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The study of the agrarian movements in Andhra shows that they originated, as elsewhere in most of the other parts of India, as a measure of self-defence of the peasants - the issues were the protection of their rights on land and a due share in the produce. The agricultural labourers were moved for better wages and land. They were aimed at the abolition of feudal land relations and establishing a democratic system of government. The Congress Party and later the Communists - independently or through peasants' and agricultural labourers' organisations - were able to mobilise the rural masses by taking up these issues.

The very conditions for the agrarian movements in the pre-independence period - which was essentially anti-imperialist and anti-feudal in its nature - were prepared by the British rule and its polices. The changes in the agrarian conditions that were brought about in Andhra by the British rule like better irrigation and transport facilities, definite rights of private property in land and the increased market-oriented production commercialised its rural economy to a great extent. In the ryotwari region while the
systematic extraction of 'surplus' through heavy rates of land revenue assessment and other cesses and its systematic collection led to great misery and indebtedness among certain sections of peasantry, the growth of usury capital and flow of money into the land led to the concentration of land. The policies of the British and the changes thereupon brought in the rural society mainly benefitted those classes who possessed means and money to grab these opportunities. The disintegration of rural population led to the emergence of a new class structure with a class of landlords, different classes of peasantry and the agricultural wage labourers. It also led to the consolidation of castes through similarity of class interests, matrimonial alliances and other means of cooption. Though the British were not able to transform the agrarian relations completely on capitalist lines - due to the fact that the development of agriculture was meant for the expansion of the British industry and creating market for that, due to their political alliance with the feudal landlords and the zamindars, the existence of millions of middle and poor peasants and the general underdevelopment of the forces of
production — they nevertheless, caused the emergence of the landlords and rich peasant classes, who along with other sections of peasantry and labourers fought against the political power and exploitative mechanisms of the Britishers. In the zamindari region the principal contradiction between the zamindars and the vast masses of peasantry, including all occupancy tenants came to the fore during the Depression years when the burden of enhanced rents, coercive methods of rent collection and the suppression of the democratic aspirations among the people became unbearable. This was the material base for the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal agrarian movement in Andhra.

The agrarian movement in Andhra began as a movement of the landowning middle and rich peasants and the landlords for the reduction of land revenue and water cess in ryotwari area and for the reduction of rents and formalisation of property rights to the occupancy tenants — a category which included several classes of rural population ranging from the actual landlords to poor peasants — in the zamindari area. In order to secure their interests they were opposed
the zaminder, to the inamdar and the colonial rulers, though they were always ready to compromise with these feudal lords and colonial government. The agrarian movement in Andhra in its anti-feudal, anti-imperialist phase was built around middle and rich peasants in alliance with the poor peasants and the agricultural labourers. It was because that the middle peasants, in terms of their sheer numbers and their position in the production relations, along with the rich peasants, with their resourcefulness and social position, would naturally become the base of the peasant movement and thus they enter the political organisation that leads the movement. This petty-bourgeois base of agrarian movement was the source of initial radicalism of some of the peasant leaders like Ranga. This is also significant in the sense that the Communists, who began working among the agricultural labourers in mid-30s, when took over the leadership of the peasant movement from the hands of the Congress leaders - moderate as well as 'radical' - came to rely more and more on the middle peasant/occupancy-tenant sections in conducting the militant peasant
struggles and a gradual shift was observed in their emphasis from that of agricultural labourers' problems and the wage struggles to that of peasants' problems, under the slogan of all-in-peasant unity. Thus in Andhra, which remained as an essentially agriculture-based economy, not only the agrarian movement but also the communist movement based itself among these petty-bourgeois sections which was responsible for the rapid weakening of the Communist and agrarian movement in the post-independence period and the large scale crossing to Naxals in 1967-68.

We saw that the peasant movement began during the early decades of the present century. It was rich ryots who expressed through meetings and memoranda their discontent against the bad rule of the zamindars and the Britishers and the necessity for unity among the peasants. Under the pressure of the peasants' discontent and their attempts to voice their problems and organise themselves, the Congress came forward to provide leadership in some places (presiding meetings etc.) and later took up the question of revenue problems and sympathised with
the zamin ryots. But it was only the leaders coming from these landlord-rich ryot sections who were interested in organising the peasants into independent organisations. It was this that distinguished leaders like Ramachandra Reddi, Ranga, Bapineedu, NVR Naidu, Venkatarayana Reddy, Bikkina Venkata Retnam, Dandu Suryanarayana Raju, Gottipati Brahmayya etc., from the other Congress leaders. Thus the ryot associations for a long time remained under the control of landlord-rich ryot element. Also it was this newly emerged peasant leaders, some of whom were highly educated, later replaced the Brahman dominated Congress leadership in Andhra immediately after the independence and other agrarian reforms that followed it. In the beginning it was not smooth and easy to unite the peasants who were scattered over distances, who were habituated for centuries to submit to the Rajas and Maharajas and who were hesitant to come out openly against the zamindar.

Though the peasant participation in the agitations and organisational activity was increasing even before the Communists' entry into the peasant movement, their work among the peasants made the movement more militant.
Organisational functioning became more regular and systematic and the base of the movement was widened. Within a short time the Communists became a dominant force in the ryots' organisation, which mobilised the peasants for the immediate abolition of the Zamindari, reduction of rents and water rates and liquidation of debts. Although the Communists from the beginning realised the decisive role of the peasantry in the struggle for national liberation they failed to make a concrete analysis of differentiation of classes in the rural areas that was taking place which would have made it tremendously easier for them to take correct attitude to the different strata of the peasantry. P. Sundarayya to some extent tried to define classes in the countryside and explain their respective admissibility into the ryots' organisation. They were also not completely successful in interpreting and applying the guidelines of the Communist International to the concrete conditions that existed.

The political propaganda and educating the peasantry about their own problems was done massively during the Peasant Marches, Weeks and Days, which
were aimed at pressurising the Congress Government to bring proper legislation on peasant problems. The failure of the Congress Ministry to carry out the agrarian programme on which they were elected to the Legislature was the reason for flaring up of the peasant struggles in 1935-37 and 1948-49 periods. It was a conflict between the proclaimed policies of the Congress to enlist the support of the peasantry during the elections on the one hand and the readiness of the Congress leadership to take necessary steps to implement them; between the peasants' expectations and the Congress' commitment to the rights and interests of the landlords and zamindars; and between the peasants' militancy and Congress moderation. Congress grew more and more hostile to the ryots' organisation and its activists. Peasants were enthusiastically organised and struggles were waged wherever the Communists were good in number and led the activities of the ryots' organisation like in Munagala, Challepalli, Kalipatnam etc., estates. We also found that militant peasant movements were developed in those zamindaris, where the Rajas took active part in politics and especially those who were earlier supporters of the Congress which might have
contributed to the growth of political awareness among the peasants, but their successors were anti-Congress and more cruel towards the peasants in the zamindari.

It can be said that the Congress in Andhra was more or less opposed to the zamindars because the Justice Party, whose links with the non-Brahman movement and the zamindars were very strong, ruled the Madras Presidency for long and due to the fact that the Congress leadership mainly constituted of urban based middle class Brahman professionals. But due to its policy of all-class unity and of drawing the peasant masses to strengthen the national movement, the Congress maintained that the problems between the zamindars and the peasants should be resolved through mutual accommodation and adjustment. The Congress leadership was ambivalent and inconsistent in its attitude to the zamindars - some times aided the peasantry in pressurising the zamindar and sometimes openly opposed the peasants; it tried to be neutral and occasionally acted as 'mediator' between the ryots and the zamindars. But when militant peasant movements were launched during the period it
was in power, it put down the peasant struggles with a heavy hand calling them as 'law and order' problems. But it also came forward with certain concessions and granting rights to the peasantry. This policy of concession and coercion, in fact, is a policy of all the exploiting and ruling classes. The zamindars, who became angry and fearful of the growing unity and political consciousness among the peasants also followed the policy of concessions and intimidation.

The two dominant trends in Congress Party regarding the agrarian question existed in Andhra Congress. A section of its leader, like Pattabhi Seetharamayya, were opposed to the organisation of peasants into an independent and class based associations since they thought that the peasants should express their problems through INC alone that the peasant problems would be solved only when the Congress grows in strength. They also rejected any such class basis for the national movement, which, according to them, required the support of all classes in Indian society. If at all peasant organisations were to function on a class basis they should be subordinated
to the Congress. There was another section of leaders like Ranga who felt that Congress strength grows only when the peasant organisations become strong. There were leaders like Prakasam and Kala Venkata Rao, though not associated with the work of peasant organisations, who were more forthright in the opposition to the zamindari system. It is quite interesting to note that extreme moderates of the Congress like C.R. Reddy, V. Ramdas, Pantulu etc., took active part in peasant organisations.

The agrarian movement in Andhra in the post-independence period became extremely weak and disorganised. It remained mostly at the level of propaganda and agitation and also confined to some pockets. The Congress Party which partly organised the peasant movement both in the zamindari and the ryotwari regions felt that since it is in power the peasant problems should be solved not through agitations, but through governmental action. It should be admitted, however, that some Congressmen did take part in some of the agitations on peasant problems.
People were also expecting great changes in the society in independent India. The influence of the Communists, as such confined to only some areas and drew support from the same sections as the Congress did, was weakened with the advent of independence, emergence of a new class state and the partial fulfilment of the immediate causes of the peasant movement during the national movement.

The Communists failed to adopt a new strategy and give new shape to the agrarian movement as changes came in the overall society and the position of agrarian classes. There was confusion on many issues and lack of clarity in theoretical understanding of the basic concepts. Instead of assessing the changed nature of the State, the partial fulfilment of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal tasks of the peasant movement by the Congress Government, old understanding and slogans were repeated. It was believed that no change came in the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal character of the movement — a characterisation made in the 20s of the present century — despite the admission that the Indian agriculture was drawn into the international market, the class differentiation was taking place and
it was accelerated during the war period, a new class-
state emerged with the attainment of independence and 
that the Congress agrarian reforms had far reaching 
impact on the kind of landlordism and the class 
position of peasants in countryside. The main 
feature of the agrarian movement of the pre-indepen-
dence period - building the united peasant movement 
around the middle and rich peasants instead of orga-
nising the agricultural workers as the driving force -
got perpetuated at a time when the structural changes 
in agriculture had led to changes in political and 
class alignments and the need was to give a new 
definition and content to the agrarian movement.

The Congress Party after independence came for-
ward on several issues, like abolition of the zamindari 
and similar types of statutory landlordism, more con-
cessions to the peasants in form of reducing land 
revenue and other cesses, granting remissions and 
subsides, provision of irrigation and drainage 
facilities etc., and an increased share in the poli-
tical power at the state level - the issues around 
which the peasants were organised and moved in the 
pre-independent India. The abolition of the zamindari
system benefitted all occupancy tenants, the important and influential section of the anti-zamindari struggle, most of whom now had nothing to fight but to defend their properties and for that to work for the peaceful maintenance of the new social relations that were ushered in. The Congress was very much aware that the owner-cultivators were the best guards against revolutionary militancy. Congress also proposed land reforms, mostly remained at the level of warnings to the landlords and mirage to the landless, in order to stem the tide of the peasant struggle on the one hand and to gradually transform the feudal relations in order to create conditions conducive to the accelerated development of capitalism in agriculture on the other.

The Congress land reforms achieved certain limited objectives which were aimed at; the old type of absolute feudal landlordism was transformed and the class of rich peasantry further developed. This strata together with the new type of landlords not only produced much of the surplus food grains and provided raw materials to the growing industries but also became the base of the state in the country-
side. These classes because of their social influence and caste links maintain a stronghold upon other sections of the peasantry, dominate the political parties at the local and state levels, have close connections with the bureaucracy and control such organisations as the cooperatives, Panchayats, block samithis etc. The rich peasants gained substantially in the political, social and economic sense under the Congress rule and its agrarian policies. By virtue of their hiring in the agricultural labour they entertain hostility towards the latter. It was the experience of all the united peasant movements that despite the gains they get from the united struggle against the zamindar and the government they strongly resist the agrarian movement the moment it takes up the issue of increase in the wages of agricultural labourers. Conflicts may develop between the landlords and the rich peasants, rich peasants and the industrial bourgeoisie on a number of issues, but they invariably attempt to resolve them 'peacefully', within the framework of the existing order and their solidarity against the working class.
The confusion over the understanding of the Indian State, path of revolution, assessment of the Congress Party the objectives and results of the Congress agrarian legislation and the changed character of the agrarian revolutionary movement led the Communist Party and the ryot and agricultural workers' organisations to adopt reformist attitude to the agrarian problems. Its policy regarding the land reforms was that only by utilising every piece of legislation that was enacted to the maximum, working out new suggestions and agitating for more facilities it was possible to further the interests of the kisan masses. For this the Assembly has to be utilised to improve the existing legislation as well as to ventilate the grievances of the kisan masses and get some relief for improving their lot. The ceiling limits it proposed were only a step ahead or more radical than those of the Congress. Such an approach only gives the impression to the following and the activists that the Congress, under pressure, would solve the agrarian problem, even in a capitalist way; that the Congress should accept the suggestions made by the Communists and implement the land
ceilings without allowing the landlord and bureaucratic manipulations. If the land reforms of the Congress type reflected the weak agrarian movement, the Communist leaders failed to educate the rural masses that the solution to the agrarian problems lie in taking over all the land of all the landlords with no compensation and that this is not possible in a State what they characterise as 'bourgeois landlord', and can be done only in a socialist State of the toilers.

The ryots' organisation functioned more like a pressure group. Its policy was to campaign and agitate to 'compel' the government to grant more concessions for the peasantry and thus it emphasised the urgency of agitations on such issues like tax and cess concessions, irrigation projects and remunerative prices. When the Congress government came forward to grant certain facilities, self-serving resolutions were passed that the signature campaigns, picketings and hunger strikes 'forced' the government to accept their demands. In the name of all-in-peasant unity stress was given to form joint committees on such problems to conduct propaganda. They sought the 'help' and 'cooperation' of the Congress
leaders and 'elders' of the village ryots in conducting such campaigns. Since the demands were related mainly to the upper and middle sections of peasantry, among whom the Congress had a political and electoral base, some Congress leaders came forward. The peasant leaders went on rayabaram to some how get more price for the commercial crops and other concessions from the Congress Ministers. When the demands of the Communists and the ryots' organisation were mainly related more to these peasant classes, the Congress could easily knock at the base of the peasant movement. Conceding some of these demands would suit its strategies for agricultural development and to keep down the unrest among the oppressed sections of the rural population. It does certain things, not because of the pressure brought upon by the ryot' organisation through agitations, but because it has a stake in the promotion of the interests and welfare of these classes of the rural population. Such an ironical situation is the reason for the constant weakening of the peasant movement in places like Andhra.

Also the Communists failed to rectify the weaknesses in the organisational building and drawing more
poor peasants more into the movement despite the repeated self-exhortations. The problems in functioning were not corrected though they were repeatedly identified at every conference and decisions were taken to improve the situation. The Ryots' organisation became lifeless as there was no enough cadre to conduct widespread agitations. The cadres left the movement and the remaining cadres were not enthusiastic about developing the organisation. This exit of members without returning could be due to the loss of faith in the leadership due to the quick changes in it and party policies and loss of hope in the Communist revolution. Once they went away and settled in life - in agriculture, business or industry - they became a part of the system. Secondly, the leading activists of the peasant movement, who mostly came from the rich peasant class origin, withdrew themselves from the movement once the immediate objectives of the peasant struggle and agitations were partially met. This could be due to the inadequate training in ideology and the failure to get declassed. The Communist led peasant organisation failed to counter the propaganda of the ruling party and gain control over the mind of
the toiling sections in the countryside. It was not able to withstand the State repression as the Congress, though at times allowed the Communists to function among the rural masses more or less freely, resorted to direct police repression and attacks on peasant masses to weaken their movement, especially during the years 1948-50. The two major splits also greatly weakened the agrarian movement.

Coming to the question of agricultural workers movement, we note that by the time the Communists began to work among the agricultural workers in Andhra, they were going ahead in their struggle against landlords' atrocities, for proper wages and better living conditions, though their movement began much later than the growth of the peasant movement. While the Congress leaders like V. Raghavaiah sought to organise them so that they would be in the mainstream of and further strengthen the Congress politics, the peasant leaders like Range wanted to organise them to avert the danger of confrontation between them and the peasantry. The tactics of the Congress peasant leaders in the pre-independence period was to put down the revolting tendencies among the agricultural workers by giving them certain concessions — giving waste lands, paying relatively
better wages, etc. The Communists were the first to organise the agricultural workers on the class basis contrary to the trends of social welfarism (of caste based and the Gandhian types) and class conciliation.

Though the credit goes to the Andhra Communists for organising the agricultural workers into independent class organisations for the first time much before the Communist Party formally acknowledged such a necessity, a shift was taking place from 1940s to give more emphasis to the activities of the ryots organisation and conducting struggles mainly on the issues concerning land owning peasants and occupancy tenants. The wrong interpretation of the correct understanding of united peasant movement at that time relegated the workers to play a secondary role in the agrarian movement, blurred the antagonisms that existed between the landowning peasant hiring the labour and the landless wage labourer and covered up the reality that even the small ryots from the dominant peasant castes supported the big ryots' and landlords' actions against the strikes of labourers by citing more of the instances of peasant worker
unity. In fact, the agrarian movement was often immediately understood as the movement of ryot masses; an agrarian coolie is also called as a ryot whereas in Andhra villages no agricultural labourer is regarded as a ryot - who have different images, social standings and personalities. Such a misinterpretation of the 'peasant-worker alliance' could be due to the absence of strong urban industrial working class organisation and movement in Andhra.

One important state-wide movement of the poor peasants and agricultural labourers in the post-independence period was the agitation to retain rights on banjar lands and for their distribution. The agricultural labourers were mobilised on this issues as the Communists found that it was easy to mobilise the 'land hungry' labourers on land problem than on the question of wages and to maintain the peasant-labour unity. Such an agitation obviously would not hurt the interests of the peasants and even the landlords, as enough care was taken to focus attention of the labourers and poor peasants on the waste lands of the government. The kind of satyagraha has launched, parliamentary work, signature campaigns,
petitions and memoranda, delegations to and negotiations with the Congress Ministers would not certainly go in the direction of solving the land problem, because it would not be possible to procure land in any meaningful size to all the landless labourers. On the contrary they might give a reformist orientation to the organisation and divert the attention and blunt the consciousness of the toiling labourers in the sense that instead of relying on their capacity to struggle and win their rights, they tend to rely upon the goodness of the ruling classes. The aim of the Communists might not be to make as many owner-cultivators as possible out of the agricultural workers under this bourgeois framework of social relations because such a process would definitely undermine the strength of the working class movement. But the concrete result of these agitations and campaigns and forcing the government to grant pattas would actually be a few hundreds joining the ranks of the peasants. On the other hand the endless talk of the Congress about land to the tiller, ending the exploitation, distribution of the surplus land, etc., rouse the hopes of the landless. It tries to obtain the active consent of these sections for the stability of the government
and the State. As the workers' organisation generally became weak the strikes of the agricultural workers also failed and they lost some of their earlier gains under the landlord threats and suppression.

One of the reasons for the weak agricultural workers' movement was that the emphasis on non-class issues like irrigation problems, tax reduction and remunerative prices continued to dominate the agrarian movement despite the repeated self-critical observations and warnings that the party woefully neglected the demands of the agricultural workers, that the whole agrarian movement has to be based on the agricultural workers and poor peasants and that it is opportunism not to organise and lead their struggles for better wages and service conditions with the fear that it might disrupt the peasant unity and especially alienate the rich peasants. As the CPI(M) leadership observed, it is also "because the bulk of our leading kisan activists come from rich and middle peasant origin, rather than from agricultural labourers and poor peasants. Their class origin, social links, and the
long training given to them give a reformist ideological-political orientation which is alien to the proletarian class point and prevent them from actively working among the agricultural labourers, poor and middle peasants with the zeal and crusading spirit demanded of the Communists.

Finally, the study of the girijan movement in Srikekulam showed that the movement was basically caused by the disintegration, during the colonial period and after, of the primitive and communal mode of production leading not to any betterment of the girijans life but to worsened conditions. The tribals in Andhra, who had the traditions of fighting against the alien rulers, moneylenders, landlords and the police, were ready to get organised. It took less time for the Communists to unite and mobilise these backward girijans on the issues of rights on the land and forests, better wages and against the usurious practices. The study showed that the Naxalites' theory of immediate peasants' armed struggle in a tribal tract like Srikekulam only harmed the well developing tribal peasant struggle in this area, invited monstrous repression of the State over the people ultimately leading to the liquidation
of the movement and the isolation of the Naxalites from the masses. It became clear that when the Communist party was not yet firmly based itself on a strong and organised working class movement in the villages and industrial centres, the task of defending and taking the movement to higher levels in a few pockets, where the movement is relatively strong and on which the ruling classes concentrate their attacks, becomes impossible without widening the base and extending the movement to ever wider areas and sections of the people.

The agrarian movements in Andhra, at the level of superficial observation may look disconnected. The attempt of this thesis is to show certain measure of continuity in them. Objective conditions for such continuity always existed underneath. The intervention of the subjective forces - be it congress, the Communists or the Naxalites - brought them to the fore.

We see in this period broadly three political and ideological trends, those of the Congress, Communists and the Naxalites working among the three segments of rural population, namely peasants, agricultural labourers and the girijans. The Congress conducted limited and reformist agitations basing itself mainly on the landlord-rich peasant classes, but mobilising
all the peasants on their immediate grievances as a part of the freedom struggle. The Communists waged more militant struggles as their entry into the agrarian movement and their leadership of the Ryots' Association widened its base with the involvement of the sections of poor peasants and agricultural labourers. But it too went on reformist lines, more so after independence, because its base still continued among the landowning peasants and issues on which agitations conducted were mainly beneficial to these sections.

We also find that the class base of the agrarian movement was fluid as changes came in the agrarian conditions and class relations in the countryside. As we said the class basis of the agrarian movement also contributes to the militancy or otherwise of the movement. The anti-resettlement campaign, the anti-zamindari movement in the initial period, under the direction of the Congress leadership remained at the level of demonstrating strength by way of mobilising the people and a kind of civil disobedience to the laws etc. This is also partially due to the structure of rural society in Andhra with riparian plain lands under the canal system and where
inhabitation of people is of a mixed character.
As the poor peasants and the agricultural labourers struggled for land and wages militant agrarian struggles broke out, with occasional resort to violence, in a few zamindaris like Munegaon, Challepalli, Kalipatnam, etc., and later like the struggles for banjar lands. Only when the agrarian movement is among the tribals, who have nothing to do with the agrarian movements in the plains in that their composition, immediate problems and environment are different, it assumes certain forms of armed militancy - both during the Seethurama Raju's revolt in Godavari agency and the Girijan and Naxalite movement in Srikakulam. Unlike the peasantry in plains, when pushed to the wall, the tribals, who always bear arms with them, naturally take to methods of violent disobedience against the oppressing and privileged classes.

We also understand from the study that no class of people can be regarded as revolutionary except in the context of the particular period and the social conditions and contradictions that were obtaining in that period. In the anti-feudal and anti-colonial movement all classes of peasants were revolutionary, though this movement failed to transform in Andhra into revolutionary militant struggle
like in Telengana where, of course, the degree of feudal oppression was more and the target of the struggle was also small and clear. With the advent of independence and the Congress measures the upper sections of the peasantry became the base of the new State in the countryside and the agrarian movement receded as the Communists failed to focus upon those classes who stood in hostile opposition to all the exploiting elements in the agrarian sector.