

# Revisiting agrarian question in political economy

Nilesh Shinde<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

The agrarian question keeps making itself contentious. Since, debates on fall and rise of agrarian question, the approaches in political economy has been scattered across schools. This paper proposes method of a dialectical reversal peculiar to major advances in social control, the idea that some are free to use others as means to an end, while others are free to allow themselves to be used in that manner, has been proclaimed the very essence of freedom. The agrarian question has become a meeting point of this social control— origin of money— property. Doing this, the paper puts forward the concept of the class focused decentered and disaggregated economy, in which capitalism is a part and not the whole of agrarian question. Accordingly the paper develops a framework of ‘labour time’ expended into labour process delineates the form of governance based the *performance, appropriation, distribution and receipt* of surplus labour. Such governance is diligently imitative of governmentality of agrarian question, where land seen as an identical/opposite *triage* of the security-territory-population in accumulation regimes. The paper concludes that the mainstream approach on agrarian question has seldom stated but rarely discussed the question of land-development as both economic as well as non-economic reality. In fact, the mainstream approach limits itself in relating the fundamental concept of money as exchange, in the meanwhile money as form of wealth is far and wide derelict. This paper takes on to theorize the debates on social control (state-class regime)—money (storage of wealth)—land (property) as character of dislocation and dispossession. Here, the character of *Ursprüngliche Akkumulation* (original accumulation) and primitive *verwerfung* (rejection) derives as tool of analysis of Capitalist mode of production, peculiar to Brazil and India.

*Keywords:* agrarian question, value, property, governmentality, Brazil, India and development

---

<sup>1</sup> The author is Masters of Economics student at UNICAMP, Campinas. He can be reached at [nileshshinde285@gmail.com](mailto:nileshshinde285@gmail.com)

## Introduction

“However, all things considered” in contemporary political economy “we have not found a shoe that really fits the foot of the new Cinderella of capitalism.”

-- Boutang in *Cognitive Capitalism* (2011, p. 46)

THE necessary question or Cinderella’s shoe in/of the political economy is, generally, the question of the land-labour-wages (capital). In order to reappraise it, the political economy must craft identity through self-realization and do so without relying on any transcending category—such as the question of the industrialization or even the question of the profit. This way of being of the political economy should be affirmed even were one to adopt, most problematically, a radical vision of eternity, one suggesting the "eternal recurrence" of all events.

This paper proposes a *view* on the political economy as eternal recurrence of self-creating thesis and self-destroying antithesis of lifeworld<sup>1</sup>. For that reason, the questions of the land-labour-wages being the question of ‘eternal recurrence’ is the question in/from the classical to contemporary economic theory. However this is not teleological view of the political economy. In fact, the paper navigates away in concerning what can be known of telos of the political economy, indeed subsequent to Marxian- Kaleckian refutation of an absolute telos (of/in the political economy) independent of human fabrication. The paper demands a view of time that differs from those that abode willing, purposiveness, and efficient causes in the service of goals, sufficient reason, and *causa prima*. In presenting a novel interpretation of political economy, the paper proposes another formulation of the *hermeneutical* method in political economy, on the premises that ‘the genealogy of political economy is a demonstration of progress and/or decay of lifeworld’.

The paper is divided into three sections. First section argues the myth of demise of agrarian question in reinterpreting the classical question. And second section put forward a novel interpretation of agrarian question as complex system of accumulation in three different logic. Lastly, in post-script, the paper briefly deliberate Brazil and India as case in conceptual framework the paper has proposed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 'lifeworld' is a grand theatre of objects variously arranged in space and time relative to perceiving subjects, is already-always there, and is the “ground” for all shared human experiences (Husserl, 1970).

In theorizing “eternal recurrence”, the paper iterates and interprets the ‘Hegelian triad’<sup>2</sup>, as against that of ‘solitary contemplation on dialectics’ of theories in political economy. At this juncture, the triad is interpreted as “social control—origin of money—property”. In which, between *Being* of social control—Immediate perception of estrangement and exploitation of (labour), and the *Notion*—the conception of immediate perception in terms of notions (such as origin of money) , lies *Essence*. Essence (of property) is to do with how something of which we do not yet have a *Notion* enters consciousness (of political economic category)—how we first form a notion of something (of sort of money). *Being* of social control is a propos *Notion*-less perception of the property i.e. *Essence*, which in turn, is about the genesis or becoming of the Notion; the Notion is about the development or concretisation of a concept of the agrarian question. In the conclusion paper deliberate the *Being*, the *Notion* and the *Essence* in negotiation with the question of land character in the government—temper, and manners of a governance, whether good or bad, and the proper remedies.

---

<sup>2</sup> In study of Hegelian logic, many will have heard of "thesis - antithesis - synthesis". Actually, Hegel never used this expression. This may be because the proposition invokes ‘algebraic polarity’ separating thesis-from anti-thesis. Nevertheless, I think "thesis - antithesis - synthesis" is fair but modified expression of Hegelian logic. This paper chooses to use the “Being- Notion- Essence”. See Hegel (2010).

## SECTION I

### 1.1 Reinterpreting the classical question

“We, who remember how difficult it was, at the beginning of our agitation, to bring men's minds to the discussion of this question, when we think that every newspaper is now full of it ...when we think that the whole community is engaged in reading the discussion and pondering on the several arguments, we can desire no more. The League might close its doors to-morrow, and its work might be considered as done, the moment it compels or induces people to discuss the question.”

--Richard Cobden, *On the Total and Immediate Repeal of the Corn Laws*  
(January 1846)

THE Classical question, as unspoken by its reader, makes itself contentious as long as it deals with Marxian potential revolutionary *moment*. But in theory, this interpretation is a patent overlook of classical agrarian question. In fact, posturing Lenin (1906), and Bukharin (1972) or Smith (1776) and Ricardo (1822) to demarcate the industrial-agriculture *divide* in contemporary agrarian question is a fallacy of logic of development. Moyo and Yeros (2011) have disputed the comparable fallacy in agrarian question as perceived through ‘backwardness’. Moreover, Amin (1974) wrote notable work, in two volumes, critiquing the ‘backwardness as underdevelopment’ theory. Also, Cocco (2007) argued rather incisive way that the agrarian question is finer than the question of growth. This section pursue such antecedent to argument that the exploitation of classical agrarian question lies in the fact of inadequacy of political economic method. This self-critique of classical question is presented as three critiques, differing in reading as well as interpretation of classical economics.

#### 1.1.1. Three critiques: Security, Territory and Population <sup>3</sup>

This paper argues that the deliberation on ‘agrarian question’ as perceived by, both, its advocate as well as challenger, is *lippum* in political economic theory. As an alternative, the paper present three fundamental critique of contemporary agrarian question, to be followed by *Section II*, in which a novel interpretation of agrarian question is to be given.

---

<sup>3</sup> The title is based on Foucault (2004) book by same name. Here, I owe it to mainly Locke (1690), (Hegel, 2010) Marx (1993), Kalecki (1956) and Mafeje (2003)

### 1.1.2. *Security in agrarian question*

The Classical agrarian question shows signs of *materialization* of micro-political, dynamic networked, self-organizing and non-linear economic quandary, then fittingly Smith (1776) corroborate with his ancestor<sup>4</sup> in airs that the ‘agriculture labour as a *primary* major of wealth (emphasis added)’. At the moment, there are two points to be illustrious now, foremost Smith, contrasting contemporary growth theorist, refutes the *hierarchical* association between the agrarian and the industrial economy, he suggests that ‘the gains of both are *mutual* and *reciprocal*, and the division of labour is in this, as in all other cases, advantageous to all the different persons employed in the various occupations into which it is subdivided (Smith, 1776)’. Secondly, Smith exercises the word ‘primary’ in logical association and not in algebraic association, therefore demystifying the complex system where one’s labour is based on another’s.

The non-linear, self-organizing character of agriculture-industry in society is more elucidated by Hume (1752). He comprehended that ‘(...) every thing in the world is purchased by labour’, and therefore the property is as emergence as ‘epiphenomenon’ of labour. Hume (1752) progress by arguing that ‘(...) when a nation abounds in manufacture and mechanic arts, the proprietors of land, as well as the farmers, study agriculture as a science, and redouble their industry and attention. The *superfluity*, which arises from their labour, is not lost; but is exchanged with manufactures for those commodities which men's luxury now makes them covet. By this means, land furnishes a great deal more of the necessaries of life, than what suffices for those who cultivate it. In times of peace and tranquillity, this superfluity goes to the maintenance of manufacturers, and the improvers of liberal arts. But it is easy for the public to convert many of these manufacturers into soldiers, and maintain them by that superfluity, which arises from the labour of the farmers (II.I.11, emphasis added)’.

At this juncture, we assess Hume (1752) in consensus with Smith (1776) on the role of government in agriculture in particular and economy in general. What is important to

---

<sup>4</sup> Specifically, Spinoza on ethics argues the possible comparison in text and real world which makes Smith as more realistic thinker, see Koistinen, Olli, 2009. *The Cambridge Companion to Spinoza's Ethics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

note down is that Hume (1752) suggests that how easily the potential farmers are *rehabilitated* into positioned soldiers. Marx (1990) pursue alike taxonomy when he argues about surplus labour as category of capitalist production systems. Consider that for classical agrarian question the treatment of industrialization as phenomenon in progress was talked by agriculture as phenomenon in present at hand. Making the question of the surplus labour as dual question, first a category of population and then a category of security.

In Marx's (1847) *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* the surplus labour has sole association with over-production but in *Capital Volume I* (1990) the association becomes an *organic* composition of capital. In a finish, in *Capital Volume III*, Marx (1992) argues how the profit rate and prices are *determined* when the organic composition of capital differs between industries and consequently commodities do not exchange at value. He was anxious to stress the idea that fundamentally profits and prices are just 'transformed' value quantities. As a result, Marx transforms the *simple* surplus army taxonomy to *complex* value quantities systems.

This paper contends that the security, as taxonomy as well as theory, is patent in Lenin (1964), Kalecki (1971) and Harvey (2006). But the contemporary agrarian question has been quiet on expansion of this theory. One of the reason of this could be a nature of the contemporary agrarian structure, which has *evolutionary emergence* within the state formation. Therefore, although the GDP contribution of agriculture seems to declining across the world (Bernstein, 2008), the agrarian question remains plausible as it was earlier. For instance, Lahiri-Dutt and Wasson (2008) argues the provincial agrarian question of Punjab, India where the majority of farmers are soldiers too. Comparable realities can be observed in many African, South-East Asian and Latin American countries as well.

In outline, this paper suggest that the security *in* agrarian question is dual in nature. First, it is character of neoliberal state function (which was in fact, anticipated by Lenin as well as Bukharin) and second it is socio-cultural phenomenon in agrarian question. At this instant, contemporary theorist patently neglect this aspect as it does not linearly transcend into economic growth per say. But this paper highlights the behaviour of security in/of non-linear systems (of agrarian question) is not subject to the principle of superposition while that of linear systems is subject to superposition. Thus, a complex nonlinear system of agrarian question is one whose behaviour cannot be expressed as a

sum of the behaviour of its parts (or of their multiples). In fact, an assumption of, 'sum = whole' in economy is particular logical fallacy of contemporary agrarian question.

On differing opinion, Foucault (2004, p. 54) advises that the notion of security (as opposed to scarcity) is *built-in* evolution of political economic thinking. Here, the security in political economy is new technology of power: namely, a move from the question of 'sovereignty over a territory' to the question of 'regulation of a population'. Making the notion of scarcity and its opponent in society, the same as the rhetoric of anti-scarcity or development so much that '(this) anti-scarcity system is basically focused on a *possible* event, an event that could take place, and which one tries to prevent before it becomes reality'.

This paper builds on Foucault (2004) in relation with Marx (1990; 2015) in argument, that, the security, seen beyond protection, is also a certification, warrantor, and capability of the state. The agrarian question is bewildered as a result of lack of this narrative, this was partially demonstrated by Mayo and Yeros (2005) in arguing that national question is not mutually exclusive from the agrarian question.

### **1.1.3. *Territory in agrarian question***

Unlike *security*, the *territory* in agrarian question is axiomatic, moreover it has venerable precedence in the political economy. Beginning with Smith (1776), Ricardo (1815) and Marx (1992), Perroux (1950) reiterates the significance of space as territory. The approach seen is parallel to Harvey (2005) who adopts it on or after Lefebvre (1992) consorting the mental space *with* real space. Foucault (2004) moves further to integrate the notion of mental space *to* power and notion of real space *to* the transition from pastoral power to 'political *governmentality*', which, according to Foucault, marks the origin of the modern state. Making the agrarian question *concrete* in political as well as social formation of the state. At this point, this paper suggests that the agrarian question is *raison d'État* of the political economic question of development. In fact, the failure to tackle the agrarian question is, consequently, a *cascading* failure of the development question.

The *territory* in agrarian question is *nested* with internal *governmentality* which Foucault (2004) entitle as 'an art of government'. He promotes that the modern state is a configuration of political quislingism with economy-enterprise with political economy. This paper suggests that each market society precedes and succeeds its particular *form*

of (capitalist or/and supplementary) production progression, which has imbibed a space defined by an *autopoietic* system of the state-market creation. This is self-contained and cannot be described by using dimensions that define another space such as ethnic nationalism and industrialization in Europe. When we refer to our interactions with a concrete autopoietic system i.e. governmentality of particular kind, however, we project this system on the space of our manipulations and make a description of this projection. Thus, it is suggested, in resolution of the agrarian question, the intrinsic question of territory gets equal cognition.

In contemporary debates, as subjected earlier, Akram-Lodhi and Kay (2010a; 2010b) advise in agreement with Byres (2003) who propose that, the path of capitalist agriculture as modulation from past to present. In order to read the economic theory of modulations, ‘if ... the agrarian question is so resolved (in this case, on the basis of peasant production, but not exclusively) ... in such a way that capitalist industrialization is permitted to proceed, then, as the social transformation comes to be dominated by industry and by the urban bourgeoisie, there ceases to be an agrarian question with any serious implications. There is no longer an agrarian question in any substantive sense (p. 23)’.

This paper disagrees that such a modulation make the agrarian question die away, the debate of *dead* agrarian question is based on ‘inclusion of agriculture as exclusion of agrarian scheme’ where the *populous* is included in the industrialization as ‘excluded individual’ subject. This can be observed as ritualistic debates on the poverty line in economics without stirring the agrarian question. The inclusion operates in creation of new character of labor, this new character does not derive from an opposition between local--global, but is internal to the productive and social dimensions of territories.

In summary, this paper perceives that the territory in agrarian question has been reshaping the fundamental character of factors of productions and accumulation. More importantly it is reshaping the character of fixed capital in political economy. The paper argues that territory acts as dual input in economy, first as landed property and second as joint production proprietary. First, is simple to understand, the landed property is further discussed in *Section II* of this paper. Here let’s focus on second aspect, the joint production proprietary.



In lieu of Marx (2015) the fixed capital is *essential* to capitalist production of value and surplus value. He confer the fixed capital in *dynamic* relation with joint production. This is because any discussion of fixed capital requires partly *used* up machines as inputs. For example, a new producer buys a new cotton spin and raw cotton to start a business, then next year he buys raw cotton, and one year old spin is used and so on. Therefore, the one year old spin alongside new raw cotton is a *joint* production. Now, this logic is not directly applied to land, due to its intrinsic capital life of landed property but territory is a *complex* scheme. Imagine, one owns land at countryside for one year, irrespective of its uses, the next year s/he is informed that the land is neighboring to proposed highway. There are two value consequences, first is simple increase in value of property i.e. valorization but second is *complex* systemic valorization or de-valorization in the territory of landed property. Jodhka (2012) observes this occurrence as dissimilar rate of depreciation of value amongst landed property in Haryana and Punjab, India. This paper named this experience as *non-linear value depreciation* (as against Marx's linear assumption). In another research Bardhan (1989) demonstrates that the physical conditions of productions and the real wages are proximate determinant of the profit rates.

This new interpretation of territory as fixed capital in joint production led to further analytics of territory as agrarian pricing determinants, additionally making the territory as centrality of debate of development of countries. As aptly summarized by Cocco (2007) as "(...) the centrality of territories is today effected by a social cooperation so much more productive that it liberates itself from the functional organization of space and from the factory's disciplinary norms. The working class struggles against factory discipline and the social exodus toward a "striated" space has constituted, alongside the lines of labour mobility and independently from policies of formal and subordinated labour, the smooth territories of a productive cooperation that coincides, immediately, with the ensemble of social relations (p. 309)'.

Next to the security-the territory, now we embark on third critique of the classical agrarian question. The *population*, here is not number of people but it is an organic composition of *species being* in territory. Such *being* is subject of governmentality, in other words, the population under the regime of the government.

### 1.1.4. *Population in agrarian question*

Population in agrarian question begins working in *synthesis* with territory and security. Population, here, is not integer but synergy i.e. creation of sum which is more than its part. Thus, population acts not as collection of individual people but a collective inter-dependent networks. Thus, Population depends on the abstract component of labour which in Marx (2015) is heterogeneous and therefore unaccountable unlike concrete labour. But in population it is reified as ‘set of reasoning’ in terms of ‘(...) it is not the absolute number of the population that counts, but its relationship with the set composition of forces: the size of the territory, natural resources, wealth, commercial activities and so on (Foucault, 2004)’.

Thus, population can be *statuette* of the class-caste composition or patriarchal or socialist-welfarist etc. governance form. The mode in which we control the inhabitants, we gets that population accordingly. Thus,  $n$  number of control on inhabitants will form  $n$  number of populations. Population is discursive space which allows us to view the diverse, de-centered and dis-aggregated class process.

For a moment, lets look at Marx’s (1990) beginning paragraph, Marx began *Capital* with the following entry point: “The wealth of those societies in which the capitalist mode of production prevails, presents itself as ‘an immense accumulation of commodities’, its unit being a single commodity. Our investigation must therefore begin with the analysis of a commodity” (Marx, 1987, p. 43). This is fair enough as a contingent object of enquiry or origin. He continued:

A commodity is, in the first place, an object outside us, a thing that by its properties satisfies human wants of some sort or another. The nature of such wants, whether, for instance, they spring from the stomach or from fancy, makes no difference. Neither are we here concerned to know how the object satisfies these wants, whether directly as means of subsistence, or indirectly as means of production. (ibid, p. 43)

Marx, thus puts the question of difference in wants from fancy but he insisted on the grammatical subject as *we= to wealth of those societies in which the capitalist mode of production prevails*. Therefore he is putting the complete *Capital* analytics in society’s shared point of view. The population in Marx, hence, keeps aside the possible analysis of Population, as a whole, and chooses to analysis of Population in parts. While we have

till now focused on class-based struggle and need based non-class struggle, it is important to realize that other non-class processes (related to gender, race, caste, nature, etc.) not only produce distinctive effects of their own on the “making” and “unmaking” of poverty but, in the process, also have significant impacts on the amount, composition, and destiny of production and social surplus. These non-class processes are too a part of Population.

Now, the population, in particular, to the agrarian question is founded on a living labour. A labour which is imbedded in market society, as each society demands basic need of food. Now, in this instance, the conception of market mechanisms is not just the analysis of what happens. It is at once an analysis of what happens and a program for what should happen. Cocco (2007) writes it as ‘(...) the processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization appear then as effects of a new conflict: the antagonism between the social and free determinations of living labour and a command that has lost its technical legitimacy that is to say, its capacity of rendering discipline and productive cooperation complementary (p. 3)’.

In other words, capital has lost its capacity of limiting the productive forces in their productive relationships: ‘it is the process, in itself, of mobilization of the work force that has been totally destabilized. The dissemination of non-statutory forms of labour and, more generally speaking, of *precarious* labour, is a result of this displacement (Cocco, p. 55)’. Building the population, thus labour, is generative as well as operative principle of government and political economy. At this moment, this paper proposes a novel approach in section two, as security-territory-population as in *motion*, perpetually constructing itself. The role of ‘the social control-money-property’ as being-notion-essence of political economic analysis. In short, the dynamic motion of this approach, is seen from Sraffian “dated input” analytic which brings time-structure to Marxian analysis. Here, the paper do not demonstrate<sup>5</sup> the exercise of such analysis but shape a novel basis, on humble note that the Marxian division of capital into –constant and variable—does not suffice to include the time structure (and thus a historic input of labour division such as caste) of labour inputs, thus it is scarce to portray a specific capitalist production forms in India and Brazil. As an alternative, in *Section II* the paper suggests an extensive theoretic reinforcement on conjecture that it is possible to develop

---

<sup>5</sup> In remarkable analysis Steedman (1977) present demonstration in Chapter 5.

a Marxian analysis of *social surplus* as class constituting category based on, say Caste-Class-Gender progression in India or Race-Class-Gender progression in Brazil.

## SECTION II

### 2.1 The *Being* of the social control

“I should like merely to understand how it happens that so many men, so many villages, so many cities, so many nations, sometimes suffer under a single tyrant who has no other power than the power they give him.”

--Étienne de la Boétie, *The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude* (1552)

It is a fact that political economy has been inept to grasp the significant emergence of evolutionary form of agrarian question. As a result, many ensued with vague narrative of “the death of agrarian question”<sup>6</sup>, purportedly for no longer an subsidiary to the *telos* of the mainstream logic of industrialization. This is happening despite practice of notable work by from Mafeje (1973) and Amin (1974) to Patnaik (2007), and Moyo and Yeros (2011) evaluating the contemporary significance of the agrarian question. Concurring above requisite to reinstate the debates on the agrarian question, this part argues that how the *category* of the social control<sup>7</sup> has matured in political economy (*Nationalökonomie*) in three basic sets of problems: the theory of value and prices, the theory of factors of production, and the theory of costs<sup>8</sup>. Making it necessary, contemporary political economy to gestate on its core aspect that is the *social control* in land capital—labour capital—wage capital.

---

<sup>6</sup> “Death of Agrarian Question” is *Question* of oddments on parts of debates amongst two leading thinkers, Bernstein (2010) considers the Question as absorbed in capitalist form of production while McMichael (1984) reiterates the Question as means to understand the capitalist production. Nonetheless this has led to contemporary agrarian studies considers it as quondam question.

<sup>7</sup> Theory of social control is long venerable tradition in social sciences and medicine, for more details see Innes (2003)

<sup>8</sup> Scholars such as Scott and Bhatt (2001); Hoelle (2015); Dubcovsky (2016); and DeVore (2014) have argued the agrarian question in perspectives of both in the developed and developing regions, and the fact that these are linked to questions of state formation, economic histories, collective memories, and sustainable development.

### 2.1.1 The *being* of Social Control *in* accumulation

Social control, in theory of value and prices<sup>9</sup>, derives its primacy from Marx (2015), reinvigorated in Luxemburg (1972) in *The Accumulation of Capital-Anti Critique* (1915) and in Bukharin (1972) in *Imperialism And The Accumulation of Capital* (1924). Although, theoretically two are different, this paper chooses to read them together with Kalecki (2009) in order to spatially locate the social control in wider political economic agrarian question.

Luxemburg (2003) instigates “an important final phase (accumulation) in the campaign against natural economy is to *separate* industry from agriculture,” she advances to understand the problem (of accumulation) in its simplest form;

“The capitalist form of production is governed by the profit motive. Production only makes sense to the capitalist if it fills his pockets with ‘pure income’, i.e. with profit that remains after all his investments; but the basic law of capitalist production is not only profit in the sense of glittering bullion, but constantly growing profit. This is where it differs from any other economic system based on exploitation. For this purpose the capitalist – again in contrast to other historical types of exploiters – uses the fruits of exploitation not exclusively, and not even primarily, for personal luxury, but more and more to increase exploitation itself. The largest part of the profits gained is put back into capital and used to expand production. The capital thus mounts up or, as Marx calls it, ‘accumulates’ (1972, p. 49, emphasis added).”

Here, Luxemburg (1972) determines three fundamental categories of social analysis. First the governance by profit, and profit by “mechanisms or exploitation (itself) are governed by the wage system”. This paper calls it as ‘the wage capital<sup>10</sup>’, given its eternally recurring nature in agrarian question as demonstrated by recently by Cramer et.al. (2008) in investigating Mozambiquian rural market as power reciprocating diversity via poverty, reaffirming Luxemburg (1972) in locating the consequence of accumulation, with governance (seen through local power structure) which enables the

---

<sup>9</sup> This paper follows Shaikh (1996) *Marx's Theory of Value and Transformation Problem* where aggregate surplus value is seen as pre-condition of aggregate profit.

<sup>10</sup> The initiation of the wage capital originates in Marx’s unfinished work of Capital Volume III, this paper reads the wage capital as both regime as well as category of capitalist production. See Marx (2015) and Lebowitz (1991).

capitalist production widens progressively, jointly with casual poverty incidence in rural market.

In market society, a steadily increasing likelihood of selling the commodities is indispensable in order to keep the accumulation a continuous process. Capital itself (as we see in Marx's *Capital* Volume I) creates the basic condition for exploitation. However, what about the opportunities of realizing the fruits of this exploitation; what about the market? What do they depend on? At this juncture, Luxemburg's second category of social analysis comes in elucidation, the category of constantly growing profit. In testing the problem '(whether) ... capital itself, or its production mechanisms, expand its market according to its needs, in the same way that it adjusts the number of workers according to its demand? (Luxemburg, 1972, p. 52)'. She refutes the linear relation between the equilibrium seeking behaviour of the market—its needs; in order to bring in the social nature of capital, nay, archeological capital evolving in (specific) social conditions. As example, the paper reads the remarkable work done by DeVore (2014) in Cacao lands in southern Bahia, the state of Brazil gives indetailed and readable description of social control operating in the wage capital—through value of Brazilian Real vis-à-vis Cacao production as well as consumption prices.

Third is the category of expanded production. Luxemburg (2003) suggests that 'the social requirement, on which the accumulation of capital depends, seems at a closer look to be the accumulation of capital itself (p. 53)'. Now, this is presumably circular logic of capitalist expanded production, however, the expansion of capital through accumulation which in theory happens in different *empyrean* of capital. This is perceived by Marx (2015) there two basic capital—fixed (constant) and variable—both mathematically may be expressed as following;

If  $p$  is Rate of Profit,  $S$  is Surplus or Accumulation,  $v$  is variable capital and  $c$  is

constant capital. We get 
$$p = \frac{S/v}{c/v+1},$$

Now for Luxemburg (2003) the logic of capitalist mode of production or surplus value creation may be inception in usurpation or accumulation by violence but in order to sustain; this the capital operates through expansion of 'rate of profit' reproduced and recirculated in  $v$  as well as  $s$ . Consequently, we interpret the original accumulation is

*simulated* in other forms of accumulation<sup>11</sup>. At this time, the value of labour power, the price of commodities and money wages are attuned with exploitation along with realization of surplus value.

Moving on towards theory of ‘rate of profit’ as seen by Bukharin (1972). Ab initio, he misconstrue Luxemburg (2003) on two crucial points. Incidentally, these points are *necessary* condition of accumulation (of dispossession as well as dislocation). First, Bukharin (1972) misread the *money form* in Marx (1990) in Capital Volume I. We shall debate the money form in next section of the paper<sup>12</sup>. Second is crucial *distinction* between the flow and the stock form of money commodity. Although, Bukharin (1972) fittingly argues an exogenous origin of money even as taken for granted that ‘of the amount of money in circulation in relation to the process of social reproduction (p. 72)’. This is archetypal error of reading Marx (1990) as well as Marx (1993). Contemporary agrarian question dwells in folly due to same error.

This paper assents Bukharin’s narrative that ‘one must *differentiate* between the increase in the amount of the circulating money, an increase which is nonetheless in no way equivalent to the growth of reproduction, and the accumulation of money capital, as a *specific* form of capital, which has its own particular *function* and its own *movement*. The entire amount of surplus value which is repeatedly produced must never be identified with the *newly* increased sum of money, since the process of realization has no need of such a sum; equally, the accumulation of capital must never be confused with the accumulation of money capital (1972, p. 80, emphasis added)’. But the paper also persist on perceptive that *transition* in/from money commodity to money capital is central for formation of original regime of the wage capital. Unless, one debates the transition as dominant class hegemony, it is difficult to (theoretically) debate the synergy between accumulation of capital in conjunction with accumulation of money capital.

But the central question for agrarian problem is how the accumulation money capital alongside the accumulation of capital control the wage capital? At this moment, the paper goes back to Kalecki (2009); in his remarkable analysis of wages in relation to

---

<sup>11</sup> Various interpretation of accumulation are : dispossession (Harvey,2008), dislocation (Dhar and Chakrvarti,2011), growth induced accumulation(Robinson, 1956); underdevelopment (Amin, 1974); form of difference (Walker, 2011 ) and off course estranement and explotation (Marx, 2015).

<sup>12</sup>See the Notion of origin of money (pp.)

how profit rate and production prices are determined when the value composition of capital differs between industries and consequently commodities do not exchange at exchange value. Kalecki (2009) demonstrates that in schematic of expanded production profits provide not only motive for investment but also the finance to support it. Further he stress that development does not depend on investment only but also needs adequate increase in output of wage goods. This moderately solves the Marxian predicament of ‘realizing the surplus’ i.e. of effective demand is somehow separate from process of accumulation.

Considering the social control in topography of effective demand, this paper argues that the effective demand has its vestiges in a process of accumulation. To elaborate, lets see that in, Marx (1990) argues that fundamentally profits and prices were just transformed value quantities. Now, these value quantities in Marx are C (constant capital), V (variable capital), S (surplus capital) and W (total value of gross output). Thus, one can derive surplus value and value from real wages and physical conditions. Conversely, one can argue that value of commodities depends on their physical and social conditions of production. Here, the value of labour power and surplus value also depends on real wages<sup>13</sup>. Thus, putting the social control into theory of value and prices via accumulation—money form— transition of money commodity—realization of surplus value—accumulation. In next section, the paper shall elaborate more on the notion of money and how it operates in agrarian economy.

### **2.1.2 The *Notion* of origin of money in accumulation**

“It is therefore in the opinion that is held of the quantities, rather than in the quantities themselves, that abundance, surplus or dearth are found: but they only rest on opinion because the amounts are assumed.”

--Étienne Bonnot, Abbé de Condillac, *On Value and Trade* (1776, 1798)

“Lenin is said to have declared that the best way to destroy the Capitalist System was to debauch the currency. By a continuing process of inflation, governments can confiscate, secretly and unobserved, an important part of the wealth of their citizens. By this method they not only confiscate, but they confiscate arbitrarily; and, while the process impoverishes many, it actually enriches some. The sight of this arbitrary rearrangement

---

<sup>13</sup> Jodhka (2012) argues this in his recent paper that real wages determining the prices of commodities.



of riches strikes not only at security, but at confidence in the equity of the existing distribution of wealth.”

--John Maynard Keynes, *the Economic Consequences of the Peace* (1919)<sup>14</sup>

Money, as understood by Marx (2015), is social institution, which is evolutionary in societies. This evolutionary progression is patent in both Ricardo (1815), Marx (1990) and Keynes (1930). In relating the *being* of social control is transcended into landed proprietorship through imminence of money form. Amongst the long venerable debate in economic, this paper chooses to highlight three main approaches, first Kaleckian critique of ‘quantity theory (1971)’; second Sraffa (1975) on rejoinder on production of commodities by means of commodities, and third Patnaik (2009) on exogenous derivation of money commodity.

Since its inception, money has role of *unit of account*, proceeding as *uniform* unit of account, it becomes a unit of exchange. Lastly the *medium of exchange* for all economic transactions, simply because of its common acceptability to everybody. Now, the medium of exchange is authenticated through *trust* in the state, making money ipso facto a *legal tender*. The legal tender makes the money as the trust-holder in not economic transaction but political (through central banking) as well as social transactions (through hegemony of holder’s). On applied facet of this, money from unit of account to legal tender actualizes its eminence via liquid assets, prolonging the argument to land economy; authors Bastiaan et.al. (April 2014) and Tiago et.al. (2016) argues that the land, more than just a simple factor of production, must be conceived of as an economic asset. In fact, the price of rural land is determined not only by the expected profitability deriving from agricultural activities but also by the agents’ expectations about its future appreciation and liquidity in an economic environment permeated with uncertainty.

But the question of *money as commodity* in pricing is complex evolutionary inquiry, in fact, here it instigates with what Ricardo (1822) assumed in two kinds of commodities. One is *scarce* and other can be increased in quantity by production. Money as

---

<sup>14</sup> There has been extensive research on Keynesian reading of Lenin, White and Schuler (Spring 2009) discuss this in details concluding that it was based on a report of an interview with Lenin that was published by prominent London and New York newspapers. There are grounds for questioning the veracity of the interview.

commodity proceeds both the categories, applied to land it maneuvers the expectation of land-money commodities as not only factor of production but also liquidity realization and then as an assets. At this time, as Patnaik (2009) succinctly put forward the money value *ipso facto* ensures the stability of system, the stability derived from nothing but rigidity of money wages. Thus enabling the micro-foundation of money commodities remain intrinsic in, money, thus, deeds as speculative as well as encrusted prerogatives. Note that, as discussed earlier, we understand the money wages as component of the wage capital, foundational in thesis of enduring the large army of reserve labour, mainly in agrarian sector. Making the wage capital include the value of both labour as well as land, for a moment connecting the component of money wages en route for land value. This is precisely the central argument in this paper. The paper reads the use values (of the fixed commodity supply such as land) are increasing *via* income deflation. Mathematically, the deflation is proportionally large than the exchange value of commodities. Thus, by nature, making the contemporary system as logic of adverse terms of trade in case of agrarian economy. Now, this may be different for cash vs. food crop. For instance, Hoelle (2015) debates this in Brazilian economy, where land in food vis-à-vis cattle culture is valued differently.

Nevertheless for the theoretical thesis, this paper proposes to focus on real wage vis-à-vis purchasing power narrative. The mainstream economics have argued the growth (therefore development) from agrarian to industrial economy, ensuring expenditure deflation on agrarian economy across the world, including Brazil and India. This expenditure deflation has led to reduction in purchasing power of agrarian economy, simultaneously with rising value of land as consumer good (not as factor of production). Thus, logically, reducing the real wages in agrarian economy. This phenomenon of agrarian demolition is occurring simultaneously with augmentation of service sector economy, which led to rise of new middle classes vis-à-vis lower classes in Brazil<sup>15</sup> and India<sup>16</sup>. Money commodity for emergent new middle classes is notion of original accumulation, both as generalized exchange and specialized factor of production.

---

<sup>15</sup> See for example Ronald H. Chilcote, *Power and the Ruling Classes in Northeast Brazil: Juazeiro and Petrolina in Transition* (2006), Cambridge: London

<sup>16</sup> See for example Harish Damodaran, *India's New Capitalists: Caste, Business, and Industry in a Modern Nation* (2008), Palgrave Macmillan: New Delhi

At the moment, for Marx (2015) economy with the generalized exchange and specialized production will have money as social device. Device which will conflicted in realization of surplus into profit. This is precisely where the contemporary agrarian question develops cynical, where it ceased to be the Theory of Money, and become the Analysis of Output.<sup>17</sup> Kalecki (2009) makes it set in Marxian reproduction schemes which made the crucial distinction between investment goods (Department I) and consumption goods (Department II). He distinguished between those variables that become active determinants of levels of income (such as investment, export surpluses, government deficits) and those which are passive outcomes of the process (such as workers' consumption). Now, applying this to land economy, we can argue that the eminence of money wages as well as Kalecki's emphasis that while ex post savings and investment are equal, it is investment that is the active factor that determines savings; further the equality is not brought about by changes in the rate of interest (which he recognised to be a policy variable) but by changes in the level of economic activity.

This paper concur that *change* in economic activity is pivotal in agrarian question. This is crucial in both Kalecki (2009) and Sraffa (1975), the change is transitional, rather evolutionary marking the pattern of price formation remains the same, with the prices of primary commodities being determined by the interaction of demand and supply, while finished goods prices reflect oligopolistic mark-up. Political influences upon economic policies and processes also remain critical. This trend can be pragmatic in both Indian agrarian market as well as in other developing countries as Patnaik (2010) proposes there has been a sharp decline in per capita grain output as well as grain consumption in the economy as a whole. Income has been shifting away from the majority towards the wealthy minority and a substantial segment of the population is being forced to eat less food and wear older clothing than before (p. 88).

This paper argues that being of money in agrarian question reveals dual logic of accumulation, first money form of commodity is caricature of social value of labor as well as land form capital inputs, enabling a permanent accumulation regime which drives the fundamental inequality between commodities (use values) that decay and a money form (exchange value) that does not has to be rectified. This is peculiar in

---

<sup>17</sup>Robinson (1978) argues that this transition of money is violent revolution.

different agrarian regime, say in Indian mode of production or Brazilian mode of production it is dictated by family based agriculture farm, producing, fuelling the food regime but contrariwise organized by cash crop regime. The political regime of money commodity constitutes an important fundamental contradiction in capitalist mode of production in both cases i.e. the question of land reform. This brings us to second logic of accumulation (intrinsic) to money commodity via exchange value and money, as in Marx (2015) mutually presume the existence of individual private property rights over both commodities and money. In next section, the paper elaborate on it.

### 2.1.3 The *essence* of property in accumulation

“There are some truths so completely self-evident, that demonstration is quite superfluous. This is one of that numbers... Yet how often in practice is that inviolability of property disregarded.”

--Jean-Baptiste Say, *Of the Right of Property* (1819)

“Now that we have considered the forcible creation of a class of outlawed proletarians, the bloody discipline that turned them into wage laborers, the disgraceful action of the State which employed the police to accelerate the accumulation of capital by increasing the degree of exploitation of labour, the question remains: whence came the capitalists originally? For the expropriation of the agricultural population creates, directly, none but the greatest landed proprietors.”

--Karl Marx, *the Capital, Volume I* (1990)

Jepsena et.al. (2015) presented *Transitions in European land-management regimes between 1800 and 2010*, in long-intensive research they concluded a detailed diver-centered analysis. There are three main categories influencing the land management, shown in *Table 1* we observe that every single driver is pivotal to land regime, which in turn, is foundational to property regime. We understand that two key points here, one, generally the property regime, functioned *via* land reforms, market access and technology dominates the land-governance systems. Second, the corporality of land reforms or market access activates in postulation of individual property<sup>18</sup>. Thus, the property vis-à-vis state formation is crucial for governmentality of land. Note that, the logical precedence of governmentality originates in particular ideas of security-territory-population and social control-money-property.

---

<sup>18</sup> Note that, the private property is not personal appropriation.

**Table 1: Results of the driver-centered analysis. Numbers refer to the frequency with which the drivers were mentioned in the narratives. Drivers can be counted multiple times in a single narrative if mentioned in more than one time period.**

Institutional	Incidence	Technological	Incidence	Economic	Incidence
Land reform	58	Mineral fertilizer	48	Demand for wood	24
Forest protection	39	Tractors	47	Production for market	21
Voluntary co-operatives <sup>a</sup>	24	Drainage	37	Specialization of agriculture	13
Land reclamation	21	New Crops (clover, potatoes, beets, feed crops in rotation) <sup>c</sup>	33	Shift from grain to dairy	10
Subsidies, guaranteed prices	21	Roads	26	Cash cropping of certain crops <sup>e</sup>	9
Protectionist policies	17	Railroads	24		
Forced collectivization	17	Irrigation	20		
Natural conservation <sup>b</sup>	17	New plough types <sup>d</sup>	9		
Abolition of serfdom	15				
Freeholders right to buy land	11				
Military operations	8				
Self-aside programs, agro-environmental schemes	8				
Shift from production to area based subsidies	8				
Land consolidation schemes	6				
Subsidies for organic farming	4				
Marshall plan, European recovery plan	4				
Tax on agriculture inputs	1				
Fascist land use paradigm	1				

a: Includes establishment of cooperatives following political revolution in Portugal. b: 10 of these are from Lithuania.

c: Includes introduction of higher quality seeds. d: This dominantly covers the iron-plated plough, but also the seed drill (UK). e: Wine, hops, fruits, vegetables, flowers, livestock.

Private property institutes an exclusive utility of commodities in terms of cost and factors of production. In agrarian economy, this occurs as accumulation regime, frequently seen as land grab or scramble of agrarian economy. Here, we shall focus on how the property regimes gets realized in accumulation regime. Private property and its inception from enclosure demonstrate a key aspect of property, seen first as territory and security, and therefore enclosed, and seen second as population relation. Both, these aspects are reified in juridical and corporal sense of the state in contemporary neo-liberal economy. Hence, we can argue that genesis of accumulation of property goes hand in hand with state realization<sup>19</sup>.

Making it is momentous to understand the social (re)production property (vis-à-vis the state) to understand the agrarian question. Going back to Locke (West, 2003) maxim that “Government has no other end but the preservation of property”, hints towards the fact the government are in existence before property, however Locke’s pregovernment was not based on the premise of the war but that of the social contract. Social contract leading towards private property also expresses man’s ability to reason and to develop his personality. Nonetheless Locke places such a heavy emphasis on economic production, instead of social relationship of property. The key aspect here is ability to reason and develop personality. Marx (Marx, Karl and Fred Moseley (Ed.), 2015) extends this to remarkable association with externality of man’s relationship with nature, as labour puts into materializing the natural ends, such as land. He formulates notion ‘(...) capital and labour are at first still united. Then, though separated and estranged, they reciprocally develop and promote each other as positive conditions’.

The property, at this stage, is realized and concretized in motion of separation and estranged, as positive conditions, for instance, land usages for food, food for population, population for labour and labour for land again. Smith (1776 (1904)) takes a precise observation. In his *Lecture on Justice*, Smith made one important distinction in Locke’s reasoning: natural rights he confined to the rights to liberty and life, whereas the right to property was an acquired right depending on the current disposition of society. In his words

---

<sup>19</sup> In remarkable thesis, James Scott (1998) [*Seeing like state*, Yale Press: New York] argues that highly planned large scale projects usually end up in failure as they are detached from their practical epistemic basis. We understand this in context of transition of property to accumulation regime in hypothesis.

“The origin of natural rights is quite evident. That a person has a right to have his body free from injury, and his liberty free from infringement unless there be a proper cause, nobody doubts. But acquired rights such as property require more explanation. Property and civil government very much depend on one another. The preservation of property and the inequality of possession first formed it, and the state of property must always vary with the form of government. (Smith 1896, 401)”

Now, that we stem a connexion between the state and property, Mill ([1848] 1969) states that “All the reasons, which recommend that private property should exist, recommend pro tanto this extension of it. But property is *only a means to an end, not in itself an end* (p. 226, emphasis added). We arrive at crucial conclusion that property seen as means of accumulation process but Mill is reprimand that it shall not be seen as an *end*, the fact that property seen as ‘exclusionary permanent ownership rights (Harvey, 2015)’. Harvey (2015) elaborates,

“Private property rights are in principle held in perpetuity. They do not expire or dissipate through lack of use. They can pass from one generation to another through inheritance. As a result, there is an inner connection between private property rights and nonoxidisable forms of money. *Only the latter can last in perpetuity*. But the evolution of forms of paper and fit money whose relative value is subject to degradation (through, for example, inflation) (p. 40, emphasis added).”

Property rights and money (commodity) are actualized through the state regime, in contemporary neoliberal regimes, the fact, that the model of free trade and export specialization that has been thrust on developing countries now stands explicitly discredited. The question is where the developing countries are to go now, with the large-scale diversion of food grains to fuel production in the North and the resulting disappearance of global food stocks and food price inflation (Patnaik, Utsa, 2010). Making property a pivotal aspect of accumulation as dispossession (Harvey, 2005), dislocation (Bardhan, 1989), hunger (Patnaik, 2007), under- development (Amin, 1974) and caste-class problem (Guru, 1997).

In summary, note that, the *being* of social control operates as fundamental datum in capitalist (neoliberal) mode of production, however, *notion* of money is dynamic contradiction, forming according to capital dynamics *process* in general and capital as *thing*. Property, thusly, operates as *essence* of conflicting union of production (of value and surplus value) and realisation (in money form). The agrarian question, as a matter of

fact, a question of what Marx (2015) concludes as a ‘splitting of labour *into* labour itself and the wages of labour. The worker himself a capital, a commodity’. Making the original question, the mistake to appear again and again as long as contradictions of capital seem to make eternally, this paper holds that one has a canon of agrarian inquiry for the worth of self-interest. If one shows ascending approach, then his worth is indeed extraordinary, as to demand the critique of *clash of mutual contradictions*<sup>20</sup>.

## SECTION III

### 3.0 Post-Script

#### The political economy in agrarian question

“The history of landed property, which would demonstrate the gradual transformation of the feudal landlord into the landowner, of the hereditary, semi-tributary and often unfree tenant for life into the modern farmer, and of the resident serfs, bondsmen and villains who belonged to the property into agricultural day labourers, would indeed be the history of the formation of modern capital.”

--Karl Marx, *Grundrisse, der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie* (p. 252)

This is a brief discussion of a specific issue of farm sizes in two countries, Brazil and India. The central argument of this section is based on preceding sketch of triage of social analysis of ‘*being-notion-essence*’, the section argues that the concept of the class focused decentred and disaggregated economy, in which capitalism is a part but not the whole of the agrarian question. The paper suggest that the class as a noun, class as a given being provide the ground to move towards an understanding of class as an adjective (to processes) or a verb (i.e., class as process of producing surplus labour or simply class process), class as becoming or doing. Accordingly the paper expand a framework of ‘labour time’ expended into labour process delineates the form of governance based the *performance, appropriation, distribution and receipt* of surplus labour.

Formerly, innumerable studies have argued that there can be inverse or direct relationship between the farm size with technical efficiency (Ayele et.al. 2009), wage structure (Hoelle, 2015), employability (Sen, A., 1975) and productivity (Jodhka, 2012). Nevertheless, the farm size as ‘return to scale performance’ has been central

---

<sup>20</sup> Clashes of labor-capital as internal as well as external, see Marx (1990)



debate in agrarian economy. This paper is not aiming on those issues, instead the farm size is seen as *internal dynamics* within the specific agrarian structure, which the mainstream approach on agrarian question has seldom stated but rarely discussed the question of land-development as both economic as well as non-economic reality. In fact, the mainstream approach limits itself in relating the fundamental concept of money as exchange, in the meanwhile money (through land-property and land-market) as form of wealth is far and wide derelict<sup>21</sup>. This paper takes on to theorize the debates on land (property)—money (storage of wealth) as character of dislocation and dispossession. Here, the character of *Ursprüngliche Akkumulation* (original accumulation) and primitive *verwerfung* (rejection) derives as tool of analysis of Capitalist mode of production, peculiar to Brazil and India.

Tables I to XI presents Brazil and India, in terms of various variables in land-tenure-property relations. We observe that both countries express moderate or severely moderate performance in terms of land-property rights. India, considering its population and less geographical size has poorer performance compared to Brazil in terms of property rights. Theoretically, the GINI (concentration of holdings) represent the inequity in land holdings but the index is silent on ownership aspect, this is reflected in Global competitiveness index. Here, the land as holding vis-à-vis ownership is crucial political economic transition. Therefore the property right transcends to being of regime instead of right in given unequal land economy. The question of accumulation, therefore, becomes a question in property as rights as well as ownership. In short, the table presents a particular political economic structure of two countries.

The *landless and marginal land holdings* in India (Table II) shows a drift in Malthusian logic of resource crunch, but in fact, *Percentage of area owned* suggests new-fangled land holding leaning. Brazil exhibits similar logic, assuming scale to population change<sup>22</sup>, here, <50 hectors constitutes a major share of land holders (Table VIII). Note that, if we agree with Marxian framework here, that agriculture is pursued by capitalists, who, > looked at in material terms, < are distinguished from other capitalists simply by

---

<sup>21</sup> Following Marx (1859) and Marx (1993) elaborates on this theorizing the Transformation of Surplus Profit into Ground Rent. However, the tranformation profit to rent has *reverse* logic in creation of values and surplus value. Thus, the rent, in money form of commdity, can be transformed to profit.

<sup>22</sup> The population density in Brazil is approximately 18 times lower than India, while, 67.25% Indians are rural compared to 14.31% Brazilians. Making a per capital land in India is 2375 sq.km compared to Brazil 40,881 sq.km. Resulting, in food deficit in India as 109 kcal per person per day compared to Brazil 12.

the element in which their capital and the wage-labour that it sets in motion are invested (Marx, 2015, p. 406). We end up with proposition that ‘as far as (political economist) are concerned, the farmer produces corn, etc. just as the manufacturer produces yarn.

On Contrary, harking back to security in agrarian question, this paper sees the land vis-à-vis an agrarian question prime over industrial, although the capitalist mode of production, as seen in Byres (1977), McMichael (1984), Akram-Lodhi and Kay (2010) and Bastiaan et.al. (2014) appears to be reckoned in industrial pursued capitalist mode of production. Observing the trends in assets and land in India, 2014 (Table IV) as well as number of workers in agriculture and livestock production in Brazil, 1995 and 2006 (Table VIII) suggests a patent logic of agrarian question preceding the industrial, however, the size of farm with which we are dealing, is transformed by invocation of capital and the capitalist mode of production, this is technical as well as labour form of capital operating in pursuance of landed property livelihood. Both in Brazil and India, the food production is based on comparatively small farms while cash crops are produced by large farms (Table VI and X). Here, the logic of territory plus security enables the case possession of the land and the soil appears as one of the conditions of production for the immediate producer, or at least as the most advantageous condition, the condition for his mode of production to flourish, thusly, the livestock rearing in India is distributed across small-marginal farms while in Brazil its’ reverse<sup>23</sup>.

Now, for Marx (1993) 'a scientific analysis of ground-rent', of the 'independent and specific economic form of landed property on the basis of the capitalist mode of production' in its 'pure form free of all distorting and obfuscating irrelevancies (Marx, 1992, p. 624)', however, he did not reach to a developed theory of landed property. In fact, Rent, in the final analysis of Capital Volume III, is simply a payment made to landlords for the right to use land and its appurtenances (the resources embedded within it, the buildings placed upon it and so on). At this juncture, Harvey (2006) inquire aptly that the land, conceived of in this very broad sense, evidently has both use value and exchange value. Can it also, then, have a value? If so, how can the existence of that value be reconciled with theories of value that rest on embodied labour time (such as Ricardo's) or, in Marx's case, on socially necessary labour time? (p.330).

---

<sup>23</sup> This is due to nature and scope of livestock rearing and its food consumption apparatus.

This paper begins at Harvey's inquiry, the paper argues that landed property presupposes that individual persons (holding land) enjoy the monopoly of disposing of particular portions of the globe as exclusive spheres of their private will to the exclusion of all others. Thus, to actualize the property, we need at least two conditions, first externality of holdings and second sanction from others. But, in Marxian framework, the sanction does not make property a social relation, in fact ensuing Hegel (1840) property is not a particular social relation, but rather a relationship between man as 'person' and 'nature', 'person' and 'nature', the 'absolute right of appropriation which man has over all "things" (p.41). However, Marx (2015) operates Hegel cautiously in dual ways, first enabling the nature-person dialogue into society-person dialogue by conception of the character of *Ursprüngliche Akkumulation* (original accumulation). Marx suggests that in real world nature-person duality gets eventually isolated by original accumulation by capitalist *person* towards *nature* i.e. landed property. In Brazil and India, we seen this as explicatory original accumulation process<sup>24</sup>.

Secondly, Marx (2015) sees it as primitive *verwerfung* (rejection) as in Hegelian terminology nature-person as original estrangement of kind. Primitive rejection operates universally, as Marx sees the process capitalism as in middle from primitive to socialism to communism transformations. This paper proposes to see primitive rejection as evolutionary historical rejection by man against his fellow man-nature settings, but Marx sees as broader species-being in world. Land, anyhow, stays central to his schematic of analysis of capitalist mode of production, in debate that land, in-itself, and is not non-producible stock, thus the debates on holding land initiates from social structure peculiar to Brazil and India.

The skewed land holding in both these countries brings us to debate the *transition* of land from non-producible stock to production capital. Here, the land as basis of reproduction and extraction is central in social structures. Following, territory vis-à-vis population theory, the land space-place-location-population density becomes a grand political economic project of capitalist mode of production. Enabling the use-exchange

---

<sup>24</sup> Personally, I read Marx's total work as genesis of formulation of original accumulation, where, it is tool used to analyze the capitalism in his context, not a universal category of analysis, mainly because unlike exchange value is universal category, original accumulation operates in historical form of production, which is peculiar to each society, nay production process. Thus, cut-paste of Marxian thesis of original accumulation is, at least, anachronistic method of analysis.

value to transgress from point-in-space to network-in-space structures. Further enabling the land accumulation as accumulated value over the time.

This, integrally, summons the examinations of value-labor time in our political economic framework of social control-money-property. The social control as category expends its form labor time. In other words, the labor time is what is proximately controlled to control the value and therefore money. Where the realization of property becomes essence. In sort, the foundational framework of social control-money-property includes the value-labor time as integral unit of elements of production, therefore relations of production. The land holding, aptly, represent not structure of farm but internal dynamics of class process in society.

In summary, the land holdings, in Brazil and India, is not a simple picture of who owns how but a concrete picture of who owns what, how, and where. Now Marx (1992) states,

“The contradictory influences of location and fertility, and the variableness of the location factor, which is continually counterbalanced and perpetually passes through progressive changes tending towards equalization, alternately carry equally good, better or worse land areas into new competition with the older ones under cultivation(p. 769)”

The land holdings in network-in-space structure of location vis-à-vis fertility. Besides in given context, 'In each historical epoch,' Marx writes, 'property has developed differently and under a set of entirely different social relations' (1847, p. 154). But that would be task of another comprehensive research paper to see in the historicity of land property.

This paper concludes Marx's general form of history can be divided into two phases. In the first, feudal labour rents are transformed into rent in kind and finally into money rents. Political economy, in general, has studied feudal labor rents but study of money rent is still undone. The newer approach in political economy shall help us to proceed in right direction. In this direction, the agrarian question has roots in circulating capital, thus it indicates the locational paths of future and contemporary accumulation regime. The regime, no longer, limited to rural-agriculture Brazil or India. In the end, the question imposes its contradictions upon the very physical landscape of capitalism itself.

## References

- Akram-Lodhi, A. Haroon and Cristóbal Kay . (2010). Surveying the agrarian question (part 1): unearthing foundations, exploring diversity. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37:1, 177-202.
- Akram-Lodhi, A. Haroon and Cristóbal Kay. (2010). Surveying the agrarian question (part 2): current debates and beyond . *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37:2, 255-284.
- Amin, Samir . (1974). *Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment (2 Volumes)* . London: Monthly Review Press .
- Aricó, José and David Broder. (2013). *Marx and Latin America*. London: Brill .
- Ayele, Gezahegn, Jordan Chamberlin, Lisa Moorman, Kassu Wamisho and Xiaobo Zhang . (2009). Infrastructure and Cluster Development: A case study of Handloom weavers in Ethiopia. *ESSP-II Discussion Paper 1, IFPRI, Washington D.C.*
- Bardhan, Pranab . (1989). *The Economic Theory of Agrarian Institutions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bastiaan Philip Reydon, and Ludwig Einstein Agurto Plata, Gerd Sparovek, Tiago Santos Telles. (April 2014). Determination and forecast of agricultural land prices. *Nova Economia* 24(2) , 389-408 .
- Bernstein H. . (2008). Agrarian questions from transition to globalization. In A. H.-L. (eds.), *Peasants and Globalization: Political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question* (pp. 239-261). London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, H. . (2006). Is there an agrarian question in the 21st century? . *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 27(4), 449–60.
- Bernstein, H. . (2009). V.I. Lenin and A.V. Chayanov: looking back, looking forward. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36(1), 55–81.
- Bernstein, H. . (2010). *Class Dynamics of Agrarian Change*. London: Fernwood.
- Bethell, Leslie . (2008). *The Cambridge History of Latin America: Volume 9: Brazil since 1930* . London: Cambridge University Press.
- Boothman, D. (2008 ). The Sources for Gramsci's Concept of Hegemony. *Rethinking Marxism Volume 20 Issue 2 [doi 10.1080\_08935690801916942]* .
- Byres, T.J . (2003). Paths of Capitalist Agrarian Transition in the Past and in the Contemporary World. In V. R. (eds.), *Agrarian Studies: Essays on Agrarian Relations in Less-Developed Countries*. London: Zed Books.
- Byres, T.J. (1977). Agrarian transition and the agrarian question. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 4(3), 258–74.
- Byres, T. J. (March 11, 1995). Political Economy, Agrarian Question and Comparative Method. *Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.XXX*, 507-513.

- Chakravarti, Anand . (April 28, 2001). Caste and Agrarian Class. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXX, 1450-1462.
- Chattopadhyay, P. . (1972). Mode of production in Indian agriculture: an 'anti-kritik'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 7(53) , A185–A192.
- Cocco, Giuseppe . (2007 ). The Labor of Territories between Deterritorialization and Reterritorialization. *Rethinking Marxism Volume 19 Issue 3* [doi 10.1080\_08935690701412703] .
- Cramer C., C. Oya and J. Sender . (2008). Lifting the blinkers: a new view of power, diversity and poverty in Mozambican rural labour markets. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 46, 3, 361-39.
- DeVore, Jonathan D. . (2014). *Cultivating Hope: Struggles for Land, Equality, and Recognition in the Cacao Lands of Southern Bahia, Brazil*. Michigan : the University of Michigan(Unpublished thesis) .
- Dubcovsky, Alejandra. (2016, 06 12). *Colloquium on Agrarian Studies* . Retrieved from Yale University: <https://yale.app.box.com/s/zrfxq4qq8pqu85399xn2dhj2h7ns2bk4>
- Duncan, Kenneth and Ian Rutledge, Colin Harding (ed.). (1977). *Land and Labour in Latin America: Essays on the Development of Agrarian Capitalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries*. London: Cambridge Latin American Studies.
- Dussel, Enrique. (2001 ). The Four Drafts of Capital - Toward a New Interpretation of the Dialectical Thought of Marx. *Rethinking Marxism Volume 13 Issue 1* [doi 10.1080\_089356901101241569] .
- Foucault, M. (1991). *Remarks on Marx* . New York : Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, M. and A.Davidson(ed.). (2004). *Security, Territory, Population*. London: Picador.
- Foweraker, J. . (2002). *The Struggle for Land: A Political Economy of the Pioneer Frontier in Brazil from 1930 to the Present Day* . London : Cambridge University Press.
- Furtado, C. . (1973). The concept of external dependence in the study of underdevelopment. In C. Wilber(ed.), *The political economy of development and underdevelopment* (pp. 118–23). New York: Random House.
- Guru, G.. (September 6, 1997). Dalit Land Question and Agrarian Contradiction. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXX, 2295-96.
- Harvey, D. (2015). *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *Paris, Capital of Modernity*. New York : Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (2006). *The Limits to Capital*. London: Verso.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich and George di Giovanni(ed.). (2010). *The Science of Logic*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Fredrich and Allen W. Wood(ed.), H. B. Nisbet(ed.). (1840[1991]). *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hoelle, Jeffrey. (2015). *Ruminations on Cattle economies and Cattle cultures*. Huston: University of Texas Press.
- Hume, David. ((1752) 2016, July 16). *Essays, Moral, Political, and Literary, Part II*. Retrieved from Library of Economics and Liberty: <http://www.econlib.org/library/LFBooks/Hume/hmMPL24.html>
- Hussain, Athar and Keith Tribe (auth.). (1983). *Marxism and the Agrarian Question*. London: Palgrave Macmillan .
- Ibhawoh, Bonny and J. I. Dibua. (2003). DeconstructingUjamaa: The Legacy of Julius Nyerere in the Quest for Social and Economic Development in Africa. *African Journal of Political Sciences, Vol:8 No. 1*, 60-83.
- Innes, Martin . (2003). *Understanding Social Control* . London: Open University Press.
- Isaak Illich Rubin (author), and Miloš Samardžija, Fredy Perlman (translators). (1928). *Essays on Marx's Theory of Value*. London: Black Rose Books .
- Jakimow,Tanya and Liana J Williams, Chiranjeevi Tallapragada. (June 29, 2013 ). A Future Orientation to Agrarian Livelihoods. *Economic & Political Weekly Vol.XLVII Nos 26 & 27* , 129-138.
- Jepsena, Martin Rudbeck and Tobias Kuemmerleb, Daniel Müllerb , Karlheinz Erbe, Peter H. Verburgf, Helmut Haberlc, Jens Peter Vesteragera, Maja Andričg, Marc Antroph, Gunnar Austrheimi, Ismo Björn, Alberte Bondeauk, Matthias Bürgil, Jessica Brysonm, Gill. (December 2015). Transitions in European land-management regimes between 1800 and 2010. *Land Use Policy, Volume 49*, 53–64.
- Kalecki, M. (1966). Money and real wages I. In M. Kalecki, *Studies in the Theory of Business Cycles*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kalecki, M. (2009). *Theory of Economic Dynamics* . London: Monthly Review Press Classics .
- Kalecki, M. (1971). *Selected Essays On the Dynamics of the Capitalist Economy, 1933-70*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kevane M. (1994). Village Labor Markets in Sheikan District, Sudan. *World Development, Vol. 22, No. 6*, 839-857.
- Keynes, John Maynard . (December 1930 (2011)). *A Treatise on Money: The Pure Theory of Money and The Applied Theory of Money. Complete Set*. London: Martino Fine Books.
- Kolers, Avery . (2009). *Land, Conflict and Justice: A Political Theory of Territory* . Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Lahiri-Dutt,Kuntala and Robert J. Wasson. (2008). *Water First: Issues and Challenges for Nations and Communities in South Asia*. New Delhi: Sage India.
- Lebowitz, Michael A. (1991 ). The Significance of Marx's Missing Book on Wage-Labor. *Rethinking Marxism Volume 4 Issue 2 [doi 10.1080\_08935699108657966]* .
- Lefebvre,Henri and Donald Nicholson-Smith (Translated by). (1992). *The Production of Space*. New York: Wiely-Blackwell.

- Lenin, V.I. . (1964). *The development of capitalism in Russia*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Lenin, V.I. and Chretien, Todd (ed.). (1906(2015)). *State and Revolution*. London: Haymarket Books .
- Lima, Wenderson De. (2011). *Forced Labor in Brazil: A Study of the Global and Local Forces that Influence Rural Coercive Work in Brazil*. Stockholm : Final paper in Bachelor's Degree in Latin American Studies, University of Stockholm .
- Locke, John and ed. P. Laslett. ([1690] 1991). *Two Treatises of Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- London, Frederic. (2014). *Willing Slaves Of Capital: Spinoza And Marx On Desire*. London: Verso .
- Luxemburg, Rosa . (2003). *The Accumulation of Capital*. London: Routledge Classics.
- Mafeje, Archie . (May 2003). The Agrarian Question, Access to Land, and Peasant Responses in Sub-Saharan Africa. *UN Civil Society and Social Movements Programme Paper Number 6*.
- Mafeje, Archie. (1973). Agrarian Revolution and the Land Question in Buganda. *ISS-Working Paper 33*.
- Marx, Karl . (1847). *The Poverty of Philosophy*. Zodiac for Marx/Engels Internet Archive (marxists.org) 1999.
- Marx, Karl . (1992). *Capital: Critique of Political Economy Volume III*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Marx, Karl. (1983). *Mathematical Manuscripts 1881*. London: New Park Publications .
- Marx, Karl. (2016, July 16). *Wage, Labour and Capital*. Retrieved from Marxist Internet Archives : <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1847/wage-labour/>
- Marx, Karl and Ernest Mandel (Introducer), David Fernbach (Translator). (27th August 1992). *Capital Volume I*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Marx, Karl and Fred Moseley (Ed.). (2015). *Marx's Economic Manuscript of 1864-1865*. London: Brill Publications .
- Marx, Karl and Martin Nicolaus (Foreword by), Martin Nicolaus (Translator). (29th April 1993). *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Marx, Karl and S.W. Ryazanskaya(translator). (1859). *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Mathijs van Leeuwen. (Dec., 2001). Rwanda's Imidugudu Programme and Earlier Experiences with Villagisation and Resettlement. *The Journal of Modern African Studies, Vol. 39, No. 4* , 623-644.
- McMichael, P. . (2009). Food sovereignty, social reproduction and the agrarian question. In e. A.H. Akram-Lodhi and C. Kay, *Peasants and globalization: political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question* (pp. 288–312). London: Routledge.



- McMichael, P. (1984). *Settlers and the Agrarian Question: Foundations of Capitalism in Colonial Australia*. New York : Cambridge University Press.
- Milchman, Alan; and Rosenberg, Alan. (2002 ). Marxism and Governmentality Studies- Toward a Critical Encounter. *Rethinking Marxism Volume 14 Issue 1* [doi 10.1080\_089356902101242099] .
- Mill, John Stuart and Sir William Ashley (ed.). ([1848] 1969). *Principles of Political Economy*,. New York: Augustus Kelly.
- Moyo,Sam and Praveen Jha, Paris Yeros. (2013). The Classical Agrarian Question: Myth, Realities, and Relevance Today. *Journal of Agrarian South, 2(1)* , 93–119.
- Moyo,Sam and Praveen Jha, Paris Yeros. (September 12, 2015 ). The Agrarian Question in 21st Century . *Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.I, No.37*, 35-41.
- Nair, Sthanu R and Leena Mary Eapen. (August 1, 2015). Agrarian Performance and Food Price: Pre- and Post-Economic Liberalisation. *Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. L, No.31*, 49-60.
- Olsen, Erik K. . (2009 ). Social Ontology and the Origins of Mode of Production Theory. *Rethinking Marxism Volume 21 Issue 2* [doi 10.1080\_08935690902743096] .
- Patnaik, Prabhat . (April 2, 2009). *The Value of Money* . New York: Columbia University Press.
- Patnaik, Utsa . (2007). *The Agrarian Question in Marx and his Successors Volume I*. New Delhi: Leftward Publications.
- Patnaik, Utsa . (2010). Origins of the Food Crisis in India and Developing Countries . In F. M. Tokar, *Agriculture and Food in Crisis: Conflict, Resistance, and Renewal* (pp. 86-101). London: Monthly Review Press.
- Patnaik, Utsa . (May, 3, 1986). The Agrarian and Development of Capitalism in India. *Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.XXX*, 781-93.
- Pereira, Luiz Carlos Bresser . (1998). *Economia Brasileira: Uma Introducao Critica*. Sao Paulo: Editora 34 Ltda.
- Postone, Moishe . (1996). *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*. London: Cambridge University Press .
- Prasad, Purendra N. (April 18, 2015 ). Agrarian Class and Caste Relations in ‘United’ Andhra Pradesh, 1956–2014. *Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. I, No.16*, 77-83.
- Preobrazhensky, E. (1965). *The new economics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ray, Sunil . (Dec. 31, 1994). Farm - Non-Farm Interaction in a Labour Surplus Economy. *Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 29, No. 53* .
- Ricardo, David and Piero Sraffa . (2005). *The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo, Vol. 4 Pamphlets and Papers 1815-1823 [1815]*. Indianapolis : Liberty Fund.
- Ricardo,David. (1822). *On Protection to Agriculture*. London: John Murray and Co.
- Robinson, Joan . (1978). *Contributions to Modern Economics*. London: Elsevier Inc, Academic Press .

- Robinson, Joan . (1981). *What are the Questions and Other Essays: Further Contributions to Modern Economics*. London: M.E. Sharpe .
- Robinson, Joan. (1956). *The Accumulation of Capital*. London: Richard D. Irwin.
- Robinson, Joan. (1980). *What are the Questions?And Other Essays*. New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc. .
- Rosa Luxemburg and Nikolai I. Bukharin and K. Tarbuck(ed.). (1972). *The Accumulation of Capital: An Anti-Critique and Imperialism and the Accumulation of Capital* . London: Monthly Review Press.
- Roy, T. . (December 30, 2006). Roots of Agrarian Crisis in Interwar India: Retrieving a Narrative. *Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.XXX*, 5389-5400.
- Sam Moyo and Paris Yeros. (2005). *Reclaiming the Land: The Resurgence of Rural Movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America*. London: Zed Books .
- Sam Moyo and Paris Yeros. (2011). *Reclaiming the Nation: The Return of the National Question in Africa, Asia and Latin America*. London: Pluto Press .
- Scoones, Ian. (2008). Mobilizing Against GM Crops in India, South Africa and Brazil. *Journal of Agrarian Change, 8(2/3)*, 315-44.
- Scott, James C. . (2013 ). *Decoding Subaltern Politics: Ideology, Disguise, and Resistance in Agrarian Politics*. New York : Routledge.
- Scott, James C. and Nina Bhatt (ed.). (2001). *Agrarian Studies: Synthetic Work at the Cutting Edge*. New York: Yale University Press.
- Sen, A. . (1975). *Employment, Technology And Development*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Shaikh,Anwar M. and E. Ahmet Tonak. (1996). *Measuring the Wealth of Nations: The Political Economy of National Accounts* . London: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Adam . (1776(1904)). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations (Cannan ed.)*, in 2 vols. London: Methuen.
- Smith, Adam . (1869). *The Theory of Moral Sentiments and Essays on Philosophical Subjects* . London: Alex, Murray and Sons.
- Smith, Adam and E. Cannan( ed.). (1896). *Lectures on Policy, Justice, Revenue and Arms*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sraffa, Piero . (August 29, 1975). *Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities : Prelude to a Critique of Economic Theory*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Surinder S. Jodhka. (June 30, 2012). Agrarian Changes in the Times: Revisiting Attached Labour in Haryana. *Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. XLVII, Nos. 26 & 27* , 7-13.
- Suzanne de Brunhoff. (1976). *Marx on Money*. London: Urizen Books.
- Tiago Santos Telles and Alex Wilhans Antonio Palludeto,Bastiaan Philip Reydon. (2016, July 16). *Price movement in the Brazilian land market (1994-2010): An analysis in the light of post-Keynesian theory*. Retrieved from ResearchGate:

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/295252576\\_Price\\_movement\\_in\\_the\\_Brazilian\\_land\\_market\\_1994-2010\\_An\\_analysis\\_in\\_the\\_light\\_of\\_post-Keynesian\\_theory](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/295252576_Price_movement_in_the_Brazilian_land_market_1994-2010_An_analysis_in_the_light_of_post-Keynesian_theory)

- Tombazos, Stavros . (2015). *Time in Marx: The Categories of Time in Marx's Capital*. New York: Haymarket Books .
- Uchida, Hiroshi . (1988). *Marx's Grundrisse and Hegel's Logic*. London: Routledge .
- Walker, G. (2011 ). Primitive Accumulation and the Formation of Difference- On Marx and Schmitt. *Rethinking Marxism Volume 23 Issue 3 [doi 10.1080\_08935696.2011.583016]*
- Weisskopf, Thomas E. . (1991 ). Marxian Crisis Theory and the Contradictions of Late Twentieth-Century Capitalism. *Rethinking Marxism Volume 4 Issue 4* .
- West, Edwin G. . (2003). Property Rights in the History of Economic Thought: From Locke to J. S. Mill. In T. L. (ed.), *Property Rights: Cooperation, Conflict, and Law* (pp. 20–42). New York : Princeton University Press.
- White, Michael V. and Kurt Schuler. (Spring 2009). Who Said “Debauch the Currency”: Keynes or Lenin? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 23.2, 213–222.
- World Bank. (2007). *World development report 2008: agriculture for development*. Washington: The World Bank.

## APPENDIX

**Table I Land economy in Brazil and India**

Item	India		Brazil	
	2002-03	2012-13	1995	2006(for census)/2009(for other variables)
	59 <sup>th</sup> round NSSO	70 <sup>th</sup> round NSSO	Census Data	Census Data
Estimated Area Owned '(000ha)	0.7228	92369	0.27245	0.2845
Average area owned per household( ha)	0.725	0.592		
The International Property Right Index(Range: 0–10; 0=worst)	7.6	7.4	5.4	5.1
World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index, 2008-2009Property Rights (Range: 1–7; 1=poorly defined/not protected by law)	3.9	4.1	4.6	4.0
GINI (Concentration of Holdings) (Range: 0–1; 0=equal distribution)	0.610	0.60	0.857	0.856
Source: various calculations				

**Table II Land holdings in India**

Category of Holding	Percentage of households		Percentage of area owned	
	2002-03	2012-13	2002-03	2012-13
Landless ( $\leq 0.002$ ha)	10.4	7.41	0.01	0.01
Marginal ( $>0.002$ but $\leq 1.000$ ha)	69.63	75.42	23.01	29.75
Small ( $>1.000$ but $\leq 2.000$ ha)	10.81	10	20.38	23.54
Semi-medium ( $>2.000$ but $\leq 4.000$ ha)	6.03	5.01	21.29	22.07
Medium ( $>4.000$ but $\leq 10.000$ ha)	2.96	1.93	22.08	18.83
Large ( $> 10.000$ ha)	0.53	0.24	11.55	5.81
Source: NSSO (2014a)				

**Table III Land and Employment in India**

	Self-employed in cultivation	Self-employed in livestock farming	Self-employed in other agricultural activities	Self-employed in non-agricultural enterprises	Wages/ salaried employment	Others	Total
% of households	42.92	1.75	3.47	11.59	32.36	7.1	100
% area of land owned	81.41	1.47	1.48	3.28	10.4	1.97	100

Source: NSSO(2014a)

**Table IV Assets and Land in India**

Size of land owned	Cultivation	Livestock	Other Agricultural activity	Non-agricultural activity	Wages/salaried employment	Other	all
<0.01	1.6	22.9	2.7	10.8	56.4	5.5	100
0.01-0.40	42.1	4.8	1.2	7.5	35.2	9.3	100
0.41-1.00	69.2	2.3	0.9	3.6	20	4.1	100
1.01-2.00	83	2.5	0.9	3.2	8.6	1.8	100
2.01-4.00	85.9	2.4	1.1	1.6	7.1	1.8	100
4.01-10.00	87.9	2.7	0.5	0.9	5.9	2	100
10.00+	89.4	5.5	1.5	1.8	1.7	0.1	100

Source: NSSO (2014b)

**Table V Structure of Land tenancy in India**

Terms of leases	% of Households
For fixed money	32.6
For share of produce	26.2
From relatives under no specific terms	14.6
For fixed produce	14.2
Under other terms	8.2

For share of produce together with other terms	2
For service contract	1.6
Under usufructury mortgage	0.7
Total	100
Source: land and livestock survey 2014	

**Table VI Land use and holding in India**

Size class	Distribution of agricultural household by types of land possessed					Operated any agricultural land for last 365 days (in %)	Having MGNREGA job card (in %)
	Homestead only	Homestead and other land	other land only	no land	all		
<0.01	70.3	23.3	1.1	2.4	100	46.6	38.3
0.01-0.40	10	89.5	0.5	0	100	94.8	45.3
0.41-1.00	2.9	96.5	5	0	100	99.4	46.3
1.01-2.00	2	97.6	1	0	100	99.6	43.8
2.01-4.00	1.9	97.4	0.6	0	100	99.8	41.4
4.01-10.00	2	97.2	0.9	0	100	99.6	36.1
10.00+	0.2	94.1	5.7	0	100	97.5	29.3
All Sizes	6.7	92.6	0.5	0.1	100	96.6	44.4
Source: NSSO (2014b)							

**Table VII Number of farms variation (percentage), by farm area groups and regions. Brazil, 1970 to 2006.**

Area group (ha)	Center-west	Northeast	North	Southeast	South
< 100	26,7	4,3	67,9	1,2	-24,0
100 to <200	12,7	-6,6	105,5	-28,5	-0,7

200 to <500	3,9	-9,8	78,7	-25,2	19,4
500 to < 1000	34,4	-12,7	470,5	-26,5	13,3
1000 and above	53,5	-11,6	437,9	-23,1	-5,9
Total	24,4	3,5	76,7	-2,8	-22,5

Source: Brazilian Agricultural Censuses, various years.

**Table VIII. Number of workers in agriculture and livestock production in Brazil. 1995 and 2006.**

	1995		2006	
	Number	Share	Number	Share
< 1 ha	1.349.711	0,08	1.518.444	0,10
1 to < 2 ha	1.378.451	0,08	1.188.253	0,07
2 to < 5 ha	2.513.564	0,14	2.211.200	0,14
5 to < 10 ha	2.058.452	0,12	1.831.411	0,12
10 to < 20 ha	2.416.889	0,14	2.205.466	0,14
20 to < 50 ha	3.055.094	0,17	2.718.038	0,17
50 to < 100 ha	1.678.601	0,09	1.399.108	0,09
100 to < 200 ha	1.197.018	0,07	901.121	0,06
200 to < 500 ha	1.007.832	0,06	785.544	0,05
500 to < 1000 ha	481.096	0,03	365.977	0,02
1000 ha and more	751.002	0,04	768.247	0,05
Total	17.887.710	1	15.892.809	1

Source: Brazilian Agricultural Censuses.

**Table IX Share in value of production of annual crops in Brazil and regions, by farm size. 2006.**

Farm size	Brazil	North	Northeast	Southeast	South	Center-west
>0 and <1	0.015	0.036	0.038	0.007	0.016	0.002

1 and <2	0.021	0.046	0.039	0.011	0.028	0.003
2 and <5	0.057	0.066	0.056	0.032	0.111	0.009
5 and <10	0.039	0.058	0.040	0.026	0.070	0.006
10 to <20	0.045	0.095	0.052	0.034	0.072	0.007
20 to <50	0.077	0.109	0.087	0.067	0.122	0.014
50 to <100	0.067	0.115	0.068	0.059	0.101	0.019
100 to <200	0.084	0.160	0.064	0.081	0.117	0.041
200 to <500	0.137	0.101	0.099	0.132	0.160	0.147
500 and more	0.456	0.213	0.456	0.550	0.194	0.752
Region's share in Brazil		0.044	0.164	0.270	0.303	0.218

Source: Agricultural Census 2006.

**Table X Number of farms and share in value of production or annual crops, by regions. Brazil, 2006.**

		Area group					
			<100	100 to < 200	200 to <500	500 to <1000	1000 to above
Brazil	Farms	Number	4.448.751	219.432	150.698	54.158	47.578
		Share	0,90	0,04	0,03	0,01	0,01
	VP	Share	0,31	0,06	0,11	0,09	0,42
North	Farms	Number	355.637	48.432	23.614	8.472	8.467
		Share	0,80	0,11	0,05	0,02	0,02
	VP	Share	0,53	0,11	0,07	0,03	0,22
Northeast	Farms	Number	2.149.260	62.318	40.831	12.335	8.212
		Share	0,95	0,03	0,02	0,01	0,00
	VP	Share	0,44	0,04	0,07	0,06	0,38
Southeast	Farms	Number	804.897	48.543	33.382	9.802	5.956
		Share	0,89	0,05	0,04	0,01	0,01
	VP	Share	0,21	0,08	0,14	0,08	0,50
South	Farms	Number	921.958	29.079	23.178	7.670	4.507



		Share	0,93	0,03	0,02	0,01	0,00
	VP	Share	0,51	0,09	0,13	0,11	0,16
Center west	Farms	Number	216.999	31.060	29.693	15.879	20.436
		Share	0,69	0,10	0,09	0,05	0,07
	VP	Share	0,05	0,02	0,08	0,12	0,72

Source: Brazilian Agricultural Censuses, various years.

**Table XI Share in land use, by type of use and land area group. Selected years. Brazil.**

	< 100 ha		100 to < 200 ha		200 to < 500 ha		500 to <1000 ha		1000 ha and above	
	1980	2006	1980	2006	1980	2006	1980	2006	1980	2006
Permanent crops	0,080	0,077	0,059	0,050	0,031	0,051	0,020	0,025	0,008	0,018
Annual crops	0,278	0,198	0,123	0,124	0,111	0,134	0,092	0,128	0,041	0,132
Natural pastureland	0,233	0,211	0,306	0,214	0,354	0,215	0,369	0,205	0,360	0,158
Planted pastureland	0,120	0,285	0,166	0,343	0,200	0,354	0,219	0,374	0,184	0,335
Others	0,289	0,229	0,345	0,269	0,305	0,246	0,300	0,268	0,409	0,357
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Source: Brazilian Agricultural Censuses, selected years.