

STORM BURSTS
ON
THE PEASANTRY



PROF. N. G. RANGA



THE INDIAN PEASANT INSTITUTE
NIDUBROLU

Blank Page

STORM BURSTS ON THE PEASANTRY



PROF. N. G. RANGA



THE INDIAN PEASANT INSTITUTE
NIDUBROLU

May, 1959

Price : 60 nP.

In Memorium
TO
The old and young Kisan leaders
Sri N. V. Rama Naidu
Founder-Editor, '*The Zamin Ryot*'
Nellore
and
Sri N. V. Rama Rao
Minister, Food and Agriculture
Andhra Government

Copies can be had from :

INDIAN PEASANT INSTITUTE

Nidubrolu
Andhra Pradesh

96, North Avenue
New Delhi, 1

New India Press, New Delhi

PREFACE

The Peasant Protection Committee was originally founded in 1931 to save the peasant masses of India from the dire results of the world economic depression. It raised the demand for moratorium for peasants' indebtedness. And that movement tried to save them from being enslaved to money-lenders, bankers, etc. This Committee has been invoked by the Bharat Kisan Sammelan at its special convention held in New Delhi on December 14-15, 1958. It is giving the clarion call at this juncture to the Indian masses against the latest threat to the very foundations of Indian democracy, namely the self-employed status.

We appeal to all democratic forces in the country for their support and co-operation, both moral and organisational, to make our mission a success. The Committee cautions the 250 million self-employed peasants and artisans of India against the impending peril. The Nagpur *approach* favouring Soviet-oriented co-operative farming is nothing but a noose thrown round the necks of our free peasantry. Co-operative farming is only a decoy placed in the way of peasants to ensnare them into collective farming, retreat from which is next to impossible. A society that is going to be built on the graves of millions of self-employed and therefore free peasants cannot be democratic and socialistic in nature. The four-decade long historical experience of Soviet peasantry under Communist dispensation is enough warning against the proposed reform.

Acharya Ranga, with long and intimate experience with the forces of world at work, has envisioned and made bold to warn our peasants about the fate that would overtake them in the event of co-operativisation of peasant economy. He firmly believes that the proposed attempts at co-operativisation of all land will result in the speedy disappearance of free peasantry. Our peasants, by being independent, self-employed and self-respecting, are the cornerstone of Indian democracy. The deprivation of their economic independence will surely toll the burial of Indian democracy.

Let us make it perfectly clear that neither Prof. Ranga nor our Committee is opposed to ceilings on land as such, but we demand that similar ceilings should be imposed on other properties and incomes also. Nor are we opposed to service co-operatives being organised to aid the free peasants. In fact, we have all along been busy organising co-operative credit banks, marketing societies and other service co-operatives since

1925 and, therefore, we are ready to welcome the newly begotten love of Congress for such co-operatives. But, we are opposed to their plan of exploiting these service co-operatives to beguile peasants into co-operative farms whose superiority to *peasant economy* has yet to be demonstrated.

Much literature has come to be published in recent years revealing the fate of peasants in Soviet Russia and other countries where co-operative and collective farming has been experimented with on a large scale. We have thus come to know about the heartening emergence of a peasant economy in an attenuated form even in those countries. In his zeal to save the peasant and artisan from being overtaken by 'co-operativisation', 'collectivisation' and 'statism', Prof. Ranga quickly reacted to the Nagpur approach. He has sounded his warning in time at the kisan conventions of 15th December, 1958, at New Delhi, 1st January, 1959, at Bangalore, 31st January, 1959, at Doraha (Punjab) and on 1st March, 1959, at Belgaum (Mysore). No one could forewarn the peasantry of those countries about the fate that would overtake them under Communist dispensation.

It is now for all those self-employed and free peasants and artisans, small traders and shopkeepers to awaken to the danger that is threatening their very existence as free people. It is also time for all those intellectuals and academicians to dispassionately examine how far the proposed joint farming will usher in the much desired socialistic order of democratic society.

In this brochure, we have brought together the relevant passages of Prof. Ranga's speeches at the above-mentioned conventions. We are also appending with grateful acknowledgement extracts from the pen profile of Acharya Ranga, published by *The Statesman* of New Delhi and from the 'Capital Comments' by 'Junius' in *Swarajya* of Madras.

We are grateful to the peasant intellectuals at Delhi, notably Messrs. K.R. Seshagiri Rao and T.K.R. for having edited this brochure.

Indian Peasant Institute
NIDUBROLU
May, 1959.

N. V. NAIDU, M.L.A.
P. RAJAGOPAL, M.L.A.
—*Peasant Protection Committee*

NAGPUR DECISIONS THREATEN PEASANTS' FREEDOM

Many friends and newspapers expressed surprise at our opposition to this nation-wide campaign in favour of joint co-operative farming on the ground that this new economy is to be introduced only after 1962 and also after the present campaign for the organisation of service co-operatives reaches a high tempo of development and they are cynical enough to think that these campaigns might largely remain in the air and might also fail on the rocks of practical difficulties regarding personnel, funds, etc. It would be suicidal for us to accept their advice.

If really the Government and the planners are not so serious about their plans for creating the requisite climate in favour of joint co-operative farming and against peasant farm economy, and if they do not hope to achieve considerable degree of success in weakening the confidence of peasants in their ability to survive as efficient producers and as self-employed toilers, why should they have taken the great risk of warning the country and our peasant masses at this early hour about their designs? Why should they have begun their campaign in favour of co-operative farming and against peasant farm economy in such a manner with so much gusto? Why should they have taken so much offence at our peasants' opposition to their campaign?

Our freedom-loving peasants are to be grateful to the Nagpur decisions, because they have been awakened by this threat to their very existence as free, self-employed, non-exploiting and self-reliant multi-purpose producers.

They have told us that what we have looked upon as our best champions and armours, that is service co-operatives, are to be developed with our co-operation and with all the resources of the Governments and their political leadership, into the halters and decoy-elephants to lead us into the embraces of our successors, the joint farms and

their managers. They have declared their determination to exploit their control over governments to weaken our peasantry, rob them of their self-confidence, exploit their weaknesses, and waylay them into "joint farms" and "co-operative farms" and thus sedulously quicken the march of our peasant proprietors, tenants and all other self-employed agrarian masses into their politico-economic grave.

Let it be remembered that to depress the vast millions of self-employed peasantry, to weaken their confidence in their independent agricultural activities and to make them feel by constant propaganda that their productive activities are not looked upon as progressive and conducive to national prosperity is to render the greatest disservice to India's cause for social freedom, economic independence and democratic progress. Unfortunately, this is exactly what the present campaign tends to achieve. So, I have no hesitation to look upon it as the most unpatriotic activity.

DEMAND DUE RECOGNITION FOR PEASANT ECONOMY

Let us demand from the Government an unequivocal statement that it does not wish to discriminate against peasant farm economy, that it has confidence in the future of our self-employed peasantry and that it recognises its duty to give them all the assistance, encouragement and recognition that they need in order to fulfil their role in our planned economy. So far, there has been no such recognition and appreciation on the part of the Government of the contribution being made by our self-employed peasants. On the other hand, the Government and its planners seem to be nursing their wrong thesis that they would be helping the small peasants possessing or cultivating less than the so-called economic or basic holding, by persuading them (small peasants) to liquidate their holdings through the joint co-operatives on the ground that the separate cultivation of their tiny holdings would not yield either adequate employment or sufficient income. They know, however, that they are in no position to provide either alternative

employment or increase the quantum of employment available for these peasants by forming the joint co-operatives.

All their professed sympathy for the small holders can be no better than crocodile tears when their manoeuvres can only lead millions of small holders, who today are enjoying their self-employment for at least a few days and earning a part of their living through their employment on their holdings, into the membership of joint co-operatives over the management of which they would have little or no say. I am convinced, therefore, that as long as the prospects for alternative or better employment or for a larger quantum of employment in other avocations of life are not adequately developed to absorb all those peasants as are willing to prefer such non-agricultural employment, it would indeed be a great disservice to our national cause of democracy and freedom to intensify the present campaign in favour of joint co-operative farming.

It is the duty of every democratic society, if it wishes to be progressive, to welcome free peasantry, to appreciate their contribution and learn to draw sustenance from their self-employed status and self-reliant productivity for the growth of a fully socialistic decentralised democracy. We wish to sound our warning that all public workers and politicians who are so unjustly castigating us as reactionaries are themselves playing into the hands of totalitarian reactionaries¹ and the new class of economic dictators and would be undermining democratic freedom and social ideals of our nation.

Our peasants are no longer begging for mercy from the rulers of Governments and industries. They are determined to pursue all possible peaceful and organised means to protect their life-giving freedom for self-employment,

1. In this connection, it will be interesting to note the Prime Minister's statement of March 7, 1959 that "people talked of co-operative farming leading to collectivisation and eventually to communism". He did not agree with this diagnosis, but if it did lead to communism, he declared with some heat, "let it lead there".

and socio-economic independence. *They are inspired by the triumphs of Soviet peasants of the U.S.S.R. and South European countries, in gaining the right of co-existence for peasant family economy side by side with co-operative farms and state farms.* They are fully conscious of their historic and constructive role.

REACTIONARY ATTITUDE OF PLANNERS

If the planners cannot appreciate their (peasants) love of freedom as being the granite foundation for our democracy, their approach can only be reactionary. If they do not cherish the self-employed and self-reliant entrepreneurship of the peasant masses, they can only be the high-priests of totalitarianism. If they do not know how to cherish the non-exploiting peasant economy and encourage such decentralised multi-purpose freedom-laden and freedom-sustaining sources of employment, their socialism can lead only to statism, proletarianism and economic slavery. If they wish to convert peasants into single-purpose producers under the cold eyes of supervisory eagles, they will reproduce or intensify all the evils from which the proletariat of the highly industrialised nations, both capitalistic and Soviet, are suffering.

Viewed from whichever angle possible, our planners' attitude of hostility and lack of appreciation towards self-employed masses of peasantry is reactionary. If our society is to grow into a full-fledged democratic society based on social justice, it must continue to encourage this vast masses of self-propelled toilers to display their initiative, enterprise and creative energy in their immeasurable productive activities.

Why do we oppose this proposed transformation? *Because, the Soviet experiences all over the concerned European countries have convinced us that the fate of peasants in the so-called joint farms or co-operative farms is as bad as that of slaves.* *Because, the powers and privileges of the army of managers, supervisors, and all others who have come to be in charge of organisation, supervision and policy-making and labour and office managements have*

gone on encroaching even upon the minimum of freedom, enterprise and initiative² that free toilers should have, if they are to live as human beings. *Because*, all the evils of capitalist-cum-feudalist management of agriculture have come to be reproduced, with much greater intensity and cruelty through the psychological and electoral upsets in the alternative economies that have been tried in Soviet lands and elsewhere. *Because*, peasants have to lose their inalienable and organic freedoms and privileges latent in self-employment that they have come to win by so many struggles throughout the ages. *Because*, the lesson of history of modern industrial and Soviet revolution is that self-employment of toilers is the best and greatest boon that any socialist society can aim at and has so far achieved. *Because*, the Scandinavian countries are certainly the best examples of happy and progressive social democracies, thanks to their democratic and socialist peasant economy clothed in the service co-operative movement.

LAND CERTIFICATES WILL COME TO MEAN NOTHING

We are told that if we agree to go into joint co-operative farms, our *pattas* would not be cancelled and that we would

2. "Members of the commune are directed to lead a collectivised life. Each person must work ten hours and engage in ideological studies for two hours a day. They are entitled to one day of rest every ten days.

"In directing the militarization of organisation, the adoption of combat spirit in action, and collectivisation in livelihood, the CCP committee of the commune has discovered that some minor personal freedom should be granted to the members in order to develop their working enthusiasm to the fullest extent. For this reason, the CCP committee rules that all members are free to use their time as they wish outside of the ten hours of labour and two hours of ideological study each day, that husband and wife may have a room of their own, that members are permitted to make tea and other refreshments in their own quarters for themselves, and that women members may use their spare time to make shoes and mend clothes...

"The commune members have enthusiastically welcomed the small personal freedoms granted them by the CCP committee".
—From a *New China News Agency* report of November 20, 1958.

be entitled to claim some dividend per acre on our holdings. But, let us not forget the fact that, first of all, it is doubtful if such joint farms would yield any net income after paying wages, bonuses and allowances on the lines of similar payments made for factory workers and after meeting the interest charges and paying contributions to the depreciation fund and various other reserves.³ Secondly, even if there were to be some surplus out of which dividend could be declared for the land holdings, it would not take long before the claims of member-workers to their share for the labour contributed would have to be given primacy over the claims of pattadars. Within a short period of five years after

3. "Out of the total production the lion's share goes to the government in the form of what amounts to forced sale at nominal and, it will be recalled, secret prices, payments in kind to the Machine Tractor Station, and payments into the 'invisible' or reserve fund of the individual Kolkhoz. The peasants' claim on agricultural production is definitely the last one to be met..." —*'Terror and Progress in USSR'* by Barrington Moore Jr. (p. 83)

The production and distribution sheet for the year 1947 of a Kolkhoz in his village, given by Mr. Fedor Belov, an Ukrainian, in his book *'The History of a Soviet Collective Farm'* (p. 138) gives dismal reading while strengthening the above statement.

"The total grain harvest of our Kolkhoz in 1947 was 1022 metric tons which were distributed as follows:

Compulsory deliveries	...	...	360.8 m.tons
of which			
arrears from previous years	94.0 m.tons		
initial compulsory delivery	196.8 m.tons		
supplementary delivery	70.0 m.tons		
Payment in kind for MTS work	...	264.0 m.tons	
Advance payments in kind to MTS	...	83.0 m.tons	
Payment in kind for grain haulage in state vehicles	...	47.2 m.tons	
Total grain given up by the kolkhoz		755.0 m.tons	
Allocation to seed fund	...	130.0 m.tons	
Allocation to insurance and forage funds		49.5 m.tons	
Payment to kolkhoz members for labor days	...	87.5 m.tons	
Total harvest of grains		1022.0 m.tons	"

It is interesting to note that the peasants received only 8.45% of the total harvest and about 74% of the harvest was given up by the kolkhoz to the state.

such dividends come to be possible, there would arise an insistent and inescapable demand for the cancellation of payment of dividends on the ground that the land contributions could no longer be treated as of social value. We are sure to lose the capital-value of our lands even if these *pattas* are transferable. So, let us not be deceived by the assurance that we would gain something substantial by the primary recognition by any joint farm co-operative that our land holdings would continue to be recognised.

Whenever joint co-operative farms come to be organised, primary importance would inevitably come to be given to labour contributions and not to land contribution and the services contributed by members would come to be evaluated more on the basis of their labour contribution than on that of land contributed. So, the continuation of the recognition of *pattas* of our peasants would not amount to very much. Once such a co-operative farm comes to be organised, it becomes practically impossible for any of its members to withdraw his land from the farm even if such a right were to be conceded in law in the beginning, because when almost all the land in a village comes to be incorporated in such farms the few peasants who would like to retain their own self-employment would come to be discriminated against in various ways. This has been truly demonstrated by the experience of Soviet peasantry.⁴

4. *Kolkoz*: "Its definition of the Kolkoz as an independent voluntary association of peasants is, however, entirely false. While the statute provides that the Kolkoz be built on the basis of voluntary membership, the overwhelming majority of Kolkozes were organised through coercion. The Government resorted to a variety of methods to achieve full collection, but administrative and economic pressures were decisive. The usual method of organising Kolkozes was as follows:

"On the initiative of Communists, the poorer elements of a village adopted a resolution to organise a Kolkoz. The property of the well-to-do was then confiscated and turned over to Kolkoz. Peasants who actively resisted were arrested and sent into forced labour. Those who, in various ways, tried to avoid joining were deprived of the possibility of buying industrial commodities and were subjected to special taxes. Peasants who joined the Kolkozes received tax exemptions and special

It is easy to say that there is not going to be any coercion in making peasants go into joint farms, but it is not so easy to help peasants to remain self-employed and continue to cultivate their own lands in a self-reliant manner when the whole of the State machinery is geared to encouraging joint co-operative farms by all kinds of subsidies, favours and concessions. Who would bother about the higher production (see Appendix II) achieved by such self-reliant, self-employed peasants, when the general atmosphere generated by the propaganda of the press, the radio and other governmental agencies puts the premia not on production, but on co-operative or collective centralisation of agricultural activities?

When Government is keen on maximising the contributions of agriculture in terms of foodgrains and other crops to industries and not on maximising per acre and per capita production and when the national leadership comes to exaggerate the contributions made by industrial and other urban enterprises and their managements and workers and undermine the importance and utility of similar contributions made by free and self-employed agriculturists,⁵ it is

privileges in marketing 'surplus' and purchasing manufactured goods. In the light of these circumstances, Kolkozoes can hardly be considered voluntary organisations ..

"Their operation is also subject to the strictest Government control and supervision. The Government has not only imposed binding regulations, but it also directs, through periodic orders, their plans of operations and maintains rigid control over their entire administration apparatus."

—*'Soviet Russia Today'*, edited by John L. Stipp, p. 114.

5. Total cropped area increased from 32.59 crores of acres to 36.33 crores of acres (+3.74 crores of acres); and if we assume that an expenditure in cash and in labour etc. of at least Rs. 300 per acre has to be incurred to bring an acre of land under initial type of cultivation, kisans must have invested in bringing all this land under cultivation at least Rs. 1122 crores, that is as much as $\frac{1}{2}$ of the total Second Five Year Plan expenditure ($\frac{1}{3}$ of the First Plan) incurred by all the State and Union Governments and private enterprise in industry and commerce. Surely, the nation ought to be grateful to kisans for so much contribution. (Between 1950-55.)

not difficult to realise how difficult it would be for the self-employed peasantry to continue their independent status and how they come to be socially coerced into falling in line with all others and hugging their slavery to the local organisations.

PREVENT N.E.S. ALSO FROM ENSNARING PEASANTS

We have clamoured for long for some such approach as the National Extension Scheme to bring our villages and self-employed masses within the ambit of the "Welfare State". It is our duty to see that the panchayats and co-operative societies, their non-official and official personnel do try to improve the prospects of our self-employment and cement the mutual relations as between the different sections of our landed and landless peasants and other self-employed peoples.

It is also our duty to take care that this innovation does not prove or is not turned to be one of the engines in this Government set-up of oppression and degeneracy of our peasantry. But, are we quite sure that the present N.E.S. are being developed and utilised solely to promote our creative and fundamental interests? Where is the guarantee that the village level workers, panchayatdars, and directors of co-operative societies and their employees would not be utilised by Government to discourage our peasants, weaken their love of freedom and demoralise their economy by creating splits among themselves and other sections of village folk and make them get disgusted with their peasant economy, and self-employment and prefer,

Moreover, an additional area of 96 lakhs of acres had been brought into irrigation as between 1947-48 and 1955-56 and a minimum expenditure of Rs. 1000 per acre has to be incurred to make it fit for initial irrigation; so kisans must have invested at least Rs. 900 crores on this costly process. Thus, our kisans ploughed into their agricultural self-employment at least Rs. 2082 crores. Surely, this is such a considerable contribution that our agriculturists can be proud of and the nation ought to be grateful to them. (Figures are taken from *India 1958*.)

out of desperation, the enslavement to the officers' regime in the panchayat landlordism or joint farm? How can we be sure that all these new officers will not swoop upon our villages as locusts and discriminate against all such peasants as prefer to espouse the cause of self-employment and the self-employed and abstain from distributing to them manures, implements, seeds, insecticides and credit and other supplies? It is, therefore, the duty of all well-wishers of our peasants to be on their guard and see that at every step no room is given to these new agents of the *Sarkar* (Government) to disrupt and depress our peasants and that they are obliged to serve our agriculturists in a truly constructive manner.

GOVERNMENT IGNORES PEASANTS' GREAT CONTRIBUTION

May we not ask our planners to indicate whatever justification they have for opposing peasant family economy, for ignoring its contribution and for deciding so uncere- moniously against its very existence? Have not our peasants helped our country even after partition has caused the loss of rich canal irrigated lands of West Pakistan and alluvial plains of East Pakistan washed by the Ganga and the Brahmaputra rivers to avoid the repetition of 1943 food famine? How can India's present need for imported foodgrains be quoted against them when for decades before the war India had been importing millions of tons of rice from Burma and other South East Asian countries?⁶

6. *History of Imports of Foodgrains* ("India 1958")

Average annual imports for the

<i>Years</i>	<i>Total in lakh tons</i>
1925-30 (Undivided India)	7.60
1930-35 "	12.70
1935-40 "	13.80
1945 "	17.78
1947	26.54
1949	37.06
1951	47.25
1953	20.03
1955	7.00
1957	37.16

Have not our peasants helped India to minimise considerably her dependence upon Pakistan for jute and cotton? (see Appendix II). Have they not also been producing commercial crops yielding nearly two-thirds of our total foreign exports?⁷ In short, have not our peasants been responsible for increasing the yields per acre and total production of all crops⁸ and in bringing under dry as well as wet cultivation and ploughing back into agriculture maximum quantities of their labour and capital obtained by paying high rates of interest and undergoing semi-starvation? Are they to be penalised now for having failed to insist and obtain remunerative prices for their agricultural produce? Are they to be victimised for having loved their self-employment status and for having sacrificed so much by continuing

“Our total imports in 1957 amounted to Rs. 1025.82 crores. During 1957, India had to import about Rs. 55.39 crores worth of foodgrains. The foodgrains imports thus represented only 5.4 per cent of our total imports...”

“In terms of tonnage, total food production in 1957 was of the order of 68.69 million tons and imports about 3.58 million tons, that is 5.2 per cent. In 1958 the food shortage was about the same order. These figures do not spell disaster considering that Britain had to import food-stuff to the extent of 38% of her total imports in 1957...” (From *The Hindu* ‘Case Against Land Coops & Ceilings.’)

7. Shri B.P.Singh Roy, President of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, addressing the 23rd Annual Session on March 7, 1959, said “... nearly half of our export earnings were derived from commercial crops like tea, jute, oilseeds. The agricultural contents of exported manufactures accounted for another one-fifth of these exports. As much as 70% of our export earnings were thus directly or indirectly derived from agriculture...” This is borne out by a similar statement made by the Food and Agriculture Minister in Parliament.

8. *The Hindu* of Madras says that “In the last ten years Indian agriculture has not done so bad. The country’s food production has gone up in the decade by 25% and when it is realised that much of the irrigation potentials of the major river projects under the First and Second Five Year Plans have not been fully utilised, there seems to be no reason to get impatient at India’s performance in agricultural production.”

to be under-nourished and semi-clothed and overcrowded in their mud-huts, and for having allowed post-swaraj government also to favour all at their cost, the towns, industries, commerce and plan-fed professions?

Surely this imposition of social injustice and exploitation ought not to be further intensified by the destruction and denial of their self-employed status also. If our planners have any sense of justice, they should be grateful to our peasants for making their ever increasing contribution to national production and wealth without even a threat of strike or lock-out and without any higgling over the prices to be paid for their produce.

DYNAMIC AND PROGRESSIVE PEASANTRY

We have stated time and again that our peasants are prepared to accept the challenge of joint farming and co-operative farming and that they are sensible enough to take to these new forms of organising their agricultural activities and utilising their lands and working together if only their unmistakable success would come to be demonstrated in actual practice. They have in the past displayed their capacity for shedding their earlier crop economies and the adoption of production of such new crops as virginia tobacco, cambodia, karunganni and other improved varieties of cotton, new varieties of sugarcane, jowar, wheat and rice, the new crop of groundnut during the past 70 years without very much prompting from scientists, with little or no encouragement from Governments and long before the present N.E.S. was dreamt of by the new ruling groups. They can thus be trusted to take joint farming if only such farming in any group of 20 or 40 villages could be proved to have welded together the farm families concerned into a harmonious community of working people, resulted in the introduction of better crop economy, higher yielding crops, saving of back-breaking labour as well as employment yielding, land utilisation and larger crops, more economical production and higher per capita incomes for all the members of the families concerned. Unfortunately, it has not become

possible for any of the Governments and the new enthusiasts of joint farming to demonstrate how and in what areas so many peasants have come to take to the joint farming and co-operative farming because of its obvious and all-round success over a period of five or ten years.

REAL DESIGNS OF THE PLANNERS

Why are our planners so impatient to start their campaign in favour of joint co-operative farming? Why do they not recognise that it is putting the cart before the horse to raise this campaign in its favour long before its comparative success over peasant family economy is demonstrated? Why have they chosen such an unscientific attitude as to exalt their fancy into a mission and their nostrum into a national campaign? Could it be because they are impatient with their duty to conciliate, coax, educate and win the confidence of the teeming crores of our free peasants to co-operate and yield maximum portions of their total produce from land without expecting any commensurate payments in terms of industrial goods and social services? Could it be possible that these planners wish to be free from the obligation of paying to our peasants such prices for their produce as would assure their parity with non-agricultural masses? Could it be possible that our planners are afraid of our free peasants utilising more and more of their increasing agricultural produce for their home consumption and thus gradually raise their nutritional standards? Are our planners also as anxious as the planners in Soviet lands and industrialists in capitalist countries to feed, clothe, shod and house the urban industrial masses at the cost of the starving peasant masses?

We wish to know as to why our planners are so mad after their national campaign to popularise joint co-operative farming long before its higher productivity is demonstrated. They seem to claim that it will be conducive to higher production per acre. But that has not been demonstrated anywhere either in India or abroad. Both Tito and Gomulka complained of the fall in production totally and

per acre after the co-operativisation of Yugoslavian and Polish agriculture respectively. Hence, their decision to give freedom to their peasants to leave the co-operative farms and hence also the abandonment by more than 75% of peasants of the co-operatives and resumption of the economy.⁹ (see Appendix I.)

DON'T PLAY WITH PEASANT ECONOMY

Are our national planners willing to accept our challenge to await the results of such experiments before they yield to their passion for launching their nation-wide campaigns in favour of joint farming and co-operative farming? Are they willing to warm up towards our peasant farm economy if they find their experiments with co-operative farming are not successful? Will they abandon their dislike and disbelief in our peasants and develop faith and patience in the productive and creative capacity of peasant masses just as we are willing to learn from their experiments with joint farming? Are they willing to apply the principle of equal social justice to our peasants and allow them to enjoy the full fruits of their labour and toil without being exploited

9. "After a period of experimentation and hope, the Yugoslavian Government disbanded the compulsory farm collectives in March 1953 and permitted the peasantry to revert to private farming on privately owned land. The Titoists, to be sure, retain the ingrained Marxist prejudice against capitalist agriculture and arouse the peasant suspicion by occasional sighs for village socialism. But they content themselves with fostering co-operative retail shops, co-operative marketing and co-operative use of machinery and favouring the few remaining voluntary collectives as examples. Despite the uncertain outlook, the heavy taxation of prosperous peasants, and the stark backwardness of farm methods which have prevented Yugoslavia to this day from achieving food self-sufficiency, the situation is a vast improvement for the peasants over collectivisation. For the Government it means relief from the back-breaking, resentment-breeding task of directing and supervising every minute act in the peasants' daily work cycle. The end of imposed collectives has an explosive attraction for Russia's satellites and would have for Russia if the peasants knew about it..."

—Louis Fischer in *"Russia Revisited"*.

by other social circles? Will they refrain from their enthusiasm for these new modes of farm economy which have become outmoded even in the Soviet lands after their large-scale experimentation? Would it be uncharitable to them to entertain the fear that they want to raise the industrial and urban wealth of the country at the cost of our peasantry as a whole by first ensnaring them into joint farms, placing them at the mercy of the new phalanxes of supervisors, accountants and so-called elected bosses and then subjecting them to under-nourishment and other rigours of sub-normal existence? How else are we to account for the unreasonable and inexplicable passion of our planners for this less productive but complicated, more troublesome and anti-peasant mechanism of land use and management of agricultural manpower?

Let there be no doubt as to what our planners wish to achieve. They will not be content with the dispossession of surplus lands of those few thousands of big landholders in any State who may be found to possess holdings above the ceiling limits. They will not be satisfied merely with conferring right of permanency of tenure upon tenants who lease out the lands of defence personnel, disabled people, orphans and widows, nor do they want only the transfer of rights of ownership of all such land to these tenants. They will not stop at experimenting with co-operative farming. They will not await their economic success and social example in democratic and fraternal comradeship to persuade free farmers also to form themselves into other co-operative farms or join the existing co-operative farms. *They will not be reconciled to the co-existence of peasant farm economy and co-operative farm and to the free and healthy competition as between these two agrarian economies. They want to emulate not even the Soviet Russian and South East European Communist evolution of co-existence of both these economies but the commune-oriented Chinese system of agrarian economy, in which the Government and national leadership will mobilise all their resources, coercive, persuasive and mobwise, to drive masses of peasants into the*

collectives, to be named in India as joint farms, co-operative farms and State farms. They want to degrade all in the villages to the parlous position of wage slavery.

FALSE CLAIMS OF THE PLANNERS

Our planners also claim that it would help our peasants to achieve larger incomes and higher standard of living. But they have not so far demonstrated how it could be achieved when actually so many of them would be put out of employment because of rationalisation that will inevitably be coming in the wake of co-operativisation and in the absence of any alternative employment. The total quantum of employment cannot be increased through co-operativisation even if in certain cases it does not cause unemployment.

Co-operativisation is also wrongly claimed to benefit landless people. The total land available in any village cannot be increased. The crop economy, however rearranged, cannot step up production, because of the weakening of incentives for higher and better individual effort. The supervisory bossing can only excite obstruction and indifference from the working members in receipt of wages. So, it is impossible to imagine how the incomes of landless agricultural workers can be pushed up while the total earnings of all can only tend to come down due to the abolition of peasant management of agriculture.

That these new economies cannot result in higher production and their effective functioning is being ensured only by allowing peasants to enjoy self-employment on their private kitchen-gardens has been demonstrated by the experiences of Soviet Russia and South Eastern European countries. Their failure to raise the standard of living of peasants has also been writ large on their post-war social history. Wherever a free choice has been given to peasants to display their preferences, they have preferred only the peasant family economy. Hence, also our demand that they should only be experimented with on as large a scale as possible at first on the hitherto unoccupied lands and next on such peasant lands whose owners are

insured against risks of failure and assured the freedom to withdraw from such experiments after giving one year's notice.

CO-OPERATIVISATION BREEDS CONFLICTING INTERESTS AND TOP HEAVY BUREAUCRACY

On the other hand, co-operativisation may lead to conflicts between the supervisor and member-workers, between the board of directors and supervisors and member-workers and also between members who contribute land and draw dividends (rents) therefrom in addition to wages and those of the members who only contribute labour. If we are to judge from the working of the present tens of thousands of co-operative societies of all types in different parts of India, joint co-operative farms would create endless problems of disputes over elections, financial irregularities, mismanagement, frictions in dealing with labour, crop planning and final allocation of incomes in cash and kind as between various necessities and their uses. Every such dispute will invite the unwelcome, fearful, and disruptive governmental interference and its ammunitions of groupism, casteism and nepotism. Besides, joint co-operative farming will superimpose, what is now freely obtainable from peasants, the costly concomitant of large-scale management, that is overhead charges. Therefore, joint co-operative farming would only give rise to costly and painful problems, lead to loss of incentives for better and bigger activity and result in higher production costs, lower aggregate yields and unsocial and disruptive mutual relations among agriculturists and managements. *It will also give a further fillip to the growth of a "new class" of bosses, supervisors, directors, planners, auditors and accountants who will prove to be more burdensome and freedom-killing than the earstwhile zamindars.*¹⁰

10. *Soviet Kolkhoz*: "Some idea of the enormous number of people in Government and party organs of district and regional centres that are engaged in controlling Kolkhoz activities can be gained from the fact that, for the 27000 Kolkhozes of the eastern Ukraine, there were over 29000 responsible officers in control agencies. Although friction between party and

For instance, the Government of India indicated that to man 3,000 co-operative farming societies about 400 inspectors and 3,000 farm managers with high qualifications would be needed on the basis of one inspector to eight societies and one manager to every society. They will be asked to do "some farm work too" to free them from "white collar mentality".

Let us examine another consequence of the declaration made by many of our planners that our peasant economy should be replaced by joint farming. It means that even after the introduction of ceilings upon our landholdings, there is no permanency for the rights of our peasant proprietors to continue to use their holdings with any sense of security and freedom as the means for their independent employment. They cannot hereafter hope to find independent living and freedom from exploitation in their employment through the cultivation of their holdings. They are threatened with the loss of their freedom to find free and growing expression for their personality, initiative and enterprise by working on their holdings. They will be denied the right to employ and lead themselves in the company of the members of their families. They will become, in short, enslaved to the Jagannath of nation-wide bureaucratic machine of employment and economic production in the same way as the industrial workers have come to be in the Sovietised or capitalistic parts of the world. They will have to work under bosses appointed by managers, who, in their turn, come to be appointed by political or economic agents of their national regimes. Whatever opportunities, some of them would be vouchsafed to display either

Government organs does not, under Soviet conditions, assume the character of open conflict, the position of Kolkos in such an inter-departmental struggle is, nevertheless, quite complicated.

"The third member of the 'triangle', the Kolkos itself was at first helpless object. The Kolkos peasant is completely removed from the control in the organisation of production. He must play merely the passive role of a labour unit. All Kolkos affairs are decided by the District Executive Committee and the District Committee."

—*Soviet Russia Today*', edited by John L. Stipp, p. 122.

initiative or enterprise, would be conditioned by the decisions made by masters imposed upon them and also their whims and fancies. They can no longer be free producers nor can they be creative personalities. *They will come to suffer from all the disabilities and sociological debilities by being degraded into mere cogs of the national economic machine from which today crores and crores of industrial masses of the West have been suffering.*

KISAN SAMMELAN'S STAND

The Kisan Sammelan has repeatedly stated that it would have no objection to experiments being made with joint farming and co-operative farming in different States on Government lands and lands acquired after the imposition of ceilings and on bhoodan lands (see Appendix III). We have indeed no objection to such of our kisans as are keen on making their own experiments with these forms of utilising their lands with a view to increasing the productivity of their lands and enhancing their standard of living. In fact, the kisan movement has been doing its best in many States to maintain the faith of our peasants in such co-operative efforts in respect of their initial disappointments and heart-rending internal disputes in so many of these experiments. But, what we have found is that in most of these cases of co-operative or joint farming, the groups of farmers who have come together could not remain united as a unit of co-operative community. They have indulged in heart-rending internal disputes. They have had to invoke the interference of co-operative department, the intervention of police, courts and revenue authorities. In too many cases, Government has had to interfere in their internal affairs. And its officers and their partisans have found it a rich source of political and other influence and power over the activities of the members of such societies not only in the management of those societies, but also in their social and political life.

PROVED ADVANTAGES OF PEASANT ECONOMY

Why do we want the protection and promotion of peasant economy? *Because*, it is the progressive responsibility of our society to help them to sustain their existing quota of economic freedom as the very essence of a democratic society. *Because*, peasant family economy provides social security for the children, the aged and the infirm and the under-employed dependents in the least expensive and most affectionate manner. *Because*, it relieves society from the onerous responsibilities of finding employment, supervisory labour, managing agricultural activities of more than 50% of the working population of India. *Because*, it yields the best economic results, consistently with freedom. *Because*, it has come to be the most efficient means of producing more per acre.¹¹ *Because*, it has eliminated most processes of exploitation and supervision and consequent overhead costs and social evils of feudal or capitalist or Soviet economies of utilising land and organising agriculture. *Because*, it has given rise to the constructive and revolutionary socio-economic mechanism of service co-operatives of the Scandinavian and Japanese pattern to provide just the needed degree

11. Shri M.R. Masani, M.P., speaking on 16th February, 1959 in the Parliament said that "the two countries with big farms in the world are the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., both have relatively very low yields of wheat. The U.S.A. produces 12.1 quintals per hectare and the U.S.S.R. 9.3. Now compare against those two giant farming systems and small farms. In the U.K., with small farms, the figure is 28.5 quintals per hectare, in Denmark—smaller still—it is 344 quintals and in Japan—whose average holdings were less than ours—the figure is 22.6 quintals per hectare or twice as much as in the U.S.A. and 2½ times that in the U.S.S.R. . .

"The U.S.A. produces 28.3 quintals of rice per hectare and the U.S.S.R. produces 25. Japan, again with smaller farms, produces 48.5 quintals per hectare twice as much."

From a study made by the Indian Agricultural Institute of Sugarcane Production he said "ploughing by bullocks yielded 410 maunds of sugarcane, ploughing with tractor farming up to 6 inches 361.5 maunds, with tractor farming up to 10 inches 356.0 maunds". Therefore, bullock-ploughing proved to be the most economical.

of cohesion and integration as between these decentralised and democratic productive agencies of agriculture, namely farm families. *Because*, it has demonstrated its ability to survive the terrible Soviet terrorism and to win from the Soviet masters, its right for co-existence.

We are convinced that it is the best social instrument that human history has so far fashioned out to assure society of maximum production from agriculture. *It assures individual members of peasant families the largest degree of social freedom and economic independence.*

DEMOCRATIC WORLD SUSTAINS SELF-EMPLOYED PEASANTRY

The tendency in all other parts of the democratic world is for placing more and more reliance on the peasant family economy. So many of us all over the world used to have idealistic faith before 1950 in the possible advantages of joint farming and co-operative farming because of the inadequate information available. We have come to know only much later how in Soviet lands the big peasants were first liquidated under the charge of being kulaks and then the middling peasants were got rid of, as being obstructionists to the co-operativisation and such of the poor peasants who were peasant-minded, that is, who loved their self-employment status as being as dear to them as the passion of the Communist to liquidate peasantry¹² were castigated as enemies of the people and driven into slave camps, etc. Where is the guarantee that any or all those inhuman

12. "...Every village in Russia had been the scene of bitter internal strife... animals slaughtered or allowed to die... grain barns and houses burned... That Summer I drove nearly 200 miles across country through land that was lost to weeds and through villages that were empty..." (p. 167) as admitted by Walter Durant later.

"...Stalin told Churchill 10,000,000 peasant households have to be liquidated..." (p. 165) from *Churchill's Memoirs*.— as quoted in 'Khrushchev and Stalin's Ghost' by Betram D. Wolfe.

measures are not in the offing in our country or are not likely to be countenanced by the Nagpur-Messiahs, who seem to be more keen on welcoming the plaudits of Communists than on heeding the yearnings and warnings of free-peasantry? We are, therefore, obliged to reorient our political attitudes, regarding the roles of different sections of our peasantry and other self-employed masses in the socialist democracy that we stand for.

FATE OF PEASANTS IN SOVIET KOLKOZES AND SOLKOZES

The fate of the co-operative and collective farms which had been organised on so large a scale in the Soviet countries has revealed their comparative failure to increase the productivity of lands or the yields of different crops. The Soviet co-operative farms have also failed to raise the standard of living of the toilers engaged on such crops, or to retain the loyalty of the farmers. On the other hand, the recent history of Soviet lands is replete with instances of large-scale abandonment of these new but unwanted forms of joint or co-operative farm economy. The withdrawal on a large scale of the great mass of peasantry from their embraces wherever and whenever freedom has been given to the members of such farms to make their choice as between joint and co-operative farming and family farm economy, has opened our eyes to their utter unsuitability to agricultural economy. In fact, *there has been a revulsion or retreat from co-operative farming to peasant farming, since the latter is free from the evils of bossing, bureaucracy and wage slavery even under the so-called elected management.*

In Soviet Russia, for instance, there has not been any evidence of an increase in the number of peasants who are willing to exchange their kolkoz (so-called co-operative farms) to solkoz (state farms) even though the members of the former are denied social security, etc. So the better paid State employment is not as pleasing as the membership of the less favoured co-operative farms. Why? Because, the Soviet peasants prefer kolkoz with their

attenuated freedom of the group to the solkozes without any freedom of any kind. So, the Government has had to continue its process of making concessions to the irrepressible yearning of the Soviet peasants of the third generation for larger and larger quantum of farm family economy. It had to allow more and more of them to develop their own so-called kitchen gardens or small holdings of 1/2 acre to 2 acres per family and permit their old folk to work on those allotments as an insurance of premium for the success of kolkozes.

According to the latest reports, more than half of the dairy animals of Soviet Russia are thus owned by the peasants and maintained on their small holdings and their products sold in the so-called free markets.¹³ Similarly, large quantities of vegetables, notably, potatoes and pig and chicken meat are also being produced with the help of their small holdings, and are being marketed by such peasants in the kolkoz markets. This is the irrefutable experience of Soviet Russia after it has treated its peasant masses so mercilessly for more than three decades, sacrificed such large section of them at the altars of its idealistic co-operative and collective farm economies and its ambition to build up its industrial prosperity on the limitless exploitation of peasantry. As a matter of sheer survival, the Soviet masters have had to yield to the unconquerable passion of peasants for a modicum of self-employment, economic freedom and social hegemony.¹⁴

13. "Although the private plots constituted only 5% of the area under collective cultivation in pre-war years, they accounted for about 20% of the total agricultural production of the country at that time. More than half of the livestock in the country was then in private hands..." As published in *Bolshevik* in December 1951 and quoted by Barrington Moore Jr. in *'Terror and Progress in USSR'*.

14. "Throughout the experience of collectivised agriculture in the USSR there runs the theme of the subterranean struggle between the traditional peasant work unit, the family and Communist attempts to impose a new form of organisation which the peasants continually seek to subvert and refashion in the image of the traditional form." *'Terror and Progress in USSR'* by Barrington Moore Jr. p. 89.

AGRICULTURAL LABOUR

Our peasants are ready to do their best to raise the social status and economic freedom of agricultural workers. But to ask them to give up their self-employment and whatever economic freedom they now enjoy in order that our agricultural workers may be helped to approximate themselves to their degraded position is to pervert socialism. We say that this approach is the denial of social justice. We maintain that it is the duty of the whole of society and not merely that of our peasants to undertake the responsibility of improving their conditions. It is not only agriculture but also all other industries and services which should make their contribution to their welfare. We solicit the rest of our society to co-operate with us in shouldering the burden of their protection and progress.

The Kisan Sammelan has been pleading, ever since 1935, that all the unoccupied Government lands and all such surplus lands of zamindars which would be fit for cultivation should be distributed freely among the families of local agricultural workers. Instead of following that policy, Congress Governments have been granting large slices of such lands to the big landholders through auction sales and other means. We demand once again that Government should be willing to spend enough to make such lands fit for cultivation, bring such of them as are within the commandable zones of irrigation projects (major and minor) under irrigable conditions and to advance adequate working capital to the allottees—agricultural workers—to help them to develop productive cultivation.

There is available for allotment more than one-tenth of the total cultivable land, that is 540 lakhs of acres, apart from 597 lakhs of acres of fallow land and the Dandakaranya area (90 lakhs of acres to be cultivated in the Second Plan period) is only a part of it. Just as the East Bengal refugees are being rehabilitated there at a cost of Rs. 10 crores up to 1961, so also sizable sections of landless agricultural workers can be granted small holdings from out of these lands, besides the so-called bhoodan and gramdan

lands, to serve the double purpose of establishing them as self-employed peasants and providing some secure and independent means of employment and living. Why is the Government not anxious to pursue such a constructive policy?

Till today, lakhs of acres of such land lying within irrigation project areas are allowed to remain unirrigated because of Government's unwillingness or inability to afford minimum facilities to these poor kisans. As if this callous indifference has not sufficiently depressed the landless agriculturists, the Nagpur leaders have gratuitously refused to grant individual holdings to these land-hungry people but offered to take them only as member-workers of the promised joint co-operative farms, thus giving the go-bye to the oft repeated offer of raising them to be self-employed small-holders. *The Kisan Sammelan on the other hand demands that, as far as possible and whenever desired, the local landless agricultural families should be allotted, through some impartial procedure, separate and small holdings with freedom to cultivate them separately and thus become landowning, self-employed peasants.* It is only through this means that the hitherto landless kisans can be raised to the status of the other landholding kisans.

It is as well for our public and the press to note a few salient facts regarding the relative positions of landed and landless kisans. The former number about four times as many as the latter (1673 vs. 448 lakhs). If we take into consideration the tenants (316 lakhs), who are also self-employed but who do not as yet own their holdings, then the total self-employed kisans are more than four times as many as the agricultural workers (1989 vs. 448 lakhs). We are all too keen on strengthening the rights and status of tenants and, therefore, the Kisan Sammelan has long been pressing for a just reduction in rents and also for a long enough tenure over the lands so that tenants can have security of tenure and incentives to produce more and assurance of large enough remuneration for their labour.

More than everything else, the Swaraj Government has been clamouring for more and more production and

dared to quote the example of China and other countries for their higher production per acre. But it has failed miserably, when compared to those countries, to provide at least the minimum of armour and assistance to our peasants, so badly needed by them, so universally offered to farmers in other countries. These Governments, manned by ministries whose majorities are due to peasants' overwhelming support, have been doing their worst to weaken and subvert the peasant economy and to mount the economic offensives and social rivals against them. They have even gone to the extent of accusing our peasants as obstructionists, hoarders and black-marketeers. They have used their so-called "food subsidies" not to serve both the consumers and producers but only to subsidize the purchase of foreign foodgrains at much higher prices and thus depress prices of our foodgrains and debilitate our peasants.

MEANING OF SOCIALISM?

Why do we want socialism? Surely, it is not to lose whatever freedom our producers have come to achieve through ages of revolutionary striving against so many systems of exploitation but to increase the area of that freedom. We want socialism so as to be freed from all engines of exploitation to lead a peaceful life in creative and constructive social endeavour and to have opportunities to enjoy maximum felicity in fruitful co-operative efforts within one's family companionship. Socialism cannot be desired, nor has it been desired by the socialist sages of the world for imposing regulations, controls and managerialism upon those toilers who make constructive contribution to the production and social well-being of society and from whom there can be no threat to the freedom and happiness of any other section of society. How could, therefore, the present efforts of our planners be reconciled to socialism, when what they scheme to do against our peasantry could only subvert their free economy and rob them of their economic independence? *While expressing their horror at the prospects of distributing poverty by the imposition of ceilings on professional*

and urban incomes and hoarding of property, these Sino-socialist-minded planners have no compunction to plan for the communization of all our holdings and dragooning all kisans, landed and landless, into the same miserable status of wage slavery under the so-called elected bosses of co-operative farms.

Let our peasants take heed that there can now be no doubt, thanks to the Nagpur thesis, that our policy-makers are out to pursue their anti-peasant, anti-self-employment plans. They want us all to become the politico-economic slaves of their Soviet-oriented socialism.

COMMUNIST AND SOCIALIST EXTENSIONS OF CONGRESS

It is interesting to know that the Communist Party and the P.-S.P. have hastened to rush to the rescue of our national planners in their ideological struggle with all of us, the self-employed masses of this country, for the propagation of their cult of co-operative farming. We need not be surprised at their happiness over this premature campaign of our planners because they have been wedded to this means of liquidating free peasantry for which their gurus (teachers) from Marx to Mao Tse-tung have been exhorting them to achieve. But, what is surprising, however, is that these planners who claim to be democrats and who loudly profess their anxiety to keep their campaign for joint co-operative farming entirely voluntary and never to mistake collectives for co-operatives are so happy over these professed embraces from parties who have been traditionally anti-peasant and passionately yearning for liquidation of peasantry and for transforming agriculture from the enterprise of the self-employed into the factory enterprises on land.

It is also interesting to know that just as the Communists and the P.-S.P. have been hastening to demonstrate their affection for this new cult of our planners, several other Indian parties, who draw their emotional inspiration from the Indian roots of family economy and rural society, are just as passionately opposing this challenge against our

self-employed status. It is the irony of things that the very political parties in which we reposed our confidence, because of their patriotic traditions as against the internationalist parties, have now adopted the credo, so far as our peasants and rural economy are concerned, of the Communists and Socialists of Marxist inspiration and are now running their suicidal race with the Communist Party in their attempts to liquidate our freedom and independence, enterprise and initiative which are all embodied in our self-employed status.

BEWARE OF THE NEW VESTED INTEREST

Our policy-makers and their press and protagonists are following the familiar Soviet method of attacking their critics as the champions of vested interests. Let us remind them that the great majority of our kisans and kalakars earn much less than the lakhs of upper subordinate clerks who are in the employ of Government and industrial sector and that they do not enjoy so much social immunity from economic blizzards as the industrial proletariat. Therefore, we need not be afraid of championing the kisans' cause. Let us also tell them that it is they who have been politically benefiting by protecting the owners of sugar mills and other industrial concerns, owning huge landed and other properties, while pretending to exempt their properties and incomes for the sake of so-called higher production.

Today the presidents and members of village panchayats, block parishads and co-operative societies and licensees under the controls have come to be the most powerful elements in rural life. Large sections of them are being converted by Government into a new vested interest, endowed with its power and influence. They are consequently becoming its dependents. They are the political and economic offspring of our planned economy. Whatwith the officers, experts, V.L. Workers of NES and the executive secretaries, supervisors, maistris etc., of co-operative farms and officers of village panchayats, two-million strong agents of the Government are soon to feast upon our rural economy. The

latest AICC deliberations (10.5.59) indicate how this new move can be utilised for political advantage. So, *these planners and rulers are fast coming to be the leaders of this new vested interest and they want to enlarge their powers by encroaching upon our freedoms.* It is we who are out to fight this new vested interest and who want equal social justice. *Whoever comes forward to fighting this new and dangerous vested interest of unparalleled power and exploitation, places himself in the vanguard of socialist construction and democratic freedoms.*

OUR ALTERNATIVE

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, and lesser dignitaries on the side of co-operative farming challenge us to show the alternative to their nostrum of co-operative farming. The best alternative is to promote the self-employed sector and the self-governing economy of the self-employed peasantry. Liberate them from the vicious laws of key services and production under duress. Let there be parity economics.

We maintain that so far the self-employed peoples and especially peasants have only been imposed upon, exploited and enslaved but never protected or promoted throughout history. The landlords and their governments, the merchants and money-lenders and their Kautilyan Calvinistic and mercantalist courts and administrators have only sought to squeeze out the juice from out of the fruits of their labour and keep them continually impoverished. The growing urban populations and the rising industries and their hand-maiden, modern commerce and world markets have reinforced the feudalistic and imperialistic anti-peasant processes of draining rural economies and their principal wealth-yielding elements of self-employed peasantry and artisans. Even in the West they have had to succumb under these blood-letting processes and make way before the large-scale economies of the present industrial-cum-commercial age.

The British tried but in vain to sweep away the Indian peasant economy and graft their familiar Western method of feudal-cum-commercial land economy upon the stumps of Moghul jagirdari system through the permanent settlement for landlords in the major portion of India. But the Indian peasant masses continued to struggle and hark back to their centuries-old independent ownership of holdings and self-employment status.

When the Western industrial economy came to demand ever larger production of commercial crops for its manufacture, the Western imperialists just tried to introduce plantation—large-scale agricultural production in all their Asian possessions. But they soon found that it would not do the trick. They also discovered that the jagirdari and zamindari systems also could not cope up with the new demands for expanding production. So, in country after country, they have had to try to reinstate the peasantry in partial or full possession of their holdings, assure them either security of tenure and freedom from fitful evictions or peasant proprietorship. Munro recognised by 1815 the peasant proprietorship of the South Indian peasants but the North Indian peasants had to wait till 1950 to regain that status. The British also tried to control their exploitation by money-lenders and offer some protection from the ravages of famines.

Throughout the ages, from Kautilya to Manu, from Akbar and Todar Mal's settlement to Gandhijee's ultimatum to Irwin, all that the best Governments in India were expected to offer to our peasants was to set a limit to their demands upon peasants. There was so little mention of what the Governments had done or were expected to do to lighten the rigours of peasants' life or to promote agrarian economy or to strengthen the springs of their prosperity and happiness, beyond the performance of police functions.

The British began to realise, in the last quarter of their sway over India, that if only some incentives were offered and some protection from the levies of the State could be assured, Indian peasants could be trusted to produce all the agricultural produce demanded by their industries. So, they offered not to enhance land revenue demand except once in 20 or 30 years, and then too, the enhancement if any would not be more than $18\frac{3}{4}\%$. They also offered never to evict any peasant, except for failure to pay land revenue and then too, the land could only be auctioned and not confiscated.

The Indian peasant movement has been demanding since the successful inauguration of Rooseveltian New Deal for agriculture and its core, the policy of price-stabilisation and price-supports as the best incentive for continued and rising production from land in the most economical manner. And when the experts of even the British Government underwrote that demand, we felt confident that Swaraj Government would give it top priority. To our great disappointment the Swaraj Government has failed to adopt any such protective policy. It has, by irony of fate, begun to devise plans and policies which are calculated to undermine and ultimately to liquidate the peasant economy as a whole. It has thought of co-operation, not to shield and strengthen peasant economy, but to decapitate it and fill its place by a form of co-operation which has so far failed to serve either peasants or national interests of any large country in the world. Can there be a greater betrayal of the hopes of the national revolutionaries with peasant-moorings or of the greatest sources of strength of the national movement and the broadest foundation of Indian democracy.

The Rural Credit Survey made by the Reserve Bank of India has indicated what has to be done to resuscitate our peasants and how little has so far been done in that direction both by the co-operative movement and Government. So, it has recommended that large-scale assistance should be given by Government to the co-operative credit and other aspects of co-operative movement only to protect and strengthen peasants as such and help them to enjoy their peasant proprietorship and gain higher prices. It has not contemplated the possibility of the Government replacing peasant economy by co-operative farming.

It is but natural for those of us peasants who have built up the peasant movement since 1920, to expect the Swaraj Government of India to begin to give active assistance to our peasant masses, besides offering protection from the exploitation of key services and from the ravages of famines and floods, pests, cattle epidemics, and such other wasting calamities. We have been confidently

expecting that with a planned economy, it would become more possible for our Government to give maximum promotional assistance to our peasants. We hoped that incentives for higher and better production and more intensive and effective cultivation, would come to be fully stimulated for the benefit of our national economy.

Till now our Government has not begun to implement even the minimum programme of protection and promotion of peasant economy. It has not made any careful study of the basic and constructive role that peasants' self-employment plays in our national economy.

It has not so far assured protection from failures of crops caused by drought or floods or frost and there is not an attempt made to organise crop insurance or cattle insurance. It has not even undertaken the responsibility of assuring remunerative price-levels for even the principal crops. Indeed, it has not cared to estimate the costs of cultivation and remunerative levels of prices, which have to be based upon its estimates of costs of cultivation. Its so-called rabi and kharif crop campaigns, initiated in 1958-59 have had a sorry finale because of its admitted failure to meet even a portion of the mounting demands of our wide-awake peasantry for the promised tested-seeds, fertilizers, implements, pesticides, etc. On the other hand, the burdens of taxation upon our peasantry, both direct and indirect, have been trebled. The drain of peasants' resources, through the mounting inflation, imposition of unremunerative prices for foodgrains through the anti-peasant operations of Essential Commodities Acts and rising real costs of urban products and services has been on the increase. That our country-side is being continually impoverished is indicated for instance by the failure of house construction in rural areas, when compared to the phenomenal rise in the number and size and quality of new houses in urban areas and also by the great and growing disparity in the poor and static earnings of even self-employed peasants, not to speak of landless agricultural workers and the ever-rising incomes of urban people.

Sri Jawaharlal Nehru said "Land has been experimented upon by everyone for thousands of years" (28-3-59). Too true. But with what object? To exploit the peasants! By whom? By Governments and their leaders, landlords, merchants industrialists and by all key services. Certainly, peasants have been experimenting on land, for making it yield bigger, more varied and ever fresh crops, and for protecting, improving, nursing and cherishing it. Peasants had not been known to have destroyed or neglected her needs for manures, water, ploughing or husbanding. On the other hand, every class and cadre of rulers and type of Government has been mostly busy to squeeze out her very essence through peasants, her most devoted comrades.

This is the secret of history. Can our Planning Commission or the Cabinet deny this historic fact? There are yet a few more experiments to be made on land. They are long overdue. One of them is the proffered national campaign for the organisation and strengthening peasants' co-operatives, now christened by the rulers as the service co-operatives. We have long been working in this direction, of organising peasants' co-operatives for the supply of credit—long-term (mortgage) medium-term and short-term—, for the supply of improved seeds, fertilizers, modern implements and raw materials needed for those implements, iron, steel, cement, deisel oil, kerosine oil, cattle-feeds, and for storing, marketing and processing various agricultural produce and also for the supply of consumers' goods. Those of us who have devoted so much of our time as could be spared from the Swaraj struggle to making co-operative movement popular and democratic did not get much encouragement from so many of the present ruling groups in the Congress. We prevailed upon the Congress once Swaraj was achieved to adopt Co-operative Commonwealth as its ideal for Swaraj India's economy. But the present official leaders were then not so enthusiastic about that new ideal because they could not visualise the potentialities of co-operation, when harnessed to the self-employed economy of the majority of our masses. We have met with so little

encouragement and not so little obstruction from the Swaraj Governments during the past eleven years of freedom, notwithstanding the liberal paragraphs included in the Plan Reports in favour of co-operation. The good intentions of many a minister have come to be nullified by the political machinations of various elements in the ruling circles and the bureaucratic agents of the co-operative departments. Positive harm was done by their undue and unwanted interference in the elections and day-to-day administration of the co-operative societies. So, we hail this national campaign of 1959, being sponsored by our dynamic Prime Minister in favour of service co-operatives. Let us hope that at least under his inspiration, registration of new co-operatives and admission of new members will become easier; encouragement to non-credit-worthy peasants will become possible, interference in elections and management of co-operatives by official and ministerial agents will be reduced and the need for societies to resort to courts and their writs, for Government to supercede societies and prosecute co-operators will be removed. If the Government succeeds in all this, it will be achieving a wonderful beginning towards the uplift of our peasantry within this "Plan Regime". We are prepared to offer our heartiest co-operation to the Prime Minister in this valiant venture.

Unfortunately, this very good and welcome contribution of Nagpur Congress has been sought to be prefaced by the threat, that the success of service co-operatives is to lead the nation ultimately to replace peasant economy by co-operative farm economy. This threat is a needless one. This ultimate goal is not instinct with the service co-operatives as exemplified by the success of Danish co-ops in strengthening self-employed peasantry. It is most unwise, to say the least, to have immersed the seeds of service co-operatives at the very source in the poisonous atmosphere of co-operative farming. By the very juxtaposition of their relative places in that fateful Nagpur resolution, the Prime Minister has pre-conditioned (pre-natal treatment) the good move for service

co-operatives by the suicidal move for co-operative farming. This is indeed a tragedy.

Let us, however, see what contribution the service co-operatives (including single-purpose and multi-purpose societies) can make to the strengthening of peasant economy and alleviating the general poverty of our peasant masses. It is a notorious fact that the great majority of our peasant masses are heavily indebted. They are also obliged to be dependent for more than 75% of their debts—including working capital—upon usurious loans carrying 18 to 36% interest. If, by any magic wand, our Prime Minister can succeed, with all our assistance, to liberate them from this blight and afford them all the credit needed for purely productive purposes, during the good and bad seasons at six per cent interest, he can certainly raise their annual incomes by at least 10% on the average. For want of a timely and cheap enough supplies of agricultural needs, our peasants suffer at least 10% losses of their prospective incomes. Through the wastage allowed by present methods of or lack of means for fighting pests, epidemics and rats, locusts and cranes, peasants sustain at least another 10% losses.

It is admitted by all concerned that our present marketing methods and agencies absorb anything between 20 to 40% of the market prices and these costs can and ought to be halved. Similarly, the present methods of storing agricultural products cost 100% more than necessary. Surely, another 10% can be added if only the consumers' needs of peasants can be channelled through efficient and honest co-operative stores. Thus, at the most conservative estimate, we can assure the Prime Minister that Governments and all of us, working through the service co-operatives, can help our peasant masses, through healthy competition with the usual sources of supply of these services, to increase what have come to be possible so far as their normal incomes by at least 50%. That would mean the raising of our national income by more than Rs. 2,400 crores. Surely, that will be a heroic enough achievement and that will enable us

more effectively not to "accept the fact of the poverty of our agricultural classes continuing."

To insure peasants against the ravages of famines caused by droughts, floods, pests and cattle epidemics and let the whole society shoulder at least 50% of their incidence will go a long way to remove the biggest factor that never allows Indian peasants to get "out of this morass of poverty". Up till now, we have only considered experiments which will not in any way affect consumers of foodgrains, etc. and so, Governments need not be afraid that their special proteges may oppose any such national experiments.

Even more effective, urgent and practicable experiment, that almost all democratic countries of the West have made with nationally good results, is to raise the agricultural prices to the same level as those of industrial prices and commercial and professional remunerations, as per a more just and reliable index computations. If the Prime Minister is willing to extend his broad-mindedness, let him make bold as President Roosevelt did in 1930, to allow agricultural prices to rise by at least 25% so as to reach parity with the incomes of all other toilers in towns. This experiment has never been tried in India despite the 30 years' long demand of the kisan movement.

We can assure him and the nation that once this 75% rise in the annual incomes of our peasant masses comes to be achieved through such constructive, productive and positive experiments, the productive capacity, creative energy and will to work more and achieve better results of our peasant masses can come to be doubled. So, our total agricultural contribution to national wealth will increase through a progressive chain reaction, by leaps and bounds.

Moreover, let our Planning Commission compute the possible impact of such a progressive rise in peasants' incomes upon the end products (consumers' goods) of manufactures and its healthy chain reactions. Let them

remember that the biggest-ever and life-giving device that Roosevelt used in 1930 to revive the prostrate American industry, was the parity price economy and the sudden increase of 25% in agricultural prices. Indeed the adoption of such a policy will enable them to provide additional employment in urban avocations for at least 15% more of our rural landless labour. Therefore, it is high time that Government and its national leaders begin to examine what can be and ought to be done to strengthen the lifespings of our peasant economy and enable it to yield better and bigger results and thus contribute more to our national wealth before they hasten to promote alternatives to uproot and replace it. But, alas, they do not seem to be anxious to do any such thing.

Till now, no national effort has been made in our country to safeguard, strengthen and cherish the self-employed peasant as a nationally productive and progressive agent of production and social management. Not even universal elementary education, or rural communications or protected rural water-supply or rural housing have been vouchsafed to him. Yet he has so far played a progressive role in tune with the much better protected and cherished industrialist and professional and industrial toilers. Let the Prime Minister try this great experiment—unique in Indian annals—*of helping the self-employed peasant to stand on his own feet, to be freed from the exploitation of both man-made institutions of commerce, industry and professions and their benefactors and armours, Governments and to gain his proper share and power in the benefits of this much-lauded planned economy.* We can assure him that this will yield phenomenally good results and strengthen the roots of Indian democracy and the avenues of people's freedom. Let us not forget that it is wiser to widen a well-trodden path that has scope for greater width, strength and perspective. It is prudent to use the open door, rather than try to scale the wall for the mere adventure of scaling, forgetting the main purpose.

So, the best alternative to this proffered innovation of co-operative farming is the self-employed peasant himself,

buttressed as he must be by the service co-operatives and all other insurances. It is unjustifiable for our rulers to hastily and wrongly turn their backs on this great institution of self-employed peasant, which has been tempered by the buffetings of history and steeled against the worst calamities and risks.

This is not a single-purpose institution as is a professional employee or an industrial proletariat. It is a multi-purpose family organisation. It does not need a costly or complicated managerial set-up or organisational overheads. It is self-propelled. It is self-managed. The family is its area of labour-relations. The family bonds of affection, discipline and capacity for mutual adjustments, overcoming momentary or occasional misunderstandings or grouches help it to maintain the unity of purposes of production and living. Even the Prime Minister has at last come to recognise its inherent values and has therefore urged that a number of families should come together and form a joint family co-operative farming. All he has to do is to recognise yet another crucial truth that it is best to rely on the self-employed peasant and allow more and more of them to live in their self-employed sector, without the costly and troublesome worries of statutorily bound, and regulated and politically propelled co-operative farm.

Let it not be forgotten that it is not a better alternative to offer to our peasants paper-bonds for their holdings, in place of their existing privileges of finding free employment on them and working on their own in company with the members of their families in the production of various crops under the inspiration of the best possible incentives for the highest production, etc. After all, peasants have so far come to look upon their holdings, also as the surest and stablest security of property and have, therefore, invested all their labour and earnings in their fertility and improvements as well as land values. Would those investments continue to be currency after the holdings come to be merged in the co-operative farm? Would not the land values begin to slump steeply as soon as peasants come to realise what is at stake? Is not the

prospect of such a steep fall in land values of such terrific magnitude ? After all, the total wealth, as represented by the land values is comparably greater than all other properties. The proffered issue of certificates by co-operative farms in place of actual possession of land-holdings can but spell a national disaster. Is our Government justified to engineer such a disaster, when the need for maintaining confidence in the personal and private properties of entrepreneurs including peasants and the basic values of our essential avenues of employment, social security is so paramount ?

We sincerely trust that even at its worst, the Government will be wise enough to agree to our compromise proposal; that is, not to use service co-operatives to undermine peasant economy and its most progressive and productive content, self-employment. At the same time, let it proceed to make its experiments with co-operative farming.

Let both the economies exist in healthy competition and *let the State cherish both equally*. This compromise proposal for co-existence should not be treated as a defeatist move from the self-employed sector. We are confident that peasant economy, strengthened as it must be by service co-operatives and social insurances, etc. is capable of producing more per acre and also per man employed and assuring a higher standard of living for the families concerned than co-operative farming. We are also sure that it evokes better and stronger incentives for greater and better production, better improvement of land, larger incomes for the nation and for all the people concerned.

Yet, we are willing to face the healthy challenge of the rival economy. Let the Government make bold to experiment with this recognition of the self-employed sector as one of the biggest and most productive and progressive socio-economic sectors, deserving of its best support. Let it also sincerely and frankly abandon its last-minute choice made at Nagpur and so sedulously reiterated since then, to develop service co-operatives only to use them as the bull-dozers, and rolling stones to pave the way for co-operative farm economy in place of the self-employed

peasant economy. So far, there has been no satisfactory or chivalrous response to our offer. We shall keep our offer open without any time-limit. In the meanwhile, as ever, the kisan movement and kisan masses will continue to organise themselves to ward off all these manoeuvres of the rulers and to strengthen the life-springs of their creative urges and progressive activities and thus promote the fundamental freedoms of our self-employed masses and their spiritual and social independence.

The Prime Minister has repeatedly been saying that this programme for co-operative farming, etc. adopted at Nagpur has come to be accepted by the nation. Surely, this statement is unwarranted, in view of the widespread protests voiced by the major section of the daily and other press and by numerous mammoth gatherings of peasants. Such questions ought never be raised by any responsible party in the mid-term after the general election and if, however, the ruling party wishes to make such a drastic change in its policy or election manifesto, it should await its approval by the majority of the voters at the ensuing general election, before it could claim to have been accepted by the nation, as I had already warned at Doraha on the 30th January.

I am convinced that if there were a general election now, the nation will certainly repudiate this Congress drive towards co-operative farming. More especially will it be so, as the Prime Minister has repudiated his own four months' old assurance that this programme will be taken up only after 1962 and has begun to talk of earlier start on his gallop towards the precipice. The Prime Minister, thus, does not seem to be keen on encouraging people to have faith in the stability of his assurances.



A CONGRESS FARMER AND THE NAGPUR SESSION

We reproduce, with the courtesy of the Statesman, the following extracts from the special interview that its special correspondent had with Rangajee and published on 14th February, 1959.

Professor N.G. Ranga is an agricultural economist, whose theoretical contributions have been based on practical experience. For Prof. Ranga is a farmer in his own right, and has in the last 30 years amassed a wealth of experience of the conditions of Indian agriculture and the workings of the peasant mind.

Prof. Ranga is also that rarity, a politician who is not afraid to defy the party whip and give full vent to his views, quite regardless of personal consequences. Perhaps it is his sincerity and unquestionable *bona fides*—he has been a Member of Parliament for 30 years—that gives Prof. Ranga the power to speak as he does.

Of the Nagpur resolutions Prof. Ranga had much to say. He believes that the Congress Party has adopted principles that will lead to a collectivized, fear-dominated Soviet State. Prof. Ranga, whose fervent faith in democracy dates back to his early days at Oxford finds it difficult to believe that the Congress leaders could so unthinkingly have committed themselves and the country to a policy that “would negate much that they so vociferously claim to stand for”.

Prof. Ranga's objection to co-operatives takes two forms. On the ideological plane he is opposed to any unnecessary proliferation of the State's activities and, more pragmatically, he believes co-operative farms to be expensive, wasteful and conducive to “Bossism”.

“In no country have co-operative farms been a success”. In no country, claimed Prof. Ranga, “has the wilful co-operation of peasant proprietors increased agricultural

productivity. The very Soviet experience that these urban interlopers are so fond of recalling belies the idea of co-operation." In Russia co-operation failed and collectivization was only achieved through the mass liquidation, first of the Kulaks and later of middle-holding peasants. But there is no need, Prof. Ranga felt, to look for examples abroad. In India itself over 200 experiments were carried out in the formation of co-operatives in U.P. and Bombay. Great concessions and incentives were provided to induce farmers to form co-operatives. It was not a happy experience. Quite apart from the additional overhead charges that the system of co-operatives implies, he says, there soon developed amongst the farmers a sense of frustration, a blind hostility towards the supervisors and an apathy to greater production.

Prof. Ranga is far from satisfied with the present state of agriculture. As a substitute for co-operatives he proposes the formation of what he calls Service Co-operatives. This would involve the setting up of tractor stations, pesticide squads, fertilizer distributing centres and so forth. The peasants could make use of these facilities on a payment basis. It is a great mistake, in his opinion, to consider India's peasants backward. They are perfectly capable of making the best use of any facilities within their reach. They are both progressive and enterprising. Prof. Ranga considers that Congress policy is too much concerned with the condition of the peasants of U.P. and Bihar who are by no means representative of the country as a whole. They have been free from the oppressive zamindari system for a mere seven or eight years. If the Congress leaders considered the peasant proprietors of Mysore, Tanjore and Andhra in the South and those of Punjab, Maharashtra and Gujerat in the North, who have been free for centuries, they would form a very different estimation of the ability, and initiative of small-holding farmers.

Prof. Ranga has been accused of being a proponent of landlordism. I found him far less agitated over the proposed ceilings on land holdings than on the subject of co-operatives. He did, however, feel that the ceiling was ludicrously

low; he thought it extraordinary that the Prime Minister could oppose the ceiling of Rs. 30,000 per annum on industrial incomes and yet agree to a limit of Rs. 3,600 on agricultural incomes. It would certainly drain agriculture of what little talent it had. "They are conspiring to make land the sediment of all stupidity", he remarked. It is certainly inconceivable that men of ability would be prepared to slave away for a pittance, for a fraction of what they would earn in urban employment. In addition, he felt that this unwarranted discrimination between agriculture and industry was a travesty of social justice.

The example of China does not fascinate Prof. Ranga; in fact, it appals him. The Government seemed to have set its heart on following China at any cost, he said.

Relevant extracts from the Nagpur Congress resolution on agrarian pattern:

The organization of the village should be based on village panchayats and village co-operatives, both of which should have adequate powers and resources to discharge the functions allotted to them. A number of village co-operatives may form themselves into a union. All permanent residents of the village, whether owning land or not, should be eligible for membership of the village co-operative which should promote the welfare of its members by introducing progressive farming methods and improved techniques of cultivation, encouraging cottage industries and developing animal husbandry and fisheries....

The future agrarian pattern should be that of co-operative joint farming, in which the land will be pooled for joint cultivation, the farmers continuing to retain their property rights, and getting a share from the net produce in proportion to their land. Further, those who actually work on the land, whether they own the land or not, will get a share in proportion to the work put in by them on the joint farm.

As a first step, prior to the institution of joint farming, service co-operatives should be organized throughout the country. This stage should be completed within a period of three years. Even within this period, however, wherever possible and generally agreed to by the farmers, joint cultivation may be started.

NAGPUR AND AFTER

Admittedly, Mr. N.G. Ranga is, in American parlance, a "tough guy" or, as Wodehouse would have it "hot stuff". He may well be hailed as Andhra's Wat Tyler. He speaks from no ivory tower but roars from the countryside. He has live contact with the masses; he knows his peasants; he is indeed the leader of the kisans. If today he has raised his voice—or is it the banner of revolt?—against the Congress, because of its agrarian policy, it is not for want of appreciation of Congress zeal for land reform or understanding of socialist ideology but because of his firm conviction that what is sought to be done is harmful to larger agricultural interests and the way in which it is sought to be done is authoritarian in character. It would be easy to call Mr. Ranga a rebel; it may even be easy to elbow him out; it would not, however, be fair to leave so senior and sturdy a partyman unconvinced of the wisdom of Congress decisions and drive him, and others like him, to despair. His presidential address at the recent Punjab State Farmers' Convention is a forthright, frontal attack on the Nagpur Congress in so far as it sponsored and blessed collective farming.

According to Mr. Nehru, any resistance to the new drive, since it would be tantamount to a violation of Congress pledges, is "an act of betrayal". It would be impossible for such Congressmen as dare to differ, to get on as partymen if they are expected, or commanded, to prefer imbecile submission to serious questioning, and if they are told that any deviation from regimented opinion is nothing short of apostasy. Surely it is no disrespect to Mr. Nehru or his leadership if Congressmen are cautioned against the pursuit of a policy and the implementation of a programme in which there seem to lurk hidden dangers, if not dangers so much hidden either.

—'Junius' in 'Swarajya' of 7th February, 1959

APPENDIX I

Experiences of Poland : Agriculture

"After ten years of Communist rule and pressure, more than 75 per cent of Polish farmland is still in private hands. In contrast to the tactics used in Soviet Union, where the regime did not hesitate to wage a brutal civil war against the peasantry in order to achieve collectivisation, Polish Officials have moved very gingerly.

"In 1955 state farms and collectives (or 'producer co-operative farms') together accounted for somewhat more than a fifth of the total agricultural area and for about 14 per cent of total agricultural output. More recent exact figures are not yet available, but the Polish Government has noted that since October 1956, only 2000 collective farms remain out of a total of 10000. Not only are private farms responsible for the bulk of agricultural production, but the value of output per hectare (2.47 acres) is about 20 per cent higher on private farms than on collective farms. This may be seen from the following table:

Polish land holdings and farm output, 1955

	Type of farm ownership		
	<i>Private</i>	<i>Collective</i>	<i>State</i>
Share in Farm land	78.8	8.6	12.6
Share in total output	83.9	7.7	8.4
Share in livestock production	91.0	4.0	5.0
Value of output per Hectare of arable Land in Zlotys (4 Zlotys=one dollar)	621.1	517.3	393.7

"The new agricultural policy, announced in 1957, emphasised the free development of individual farms, property rights are to be clearly defined and observed; *the feeling of ownership* is to be strengthened.....

"Individual peasants and collective farmers will henceforth be allowed to buy all types of agricultural machinery. The peasants formerly were dependent upon State-run village machine centres; the State machine centres, which formerly serviced collective farms only, are now to lend support to private producers as well.

"Private farming is also emphasised in another sector. The peasant self-help association (ZSCH) advocated in early October that dairy plants be given back to the peasants and run as profit-making concerns under co-operative managements. Witold Mierzejewski, Chairman of the ZSCH in Poznan Province, declared in an interview that peasants were the rightful owners of the dairies and that after the dairies were nationalised in 1950 'we have seen the growth of a tremendous bureaucracy in all phases of dairy farming'. Before nationalisation the average establishment employed 4 to 5 people, but since then the number has gone up to 15 to 16. Moreover, with the recent abolition of compulsory milk deliveries, dairy plants under state operation were no longer assured of their milk supplies.

State farms:

"State farms are regarded as the highest form of socialist agriculture and get priority in the supply of equipment, fertilisers and trained personnel.

"The performance of state farms, however, has remained below expectations. Although they occupied in 1953 about 12 per cent of agricultural land, they accounted for only 9.2 per cent of agricultural production. No improvement was visible in more recent years. Bad management is the major difficulty. Insufficient supervision by administrative officials, theft of building materials, and falsification of payrolls and records appear to be quite common...and unsatisfactory working conditions.

"Of particular interest is the proposed transfer of inefficiently cultivated arable land of *state farms* in the Western territories to *private producers*, since 'it may yield better results if cultivated by them'."

"*Poland, Its People, Its Society, Its Culture*" by Clifford R. Barnett, p. 228.

Similar is the failure of Indian Military Farms etc.

APPENDIX II

Indian Agriculture has not done so badly:

Production of Principal Crops (000 tons)

	1951-52	1954-55	1956-57	1957-58
Rice	20,964	24,531	28,820	24,820
Wheat	6,085	8,778	9,310	7,650
Total Cereals	42,890	56,180	57,251	52,800
Cane	60,660	5,780	6,750	6,370
Groundnut	3,142	4,128	4,086	
Cotton	3,133	4,250	4,740	4,750
<i>(India 1958, p. 259)</i>				

It can be seen that there is a uniform rise in the production of all the crops during the six years (1951-57). And this trend has been maintained ever since.

APPENDIX III

The following substitute amendment given notice of by Prof. Ranga to the resolution of Shri Uma Charan Patnaick, M.P., and moved in Parliament on 13-3-59, makes our stand clear towards the Nagpur resolution on agrarian pattern.

"The House is of the opinion that peasant family economy has been evolved by experience to be a very satisfactory and labour intensive economy, assuring economic freedom and self-employment to the single largest number of our working population and it has served the country so far so well and it can be helped to become more productive by active governmental assistance including the development of a network of multi-purpose co-operative societies or service co-operatives. The House is further of the opinion that in so far as the proposal for joint co-operative farming is concerned, it may be taken up as an experimental measure to be tried and tested on governmental lands including newly reclaimed agricultural areas and colonies, bhoodan and gramdan areas, and if and when such experiments result in higher yields and larger peasant incomes without the evils of bureaucracy, then alone the co-operative farming economy may be recommended to be adopted voluntarily by peasants to co-exist in healthy competition with farm economy."

Blank Page

THE PEASANT AND CO-OPERATIVE FARMING

By

Prof. N.G. Ranga and P.R. Paruchuri

Publishers: The Indian Peasant Institute, Nidubrolu, Andhra Pradesh; Rs. 3.

"... is a timely warning against too readily assuming, when planning agricultural development, that co-operative farming can be the solution to all the problems of small-scale farming. Expert opinion in FAO shares his conclusion that the potentials of co-operative farming cannot be correctly assessed without taking into account the non-economic values of individual farming by peasants . . ."

—*B. R. Sen, Director-General, FAO, United Nations*

"... the authors have marshalled so much statistical evidence in favour of their arguments that it is difficult to disagree with them . . . Prof. Ranga and Shri Paruchuri deserve congratulations for this valuable thesis which should help clearing much of the mist that surrounds the co-operative farming . . ."

—*A. I. C. C. Economic Review*

"This book is a vigorous protest against the Planning Commission's objective of reorganising Indian agriculture on the basis of co-operative farming . . . It deserves to be carefully read by all those who are interested in the future of rural economy . . ."

—*The Hindu, Madras*

CREDO OF WORLD PEASANTRY

By

Prof. N. G. Ranga

Publishers: The Indian Peasant Institute, Nidubrolu, Andhra Pradesh ; Rs. 7-50.

"Prof. N.G. Ranga, a prominent Indian scholar and parliamentarian . . . was well qualified to have written an extensive volume on the subject of peasant ideology . . . Ranga's 'Credo of World Peasantry' is, undoubtedly, the first serious attempt on a greater scale to formulate the world-wide peasant political outlook in well documented monograph . . ."

—*International Peasants' Union Bulletin, New York*

"Prof. Ranga . . . is in a real sense the father of the Indian peasant movement . . . In the present *Volume*, Ranga sets forth exactly what the title indicates a credo of world peasantry . . . The book is instructive and thought-provoking."

—*The Hindu, Madras*