

Chapter IV

PATTERN OF AGRARIAN RELATIONS IN THE COOPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH

WE saw in the last chapter how the very development of the agrarian crisis forced imperialism to shift its position from time to time and how, in the final years of its direct rule, it had to advocate the abolition of the Permanent Settlement system in the very land of its birth—Bengal. We also saw how the Congress was, in its turn forced to go beyond the limits set by imperialism—the limit of abolition of the Zamindari system—and to talk about “removal of intermediaries between the peasants and the State”, as well also to modify the conception of equitable compensation. It now remains for us to examine how the Congress proceeded to evolve a new pattern of land relations in the country.

That the Congress cannot confine itself to certain legislation abolishing the Zamindari and other forms of statutory landlordism, but that it will have to take certain other steps giving relief to all sections of the peasantry and improving and modernising the system of agricultural production, was becoming increasingly clear as the various State Governments began to tackle the problem of land and agriculture. This set the Congress leadership thinking on how to organise the whole system of agriculture after statutory landlordism is abolished. This re-thinking on the part of the Congress leadership proceeded through several stages.

The first of these stages was the appointment, by the All-India Congress Committee, in November 1947—at its very first meeting after Independence—of the Economic Programme Committee consisting of Jawaharlal Nehru (Chairman) and Abul Kalam Azad, Gulzarilal Nanda, J. C. Kumarappa, Shankarrao Deo, Jaya Prakash Narain and others.

This was followed, in December 1948, at the Jaipur session of the Congress, by the appointment of a Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee with J. C. Kumarappa as Chairman.

This, again, was followed in January 1950 by the Working Committee appointing an Economic Planning Sub-Committee with Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant as Chairman to draw up an immediate five-year programme; together with this resolution of the Congress Working Committee was its recommendation to the Government that it should appoint a National Planning Commission.

It was this latter, headed by the Prime Minister himself, that prepared the first Draft Outline of the Plan which was published in July, 1951, and later revised the Draft Outline into the Second Revised Version of the Plan.

This process of re-thinking has, of course, revealed that the Congress leadership is by no means united on economic issues. Differences have, for example, become clear on the fixation of an upper limit to landholdings, the need for tenancy reforms, etc. There is, however, a common basis from which all those who differ from one another on such issues are proceeding.

This common basis is what is known as the "Cooperative Commonwealth", a system which, in the words of the Resolution of the Working Committee appointing the Economic Programme Committee, "can provide an alternative to the acquisitive economy of private capitalism and the regimentation of a totalitarian

State", a "political system which will combine efficiency of administration with individual liberty and an economic structure which will yield maximum production without the operation of private monopolies and concentration of wealth and which will create proper balance between urban and rural economies."

How this system of Cooperative Commonwealth will affect the system of land relations was outlined as follows by the Committee in its Report:

"All intermediaries between the tiller and the State should be eliminated and all middlemen should be replaced by non-profit-making agencies, such as cooperatives.

"Land should be held for use and as a source of employment. The use of lands of those who are either non-cultivating landholders or otherwise unable for any period to exercise the right of cultivating them, must come to vest in the village cooperative community subject to the condition that the original lawful holder or his successor will be entitled to come back to the land for genuine cultivation. In the case of minors and the physically incapacitated, a share of the produce of the land should be given to them.

"The maximum size of holding should be fixed. The surplus land over such a maximum should be acquired and placed at the disposal of the village cooperatives. Small holdings should be consolidated and steps taken to prevent further fragmentation."

With regard to landless labourers, the Committee said:

"Suitable machinery should be created for conciliation and mutual assistance between landless and landholding peasants.

“Provincial Governments should take steps for the relief of indebtedness of agricultural labour.

“The Committee strongly pleaded for the creation of statutory village panchayats with well-defined powers and adequate financial resources, for the spread of literacy in the rural areas based upon *Nai Taleem* with agriculture as the basic craft.”

(*Land Reforms in India*, pp. 80-81.)

Although these principles have been formally accepted by the Congress, there is by no means any unified understanding in the Congress organisation or among the various State Governments concerned on how to implement the programme. The result is that there is such a variety of legislation covering the various aspects of land relations, each State having its own pattern of zamindari abolition, tenancy reform and other legislation. As a matter of fact, with respect to the very issue of abolishing the zamindari system—the issue on which the whole Congress is supposed to be unified, there being no dispute as to its necessity—acute differences manifested themselves between the State and Central Governments, inside each of these Governments and between State Governments and PCCs, etc. The last of such conflicts so far have been those in Rajasthan and in West Bengal.

In the latter State, a prolonged conflict developed between the State Government and the central leadership of the Congress. It was after prolonged consultations that the resistance of the State Government was overcome and the West Bengal Estates Acquisition Bill was introduced in the Legislature. Now that the State Government has ultimately been prevailed upon to introduce this reform, the question has become one of time—time when it will be implemented in practice, all the estates in the State being taken over. All sorts of pro-

cedural and technical objections are raised to postpone it to the last. If this is what happened in the case of abolition of Permanent Settlement in the land of its birth, one can very well imagine the extent of resistance to the other aspects of agrarian reform.

But, as against this resistance on the part of certain State Governments, there has also developed a tremendous pressure on the part of large sections of Congressmen themselves for such reforms as the Congress leadership had never dreamed of. Tens of thousands of Congressmen took their leaders at their word when they said that the objective of the Congress is the elimination of all intermediaries between the State and the actual cultivator. They, therefore, demanded that land reform legislation should embrace all types of land tenures and confer the rights of ownership on the actual cultivator, whatever the legal terminology used to express the existing rights which he is enjoying today. It was this pressure from the mass of Congressmen, together with the heroic struggles waged by the independent class organisations of the peasantry, that forced the various State Governments to take up such questions as reduction of rent, security of tenure, right of the tenant to purchase the rights of this superiors, etc. The net effect of these legislations have been summed up as follows by the author of the “Introduction” to the Government of India’s publication, *Agricultural Legislation in India*, Vol. IV:

“The most significant aspect of the reform is not so much the abolition of the intermediary interests (which after all is a means to an end), but the delineation of the future pattern of land service organisation contained in the several reform measures. The central feature of the new land policy, which is sought to be initiated, is the increasing identification of ownership with management

and operation so that in time only those interested in the direct working of the land would remain on the field. The elimination of the intermediaries who enjoyed a substantial share of the produce without performing corresponding services, was only the first step. The second, and no less important, step was the provision of facilities for the progressive merging of the remaining interests in a manner which would ultimately leave only two interests, the State and the cultivator. This is sought to be achieved by various means.

“(i) Limits are placed on future acquisitions of land, as in U.P., so that concentration of land and the revival of the rentier class would be prevented.

“(ii) The Acts in general confer on specified classes of tenants the right to acquire superior interests which would make them proprietors or quasi-proprietors of their holdings. In Madras, after the abolition of zamindari, every ryot in the estate becomes entitled to *ryotwari patta* in respect of the lands held by him and is thus automatically brought into direct relationship with the State. Likewise, in Orissa, the erstwhile tenants of the zamindars would continue to hold the land under the State Government on the same terms and conditions as before. Madhya Pradesh Act allows certain classes of tenants to purchase ‘*Malik Makbuza*’ rights; in U.P., similar provision exists for affording facilities to the *Sirdars* and *Adivasis* to acquire ‘*Bhumidhari*’ rights. Madhya Bharat Act has allowed tenants and sub-tenants mentioned in the Act the right to become ‘*pucca*’ tenants on payment of specified amounts. Under the Rajasthan Act, the tenants holding heritable, transferable rights in land are recognized as ‘*Khatedar*’ tenants, and other tenants can acquire ‘*khatedari*’ rights in *jagir* lands on payments at prescribed rates. The tenants of *Girasdars* in Saurashtra could likewise become occupancy tenants

on payments of specified sums. One of the important objects of these several reform measures is, therefore, the loosening of the rigid stratification of tenure interests, so that it would become possible for the lower interests to acquire superior rights and thus improve their status *vis a vis* the State.

“(iii) Several of the recent Acts contain provisions restricting letting and sub-letting of land, except under specified conditions. These restrictions, combined with limits on future acquisitions of land, would encourage self-cultivation and lead to the gradual disappearance of tenancy.

“(iv) Other clauses prescribing fair rent, prohibiting ejection except under specified conditions, restricting transfers and mortgages, etc., are also intended to achieve the objective of eliminating exploitation from the rural policy.”

These legislations have undoubtedly improved the lot of sections of the peasantry in several areas. Particularly is this so in those areas where there is a conscious and well-organised peasantry led by the Kisan Sabha prepared to take advantage of every provision enabling the peasant to get his rent reduced or to prevent evictions, etc. These provisions, however, are vitiated by the fact that all the Acts contain the provision enabling the landlord to “resume his land” for “personal cultivation”, which means he can evict his tenants from the land which they are now holding. In the words of the author of the AICC publication, *Land Reforms in India*:

“The area which a landlord can resume for personal cultivation by ejection of the tenant (inclusive of the area which he already holds under his personal cultivation) differs from State to State [Bombay—50 acres;

Orissa—33 acres; Punjab—30 standard acres (50 standard acres in case of evacuee land); U.P.—8 acres (right of resumption to accrue only in areas to be notified by the Government); Hyderabad—5 times the economic holding; Rajasthan—75 acres un-irrigated land; Himachal Pradesh—5 acres.]. Delhi does not provide for any resumption and consequently does not permit the displacement of any cultivating tenant. Some other States, notably Assam, Bihar, Madras, etc., have so far placed no limit on the area which a landlord can resume for personal cultivation. The landlords, therefore, retain the right to eject all or any tenants on ground of personal cultivation.

“It may here be borne in mind that such cases abound where a landlord may have considerable areas recorded as his personal cultivation but may be actually cultivating only a part of it, or none at all. The tenant cultivators on such lands have no rights, and even if rights have been conferred by the new legislation, the landlords see to it that they are evicted before the law becomes effective. This right to *Sir* and *Khudkasht* have made the zamindars resort to eviction of even the occupancy tenants themselves on a large scale and claim it as their personal cultivation. Hundreds and thousands of acres have been thus affected in recent months.

“Further, in view of the fact that in most States (except PEPSU and Punjab) the resumable area is not demarcated and as no time limit has been prescribed during which a landlord could resume land for personal cultivation, so that in case of his failure to do so the tenant could acquire permanent right in land, the tenants have been placed under a constant and continuing threat of ejection.

“The tenants who have been cultivating these lands for years naturally resist these ejection proceedings and thus is created a danger of widespread disturbance

of rural peace, particularly when we have political parties in the country who are only too ready to utilise such situations. Acharya Vinoba Bhave made a reference to this process of eviction in his address to the Bhoodan Convenors' Conference at Khadigram in Bihar in September 1953. In fact, as an esteemed daily has remarked eviction has become a habit with the divested landlords.

“The situation is fast deteriorating and can only lead to an intensification of the problem of unemployment.” (Pp. 451-52.)

The land reform measures of the Congress Government are thus proving to be the means of continuing and further intensifying the process of pauperisation of the peasantry, the process of transforming cultivators into landless poor, which has been going on for several decades. While, on the one hand, they confer some benefits like fixity of tenure, rent reduction, the right of purchase of the landlords' right, etc., on some sections of the peasants, the large mass of peasantry are made victims of the landlords' right of resuming their land, i.e., evicting their tenants. Tens of thousands of peasants are thus driven out of their lands and forced to seek other means of livelihood, precisely because of those very measures of land reform which are trumpeted as the great achievements of the Congress Governments.

Nor is this accidental. It arises out of the very basic conception of agrarian reform which the Congress has evolved. For, whether it be a measure abolishing Zamindari, Jagirdari, or some other form of statutory landlordism, or whether it be a measure regulating landlord-tenant relationships in any part of the country, the Congress has accepted the “proprietary right of the landlord” on his land as the “fundamental principle” of social policy; arising out of this “fundamental right” of the landlord is his right to take back and keep in his

possession a good chunk of the land which is at present being cultivated by his tenants. The protection of this right of the landlord comes, in the eyes of the Congress, before the right of the tenant to own and cultivate the land which is in his possession.

It is this "fundamental right" of the landlord that governs even the most radical proposal of land reform so far made by the Congress—the proposal to fix a ceiling on land-holdings. This would appear to be a proposal which would restrict the proprietary rights of big landlords; and it is true that it can be used for that purpose, provided the surplus lands (lands in the possession of landlords which go beyond the ceiling) of all big landlords are taken over and distributed free among the landless and land-hungry peasants. As a matter of fact, however, this proposal, as is now conceived of by the Congress Government and as is sought to be implemented in certain States, does nothing of the kind; on the contrary, the proposed ceiling on landholdings is actually proving to be a measure of still further speeding up the process of transformation of tenant cultivators into landless proletariat. For, while no State Government so far has interpreted the ceiling on landholdings to mean the taking over of surplus lands of big landlords for free distribution among landless and land-hungry peasantry (even with compensation), while the concept of ceiling on land-holdings is used only in relation to "future acquisitions", this very idea of ceiling on landholdings is used to fix the limit of "resumption for personal cultivation". In other words, *while the lands above the ceiling are not taken over from big landlords, every landlord, big or small, is allowed to evict his tenants in order to enable him to keep lands upto the ceiling.*

While the land reform legislations adopted so far are thus depriving large numbers of peasants of the lands which they are now cultivating, proposals are also

made for depriving the poor peasants of any effective hold on the lands which they own or cultivate. For, very serious proposals are made that, in order to increase the efficiency of cultivation, uneconomic holdings should be discouraged and incorporated in bigger farms. The most progressive of the patterns of future agrarian economy which have so far emanated from Congress circles—the pattern recommended by the Congress Agrarian Reforms (Kumarappa) Committee—includes a suggestion that "individual farming should not be allowed on holdings which are smaller than basic holdings. They should be in course of time brought under a scheme of Co-operative Joint Farming.... Of course, a scheme of compulsory joint farming would involve an amount of coercion. But we must also consider that, by the judicious exercise of coercion by persons with proper perspective, the edge of unpleasantness involved in coercion can be greatly taken off."

This proposal of Co-operative Joint Farming, as well as other proposals like Capitalist or Estate Farming, State Farming, Collective Farming, etc., are all made in the name of "facilitating technical progress". Examples of Collective Farming in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are also sometimes cited. But, behind all this talk of improving technique by bringing the hundreds of thousands of small peasants into bigger farms and thus enabling them to introduce the modern forms and techniques of cultivation there is the reality that this is attempted within the framework of existing social relations.

In glaring contrast to the USSR and the People's Democratic countries where the introduction of new technique was based on a system of society in which there is no landlord exploitation and where collectivisation followed distribution of landlords' lands, India is attempting to bring about technical improvement in bigger farms

under conditions in which landlord exploitation continues. The large mass of peasants have still to pay a major portion of what they produce to the landlord and the usurer—the provision for the payment of compensation for the landlords makes sure of that. Furthermore, the erstwhile landlords in those areas in which they are supposed to have been “abolished”, own vast areas of land as their home-farm lands. This fact, together with the tremendous influence which they are able to wield on the bureaucracy, enables landlords to dominate the Co-operative Societies, Village Panchayats and other organisations in the rural areas which are charged with the task of land management under the scheme of improving agriculture evolved by the Congress Government. The result of all this will be that, wherever it is proposed to organise the poor peasants (peasants with less than a basic holding) in Co-operative or Joint Farms, it will be the landlords, in collaboration with certain elements of well-to-do peasantry, that will dominate these Co-operative Farms; the “right” of the poor peasants who are members of the Co-operative Farming Society on their lands will be nothing more than formal, the effective control being in the hands of a handful of Directors of the Society.

The pattern of future agrarian economy that is placed before the country by the Congress is thus one in which the class of landlords will be able to continue their hold on the mass of peasantry. Landlordism in the form in which we are used to it—a form under which the landlords have juridical rights over their lands and over the peasants who cultivate those lands—may not exist, but landlordism in the real economic sense of the term will continue. For,

Firstly, the burden of rent borne by the peasantry will continue to be imposed on them by way of the huge

amount of compensation that has to be paid to the landlords.

Secondly, landlords that are being “abolished” will continue to enjoy tremendous power over the people, since they are still the richest elements in rural society both because of the vast areas of land which they hold directly, as well as because of the huge amount of cash in their hands.

Thirdly, still larger masses of the peasantry would have been rendered landless by the time this pattern of agrarian economy emerges—provision for landlords’ right of resumption guarantees that.

Fourthly, still heavier burdens are being imposed on the large mass of peasantry by way of new taxation. It should, in this connection, be noted that the very formulation of the Draft Outline of the First Five-Year Plan was accompanied by proposals for the imposition of various forms of new taxes on the peasantry—taxes like Betterment Levy, Development Tax, increases in the irrigation rates, Surcharge on Land Revenue, etc. As a matter of fact, the very first Budgets presented by the Congress Governments after the 1951-52 General Elections contained proposals for several items of new taxation on the peasants. The incidence of all these new taxes on the mass of peasantry is such that it more than counterbalanced any concessions which certain sections of the peasants got through the agrarian legislations, while it was a heavy blow to the mass of the peasantry.

Above all, the economic plan of the Congress Government is a plan of keeping India an industrially-backward country. It is based on the assumption that India has for years to remain a predominantly agricultural country. The result is that the basic problem of Indian economy in general, and of Indian rural economy in particular, re-

mains precisely as it was under the British: the large mass of rural poor are either totally, or almost totally, unemployed and cannot be absorbed in any productive activity.

The Congress Government refuses to see that, for any development of our economy, two pre-requisites are needed: *one*, there should be such a rapid development of modern large-scale industries that they will absorb a considerable and ever-increasing section of the now unemployed or under-employed rural poor, thus finding a solution for "over-population" on the land; *two*, in the very interest of working towards such a rapid development of modern large-scale industries, it is necessary for the home market to be very rapidly expanded; to this end, the huge burdens of rent, indebtedness and exorbitant taxes should be taken off the shoulders of the peasantry. The result is that, in spite of the grandiose plans of developing industry and agriculture which the Congress Government has formulated, the two extremes of the rural economy—on the one hand, a large mass of landless and land-hungry peasants having no employment and starving for the major part of the year and; on the other hand, an extremely small proportion of big landlords—will still continue; the much talked-of "Co-operative Commonwealth" is thus a system in which these extremes will be a permanent feature.

The Congress Governments, however, will not find it possible to work out these plans just as they please. For, as we have repeatedly pointed out, the plans of the ruling classes have very often ended in fiascoes because of the resistance to them by the mass of peasantry. This is once again happening now. Resistance to evictions is taking a universal, organised form; the struggle against new burdens put on the peasantry—burdens like new taxes—is also assuming big dimensions. The more the Congress boasts of having introduced land reforms, the

more are the peasants showing their dissatisfaction against these reforms.

This resistance of the peasantry is forcing the ruling party to seriously re-think all its land reform policies. Under the significant title, "Land Reforms—Second Round?", the *Eastern Economist* writes as follows:

"The Congress Working Committee which concluded its session in New Delhi last Sunday has reverted to the subject of land reform, and it is now practically settled, if, indeed, there was ever any doubt, that Article 31 of the Constitution, which was amended about three years back, will be further amended in order to realise the Congress's objectives....

"One has only to read the literature sponsored by the Congress Party in order to grasp the point that there is a sense of urgency in this matter. Now that a certain helplessness in the face of a legal tangle does not hamper the party any longer, this sense of urgency is apparently to be allowed in future to have full play; it is related in part to the fact that inevitably, as time passes, land reform plans in India have to be drawn up not only in terms of abolishing intermediaries (the legislative framework for this is now more or less complete) but also in terms of improving the cultivator's standard of life. *Before the suspicion that the abolition of intermediaries may not after all have made any difference breaks out into discontent—and this is not unlikely to happen, because with a 5 hundred crore bill for compensation the state is sooner or later bound to take by way of taxes nearly as much as did the intermediaries themselves—it would certainly be desirable to do something. It is believed that it would be wise, for example, if things could be so managed that the new institutional framework for agriculture in India does not compare unfavourably with the reforms in Burma, where the Constitution contains drastically Socialist and*

authoritarian provisions enshrined in the very text; or China, where the re-ordering of society is completely uninhibited by bourgeois respect for the rigidity of the law." (May 28, 1954—Emphasis added.)

The Paper then goes on to suggest that there are three tasks awaiting the Congress leadership in this "Second Round of Land Reforms": "First, to exempt the ryot, who has been freshly liberated from the payment of exorbitant rent, also from the payment of taxes, if he is too poor to pay them—thus honouring a Congress pledge, which has been prominently featured in the All-India Congress Committee's recent brochure on land reform. Secondly, to fix ceilings for landholdings in all the States; and third, to facilitate the taking over by the States of land for the purposes of co-operative management, an amendment of the Constitution for this purpose having been rendered necessary by the Supreme Court's judgement in the Sholapur Mills case."

The Paper concludes "that land tenures cannot be modified any longer to any useful purpose but that new and better methods of land management should be brought into use. . . .this is exactly what should follow the extinction of intermediaries' rights. While there is no need to be pessimistic, for the scale on which tractors and electricity are used in agriculture now should finally bury the myth that Indian agriculture is unchanging, it is only in proportion as better farming methods are brought into use, and as these methods increase production, that the Indian farmer can hope to enjoy the full benefits of the ownership rights which have recently been conferred on him."

Farsighted leaders of the ruling classes, however, do not share this enthusiasm exhibited by this organ of big business that better methods of land management will enable the Indian peasant to enjoy the full benefits

of the ownership rights which have been conferred on him. Correctly taking the lessons of the post-Independence developments, they are afraid that this "second round of land reforms" would lead to another fiasco which would naturally lead to another round of peasant discontent and peasant struggles. They are therefore preparing themselves for this contingency. It is to this end that they are now propagating the new theory of *Bhoodan*.

The crux of this movement is that the people should not ask for land legislation, but should build up a movement of voluntary gifts of land by those who own it. Answering a question as to why he does not press the Government to pass suitable legislation in order to bring about the distribution of land without compensation, Acharya Vinoba Bhave said:

"My duty is clear. It demands that, without taking recourse to legislation, we should be able to bring about a change of heart among the people, so that they may voluntarily distribute land without waiting for any legislation. Is it because of legislation that mothers suckle their children? There is then such a power as love in the hearts of men which enriches human life. Man lives on love. He is born through love and through love is he sustained in his life. And finally when he makes ready to depart from here and looks around to catch a sight of his dear ones, it is love which consoles him and strengthens him to start on his unknown journey.

"If in spite of such overwhelming evidence of the power of love on every side, I do not endeavour to enlarge the bounds of this force so as to make it the basis of social life, if instead I merely keep harping on legislation, I fail to discharge my duty and I falsify the hope of the Government. I, therefore, want to devote myself to the creation of *Janashakthi*, the forging of the

sanction of the enlightened masses—a power which is opposed to the force of violence and different from the authority of the State.” (*Bhoodan Yajna*, Navjivan Publishing House, p. 89.)

This is the exponent of the ideology of the ruling class speaking. In the first phase of their regime, they called upon the people to have faith in the Government and to give it time—five years, they used to say at the beginning—to bring about the necessary legislative reforms.

But the more the economic crisis deepens, the greater the unemployment, the higher the cost of living, the steeper the fall in the prices of our produce, the more insistent is the demand of the common people that the State should help them to tide over their difficulties. And the tiding over these difficulties means nothing less than taking effective steps against the princes, landlords and other Indian exploiters as well as foreign monopolists. It is, however, precisely this that the ruling classes are anxious to avoid.

So, now they come out with their new sermon before the people: Do not rely on the Government, do not clamour for new lands, rid yourselves of your own shortcomings and support yourselves. President Rajendra Prasad, himself the symbol and representative of law, chides the people for asking for land to better their conditions:

“The administration and some people believe that laws can solve all problems. We want laws to end the zamindari system, and enable the Harijans to enter the temples. We also want laws to safeguard the property attached to temples and to improve the relationship between the workers and the employers. We enact legisla-

tion to save ourselves from epidemics and disease. No one knows how much more legislation we want.”

Not that the leaders of the Congress themselves mean to renounce State action. They employ State power and all its apparatus to rush help to landlords in order to evict their tenants or to collect rent from them; to despatch police to factories and workers' quarters to suppress strikes; impose bans on even peaceful demonstrations; pass Draconian laws like the Preventive Detention Act to jail leaders and organisers of mass movements or Press Acts to gag reports inconvenient for the Government; let loose the armed forces whenever the people actively come out in support of their demand for better conditions.

Even Vinoba Bhave who is all for changing the hearts of zamindars and jagirdars instead of passing legislation against their unjust oppression of the peasantry, even this changer of hearts wants legislation and its strict enforcement on the question of prohibition when it comes to changing the hearts of millions about addiction to drinks.

Thus, they frown upon the trusting masses when they ask for State power to be used in their interest against the exploiters, but they come down upon them with all the might of State power when that is to be used against the masses.

Thus they want to create a new ideological rampart to hold back the movement of the masses. As the people are more and more shedding their illusions about the words and promises of the ruling classes, they in their desperation are coming out with this new deception that the masses must not look up to State power, that all ills of the day are inherent in it.