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CHAPTER VI

DIFFERENTIATION OF AGRARIAN CLASSES IN ASSAM

Our understanding on the political dimension of agrarian reforms in Assam will remain incomplete unless we grasp the impacts of reform measures on the class configuration of the peasantry. We have already depicted the pattern of distribution of cultivated land in Assam. We have also tried to understand the existing forms of tenancy and their impacts on land resource position of the surveyed households. This has undoubtedly helped us to have a broad assessment of economic differentiation within the peasantry, and consequently, a rough approximation to the class status of the agricultural households. Yet, for a better understanding of this aspect, it is an imperative to identify the agrarian classes more accurately and to understand their interplay in the production system.

The emerging class differentiation within the peasantry in different parts of the country has been addressed by the scholars with different approaches. We have pointed out some of them in the introductory chapter of this study. In view of the specificities of the agrarian society of Assam, we have followed the "Labour exploitation criterion" as devised by Utsa Patnaik to comprehend the agrarian class empirically. In the given context of a significantly uneven pattern of distribution of land
resource and various forms of feudal and semi-feudal practices involved with the agricultural sector of Assam, we have found that the single criterion of labour exploitation is appropriate to identify the agrarian classes empirically. This criterion denotes the use of hired labour relative to the use of family labour in operational holding of a household. For application of this criterion, a "labour exploitation" ratio \( E \) (\( E \) ratio) can be calculated for each household as:

\[
E = \frac{X}{Y} = \frac{a + b}{1} + \frac{(a - a) + (b - b)}{1} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{2}
\]

where,  
\( a \) = labour days hired in  
\( a \) = labour days hired out  
\( b \) = labour days taken through rent  
\( b \) = labour days given through rent,

therefore,  
\( a \) = net labour days directly hired in,  
and,  \( b \) = net labour days taken through rent.

Now, the peasantry can be categorised into certain mutually exclusive economic classes by setting limits to the \( E \) ratio as shown in Appendix-9. It must be mentioned that Utsa Patnaik has formulated the \( E \) ratio as an empirical and therefore, descriptive approximation to the analytical concept of class. We have applied this ratio to identify the agrarian classes in Assam taking into account the land resource position of the households.
After computing the $E$ ratio for each household, we have identified the following economic classes within the peasantry of Assam.

The exploiting classes:
1. Landlords
2. Rich peasants
3. Middle peasants

The exploited classes:
4. Small peasants
5. Poor peasants
6. Agricultural labourers

Moreover, depending on the form of their exploitation, we have further divided the first two exploiting classes into certain sub-categories. The landlords can be divided into at least two distinct classes in themselves: i) Capitalist landlord class; and ii) feudal landlords. In case of the capitalist landlord, the value for $a$ is greater than $b$; and in case of the feudal landlord, the value for $b$ is either greater than or equal to the value for $a$. The value for $Y$ for both capitalist as well as feudal landlords is zero, and therefore, $E$ ratio goes to infinity. Similarly, we can divide the rich peasants into two distinct classes in themselves: (i) Proto-bourgeois, and (ii) Proto-feudal.

We have shown in Table-6.1 the positions of all the agrarian classes we have identified in our surveyed villages. Table - 6.2 provides us further insights to situate the class positions of the surveyed households in all the four villages separately.
### Table - c.1

**DIFFERENTIATION OF AGRARIAN CLASSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Average Number of Families</th>
<th>Average Number of Households Operative &amp; Land in Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. proto-bourgeois</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. proto-feudal</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rich Peasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. proto-bourgeois</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. proto-feudal</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Middle Peasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. proto-bourgeois</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. proto-feudal</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Small Peasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. proto-bourgeois</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. proto-feudal</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Poor Peasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. proto-bourgeois</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. proto-feudal</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Agricultural Labourer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.2

VILLAGE WISE DISTRIBUTION OF CLASS POSITION OF THE HOUSEHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Percent to the total household in the village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bamun Gaon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Landlord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Capitalist</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proto-bourgeois</td>
<td>16.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proto-feudal</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rich Peasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle peasant</td>
<td>22.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Small Peasant</td>
<td>13.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Poor Peasant</td>
<td>16.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Agricultural Labourer</td>
<td>8.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>11.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LANDLORDS: Table 6.1 reveals that approximately 7 percent of the total surveyed households belonged to the category of landlords of both capitalist and feudal type. Unlike the peasants, the family members of these households do not perform manual labour in cultivation of their land (supervision and managerial works are not considered as manual works). The landlords of capitalist type, as it is explicit from Table 6.1, rely mainly on the labour directly hired in for cultivation, while the feudal type of landlords depend wholly on the labour days taken through rent.

Capitalist landlordism in Assam, nevertheless, is relatively a recent phenomenon. We have observed that all the households identified as capitalist landlords were previously feudal landlords. It must also be mentioned that in terms of their ownership holdings some of these households are even semi-medium holders, and on an average each of these households has about 30 bighas of operational land. Yet, we have characterised these households as capitalist landlords mainly because of the facts that the family members of these households do not perform any manual labour on their operational land. And, these households generate enough surplus from their total production. Let us try to understand the phenomenon of capitalist landlordism in Assam with the help of an example.

The household headed by the respondent Bhupen Sharma comprised of total 8 members, and it belongs to village
Bamun Gaon. The respondent is well educated and 37 years old. The household owns total 45 bighas of cultivated land. As the respondent reports, his father used to lease out half the cultivated land on Adhi, but for last eight years the household is not leasing out any land.

At present, annually four crops are grown by the household. The first major crop is Sali paddy and it is cultivated on entire 45 bighas. The second major crop is Ahu which is cultivated on 25 bighas every year. The third one is Mustared being cultivated on 12 bighas, and the fourth crop is Pulse which is cultivated on about 8 bighas every year. Hence, the gross-cropped area for the household is about 90 bighas, and therefore, the intensity of cropping is about 2.00.

The household has total 4 plough bullocks and a couple of iron ploughs. However, the household has to use a tractor to a large extent, on rent. In addition to that, the household has a pumpset for irrigation when required. We have also observed that the respondent has a fair knowledge of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, and he uses chemical fertilizers along with cow dung for each cropping. The respondent has also reported about using seeds of high yielding varieties (HIV seeds) to a large extent, particularly for the first and the second crop. We have estimated that on an average, the yield ratio for Sali and Ahu paddy is about 8 quintals per bigha and the same for Mustard and Pulse is 0.8 quintal per bigha.
For all the manual works involved in agriculture, the household has two permanent servants and each of them is paid Rs. 500.00 per month in addition to food and cloth. Further, particularly female wage earners are to be engaged at the time of transplantation. We have observed that none of the family members works manually in the field. Thus, our respondent is, infact a supervisor of his own farm. Finally, our respondent reportedly earns about Rs. 20,000.00 from his marketable surplus production excluding the total cost of production which includes the wages for the labourers.

We have observed certain features common to all the households which are identified as capitalist landlords. First, the head of each household is below 40 years in age, and has atleast some amount of formal education. Second, each household has atleast one family servant. Third, each household has an access to a pumpset and a tractor which can be rented in when necessary. Fourth, each household uses chemical fertilizers, and pesticides, though which may not fulfil the minimal requirement norms of the Agriculture Department. Fifth, each household uses HYV seeds atleast for 40 percent of the total production of the major crops. Sixth, intensity of cropping for each household is in between 2.00 to 3.00. Seventh, the average yield ratio for the major food crop is about 7 quintals per bigha. Eighth, each household cultivates atleast one remunerative crop in a year mainly to supplement their family income.
Further, it must also be mentioned that some of the households identified as capitalist landlords still lease out a portion of their cultivated land. But, we have observed that all these households used to lease out a much bigger size of their cultivated land a decade back. This indicates a gradual transformation of the feudal landlords to capitalist landlords. This relatively recent phenomenon is worth noticing in the specific context of Assam.

The feudal landlords, however, depend fully on the labour appropriated through rent. In other words, they lease out their entire cultivated land and live on the land rent paid by their tenants. Nevertheless, these households has a secondary source of income also. To understand this phenomenon, we may recall the case study - II cited in the previous chapter.

Needless to say that this small section of exploited class constituted of capitalist as well as feudal type of landlords has a command over a disproportionately high percent of the cultivated land. Further, it is also clear from Table - 6.2 that all the four major communities of rural Assam, i.e., caste Hindu Asamiya, Plain Tribals, Scheduled Caste and Na-Asamiya Muslims, represented by Bamun Gaon, Deulguri, Sil Bharal and Tupamari respectively, witness the phenomenon of landlordism in common.
RICH PEASANT:

This exploiting class is distinguishable from the landlords on the basis of a positive value for it associated with it. It is evident from Table - 6.1 that the land resource position per capita for the rich peasants is also considerably high. About only 13 percent of such households have a command over more than 33 percent of the total operational area of the surveyed households. As a result, appropriation of others’ labour by these households, as we can see in Table - 6.1, is more important than family labour in cultivation. We have found that more than 11 percent of the total households belonged to proto-bourgeois type of rich peasants, and, on an average, they appropriated significantly high amount of others’ labour in comparison to their family members in cultivation. It must be noted that we have not found much difference between a capitalist landlord and a proto-bourgeois rich peasant in terms of cropping pattern, technology of production and yield ratio of the major food crops.

The proto-feudal section of rich peasants, however, depend more on the labour appropriated through rent than labour directly hired in. As a result, the average size of operational holding of this section of the peasantry is smaller than the proto-bourgeois rich peasants. Nevertheless, there is hardly any difference between these two sections of the rich peasants in terms of ownership holding.
It is worth noticing that usually one member of the family is directly engaged in agriculture in case of both proto-bourgeois and proto-feudal type of households. The latter, however, is quite often supported by a secondary source of income. We have also observed that in most of the cases, there is no significant difference between a proto-bourgeois rich peasant and a proto-feudal rich peasant in terms of cropping pattern, use of modern agricultural inputs and yield per unit area under cultivation.

Table - 6.2 reveals that the percentage of proto-bourgeois type of rich peasants is much higher in all the surveyed villages (except for Sil Bharal) than the proto-feudal type of rich peasants. Further, the former is more prominent in Bamun Gaon than Deulguri and Tupamari. Perhaps, a deeper impact of formal education, and comparatively a better resource base of the farmers, are some of the major factors which have contributed to a faster pace of capitalist transformation of the Caste Hindu Asamiya farmers than the farmers belonged to the other communities of the rural Assam.

MIDDLE PEASANT :

This section of the peasantry as Table - 6.1 indicates, is primarily self-employed. About 14 percent of the total surveyed households belonging to this category has a command over about 25 percent of the total operational area. Therefore, the per capita land resource position of
these households is not as high as the other categories mentioned earlier. Yet, we have found that these households have enough operational holding to employ their family members adequately and to provide livelihood at a subsistence level. Nevertheless, in some cases as we have found, the household has to depend on leased in land to certain extent, which is reflected by the negative value for 'b' as shown in the Table. Since the value for 'x' is positive (though not very high in comparison to the value for 'Y'), we can say that this category of the peasantry is also net exploiter of others' labour.

The more striking feature, however, is the aspect of self-employment for the value for 'Y' is much higher than any other category of the peasantry listed in Table - 6.1. It implies that, the middle peasants own the means of production and have the capacity to produce enough to meet their own requirements without involving much in the practice of hiring in or hiring out labour in any form. This category of the peasantry in general provides the backdrop for the theoretical constructions on peasant economy.

We have found that the larger chunk of middle peasants are still associated with traditional practices of cultivation. Though they have sufficient land, as we have observed, their method of cultivation is primarily labour intensive, and production is mainly for self-consumption. We have found that more than 70 percent of the total cropped
area operated by this section of the households is covered by local varieties. Similarly, use of chemical fertilizers, pesticides etc. is also limited only to few households, and irrigation has no impact on production at all. Not to speak about power tiller or tractor, the households, as we have found, rarely use iron plough. Further, the households concentrate more on production of Salı paddy only. Often they go in for the second crop, i.e. Ahu paddy, but not on the entire operational area, and its production is generally constrained by the lack of irrigation facility. Production of remunerative crop is also almost absent.

Consequently, intensity of cropping, on an average, is not more than 1.50. The yield ratio for the major food crop is below 4 quintals per bigha. We have found that a few households have one family servant, but in most of the cases the head of the household remains busy almost for the whole year with cultivation. We have seen in Table-6.2 that the middle peasants are very unevenly distributed in our surveyed villages. They are concentrated mainly in the village Bamun Gaon followed by Tupamari.

SMALL PEASANTS:

The small peasants are primarily exploited and obviously they do not exploit outside labour in any form. Table - 6.1 shows that the land resource position of these
households is much weaker than the middle peasants, and consequently, we have found that these households are yet to win the struggle to reach the level of subsistence. They struggle to ensure their livelihood mainly through self-employment, but quite often they have to supplement their inadequate income from their own resources by working to a small degree for others by directly hiring out their labour or as tenants. Needless to say that the agricultural practices of these households are highly traditional and labour intensive. Consequently, the intensity of cropping and yield ratio are also not higher than what we have found in case of the middle peasants.

Table - 6.2 shows that, like the middle peasants, this section of the peasantry is also highly unevenly distributed in our surveyed villages. We have found that the highest concentration of this section in the village Deulguri followed by Bamun Gaon and Tupamari.

POOR PEASANT:

As Table - 6.1 reveals, about 16 percent of the total households belong to the category of poor peasants, and this section as a whole has a command over only about 11 percent of the total operational area. For overall poor resource position of these peasants, we have found that they have to work mainly for others in order to obtain a subsistence either as a wage earner or through leasing in
cultivated land, or as both wage earner as well as tenant. In most of the cases, we have found that the poor peasants work on their operational holding whether owned or leased in for two or three months in a year, but in the remaining part of the year, they are forced by the existential situation to hire out their labour as wage earner.

Consequently, as Table - 6.1 reveals, 'X' has a very high negative value. Since they operate in some land either owned or rented, we have found a positive value for 'Y'. Nevertheless, working for others is more important for these households than working on their owned land. We have noticed that some of these households are purely tenants.

Approximately, 40 percent of these households have about 5 bighas or more of their owned land and rest have lesser than that. Even with a small holding such as 5 bighas, a household can attain a level of subsistence without working for others, provided the intensity of cropping has been rose to at least 2.75. For such a qualitative break-through, a household has to be assisted by fertilizers, HYV seeds, irrigation facilities as well as required training for scientific management of farming. In some other context, we have conducted a household survey in the last part of 1991 in a village nearby our present surveyed village Sil Bharal. And, we have found some households which could attain a subsistence level of production even with a small ownership holding of 5 bighas.
However, the overall scenario of our present surveyed households reveals that the poor peasants are the worst victims at the hands of the feudal landlords and the proto-feudal type of rich peasants. We have also found that in most of the cases at least two members of the households irrespective of their age and sex, are directly involved with agricultural activities. The head of the household generally cultivates the plot of land whether leased in or owned, but at the same time his eldest son, and in some cases, his wife or daughter goes out to work for others as wage earner.

Table - 6.2 reveals that the poor farmers are mainly concentrated in the village Sil Bharal followed by Beulgori. Needless to point out that in these two villages respectively, we have also found the highest percentage of the feudal landlords.

LANDLESS AGRICULTURAL LABOURER:

This category of the peasantry can also be perceived as the class of agricultural proletariat in itself. They are full time labourers and do not operate any land at all, and consequently, the value for 'Y' is zero. This section of the peasantry depend wholly on hiring out of labour for wages, and therefore, we find a high negative value for 'X'.

It must, however, be mentioned that a few households owned small strips of land. But, they have leased it out
mainly on bandhals and in some cases on Adhi also. We may recall here the example of Sarbaram Das cited in our previous chapter. Nevertheless, the labour equivalent or the rent received or a positive value for 'b' is negligible in comparison to the high negative value for 'a'.

We have also found that, to a large extent the section of the surveyed households is the worst victim of the system of Bandhaki, and obviously therefore, the capitalist landlords and the proto-bourgeois type of the rich peasants have been successful in exploiting the Bandhaki system to their advantage. We have seen in table - 6.1, that almost 17 percent of the total surveyed households belong to the category of landless agricultural labourer. Further, as table - 6.2 reveals, the landless agricultural labourers are concentrated mainly in the village Lupamari followed by Sil Bharal.

LANDLESS HOUSEHOLDS NOT RELATED WITH AGRICULTURE:

The households belonging to the last category of table - 6.1 and 6.2 do not depend on agriculture to earn their livelihood. A small section of such households, i.e., approximately 4 percent of the total surveyed households are small shopkeepers. Another section about 4 percent of the total surveyed households is traditionally fishermen. The remaining households depend on a host of other occupations such as Government and semi-Government services of lower rank, construction works, rikshwa pulling etc.
SUMMING UP:

Our attempt to identify the agrarian classes in Assam has been somewhat austere economic-statistical categorization of classes. The economic classes are influenced by several other factors, and a comprehensive overview of all the factors is necessary, which is a formidable task. Apart from class consciousness, the depth of economic cleavages as well as the nature and domain of class formation process are significantly influenced by social, political and cultural milieu. Our categorization of peasant classes for instance, do not tell us the intensity of class division, or to put it simply, the economic distance between labour hiring rich farmers and the family farmers. Further, a labour hiring Brahman farmer may be poorer in asset endowment than a middle peasant or even a small peasant of a lower caste. Of course, non-participation or relatively lesser participation in manual labour demarcates the former as a member of a particular exploiting class. Yet, we have got substantial empirical evidences to say unmistakebly that the agrarian structure of Assam does witness a slow growth of capitalist relations to an extent. Though it is extremely small, the emerging capitalist relations in the agricultural sector of Assam is undoubtedly an outcome of the intervention made by the post-colonial state through its agrarian reform programmes. Some of the feudal landlords were allowed to retain their land and landed property much more than the average level, and could
afford to irrigate their cultivated land at their own expenditure. They have virtually monopolised the consumption of modern agricultural inputs. In the process they have emerged gradually as capitalist landlords and proto-bourgeois type of rich peasant.

Nevertheless, at the broader societal context, the agrarian reform programmes have totally failed to bring about any significant change. Not to speak about the small and the poor peasants, even the medium peasants have failed to improve their material condition and, the agrarian class structure is still heavily loaded with the semi-feudal relations of production. Now, it can be safely said that the ruling class in Assam has attempted to superimpose capitalism in the agricultural sector without mitigating the semi-feudal interests. The socio-economic base of the nascent agricultural capitalist class in Assam is, however, extremely narrow. This class is not yet capable of generating enough profit which could be reinvested for large scale mechanization of their farms. In absence of adequate institutional reforms, and irrigational facilities, the post-colonial state has failed to create a situation conducive to a faster pace of capitalist transformation as well as significant growth of the agricultural sector in Assam. The larger chunk of the total cultivated land of the state is still under the command of the feudal landlords and the pro-feudal rich peasants.
In this context, it must also be pointed out that the section of rich peasantry, more specifically a section of absentee landlords cum petty merchant locally known as Mahajan, is also responsible for the semi-feudal practice of usuary. In certain places role of Mahajan is also played by the Marwari merchants. Generally, the exploited sections of the peasantry approach the Mahajans or the landlord capitalist for a consumption loan during the lean season of the year. Normally, they take the loan in kind, but sometimes they have also to opt for cash loan under the situation of emergency. For the loan in kind, i.e., normally paddy, the common practice is that the borrower has to return one and half mounds of paddy for each mound of paddy that he takes on loan. For the cash loan also, the rate of interest is equally exorbitant. As a result, for a relatively higher amount of cash loan, quite often, the poor peasant has to alienate a portion of his cultivated land to get rid of indebtedness. The landless agricultural labourers, those who are indebted, have to work for the Mahajan or the rich peasant to free themselves from the burden of the loan. Thus, it can be safely said that the semi-feudal practice of usuary leads to alienation of land and a situation of perpetual bondage, in addition to its contribution in growing incidence of rural poverty. And therefore, it is a question related to agrarian reforms.

The paramount importance of agrarian reforms in favour of vast majority of the peasantry in Assam must be
understood in the overall context of economic backwardness of the state. It is worth noticing that the industrial policy followed by the post-colonial state in India has hardly benefited the economy of Assam. Despite of the rich resources and vast potentiality of industrialization, Assam has remained as one of the most backward states in terms of industrial development. Being strategically a sensitive state near the border of four foreign countries i.e., China, Bangladesh, Bhutan and Burma, Assam has failed to attract any large investment from the post-colonial Indian state as well as from the private capitalist houses to develop an industrial sector of much economic and social significance. Owing to the available natural resources, the state has, nevertheless, become an open ground of exploitation by the Indian big bourgeoisie after independence. This class has been exploiting Assam mainly by taking away the processed raw materials from Assam to support their industries located in other parts of the country rather than establishing big industries in Assam. To quote Hussain, "....inadequate industrialization of Assam inspite of its rich resources and vast potentialities, placed it in a vicious trap of underdevelopment". In view of the present economic policy of the Indian state, growing political tension and inadequate infrastructural facilities, it would not be entirely unrealistic to assume that the industrial scenario of Assam is not going to change drastically. The state will therefore remain exploited in the coming years also as it is now.
Further, the rural society of Assam is also marked by only a rudimentary level of economic diversification. Off-farm economic activities of the rural population in Assam is largely constrained by poor financial resource position of the people at large. The Government has made an effort to encourage various off-farm activities by extending training to develop the required skill and credit facilities to the rural poor through the Integrated Rural Development Programmes (IRDP). But in practice, we have found that the Government has utterly failed to help the rural poor by involving them in off-farm economic activities in any significant way.

Under the given circumstances, a relatively higher growth of population in Assam is responsible for aggravating further the problem of rural poverty in Assam. The section of population which depends upon land for livelihood has grown almost proportionately to the total population of the state over the last couple of decades. But, we have observed that the overwhelming majority of the farmers do not have adequate cultivated land of their own. Nevertheless, we have found that the rural economic scenario of Assam can be drastically changed by resolving the agrarian question equitably.
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