
CPI (M)	23.81 (14.29)	14.28 (15.00)	33.33 (58.34)	71.42 (22.39)	100.00 (31.34)
FORWARD BLOC	31.82 (20.00)	18.18 (20.00)	4.55 (8.33)	54.55 (17.91)	100.00 (32.84)
OTHERS	- (-)	50.00 (5.00)	50.00 (5.00)	100.00 (2.98)	100.00 (2.98)
TOTAL	25.37 (48.58)	17.91 (60.00)	13.43 (75.00)	56.71 (56.71)	100.00 (100.00)

N.B.: Figures in brackets indicate percentages of column total.

TABLE 6.33 : PERCENTAGE OF DISTRIBUTION OF LEADERS ACCORDING TO PARTICIPATION OF FAMILY MEMBERS IN POLITICAL ACTIVITY.

Party Affiliation	YES				GRAND TOTAL
	FORMAL	DEFEATED	INFORMAL	TOTAL	
CONGRESS[I]	9.09 [5.71]	9.09 [10.00]	4.55 [8.33]	22.73 [7.46]	100.00 [32.84]
CPI [M]	9.52 [5.71]	9.09 [10.00]	23.81 [41.67]	42.85 [13.44]	100.00 [31.34]
FORWARD BLOC	36.36 [22.86]	4.55 [5.00]	- [-]	40.91 [13.44]	100.00 [32.84]
OTHERS	- [-]	50.00 [5.00]	- [-]	50.00 [1.49]	100.00 [2.98]
TOTAL	17.91 [34.28]	8.96 [30.00]	8.96 [50.00]	35.83 [35.83]	100.00 [100.00]

N.B. : Figures in brackets indicate percentage of column total.

a considerable proportion of them never contested panchayat election and may be assumed to have taken responsibility of building party organisation.

Since primary base of a rural leader was considered to be his family, the political undertones of the leader families may be taken into account in any discussion of political awareness and political aspirations of leaders' families. The table 6.31 is presented to show the percentage distribution of leaders on their view about participation of their children in politics. The table 6.31 shows that 56.21 percent of the leaders had positive attitude towards participation of their children in politics, 34.33 percent were not in favour and 7.46 percent leaders desisted to comment on the issue. The partywise discrimination, as it emanated from the table 6.31, virtually does not exist at all.

The table 6.32 is framed to show the view of the leader on the issue of political discussion in the family. It is revealed that 56.71 percent leaders were in favour of the issue and CPI(M) leaders were the major group (71.42 percent) in this respect. To see the actual political activity of the leaders' families, table 6.33 is framed and it shows that only 35.83 percent of leaders' families participated in actual political activity, the highest participation rate being attributable to CPI(M) families (42.85 percent) and lowest to Congress(I) (22.73 percent).

To sum up the whole discussion on the political aspirations and political undertones in the leaders' families, the following conclusions may be drawn up easily.

- i) Though the leaders expressed very little aspirations in politics, in actuality, they were eager to be a part of it.
- ii) Though the leaders, in majority, theoretically favoured the political discussion and participation of their children in politics, in practice, a small number of leaders' family members took part in politics. This was true in respect of CPI(M) leaders also.

6.4: Conclusion:

To sum up the total discussion of this chapter on the rural leadership pattern in Cooch Behar, it would be worthwhile to draw an 'Ideal type' following Weberian⁸ pattern of analysis. The main features of the 'Ideal type' of rural leadership in CoochBehar are the following:

- a) He, in most cases, belong to Scheduled Caste community.
- b) He is in the age-group of '30 to 50' years.
- c) He is not highly educated. In general, he in the educational class of 'class-V to H.S./ Secondary/ Matriculation'. His family members are more educated compared to general people.
- d) Occupationally, he is related with agriculture and follows another occupation as well.
- e) His family income varies between Rs.10,000/- to more than Rs.30,000/-.
- f) His per capita income ranges between Rs.3,000/- to Rs.5000/- at constant price of the reference year.

- g) He belongs to the moderate landholding class of '3 to 7 acres'.
- h) His position in the hierarchies of landholding, income and occupational pattern is far better compared to general people.
- i) He has a moderate family size.
- j) Though he has a considerable better financial position, he considers himself in the 'Lower middle class'.
- k) He follows either 'mixed' or 'modern' methods of farming.
- l) He has good outside contact within the district. m) He maintains personal relations with B.D.O and Bank Officials very well.
- n) Publicly, he is involved with educational institutions, party organisations, labour/farmer organisations, Co-operative Societies and youth clubs.
- o) Mostly, he is influenced by a person or by his family to enter politics.
- p) Party position is a supportive factor for getting his leadership status.
- q) He is mostly a first generation leader.
- r) He often has a migration background.
- s) He has sufficient political aspiration to stick to the system.
- t) Though, he is positive towards participation of his children in politics and in favour of political discussion in his family, in practice, his family members do not participate in political programmes and activities to a great extent.

This 'Ideal type of rural leaders' in Cooch Behar dominates all the proceedings in the rural administration and with the introduction of the Panchayati Raj, they

virtually decide the fate of the rural gentry and prepares the future course of rural development.

NOTES AND REFERENCES:

1. T.B.Bottomore, Elite and Society; Panguine; 1964; P.12.
2. G.K.Lieten, Continuity And Change in Rural West Bengal;Sage Pub.;New Delhi; 1992; PP.114,115)
3. The occupation generating more than 50 percent of income is termed as main occupation.
4. Mukherji and Bondyopadhyay, New Horizons for West Bengal's Panchayat; Govt. Of West Bengal, Deptt.of Panchayat;1993; P.15.
5. Appendix-1.
6. Raymond Aron, Main Currents in Sociological Thought (part-2); Penguine, 1977; P.186.
7. Appendix-1, Subsection-C.
8. Raymond Aron, Main Currents in Sociological Thought (part-2); Penguine, 1977; PP.206,207.