

DOCUMENTS
of the History
of the Communist
Party of India

Volume VIII

1951-1956

Edited by
MOHIT SEN



PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE
New Delhi

First Printing, January, 1960

**Printed by Jiten Sen at the New Age Printing Press, Rani Jhansi Road,
New Delhi 110055, and published by him for People's Publishing
House (P) Ltd., Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110055.**

Introduction

The six years (1951-56) with which the documents of the Communist Party of India (CPI) brought together in this volume deal were of extraordinary importance both for our nation and the party. They were the years of the consolidation of national independence, significant shifts in the policy of the ruling capitalist class and Congress party, start of an effective democratic opposition to the Congress and the emergence of the CPI as a nationwide political force and main opposition to the Congress. The CPI also developed not only in mass influence but ideological political maturity.

The latter part of this period was also of great importance in that the new turn in the world communist movement takes shape coming to a dramatic climax with the 20th congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). It is important to remember that in those years the Communist Party of China (CPC) also played an important role in participating in and effecting this turn.

It was no accident that the two processes—national and international—converged and mutually influenced each other. Those were the years of the start of nonalignment in foreign policy, Afro-Asian solidarity, Indo-Soviet and India-China friendship along with the new orientation embodied in the planframe for the second five-year plan and the acceptance of the "socialistic pattern of society" as the goal of the Congress at its Avadi session.

It cannot be overlooked that those were the years at the same time of mounting democratic opposition to the capitalist path of development which increasingly clearly became the cardinal feature of congress policy as a whole. This mounting democratic opposition found expression not only in widespread and sustained struggles of the workers, peasants and other toiling sections. It also found expression in such more directly political forms as the shift of the masses in many parts of the country towards the

democratic opposition parties, with the CPI being in the forefront. This shift which found expression first in the 1952 general election continued. It was partially arrested by the new turn in congress policy assisted, most regretably, by the failure of the CPI to break from dogmatism and sectarianism until the very last 18 months of this period and the continued barren opportunism of the other left parties.

As far as the CPI is concerned, the entire period can be characterised as advance from dogmatism and sectarianism towards a correct Marxist-Leninist revolutionary understanding of many of the basic features of the reality and trends of change in our country. The start made by the adoption of the party program and tactical line in 1951 was not a false start though not the point of arrival that it was thought to be at the time. The volume opens with these two documents and at almost the close comes the documents of the fourth (Palghat) congress of the CPI in April 1956 which sets out guidelines whose value was long-lasting and which continue to be of great relevance even today.

Throughout this period the innerparty situation was not a happy one, marked as it was by tension and discord. This burst out in the very sharp and acrimonious innerparty struggle from the time of the defeat in the 1955 Andhra mid-term election to the Palghat congress. These differences were not really resolved even then and took on a far more damaging form in the split of the CPI in 1964. Nevertheless, this tension and struggle generated both light and heat, the former even more than the latter. And the fortunate fact was that the CPI remained one, finding the sense and the strength to contain the conflict within some agreed limits.

It has, moreover, to be recognised that in these years the CPI not only led and participated in innumerable mass struggles. It also played a vanguard role in the struggle for the linguistic reorganisation of the states of India which had profound antifeudal and democratic content. It played the same role in the tremendous national movement for the liberation of Goa and French Indian territories. It actively campaigned for Indo-Soviet

and India-China friendship, for Afro-Asian solidarity and an anti-imperialist foreign policy.

Another great achievement of the CPI in this period was the successful effort it made in understanding the new situation on the tradeunion front, the changing composition and currents in the working class. On that basis it laid the groundwork for restoring the All India Trade Union Congress (AITUC) to its premier position among the organised working class.

But, perhaps, the most significant achievement of this period as far as the party itself is concerned is the great advance it made towards autonomy and independence while retaining and developing its longstanding fine tradition of international workingclass communist solidarity. It is quite untrue to say that the CPI ever at any time either received or acted upon "order from Moscow". It is also quite untrue to say that the CPI's awareness of the need for proletarian internationalism and its recognition of the unique and vanguard position of the CPSU in the world communist, workingclass and anti-imperialist movement, prevented it in any way in struggling for the freedom of our country and the advance of its toiling people. But, particularly in the period termed that of the cult of Stalin's personality, there was the dominant tendency of believing that the development of Marxism-Leninism and a correct understanding of the situation in one's own country emanated from a single centre, a single party and a single personality. This did great harm to the CPI as to other communist parties in the world. The CPSU and its historic 20th congress rendered tremendous service by boldly taking the lead in breaking from this tradition.

This period of the history of the CPI is, above all, marked by its determined and largely successful efforts also to break from this tradition. In this connection, particular importance attaches to the June 1955 resolution of the central committee of the CPI. Helped by the struggle against dogmatism as a part of the struggle against the cult of Stalin's personality already launched by the CPSU, learning from its own experience, especially the serious setback in the immediately preceding Andhra election, the leadership of the CPI courageously broke from dogmatist

moorings and advanced in the direction of studying the concrete situation in India from the standpoint of the method and fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. This did not pass without a serious innerparty struggle. The period from the adoption of the June 1955 central committee resolution to the fourth Palghat congress in April 1956 was marked by controversy on all the basic elements of the new understanding. The brunt of the attack was made by an important section of the leadership at the central and state levels which had not broken from the earlier dogmatist understanding. There was also another section which tended to pull the new understanding in the direction of reformism and overestimation of the advance made and the possibilities of further advance without basic revolutionary struggle and transformation. Eventually the resolution of the fourth Palghat congress confirmed the new understanding and the new method of arriving at any correct understanding which was, of course, of much greater and lasting importance. The quite fierce debate, incidentally, was a significant repudiation of the canard that the CPI, as in the case of other communist parties, arrives at its decisions in an "undemocratic, dictatorial and dictated" manner. As in any passionate controversy between those who know that the outcome will decide not some academic issue but the lives of millions and their own lives, there were things that were overdone but the fact of the controversy conducted through the publication of a special innerparty forum and the themes of that controversy do demonstrate the live nature of innerparty democracy in the CPI.

Another aspect of the ideological maturity of the CPI is to be seen, again, in the very first documents of this volume. In the previous volume, it will be recalled, the documents given show that for some time many of the basic problems of the revolution in our country were debated in terms of the "Russian path" and the "Chinese path". An attempt was made to break from this in the "Three Fs Document" (Ajoy Ghosh, S. A. Dange and S. V. Ghate). This attempt was carried forward in the tactical line document. One cannot, of course, overlook the serious errors in the analysis (especially the failure to acknowledge the independ-

ence of our country and the class character of the state). But a significant departure is made from "revolution by analogy" and there is the start towards trying to understand the specifics of the Indian situation and traditions as an essential prerequisite for charting the path of the revolution in India. The search for specifics, forms of transition, appropriate methods of struggle which began in this period continues, but the big leap that this represented cannot be underestimated.

The party program and tactical line of 1951 had by no means broken from the dogmatist understanding of the 1948-50 period but they represent an important transition away from it and towards the essential search for specifics mentioned above. At that time these two documents played the further important role of maintaining the unity of the party and pushing it back to the masses and to effective mass work. Without them the breakthrough that the CPI made in the first general election in 1952 when it carved out a place for itself in the political map of our country, defeating the US imperialist strategy evident even in those early days of imposing a two-party system on our country. Incidentally, this shows the indispensability of a historical approach to documents of history if one is really to estimate their significance. These two documents are undoubtedly full of errors but it is they which made possible and represented the correction of truly gigantic error.

Yet another facet of the autonomy and ideological maturing trend in the CPI in this period is to be seen in its response to the criticism of the cult of Stalin's personality. The party welcomed the new points of departure of the 20th CPSU congress, the break from dogmatism and sectarianism, as well as the principled criticism of the very serious mistakes and even crimes of Stalin. Of course, very important sections of the leadership never really welcomed all this. They were able to prevent the spread of knowledge of all this inside the party with subsequent grievous negative results. But the leadership as a whole, while welcoming all this, did not hesitate to make known its differences from the way in which only the negative aspects of Stalin's life work were being highlighted

and from the way in which there was no deeper analysis of the causes and consequences of these negative phenomena. In Ajoy Ghosh's report to the fourth Palghat congress, as well as his article on the birth anniversary of Stalin, this is made amply clear. At the same time, his reply to the rather crude attempt made by Jayaprakash Narayan to fish in anti-Soviet waters splendidly set the record right as far as the historic grandeur of Soviet achievements is concerned.

It would not be out of place here to place on record, in spite of the danger of making invidious distinctions, the unique service rendered to the party in this period by the late Comrade Ajoy Ghosh who was elected its general secretary in 1951 and remained at that post till his death in 1962.

It was an unfortunate fact, however, that despite this promising start so much never even really began. The search for the specifics of India never really extended beyond **economic** analysis. It never really went to the study of the specifics of the structures of our society and of the classes of our society in their interconnection and development. In many ways, this is yet to be done.

* * *

This volume is a selection of documents made from the standpoint of enabling its readers to understand the historical development of the thought of the CPI. Much that was of interest had to be left out on considerations of space and expense, especially the controversy in 1955-56. The editor has adhered to the principle of selecting only what was the thought of the party rather than what helped it become so.

Much more than gratitude is due to Smt. Vanaja Iyenger, without whom sheer survival from a terrible accident last year would not have been possible. And for Sri M. B. Rao no thanks are enough. He must share the blame as he is, in fact, the co-editor.

Ajoy Bhavan,
New Delhi,
24 September 1977

MOHIT SEN

Contents

Publisher's Note	iv
Introduction	v
1951	
1. Program of the Communist Party of India	1
2. Tactical Line	19
3. Statement of Policy of the Communist Party of India	42
4. Communist Party Ready for Negotiated Settlement in Telengana	55
1952	
5. Election Manifesto of the Communist Party of India	61
6. The Results of the General Election and the Tasks before the Party	85
7. On the Indian Trade Union Movement	119
8. Some of Our Main Weaknesses	183
1953	
9. The Extended Plenum of the Central Committee	193
10. Political Resolution	211
11. Some Problems of TU Unity	239
12. The Situation in Kashmir	258
13. The Situation in Kashmir Following the Dismissal of Sheikh Abdullah	261
14. Regarding the People's Democratic Front in Hyderabad	267
1954	
15. Political Resolution of the Communist Party of India	284
16. Support the People's Movement in French India	321

17. Our Tasks Among the Peasant Masses	323
18. States Reorganisation	357
19. Memorandum to the States Reorganisation Commission	362
20. Government Must Intervene in Goa	373
21. French India Struggle	374
22. Welcome to Chou En-lai	375
23. Nehru-Chou-En-lai Joint Statement	376
24. Communist Answer to Pandit Nehru	377
25. Andhra Election	394
1 9 5 5	
26. Nehru's Socialism—A Hoax	393
27. Communist Party in the Struggle for Peace, Democracy and National Advance	416
28. Communist Party and Problems of National Reconstruction	441
29. Goa—What Next?	464
30. Goa	473
31. A Visit of Great Historic Significance	481
1 9 5 6	
32. Defeat Merger Proposals of Existing States	490
33. On the 20th Congress of the CPSU	495
34. Political Resolution	523
35. Struggle for Linguistic Provinces	572
36. Statement on Communal Situation in Punjab	575
37. Struggle Against Cult of the Individual in CPSU	579
38. Basis for Settlement of Naga Problem	584
39. Statement on Bilingual Bombay State	587
40. On India's Path of Development	588
41. New Perspectives	614
42. J. V. Stalin	639
43. Forward to Election Battle	645

1. Program of the Communist Party of India

1. When the British imperialist rulers of India established the government of the leadership of the National Congress in Delhi in August 1947, and the hated British viceroy and governors departed from this country, the people of India were led to believe that foreign imperialist rule was at an end that India had achieved independence and freedom and that now the government and the people could work out a happy life for the millions of our countrymen, with our resources of land and labour, our factories and workshops, our immense natural wealth and manpower. We could now set to work to gradually overcome our poverty and guarantee food, housing, clothing and the minimum decencies of life to everyone.

2. Four years of the Nehru government in power has belied the hopes of the masses in every respect. Experience has led them to the conclusion that the government of National Congress that rose to power on the basis of the heroic struggle of the masses is a government pledged to the protection and preservation of parasitic landlords and the wealth of the princes of India, who for centuries had supported the foreign invaders and jointly with them robbed our people and our country. Experience is also leading them to the conclusion that the government of the National Congress was installed in power by the consent of British imperialists because it was a government pledged to the protection and preservation of foreign

This program was adopted by the all-India party conference, Calcutta, 9-15 October 1951 after amending the draft published by the politburo in April 1951. It was published in October 1951 and reprinted in March 1953. The third party congress, Madurai, 27 December 1953 to 4 January 1954, readopted this program with a single amendment in para 29. This was published in March 1954.

British capital in India. In every sphere of life of the masses, the government has failed to carry out its promises to the people. Everyday life for the masses has worsened while the landlords and profiteers have enriched themselves more and more at the expense of the people.

3. The five million workers manning our factories, railways, mines, shipyards, plantations, etc. are suffering from fall in real wages, rising prices, capitalist rationalisation and unemployment. Their struggles for better wages and conditions are drowned in blood by shooting and police terror. Their fighting trade union organisations are disrupted, divided and suppressed by the government and its henchmen. Demanding increased production in the name of the people the government only imposes worsened conditions of labour on the working class, enabling the profiteers to increase their profits alone.

4. The millions of our peasants constituting eighty per cent of our people are ground down as before. Those who have land and can cultivate it, their fruits of labour are looted by the landlord and the moneylender, through exorbitant rents and interests, and by the manoeuvres of the capitalist market and taxes of the state. But three-fourths of the peasantry have practically no land of their own. Those who have no land and find no work live in conditions of perpetual pauperism. And those who do find work on the landlords' and sowcars' (moneylenders) estates, as agricultural labourers or poor tenants, have to work like serfs and slaves, hardly getting even a subsistence wage for the family. As a result production of food and industrial raw materials is falling, leading to the worst food crisis in the country and starvation and death to millions. While the government run by the landlords and profiteers shouts about abolition of landlordism, it only hatches schemes of compensation of millions of rupees to those oppressors of the people, to enable them thus to indirectly realise their rent through the state from the toil of the peasant. The struggles of the peasantry for land, for reduction of rent, interest and taxes are also drowned in blood and their organisations suppressed, along with the

struggles and organisations of the working class. Whole villages, talukas and districts are handed over to military and police occupation, because the peasants and landless labourers have dared to ask for land, for reduction of rent and interest and for increased wages and the establishment of better conditions.

5. The middle classes in the towns are faring no better. High cost of living, falling salaries and unemployment is their lot too. The middleclass wage-earners in government services, private offices, banks, insurance companies, commercial concerns, schools and colleges, etc. are faced with the same problem of life as the working class and the toiling peasantry.

6. Even the industrialists, manufacturers and traders are hit by the policies of this government which is totally in the grip of monopoly financiers, landlords and princes and their foreign British advisers, working behind the screen. Allocation of capital issues, raw material, transport, import and export licences, etc. is carried out by the bureaucrats in the government machinery in such a way as to hit the small industrialists and traders and benefit the big monopolists in league with the banks and syndicates of foreign firms.

7. The schemes of 'reconstruction', of building irrigation, hydroelectric stations, factories, etc., whether directly by the state or in partnership with private capital, are all foundering, except such as feed war purposes. They are turning out to be the means of looting the state budget by foreign firms of experts and suppliers, by high-placed bureaucrats in charge and big speculators on the stock exchange. The demand for nationalisation of industries, promoted by the looting of the people by blackmarketeers, is used to swindle the state budget by making it acquire bankrupt or wornout units or participate in bogus schemes which invariably fail and are then sold out to the government henchmen and private capitalists. The result is that industrialisation of the country, which is held at the mercy of the British and the Americans and who certainly are not interested in making India an industrial nation, is

making no headway in the hands of this government which is tied to the chariot-wheels of British capital.

8. And whatever industries exist are continually finding themselves in a crisis, because the growing poverty of the masses, specially the peasantry, does not give them an adequate market inside the country. Outside as well as inside the country, they come up against the competition of foreign firms and other imperialist masters of the colonial world and thus find themselves in a deadlock.

9. On the top of all this comes the fact that this tottering government in order to keep itself in saddle, when faced with the rising discontent of the masses, suppresses all civil liberties of the people, outlaws political parties and groups, bans trade unions and other people's organisations, imprisons thousands of workers, peasants, students, men and women in prisons and concentration camps. The supreme ruler becomes the police official and the bureaucrat, helped by the local congress leader and landlord in the whole countryside. No wonder that to maintain such a police state, the burden of taxes increases and more than fifty per cent of the state budget is spent on military and police, prisons and the bureaucracy and not for food and cloth, homes and education, health and sanitation for the people.

10. The people of India are gradually realising the meaning of this state of affairs and are coming to realise the necessity to change this government of landlords and princes, this government of financial sharks and speculators, this government hanging on to the will of the British commonwealth, the British imperialists. The disillusioned masses are slowly rising in struggle, no longer able to withstand this state of slow starvation and death. They are rising in struggles of the working class in towns and the resistance of peasantry in the countryside.

11. In order to prevent this growing unity of the people, mainly the unity of the working class and its alliance with the peasantry, the unity of all classes that are interested in ending this government of landlords and princes and the

reactionary big bourgeoisie, collaborating with the British imperialists, the present government is utilising other means apart from police repression.

12. Knowing the desire of the people to make our country completely independent of British imperialism, the government has proclaimed India a republic. But unwilling really to break its ties with imperialism, it has shamelessly proclaimed the republic to be a part of the empire!

The membership of the British empire is not only a formal matter, as is declared. While playing on the rivalries between England and America, to its own advantage in certain circumstances, the government of India essentially carries out the foreign policy of British imperialism. Though it speaks for peace and against the atomic bomb under pressure from the people, who do not want war and want peace, it has not hesitated to send help, even though nominally medical, to the American troops in Korea; it has allowed British imperialists to recruit gurkhas and sikhs for the suppression of Malaya's fight for independence; it has allowed landing bases in India for the French planes on their way to fight against the People's Republic of Vietnam. The Indian navy operates as part of the British navy and under British command and the keys to the military technique of the defence department of the government are held and moved by British advisers. If the independence of the armed forces of a country is a sign of its sovereignty and independence, then the key part of our independence is still left in the hands of British imperialism.

In addition to this subservience to British imperialists, the policies of the government of India are leading to penetration of American imperialists into our economy and life, into the affairs of state and threaten us with added slavery to American capital.

13. The British imperialists before covering their rule with the mantle of the new congress government drowned the country in hindu-muslim strife and massacres and then divided the country into the two states of India and Pakistan. The imperialists thereby weakened the economy

of India in agriculture and the economy of Pakistan in industry. It thus put both the states at loggerheads and undeclared war with each other and dependent on the so-called 'neutral third party', the imperialists.

The division of the country enabled the congress government to drown the just demands of the people in a hysteria of hindu-muslim war. It enabled the government to spend on armaments the money which could have been used to improve the conditions of the people. It enabled them to buy armaments from the British imperialists who desired nothing better than to sell their secondhand goods and services in exchange for its sterling debts to India and Pakistan, and to deprive our people of supplies of machinery and essential goods.

14. The division of the country and communal religious strife was used to drown the demands of the various nationalities of India for their free development, for the reconstitution of the former mixed British provinces and the princely states into autonomous linguistic provinces in a united India. In the name of a united country, the language of a part of the country, namely, Hindi, was declared an obligatory state language for all nationalities and states, to the detriment of their own national language. Vast areas and millions of people of one nationality are compelled to live under the rule of bureaucrats and governments dominated by another nationality. Large tribal areas, with their own economy and culture, are put at the mercy of the landlords and financial sharks of this or that alien group, thus utilising the desire of the masses for a united country to actually sow division and discord among its people.

15. In order, finally, to come forward as a government of the people, after spending millions of the people's money on wrangling in legislative houses, the government produced what it calls a democratic constitution and in terms of that constitution calls upon the people to elect a government of their own choice and realise the fundamental rights given under the constitution. Thus the people are told that they can end the present rule of autocracy if they so desire

and work their freedom through this 'democratic' constitution of the free republic of India.

16. While it is a fact that universal adult franchise now exists in the constitution of India and it can and will be used by the people, it is a deception of the people to say that elections alone under this constitution can end the landlord-capitalist rule in the country and the imperialist hold over its life. Adult franchise serves to gauge the maturity of the working class and the people and is formally an element of democracy but it cannot express the true will and the true interests of the exploited masses as long as the land is not the property of peasants but that of the landlords, as long as the power of landlords and capitalists holds the people in subjugation in fields and factories, so long as the power of capital over the press and means of propaganda drugs the people with lies, so long as the power of money utilises religious and caste friction and rivalry to divide and to weaken the people, so long as the bureaucrats and the police ban political parties, suppress civil liberties and imprison without trial even the elected representatives of the legislatures for their political opinions and for their honest work.

17. It is also a deception of the people to say that under the new constitution the masses or the government elected by them can work their way to freedom and happiness. The constitution guarantees no rights to the people which are enforceable in any way or which are not subject to violation by the emergency autocratic decrees of the bureaucracy which is irremovable and inviolate. The right to strike, to living wage, to work and rest for the working class and salaried employees is not guaranteed and made enforceable. The land of the landlords and the properties and incomes of the dethroned or enthroned princes are made inviolable. The landless peasant can have land, it appears, but only if he can buy it or compensate the landlord for it. But to buy land and to pay compensation, capital is needed, and tens of millions of poor peasants who live from hand to mouth have no capital. Therefore the poor peasants have to stay without land and continue their existence in poverty. It

is characteristic that by several treaties with Britain and America, the government had made the property of foreign holders in our country sacred and inviolable, having provided them with such guarantees that even their profits cannot be touched and have to be let out of the country in the way they like. And this at a time when the government refuses to guarantee the citizens from the club-law of the police officers and from the plunder on the part of the moneylenders and profiteers.

Thus while the stranglehold of landlords, princes and imperialists on our economy, land and capital is guaranteed by this constitution not a single item of the life and liberty of our masses is guaranteed, beyond stating them as pious illusory wishes. The constitution is not and cannot be called a truly democratic constitution but is a constitution of a landlord-capitalist state, tied to foreign imperialist interests—mainly British.

18. It is quite natural that in view of the terrible conditions described above, dooming the people to poverty and subjecting them to a lawless regime, the people have lost their faith in the present government, they are becoming deeply distrustful of it and start to consider it their enemy who is protecting the landlords, moneylenders and other exploiters against the people. Moreover the masses of the people openly voice their discontent and revolt in several provinces against the inhuman regime of the present government and are seeking out ways to substitute this government by a new people's government able to express the will and interests of the people, able to protect it against the oppression of landlords, capitalists, profiteers, moneylenders and foreign imperialists.

19. Faced with these facts, the Communist Party of India feels it its duty to outline to the people the practical tasks, the practical program which the Communist Party of India upholds and which should be put into effect by the people of India if they wish to come out of the deadlock into which they have been forced by the present government, if they wish to attain their freedom and happiness.

While adhering to the aim of building a socialist society the Communist Party is not demanding the establishment of socialism in our country in the present stage of our development. In view of the backwardness of the economic development of India and of the weakness of the mass organisations of workers, peasants and toiling intelligentsia, our party does not find it possible at present to carry out socialist transformations in our country. But our party regards as quite mature the task of replacing the present antidemocratic and antipopular government by a new government of people's democracy created on the basis of a coalition of all democratic antifeudal and anti-imperialist forces in the country, capable of effectively guaranteeing the rights of the people, of giving land to the peasants gratis, of protecting our national industries against the competition of foreign goods and of ensuring the industrialisation of the country, of securing a higher standard of living to the working class, of ridding the people of unemployment and thus placing the country on the wide road of progress, cultural advancement and independence.

What are the practical tasks which, in the opinion of the Communist Party of India, should be carried out by the new people's democratic government?

These tasks are as follows:

IN THE FIELD OF STATE STRUCTURE

20. The sovereignty of the people, i.e. the concentration of all power in the country in the hands of the people. The supreme power in the state must be vested entirely in the people's representatives who will be elected by the people and be subject to recall at any time upon a demand by the majority of electors and who shall constitute a single popular assembly, a single legislative chamber.

21. The restriction of the rights of the president of the republic, in virtue of which the president and persons authorised by him will be deprived of the right to promulgate

laws, which have not been passed by the legislature. The president shall be elected by the legislature.

22. Universal, equal and direct suffrage for all male and female citizens of India who have attained the age of eighteen years in all elections to the legislative assembly and to the various local government bodies; secret ballot, the right of every voter to be elected to any representative institution, payment to people's representatives, proportional representation of political parties in all elections.

23. Local government on a wide scale and with wide powers through people's committees. The abolition of all local and provincial authorities appointed from above (e.g. governors, magistrates, commissioners, etc.).

24. Inviolability of person and domicile; unhampered freedom of conscience, religious belief and worship, speech, press, assembly, strike and combination; freedom of movement and occupation.

25. Equal rights for all citizens irrespective of religion, caste, sex, race or nationality, equal pay for equal work, irrespective of sex.

Social disabilities from which women suffer shall be abolished and they shall be given protection to secure and exercise equal rights with men in such matters as inheritance of property, marriage and divorce laws, entrance to professions and service, etc.

Social and economic oppression of one caste by another or social and personal bans and prohibitions imposed by the so-called upper castes on the lower castes, especially the scheduled castes, in the name of custom, tradition or religion shall be abolished and made punishable by law.

Religious minorities shall be given protection against discrimination.

26. The right of all nationalities to self-determination. The republic of India will unite the peoples of the various nationalities of India not by force but by their voluntary consent to the creation of a common state.

27. The present boundaries of the states in the Indian Union shall be recast and states shall be reconstituted ac-

ording to the principle of common language. Princely states, where existing, shall be dissolved into the appropriate adjoining national states, and the foreign possessions shall be restored to the country and reconstituted on the same principle. The tribal areas or areas where the population is specific in composition and is distinguished by specific social conditions or constitutes a national minority will have complete regional autonomy and regional governments, and full assistance for their development.

28. Introduction of progressive income tax in industry, agriculture and trade and maximum relief in taxation for workers, peasants and artisans.

29. Right of people to receive instruction in their mother-tongue in educational institutions; the use of the national language of the particular state in all its public and state institutions, provision for the use of the language of a minority or region, where necessary, in addition to the national language. Use of Hindi as an all-India state language will not be obligatory.* In Hindusthani-speaking areas, safeguard and protection to Urdu and Devnagari scripts and the right of the people to use either of the two scripts.

30. Measures to foster, encourage and develop such literature, art and culture as will:

- help each nationality including the tribal people to develop their language and culture in their own way and in unison with the common aspirations of the democratic masses of the country as a whole;

- help the democratic masses in their struggle to improve their living conditions and enrich their life;

- help the toiling people to get rid of caste and communal hatred and prejudices and ideas of fear, subservience and superstition traditionally inculcated in them by the landlord-bourgeois classes;

- help all people grow feelings of brotherhood with the

* The third party congress added the following words here: *but will be encouraged as a means of intercourse between governments of different states and between the people of different states.*

peace-loving people of all countries and discourage ideas of racial and national hatred;

— discourage imperialist war propaganda and help people to realise peace and freedom for all.

31. The right of all persons to sue any official before a people's court.

32. Separation of the state from all religious institutions. The state to be a secular state.

33. Free and compulsory primary education for the children of both sexes up to the age of fourteen.

34. Replacement of the police by militia. Elimination of the mercenary army and other punitive forces and the establishment of a national army, navy and air force for the defence of India, closely linked with the people.

35. The establishment of the people's health service with a wide network of medical centres and hospitals all over the country designed to liquidate the centres of cholera, malaria and other epidemic diseases in the country.

IN THE FIELD OF AGRICULTURE AND THE PEASANT PROBLEM

The agriculture and the peasant problem are of primary importance to the life of our country.

We cannot develop agriculture to any considerable extent and provide the country with food and raw materials because the impoverished peasantry deprived of land is unable to purchase the most elementary agricultural implements and thus to improve its farming.

We cannot develop our national industries and industrialise our country to any considerable extent because the impoverished peasantry constituting 80 per cent of the population is unable to buy even a minimum quantity of manufactured goods.

We cannot make our state stable to any extent because the peasantry living in conditions of semistarvation receives no support from the government, hates it and refuses to support it.

We cannot improve the conditions of the working class

to any considerable extent because hundreds of thousands of hungry people forced by poverty to leave the countryside for towns swarm the 'labour market', lower 'prices of labour', increase the army of unemployed and thus make the improvement of the living standards of the working people impossible.

We cannot work our way out of cultural backwardness because the peasantry, living in conditions of semistarvation, constituting the overwhelming majority of the population, is deprived of any material means to give education to its children.

In order to get rid of all these evils and get our country out of cultural backwardness, it is necessary to create human conditions of existence for the peasants, it is necessary to take land from the landlords and hand it over to the peasants.

To achieve this, it is necessary:

36. To hand over landlords' land without payment to the peasants including agricultural labourers and to legalise this reform in the form of a special land law and thus realise abolition of landlordism without compensation.

37. To ensure a long-term and cheap credit for the peasants to enable them to purchase agricultural implements and the necessary seeds. To ensure long-term and cheap credit to small artisans to enable them to purchase raw materials, etc. and carry on their manufacture and trade.

38. To ensure government assistance to the peasants in the improvement of old and the building of new irrigation systems.

39. To cancel debts of peasants and small artisans to moneylenders.

40. To ensure adequate wages and living conditions to agricultural labourers.

IN THE FIELD OF INDUSTRY AND THE LABOUR PROBLEM

Our national industry suffers not only from an extremely low purchasing power of the peasants but also from the fact that it is exposed to competition on the part of foreign

goods in the country. Manufacturers, who are not protected by the government from ruinous foreign competition, try to make good their losses which arise from this competition by increasing pressure on the working class, by worsening its conditions. But the industries cannot develop if the living conditions of the workers deteriorate, for a hungry and moneyless worker cannot be an adequate factor for the development of modern industry. This circumstance is another reason for the insufficient development of our national industry. To break through this vicious circle, it is necessary to guard our national industry against the competition of foreign goods, to launch an all-out industrialisation of the country and to improve the conditions of the working class. The Communist Party of India considers to achieve this, it is necessary:

41. To provide for the protection of the national industry against the competition of foreign goods in the country by promulgating appropriate laws.

42. To develop the national industry and to prepare conditions for the industrialisation of the country without sparing any efforts and resources of the state to achieve this end.

43. To regulate and coordinate the various sectors of economy in order to achieve a planned economic development of the country in the interests of the people.

44. To improve radically the living and working conditions of workers by: fixing a living wage, application of the eight-hour day and fortyfour-hour week in all industries and trades, introduction of a six-hour day in underground mines and other trades injurious to health, social insurance at the expense of the state and capitalists against every kind of disability and unemployment, establishment of labour exchanges working in association with trade unions, establishment of industrial courts, recognition of trade unions, the right to collective bargaining and the right to strike.

45. To introduce effective control of prices of goods of mass consumption.

46. The problem of the refugee population, mainly of the

millions of the uprooted workers, peasants, artisans, middleclass employees, etc. must be resolved by their speedy rehabilitation by the state and specially by providing them with land, instruments of labour, employment and facilities for developing their life in their own national way.

NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE FOR INDIA

In spite of the much-advertised statement that the British have left our country, it is a fact that a large number of factories and workshops, mines and plantations, shipping and banking of India are owned by the British capitalists who annually draw hundreds of millions of profit from them. With this power over our economic life and their ties and partnership with the big capitalists in our country who are collaborating with them, the British imperialists from behind the scene and their collaborators hamper the development of our industries and thus perpetuate our poverty.

We cannot be a strong and prosperous country until we are industrialised on a wide scale; but industrialised to such an extent we shall never be as long as British capital exists in India, for the profits of British enterprises are taken out of the country and we are unable to use them to expand our industries, as long as the big national capitalists, their collaborators, keep us tied to the empire.

Moreover one has to take into account the numerous British advisers with whom our navy, our army, police and other punitive organs team.

To become a truly independent state, India has to break with the empire, to put an end to the domination of the British capital in the country's economy and to get rid of the British advisers.

Therefore the Communist Party of India considers necessary:

47. The withdrawal of India from the British commonwealth of nations and the British empire.

48. The confiscation and nationalisation of all factories, banks, plantations, shipping and mining owned by the British in India, whether in their own name or under the signboard of Indian companies.

49. Removal of the British advisers in India from the posts held by them.

FOUNDATION OF THE FOREIGN POLICY OF INDIA

India needs peace and peaceful development. It is interested in peace and economic cooperation with all states. In this respect Britain is not an exception if it only proves capable of carrying on economic cooperation with India on the basis full equality. The spurious play between peace and war, between partisans of peace and advocates of aggressive war, carried on by the present Indian government is not in India's interests.

The chief enemy of peace and advocate of an aggressive war is now the United States of America which has rallied round itself all aggressive countries. This camp of war is facing the camp of peace which includes such states as the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and other countries of people's democracy. Instead of joining hands with the partisans of peace against the aggressors and branding the United States of America as chief aggressor, the Indian government is carrying on a suspicious play between these two camps, and is flirting with the USA thus facilitating the struggle of aggressors against peaceloving countries. What India needs is not play between peace and war, but a united front with peaceloving countries and friendship with them.

Still less in India's interests is the wrangling in which the Indian Union and Pakistan are engaged and which is not counteracted on the part of the present Indian government.

The unbalancing of the integral economy of India caused by the division of the country, the strife between Pakistan and India, which enables the reactionary ruling circles to

divide the people and provides the American and British imperialists with opportunities for intervention, as in Kashmir, and for increasing their domination over both, will be overcome by a firm alliance of friendship and mutual assistance between India and the state of Pakistan. India must also enter into friendly alliance with the states of Ceylon and Nepal.

The economy of Ceylon is dependent on and complementary to that of India. Quite a large section of its people are formed from Indian plantation and other workers who have migrated to Ceylon. The Ceylonese and Indian landlords and traders incite the Indian and Ceylonese workers against each other to gain their selfish ends. The absence of alliance is utilised by the imperialists and their henchmen to sow discord among all these states and to sow hatred among their peoples, leading to the eviction of millions of people from their homeland. Only a firm alliance and friendship can defeat this game of imperialists and the reactionary ruling circles of these countries.

Therefore the Communist Party of India considers it necessary to guarantee the following:

50. Honest and consistent policy of peace in alliance with all peace-loving states and united front with them against aggressors.

51. The policy of economic cooperation with all states capable of carrying on economic cooperation without any discrimination whatsoever on the basis of full equality.

52. The policy of alliance and friendship with Pakistan, Ceylon and Nepal.

53. The policy of doing its utmost to protect the legitimate rights and interests of Indians residing abroad.

* * *

The Communist Party of India puts this program before the people of India, in order that they may have a clear picture of the objective they are fighting for.

Our party calls upon the toiling millions, the working class, the peasantry, the toiling intelligentsia, the middle-classes as well as the national bourgeoisie interested in the

freedom of the country and the development of prosperous life—to unite into a single democratic front in order to attain complete independence of our country, the emancipation of the peasants from the oppression of the feudals, improvement in the life of all working people, to bring about a major forward stride in our agriculture, a major forward stride in our national industry and secure the cultural advancement of our country.

The people of India led by its working class and its Communist Party, guided by the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, firmly allied with the million-headed peasantry of our land will achieve this program. The principles and the philosophy of Marxism and the leadership of the Communist Party have led nearly half of humanity to socialism, to freedom, to real democracy, at the head of which stands the Soviet Union. The peoples of Asia led by the great Chinese people's democracy are now battling to free themselves from imperialism. India is the last biggest dependent semicolonial country in Asia still left for the enslavers to rob and exploit. But the Communist Party believes that India too will soon take its place among the great nations of the world as a a victorious people's democracy and take the road of peace, prosperity and happiness.

2. Tactical Line

NOT PEACEFUL BUT REVOLUTIONARY PATH

1. The immediate main objectives set forth in the draft program of the Communist Party of India are the complete liquidation of feudalism, the distribution of all land held by feudal owners among the peasants and agricultural workers, and achievement of full national independence and freedom. These objectives cannot be realised in a peaceful, parliamentary way. These objectives can be realised only through a revolution, through the overthrow of the present Indian state and its replacement by a people's democratic state. For this the Communist Party shall strive to rouse the entire peasantry and the working class against the feudal exploiters, strengthen the alliance between the working class and the peasantry and build, under the leadership of the working class, a broad nationwide united front of all anti-imperialist classes (including the national bourgeoisie), sections, groups, parties and elements willing to fight for democracy and for the freedom and independence of India.

2. While resorting to all forms of struggle, including the most elementary forms, and while utilising all legal possibilities for mobilising the masses and taking them forward in the struggle for freedom and democracy, the Communist Party has always held that in the present colonial set-up in India and in view of the absence of genuine democratic liberties, legal and parliamentary possibilities are

This document was drafted in consultation with the leaders of the CPSU, and adopted by the CC in April 1951 and circulated illegally. A legal version was adopted by the Calcutta conference and published (see next item). The main heading has been supplied by the editor.

severely restricted and that therefore the replacement of the present state upholding the imperialist-feudal order by a people's democratic state is possible only through an armed revolution of the people. The concrete experience of the last three years in India, after the so-called transfer of power, has only confirmed this thesis.

COMBINATION OF PARTISAN WAR IN THE COUNTRYSIDE AND WORKERS' RISING IN CITIES

3. Nevertheless, wrong and distorted ideas have prevailed in our party ranks about the exact character of this armed struggle and the exact form it will have to take in order to ensure victory. For a period after the second party congress, the dominant tendency inside the party leadership was to forget the colonial nature of India's economy, to refuse to draw lessons from the experience of the revolutionary movement in China and other colonial countries, to minimise the immense importance of peasant struggles and to put forward the thesis that the political general strike in the cities and in industrial areas is the main weapon of our revolution, that such a strike will itself unleash countrywide insurrection and lead to the overthrow of the present state.

Afterwards, on the basis of a wrong understanding of the experience of the Chinese revolution, the thesis was put forward that the Indian revolution would develop exactly in the same way as the revolution in China and that partisan war would be the main or almost the only weapon to ensure its victory.

While the former thesis minimised the importance of the peasant masses and their struggles, the latter thesis minimised the importance of the working class and its actions. Both tactical lines were the result of ignoring the specific situation in India and of the tendency to draw mechanical parallels with other countries.

In theory as well as in practice both tactical lines amounted to repudiation of the key task of building the alliance

of the working class and the peasantry, repudiation, therefore, of the task of building the united national front of which this alliance alone could be the firm basis, repudiation of the leadership of the working class in the antifeudal and anti-imperialist revolution.

4. In order to evolve a correct tactical line, it is necessary to discard both the erroneous theses given above and to take into account all the factors of the Indian situation. India is a vast country, with a backward and basically colonial economy and with 80 per cent of its people dependent on agriculture. In such a country, partisan warfare, as the experience of China has shown, is one of the most powerful weapons in the armoury of the revolutionary movement and this weapon will have to be wielded by the Communist Party in the fight for national liberation. At the same time it must be realised that there are other specific factors of the Indian situation which are such that this weapon alone cannot lead to victory. In China, the split in the united national front in 1927 simultaneously split the armed forces also and the Communist Party had an army of 30,000 to start with. Moreover, because of the sparse development of railways and other means of transport, the enemy found it difficult to rapidly concentrate his forces against the areas held by the communists. Despite these advantages enjoyed by the revolutionary forces, they were repeatedly encircled by the enemy. Time and again they had to break away from this encirclement and threat of annihilation and migrate to new areas to rebuild again. It was only when they made their way into Manchuria and found the firm rear of the Soviet Union that the threat of encirclement came to an end and they were able to launch that great offensive which finally led to the liberation of China. It was thus the support given by the existence of a mighty and firm Soviet rear that was of decisive importance in ensuring victory to the tactic of peasant partisan warfare in the countryside in China.

5. In these respects the situation in India is different. We have no army to start with, it has to be created. The transport system in India is far more developed than in

China, enabling the government to swiftly concentrate big forces against partisan areas. And above all, the geographical position of India is such that we cannot expect to have a friendly neighbouring state which can serve as a firm and powerful rear. All these do not mean that partisan warfare has no place in India. On the contrary, because of the factors given earlier, partisan war must be one of the major weapons in our armoury as in the case of all colonial countries. But this weapon alone cannot ensure victory. It has to be combined with the other major weapons—that of strikes of the working class, general strike and uprisings in cities led by armed detachments of the working class. Therefore, in order to achieve victory of the popular democratic revolution, it is absolutely essential to combine two basic factors of the revolution—the partisan war of the peasants and workers' risings in the cities.

6. Partisan areas will inevitably arise in various parts of the country as the crisis deepens and as the mass peasant movement rises to the level of revolutionary seizure of land and foodgrains, paralysing and wiping out of the local forces of the enemy. These areas and the revolutionary forces operating in them, however, will continuously face the danger of encirclement and annihilation at the hands of the enemy. Even the coming into existence of liberated territories with their own armed forces in several parts of the country will not eliminate this danger because these areas will themselves be surrounded by hostile forces from all sides. Therefore partisan war alone, no matter how widely extended, cannot insure victory over the enemy in the concrete situation prevailing in India. When the maturing crisis gives rise to partisan struggles on a wide scale when the partisan forces in several areas are battling against the enemy, the workers in the cities, in vital industries and especially in the transport system, will have to play a decisive role. The onslaught of the enemy against the partisan forces, against liberated areas, will have to be hampered and paralysed by mass strike actions of the working class. With hundreds of streams of partisan struggles merging with the general strike and uprising of work-

ers in the cities, the enemy will find it impossible to concentrate his forces anywhere and defeat the revolutionary forces but will himself face defeat and annihilation. Even inside the armed forces of the government the crisis will grow and big sections will join the forces of revolution.

ALLIANCE OF WORKERS AND PEASANTS AS CONDITION OF VICTORY

7. Such a perspective demands the closest alliance between the working class and the peasantry and the realisation of workingclass leadership in this alliance. This alliance will be built in action, by the bold championship by the working class of the demands of the peasantry, by the direct support given by the working class in the form of demonstrations and strikes to the struggles waged by the peasantry. Leadership of the working class will be realised not merely through the leadership of the Communist Party but above all through the direct mass actions of the working class itself in support of the demands and struggles of the peasantry. Of all classes the working class is looked upon by the peasants as their closest friend and ally. Many workers come from the rural areas and are connected with the peasant by a thousand and one tie. Actions by the working class help not merely the existing peasant struggles but also, as the history of our national movement shows, inspire the peasants in the neighbouring areas, radicalise them and help in developing new peasant struggles. In the present situation in India when all classes, all sections, except the exploiting few, are facing starvation and when hatred against the present government is growing, strike actions by the working class on such an issue as food ration cuts can be a most powerful weapon to inspire the entire people, to give concrete form to their discontent, to build their unity in action and to raise the popular movement to a higher level. By fighting not merely for its own demands but for the demands of all discontented classes and sections, especially the peasantry, by acting as the foremost champion of the interests of the general democratic movement,

the working class will come forward as the leader of the revolutionary people and build their revolutionary unity.

8. It is of the utmost importance therefore that the party creates a political consciousness in the working class, makes it conscious of its role of hegemony, overcomes the present disunity of the working class, wins over the majority of workers in the vital industries and builds a powerful workingclass movement with underground factory and workshop committees as its nucleus. The best and most advanced elements must be recruited into the party. All this demands intensive political agitation in the working class, patient day-to-day work, leadership of immediate struggles for the winning of the concrete demands and the building up of a strong tradeunion movement. Only a united working class and a working class conscious of its role of hegemony can build national unity.

PARTISAN WAR OF PEASANTS

9. In the rural areas the party has to rouse all sections of the peasants, including the rich peasants, against feudal exploitation and build their unity basing itself firmly on the agricultural workers and poor peasants who together form the overwhelming majority of the population. While the liquidation of feudalism and distribution of land to the peasants must remain the key slogans of agrarian revolution for the entire period, it is necessary to formulate immediate specific demands for each province and each area like reduction of rent, fair price for agricultural produce, abolition of feudal levies and forced labour, living wage for agricultural workers, etc. and lead actions for the realisation of these demands. The agrarian crisis is maturing rapidly and the peasant masses are seething with discontent against the present government which rose to power on the basis of their support and afterwards betrayed them. Despite however this widespread discontent and despite the numerous peasant actions that have taken place in many parts of the country, the peasant

movement in the country as a whole remains weak and large sections of peasants have not yet been drawn into active struggle, because of the absence of organisation and firm leadership. It is our task to overcome this weakness by intensive popularisation of our agrarian program, by formulation of such concrete and easily understood demands as can become the basis for the broadest mass action, by patient day-to-day work and correct leadership of struggles to realise these demands, and by building up in the course of these struggles a network of peasant and agricultural workers' organisations with underground units in the villages as their leading and guiding centres. Volunteer squads of the most militant and conscious sections of the peasants have to be formed to defend the peasant movement against the attacks of the enemy—squads that will form the nuclei of partisan squads as the movement develops and reach the stage of seizure of land and partisan warfare.

10. As the crisis matures, as the unity, consciousness and organisation of the masses grow, as the strength and influence of the party develops and as the enemy resorts to more and more ruthless measures to crush the agrarian movement, the question of when, where and how to resort to arms will be more and more forced on the agenda. As the question is one of immense practical importance, it is absolutely necessary that the party is able to give a clear and unambiguous answer to it.

It must be realised that because of the vast area of India, because of the uneven level of mass consciousness and mass movement in different parts of the country, uneven acuteness of the agrarian crisis and uneven strength and influence of the party itself, the peasant movement cannot develop at the same tempo everywhere. Premature uprisings and adventurist actions of every type must be undoubtedly eschewed. At the same time, it would be wrong to lay down that armed action in the form of partisan warfare should be resorted to in every specific area only when the movement in all parts of the country rises to the level of uprisings. On the contrary, in the course of

the development of the movement, the situation will arise in several areas which would demand armed struggle in the form of partisan warfare. For example, in a big and topographically suitable area where the peasant movement has risen to the level of seizure of land, the question as to how to effect that seizure and how to defend the land so seized will become a burning live question. The party is of the opinion that partisan warfare in such a situation, undertaken on the basis of a genuine mass peasant movement and the firm unity under the leadership of the party of the peasant masses, especially the most oppressed and exploited strata, combined with other forms of struggle such as social boycott of landlords, mass no-rent struggle, agricultural workers' strike, can, if correctly conducted and led, have a rousing and galvanising effect on the peasant masses in all areas and raise their own struggles to a higher level.

Wherever such partisan struggles develop they must also be combined with mass actions of the working class, especially in the neighbouring areas, in the form of strikes and demonstrations. Undertaken on the basis of the most careful preparation and assessment of all factors, the partisan struggles must be conducted with the utmost boldness and tenacity, defending the gains of the movement by every means at our disposal.

At the same time the party has to act with the utmost flexibility when overwhelming forces of the enemy are concentrated against the partisan areas and the partisan forces run into the danger of defeat and total annihilation.

PARTISAN STRUGGLE AND INDIVIDUAL TERRORISM

11. In spite of the offensive nature of the partisan struggle, it is necessary to emphasise in our agitation and propaganda in the initial period the defensive nature of partisan struggle, saying that the objective of the partisan struggle is above all to defend the peasants from the attacks of the government and its punitive organs. In

doing so special attention should be paid to the demands for which the peasants are fighting and to the atrocities of the government which force the peasants to take to arms. It is necessary, at the same time, to point out that it is the government that is responsible for violence and bloodshed.

Partisan struggle is frequently confused with individual terrorism, it is asserted that individual terrorism is a part of partisan struggle and not only a part, but even a basis of the partisan struggle. This is absolutely wrong. What is more, individual terrorism contradicts the spirit and objectives of partisan struggle. And it is absolutely incompatible with partisan struggle. In the first place, the objective of individual terrorism is to destroy particular individuals while not pursuing the aim of destroying the regime of feudal exploitation and subjugation of the people, whereas the objective of partisan struggle is not to destroy particular individuals, but to destroy the hated regime in a prolonged struggle of the popular masses. In the second place, individual terrorism is carried out by individuals—terrorists—or by small squads of terrorists acting apart from the masses, and without any link with the struggle of the masses, whereas the partisan struggle is carried on by the popular masses and not by individuals, it is carried on in close contact with the struggle of the masses against the existing regime.

Since individual terrorism is directed against particular individuals and not against the regime it creates in the minds of the masses a harmful illusion as if it would be possible to destroy the regime by destroying individual representatives of the regime, that what matters is not the destruction of the regime but the destruction of the individual representatives of the regime, that the main evil is not the existence of the regime but the existence of particular worst representatives of the regime whom it is precisely necessary to destroy. It is clear that such a feeling created by individual terrorism can only weaken the onslaught of the masses against the regime and thus facilitate the struggle of the government against the

people. Therein lies the first main harm done by individual terrorism to the people's partisan movement.

Since individual terrorism is carried out not by the masses but by individual terrorists acting apart from the masses, individual terrorism leads to an undue minimisation of the role of the mass movement and to equally undue exaggeration of the role of the terrorists, who are alleged to be capable of securing the liberation of the people by their own forces, independent of the growth of the mass partisan movement. It is clear that such a feeling created by individual terrorism can only cultivate passivity among the popular masses and thereby undermine the development of partisan struggle. Therein lies the second main harm done by individual terrorism to the revolutionary movement.

To sum up: Individual terrorism undermines the possibility of unleashing the partisan struggle of the masses and it should be rejected as harmful and dangerous.

IT IS NECESSARY TO STRENGTHEN THE PARTY

12. Despite the tremendous radicalisation that has taken place among the masses during the last three years and despite the many mass actions that have taken place and are taking place, it would be gross exaggeration to assert that India is already on the verge of an armed insurrection or a revolution, that a civil war is already raging in the country, that the government, its leaders and agents are already completely isolated and so on and so forth. Such an exaggeration inevitably leads to the ignoring of the concrete tasks facing the party, the organising and advocacy of adventurist actions, and the issuing of futile calls for action and pompous slogans which bear no relation either to the existing level of mass consciousness or to the actual maturity of the situation. In practice it results in the selfisolation of the party, making it easy for the enemy to destroy it. It results in handing over of the masses to the socialists and other disruptors.

Equally wrong are they who through their reformism see only the weakness and disunity of the popular movement, the offensive of the enemy and advocate a policy of retreat and 'lying low', a policy of regrouping of forces, eschewing all militant action in the cities and in the countryside for the present. Tactics based on such an understanding of the situation would result in the worst type of reformism and make the party trail behind the masses instead of leading them.

13. The reality of the situation is that the crisis is maturing fast, under its impact the masses are getting fast radicalised and a period of big battles lies ahead. The government's failure to carry out a single pledge that it gave to the people, its failure to tackle a single problem—especially the problem of agrarian reform and food for the people—all these are fast shattering the illusions and already the majority of our people look upon the present government as a government of the exploiting classes, as a government of landlords and capitalists. Most of them still believe that this government can be changed and a real popular government take its place without resort to armed revolution and by means of the general elections, nevertheless in the struggle for their day-to-day demands—adequate wages, fair price for agricultural products, restoration of ration cuts, etc.—hundreds of thousands are coming out in action in all parts of the country. The growth of the popular movement still lags behind the growth of popular discontent, only a small fraction of the people have as yet been drawn into the actual struggle against the government. This lag is due not merely to the repressive measures adopted by the government but primarily and above all to the weakness of the party and the existing disunity of the progressive forces. It is therefore one of the key tasks of the party to forge the unity of the working class, to unite the popular forces on the basis of a concrete program, and to grow into a mass party so as to be able to supply the leadership which alone can unify and extend the mass movement and raise it to a higher level.

The party has to give the slogan that the present government must go and be replaced by a popular government, representing the unity of the democratic forces, a government that will break with the British empire and carry out the program of agrarian reform and democracy. It has to utilise the coming general elections for the most extensive popularisation of its program, for mobilising and unifying the democratic forces, for exposing the policies and methods of the government. It has to lead the masses in their day-to-day struggles and take them forward step by step so that the people, through their own experience, come to realise the necessity and inevitability of armed revolution.

The party must not preach the inevitability of fascism but utilise the enormous volume of democratic opinion in the country to unite the people and halt the growing drive towards fascism on the part of the present government. Through patient and systematic day-to-day work, through bold championship of the demands of the people, through correct leadership of the concrete struggles of all sections of the people, the party will grow and be able to fulfil its role as organiser and leader of the people's democratic movement.

14. It is necessary therefore to put an end to the interminable discussion that has been going on in our party for one year on the question of the Chinese path, on the question as to how armed struggle is to be conducted. Such discussions disorganise the party, dissipate its strength and leave the masses leaderless precisely when they need the leadership of the party most urgently. Discussion of such matters, carried on almost openly as they have been till now, reveals all our plans to the enemy and makes it difficult to carry them out in practice.

The fact is that if the crisis bursts forth in the near future the party in its present disorganised and weak state will not be able to fully utilise it to lead the people to revolution. It is not yet prepared to shoulder the gigantic responsibilities that such a situation will place on it. It is necessary therefore that the present weaknesses are over-

come with the utmost rapidity, the ranks of the party are unified and steps are taken to extend mass basis of the party and strengthen it. While recruiting the best elements from the working class and other fighting classes into the party and developing it into a mass party, it is necessary at the same time to exercise the utmost vigilance against the swamping of the party by elements that cannot yet be considered fully tested and trustworthy. The system of candidate membership must be introduced for this purpose. It is also necessary that while utilising all legal possibilities, the existing illegal apparatus of the party is strengthened enormously.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF PEACE

15. One of the most important tasks facing the party in our country is the task of mobilising the Indian people in the struggle for the defence of peace. Being one of the largest and most populous countries of the world and occupying a key position in Southeast Asia, India has a tremendous role to play in the battle against the Anglo-American warmongers and for the preservation of peace. It is the job of the Communist Party to ensure that India plays that role.

The forces of peace in our country are potentially very strong and are growing. Love and admiration for the Soviet Union are widespread among all sections, including the middleclass intelligentsia. The liberation of China and its emergence as a great power, the manner in which the people's government of China is successfully tackling the problems of food, famine, floods and diseases have profoundly influenced our people. So powerful is the sentiment against American aggression in Korea, so widespread the sympathy for the Korean people that even the most reactionary newspapers have had to criticise the Americans. This powerful mass sentiment as well as other factors have compelled even the Nehru government to take a stand against the most blatant acts of the American imperialists (the threat

to use atom bomb, the branding of People's China as aggressors, etc.).

16. The party, however, has as yet not succeeded in transforming the widespread peace sentiment into a powerful peace movement because, as on other issues, our approach to the issue of peace also was an extremely sectarian one. The peace movement, in the main, remained a movement confined to the existing mass following of the party and the TUs and peasant organisations under our influence. The peace platform was utilised for abstract denunciation of the government on all conceivable issues and to popularise struggles that only the party waged. Inevitably the result was a restriction of the sweep of the peace movement and failure to win over as peace partisans all the genuine lovers of peace. It is only recently that these harmful methods are being abandoned.

Another manifestation of sectarianism was the failure to link the issue of peace with the live issues facing the people, the failure to show the connection between the drive towards war and the mounting war budget of the Nehru government with the rise in the prices of necessities of life, reduction of government expenditure on education, neglect of housing accommodation, growing attack on civil liberties, etc.

It is of the utmost importance to abandon all sectarianism in order to develop a real broadbased peace movement. The growing and strengthening of the national-liberation movement helps the cause of peace. The strengthening of the peace movement also facilitates the growth of the national-liberation movement. These two movements therefore must develop in close relation with each other, each strengthening the other. Nevertheless they are not identical. The platform of peace is a broader platform. It can and must include all supporters of peace, all elements who for various reasons are opposed to war and are prepared to take their stand against all measures calculated to extend and unleash war.

17. It is necessary for peace movement to correctly appraise the foreign policy of the Nehru government in

relation to peace and to adopt a correct attitude towards all specific manifestations of that policy.

While the peace movement must support all these specific acts of the government which hamper the plans of the warmongers, e.g. Nehru's declaration against the atom bomb and the vote against American proposal to denounce People's China in the UNO, it must also simultaneously point out the halfhearted and vacillating nature of the government's policy and wage a determined battle to mobilise mass opinion in favour of consistent peace policy.

As a matter of fact the Nehru government's policy cannot be called a policy of peace. It is essentially a policy of manoeuvring between the main enemy of peace, the United States of America and its junior partner Britain on the one hand and peaceloving countries on the other. Nehru fears the consequences of a world war and therefore advocates a policy of 'moderation', of not going 'too far'. At the same time the Indian government continues to be an active member of the British commonwealth which is a partner of American imperialism in aggressive wars. The Indian government has not condemned the American war of aggression in Korea, nor repudiated its support to the illegal resolution of the UNO sanctioning that aggression. It has not condemned the British imperialists who are waging war in Malay but on the contrary permitted them to recruit gorkha soldiers against the Malayan people. It has not denounced French aggression in Vietnam and continues to give facilities to the French imperialists for the transport of troops and war materials.

Therefore, in addition to mobilising the people against the threat of atom bomb, for support to the Stockholm and Warsaw appeals, one of the specific tasks of the peace movement in India is to rally the people against those policies of the present government which abet and aid the colonial wars waged by the American, British and French imperialists against the peoples of Southeast Asia. The peace movement is not a pacifist movement, not a movement merely for recording abstract support to peace. It is a fighting movement for concrete action in defence of peace

and against the imperialist warmongers, including those waging colonial wars.

18. The peace movement must fight against all attempts to sow hostility against the Chinese People's Republic. It must explain to our people how the liberation of Tibet is not a threat to peace but a decisive blow against the instigators of war. It must uphold the heroic action of the Chinese volunteers who by smashing the plans of the American warmongers to enslave the Korean and Chinese peoples strengthened the cause of world peace.

19. We must also fight against all warmongering propaganda against Pakistan, pointing out how the growing tension between Pakistan and India is the result of imperialist manoeuvres and how it helps the enemies of the peoples of both states. We must demand a drastic reduction in the military budget and a policy of friendship and close alliance between India, Pakistan and Ceylon.

20. The peace movement must wage a determined battle against slanderers of the Soviet Union, against all those who strive to depict the consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union as a policy of war and aggression. Basing ourselves on the lucid and clear-cut statement of Comrade Stalin in reply to the **Pravda** correspondent, we must concretely expose the real instigators of war and uphold the shining example of the Soviet Union which is devoting its energies and resources to further improve the condition of the people and leading the entire progressive humanity in the struggle for the preservation of peace. Firm friendship between the peaceloving peoples of all countries must save the world from the menace of war and the people of India have to play a big role in establishing this friendship—this fact must be made part of the consciousness of the entire people.

* * *

ON PARTISAN WAR

Question-Answer

Question: Is it correct to resort to partisan war in one particular area where the conditions are ripe for it, even though other rural areas are not ripe for it and the workers are not ready to support it with mass actions?

Answer: Yes, you can and should resort to it. To start or not does not depend on us. It depends on the organizational state of the masses and their mood. If the masses are ready, you must start it.

Question: Have we to take up partisan struggle only when the peasant struggle for partial demands reaches the stage of land distribution and establishing of village peasant committees? Or, can we take it up when the movement is still in the stage of struggle for partial demands, for example rent reduction?

Answer: The partisan struggle also has stages. It starts with smaller demands—let us say, reduction of rent. It is not yet a partisan struggle. If the enemy refuses to grant the demands and the peasant is eager to win it by force, then partisan struggles can start. True, it is not the struggle for seizure of land but only for reduction of rent, still it will be a partisan struggle.

The partisan struggle is a struggle for enforcing demands by force. It starts whenever peasants start open struggle for their demands. This is the first stage of the struggle. Whenever it takes up the main demand, that means the higher stage. Whenever it takes to arms to crush the law this is the highest stage. Just like the workers' struggles.

Hence it does not depend on us. If the masses are ready and eager, we should assist them.

Question: Can partisan warfare even of the most elementary type be developed in areas where communications are well developed?

Answer: Yes, when encirclement occurs, transfer the best forces to another area. Lead out the armed forces so as to join it with the armed forces in another area, so as to create a liberation army of your own.

Question: Aim of the partisan struggle that must be the liquidation of the enemy's armed forces with the active assistance of the masses of peasants. To kill individual oppressors with a view to terrorise all the other oppressors and make them renounce their oppression is terrorism. But I cannot understand the complete banning of any individual action against any oppressor—landlord, notorious official or a spy—as a matter principle, under the name of terrorism. In my opinion, at times, it becomes necessary in the earlier phase of the partisan struggle, to organise individual actions against some notorious oppressors, not in order to terrorise other oppressors into renouncing their oppression but to guard the safety of the partisan squads. I am unable to understand how such actions make the people passive. As I understand international literature, such individual actions were conducted by partisans against German and Japanese fascists in the occupied countries during the antifascist war, and they are being done even now in Asian countries where partisan warfare is going on—Malaya, Burma, Indochina, etc. If I remember rightly, such actions were not only not banned by Lenin in his article on partisan warfare but, on the other hand, he severely criticised the mensheviks who condemned them as anarchism. I seek clarification on this point.

Answer: Comrade says he cannot understand why individual terrorism should slow down the action of the masses. Individual terrorism is called so not merely because it is directed against individual oppressors but also because it is carried out by individuals or groups irrespective of the masses. Individual terrorism creates the illusion that the main evil is not the regime but individuals, that only if a **few more** are destroyed, the regime will be finished off. What conclusions will the masses

draw? That with the help of terrorism of this type, it is possible to destroy the regime after a long struggle. And if such conclusions are drawn by the peasants, they will say "No use developing the struggle against the regime. Our glorious terrorists will do the job." Such sentiments weaken the onslaught of the masses against the regime, it is harmful and dangerous.

Individual terrorism creates the belief that the main force lies in the heroic terrorists and not in the masses. The role of the masses becomes to watch and applaud. That means to cultivate passivity. Marx and Engels taught that the liberation of the masses has to be won by the masses themselves. This is what you ought to tell them. Different results follow from individual terrorism. Masses look upon the terrorists as heroes and liberators.

Comrade's reference to Lenin is without foundation. We can give him articles by Lenin directed against individual terrorism. You must know how hard he hit mensheviks when the revolution was at an ebb and they took to terror.

The theory of individual terrorism comes to the front when the revolution recedes. It is a reflection of the weakness of the movement. Whenever the revolutionary movement is rising and the masses themselves rise their theory of individual terrorism disappears from the horizon. Comrade must bear that in mind.

On landlords and capitalist landlords: In general landlord means feudal landlord. In the case of capitalist landlords as described by comrade, there should be a limit to the total land to be allowed to them.

This program lays down the broad outline. You will have to prepare a special agrarian program of your own. You have cultured provinces, backward provinces. In some capitalist farming has made big strides. Every area has its own specific feature. All this has to be taken into account.

CLARIFICATION

Questions and Answers

Deleted from the program the abolition of all indirect taxations. Our experience shows it is not possible at this stage. Only later, when revolution gains, it will be possible to reduce prices, reduce and then annul indirect taxes. Russian Marxists at first put this in their minimum program but it proved wrong.

Also we are opposed to the abolition of regular army. Experience shows that the revolution cannot be defended without a standing army, with well-qualified and trained men, tankmen, airmen, pilots, etc. Modern army cannot exist without well-trained cadres. If India bases itself only on rifles and machine-guns, Pakistan can easily subjugate it. Must have army of its own. Present army of Nehru however is a mercenary army. Popular national armies not mercenaries. It is linked with the people. Perhaps they will not digest general principle of conscription in India. Effect of British tradition which considers conscription a misfortune. Will say that Nehru not enforcing conscription but bolsheviks want it. Better not to say anything.

On competition of foreign goods in India: Theoretically, we know that America in a crisis dumps its goods. This happened in China under Chiang. Flooded China with American goods and ruined national industries. That's why the Chinese bourgeoisie accused Chiang of not defending the national industries and opposed him. Do not know if America is doing the same in India.

Question: Can we say that the Indian big bourgeoisie has finally gone over to imperialism? If so, what is the objective basis of winning over or mobilising any section in the struggle against imperialism?

Answer: A certain part of the big national bourgeoisie has finally joined hands with imperialism but not the whole of it. Many among the bourgeoisie stand for in-

dustrialisation and would be opposed to foreign capital in the inner market.

Question: Can in India the big bourgeoisie or any section of it still be called oppositional in its relation to imperialism?

Answer: Yes. It can unquestionably. If only because the government plunders the peasants and restricts the home market. It may not shout from the house-tops about it, but it is opposed to this all the same.

Question: Is it the entire big bourgeoisie or only sections that are collaborating with imperialism? If sections, then which sections?

Answer: First part of the question already answered. As regards the second part, it is wrong to put such a question. You want to weigh them in a balance? Cannot do that. National bourgeoisie should be taken as a whole, its majority. Growth of movement will show who stands where. There are scoundrels among the national bourgeoisie but they are not typical of the class as a whole. The same is true of the working class. Not all sections and all elements are revolutionary. So, if you look at the problem in a Marxist way, the national bourgeoisie is oppositional. Partly undoubtedly reactionary but not the whole. Not only small but many of the bourgeoisie feel that the inner market is too narrow and will not prevent land being handed over to the peasants.

Question: What is the class character of the present Nehru government? We think this big bourgeois-landlord government collaborating with imperialism.

Answer: Not quite. Nehru bases himself not only on these classes but also on the kulaks. When the government cry 'buy land', it addresses itself to the kulaks and the kulaks appreciate. So the basis is not as narrow as you think. Therefore it is not a puppet government. In order to overthrow it, one has to work hard. Don't think if you blow, it will fall.

Weakness of the Nehru government is that it does not

base itself on the majority of the peasantry, workers and toiling intelligentsia. It is from this direction that you should launch your attacks.

Question: If this is so, why would kulak join us? How can we win him over?

Answer: We have to ally with him in the antifeudal struggle. The kulak sympathises with the Nehru government. But if the peasantry rises against the feudals, the kulak thinks that the part of the feudal land will fall to him, but will either support the peasants or proclaim neutrality.

Question: Are we right when we say that the united front we have to build is a united front of all classes including the national bourgeoisie?

Answer: Yes, you are right.

Question: Can we characterise the foreign policy of the Nehru government as a manoeuvre between British and American imperialism? Does this apply to the foreign policy in so far as it relates to the specific policy of peace?

Answer: Yes, subject to one correction. Nehru also plays between the peaceloving countries and the war bloc.

Question: What should be our attitude to such specific manifestation of the government's foreign policy, as for instance the stand on the use of the atom bomb or on the American proposal to brand People's China as an aggressor? Should we merely expose them as a manoeuvre or should we support them while simultaneously exposing them as halfhearted and inadequate in nature?

Answer: The latter is right. Support and expose the halfhearted nature.

Question: Is there any contradiction between the certain specific acts of the government and our general opposition to it?

Answer: No contradiction.

CONCLUSIONS

Our party possesses a very fine perspective. A very good regime can be organised in your country and a great society. For this, you should renounce personal differences. Differences will arise but they must be overcome. The minority must submit to the majority. Discuss and convince each other. Even Lenin found himself in the minority several times. He submitted to the majority. Without that there can be no discipline or no party.

3. Statement of Policy of the Communist Party of India

OUR OBJECTIVE

The experience of the last four years has taught the people of our country that the present government and the present system cannot solve their main problems of life. It cannot give them land and bread, work and wages, peace and freedom. They are coming to realise the necessity of changing the present government, which mainly serves the interests of feudal landlords and big monopoly financiers and the hidden power behind them all, the vested interests of British imperialism.

The Communist Party, therefore, has adopted a program in which it says, that it "regards as quite mature the task of replacing the present antidemocratic and anti-popular government by a new government of people's democracy".

Who should form such a government? The program says that it will be created "on the basis of a coalition of all democratic, antifeudal and anti-imperialist forces in the country".

And this government and the forces who form it must be "capable of effectively guaranteeing the rights of the people, of giving land to the peasants gratis, of protecting our national industries against competition of foreign goods and of ensuring the industrialisation of the country, of securing a higher standard of living to the working class, of ridding the people from unemployment and thus placing the country on the wide road of progress, cultural advancement and independence". Thus the program outlines the practical tasks which have to be carried out by the people's democratic government.

This was adopted by the Calcutta conference and first published in November 1951.

The immediate main objective being defined, the question then asked is: how is it to be achieved, with what methods, what forces?

OUR PAST POLICIES

There are a large number of people who think that this government can be replaced by a people's democratic government by utilising the parliament ushered in by the new constitution. Such feelings are encouraged and fed not only by this government and the vested interests but even by the rightwing socialists, who preach that the very fact of a strong opposition party on the parliamentary floor will shake the government and make it topple down.

But hardly had the people started to believe in the efficacy of the new constitution, which they thought was the outcome of their anti-imperialist struggles of the past, than even the fiction of the fundamental rights and guarantees is thrown out of that very constitution and the freedom of person, the press, speech and assembly, which the masses wanted to use to shake up this antidemocratic government, are subjected to the rule of the police baton and the bureaucrat. Even a liberal would now feel ashamed to maintain, let alone the Communist Party and other democrats and revolutionaries, that this government and the classes that keep it in power will ever allow us to carry out a fundamental democratic transformation in the country by parliamentary methods alone. Hence the road that will lead us to freedom and peace, land and bread, as outlined in the program of the party, has to be found elsewhere.

History, enlightened for us by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, places before us its vast experience, arising out of struggles which have led nearly half of humanity to socialism, freedom and real democracy, at the head of which stands the Soviet Union and in which the great Chinese and people's democracies join hands.

Thus our main road is already charted out for us. Even

then each country has to seek its own path also. What is the path for us?

The communists in India have been working with the people for the last thirty years first as communist groups and later a party. During these years they built a mighty movement of the working class, fought their struggles and won their demands. They built a kisan movement and in vast areas, as for example in Telangana, led them out of landlessness to land and from forced labour to freedom. They have fought for the rights of the people, and in these struggles hundreds and thousands have been killed, hanged, imprisoned, tortured and ruined. Naturally, while leading the working masses, many a time, at crucial points in our history, we were confronted with the question: which path to follow, what tactic would best secure the interests of the country and the people?

We do not refer here to the path that we traversed all these years, except in recent times, so that we can be clear as to what the path would be henceforth to lead us to achieve the program.

After the second party congress, differences and controversies arose inside the party about the path that the Indian revolutionary movement must adopt. For a time it was advocated that the main weapon in our struggle would be the weapon of general strike of industrial workers followed by countrywide insurrection as in Russia. Later, on the basis of a wrong understanding of the lessons of the Chinese revolution, the thesis was put forward that since ours is a semicolonial country like China, our revolution would develop in the same way as in China, with partisan war of the peasantry as its main weapon.

Among comrades who at different periods accepted the correctness of the one or the other of these views, there were differences on the estimate of the situation in the country, on the degree of isolation of the present government from the people, and on many other vital issues. It was clear that these differences had to be resolved in order that the party could lead the people to victory.

After long discussions, running for several months, the party has now arrived at a new understanding of the correct path for attaining the freedom of the country and the happiness of the people, a path which we do not and cannot name as either Russian or Chinese. It should be, and is, one that conforms to the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and that utilises the lessons given by all the struggles of history, especially the Russian and Chinese, the Russian because it was the first socialist revolution in the world carried out by the working class under the leadership of the Communist Party of Lenin and Stalin in a capitalist and imperialist country; and the Chinese because, it was the first people's democratic revolution in a semicolonial, dependent country, under the leadership of the Communist Party, in which even the national bourgeoisie took part. At the same time one has to remember that every country has its own peculiarities, natural and social, which cannot fail to govern its path to liberation.

In what way then shall our path be different from the Chinese path?

CHINA AND INDIA: SIMILARITY AND DIFFERENCE: OUR PERSPECTIVE

First, let us see where we are the same as the Chinese. It is in the character of our revolution. The thing of primary importance for the life of our country, same as the Chinese, is agriculture and the peasant problem. We are essentially a colonial country, with a vast majority of our people living on agriculture. Most of our workers also are directly connected with the peasantry and interested in the problem of land.

Our real freedom today means taking the land from the feudal landlords and handing it over without payment to the peasant. This antifeudal task, when fulfilled, alone will mean the real liberation for our country because the main props of imperialist interests in our country, as they were

in China are the feudal. So, like the Chinese, we have to fight feudalism and imperialism. Our revolution is anti-feudal, anti-imperialist.

That makes the struggles of the peasantry of prime importance. Drawing upon the fact that in China the liberation war was fought mainly on the basis of the partisan struggles of the peasantry, during which the peasants took land from the feudal landlords, and in the process created the liberation army, it was asserted that in India too the path will be the same, the path of partisan struggles of the peasantry would almost alone lead us to liberation.

The CC finds that drawing upon the Chinese experience in this way and to come to such a conclusion would mean neglecting to look into other factors of the Chinese revolution and also neglecting to look into our own specific conditions. For example:

We cannot fail to take note of the fact that when the Chinese party began to lead the peasantry in the liberation struggle, it had already an army which it inherited from the split in the revolution of 1925.

We cannot fail to note the fact that China had no unified and good communications system, which prevented the enemy from carrying out concentrated and swift attacks on the liberation forces. India is different in this respect from China in that it has a comparatively more unified, well-organised and far-flung system of communications.

India has a far bigger working class than China had during its march to freedom.

Further we cannot fail to note the fact that the Chinese red army was surrounded and threatened with annihilation again and again until it reached Manchuria. There, with the industrial base in hand, and the great friendly Soviet Union in the rear, the Chinese liberation army, free from the possibility of any attack in the rear, rebuilt itself and launched the final offensive which led it to victory. The geographical situation in India in this respect is altogether different.

This does not mean that there is nothing in common

between us and China except the stage of our revolution and its main tasks. On the contrary, like China, India is of vast expanses. Like China, India has a vast peasant population. Our revolution, therefore, will have many features in common with the Chinese revolution. But peasant struggles along the Chinese path alone cannot lead to victory in India.

Moreover we must bear in mind that the Chinese party stuck to the peasant partisan war alone, not out of a principle, but out of sheer necessity. In their long-drawn struggles, the party and peasant bases got more and more separated from the towns and the working class therein, which prevented the party and the liberation army from calling into action the working class in factories, shipping and transport to help it against the enemy. Because it happened so with the Chinese, why make their necessity into a binding principle for us and fail to bring the working class into practical leadership and action in our liberation struggle?

Such an outlook ignores the fact that we have a big working class and that it has a role to play, which can be decisive in our struggle for freedom. The grand alliance of the working class and the peasantry, acting in unison, the combination of workers' and peasants' struggles, under the leadership of the Communist Party, and utilising all lessons of history for the conduct of the struggles, is to be the path for us.

It can thus be seen that while the previous line of reliance on the general strike in the cities neglected the role the peasantry, the subsequent one of partisan struggle minimised the role of the working class, which in practice meant depriving the peasantry of its greatest friend and leader. The working class remained leader only 'in theory', only through the party, because the party is defined as the party of the working class.

Both the lines in practice meant ignoring the task of building the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, as the basis of the united national front, ignoring the task of building the united national front, ignoring the

task of putting the working class at the head of this front in the liberation struggle.

This, it has to be realised, was a wrong approach. The leadership of the working class is not realised only through the party and its leadership of the peasant struggle but actually, in deeds, through the working class boldly championing the demands of the peasantry and coming to the assistance of the peasant struggles through its own action. The alliance must function in deed and fact, and not only in theory. The working class is the friend in action, that must help the fighting peasants and must ensure victory over the common enemy.

The working class, relying on agricultural workers and poor peasants, in firm alliance with the peasantry, together with the whole people, leads the battles in towns and rural areas to liberation, to land and bread, to work and peace.

The CC wishes to convey to comrades this great lesson of history, a lesson which is neither only the Russian path nor the Chinese path, but a path of Leninism applied to Indian conditions.

Such an understanding of our perspective gives us a new outlook on how to build our mass movement, our trade unions, kisan sabhas and also a new way to build the party.

The understanding will also show to comrades that the main question is not, whether there is to be armed struggle or not, the main question is not whether to be non-violent or violent. It is the reactionary ruling classes who resort to force and violence against the people and who pose for us the question whether our creed is violence or nonviolence. Such a poser is a poser of Gandhian ideology, which in practice misleads the masses and is a poser of which we must steer clear. Marxism and history have once for all decided the question for the party and the people of every country in the world long ago. All action of the masses in defence of their interests to achieve their liberation is sacrosanct. History sanctions all that the

people decide to do to clear the lumber-load of decadence and reaction in their path to progress and freedom.

This should also tell us that all our previous understandings have to be discarded as being one-sided and defective.

COMBAT INDIVIDUAL TERRORISM

But one action history does not sanction and that is individual terrorism.

Individual terrorism is directed against individuals of a class or system and is carried out by individuals or groups and squads. The individuals who act may be heroic and selfless and applauded or even invited by the people to act and the individuals against whom they act the most hated. Still such actions are not permissible in Marxism. And why? For the simple reason that therein the masses are not in action. Therein the belief is fostered that the heroes will do the job for the people. Therein it fosters the belief that many more such actions will mean in sum-total the annihilation of the classes or the system. Ultimately it leads to passivity and inertia of the masses, stops their own action and development towards revolution and in the end results in defeat. Hence Marxism warns against individual terrorism and bans it,

IMMEDIATE SITUATION AND TASKS

The question that now remains, and an important one, is—we have got the path and the perspective, but what now? The question of the immediate, while certainly influenced by the perspective, is not solely determined by it. It is also governed by the assessment of the present situation. How far is the government isolated, how far are the people disillusioned, how far are they ready to struggle, are some of the questions that determine the immediate tasks and slogans for them.

Some say that the government is thoroughly discredited and isolated, the people are ready to rise in revolt and in places are clashing with the government, which with the blatant rule of police firing has already created conditions of civil war in the country. Hence all our work must be guided by such an understanding of the situation. We do not think it necessary to argue the question in detail.

No doubt the crisis of the government is deep, but it is not yet thoroughly isolated. As the program of the party puts it: "the masses have lost faith in the present government, they are becoming deeply distrustful of it and start to consider it their enemy, who is protecting the landlords, moneylenders and other exploiters against the people." Hence "the masses are slowly rising in struggle, no longer able to withstand this state of slow starvation and death." But it would be gross exaggeration to say that the country is already on the eve of armed insurrection or revolution, or that civil war is already raging in the country. If we were to read the situation so wrongly, it would lead us into adventurism and giving slogans to the masses out of keeping with the degree of their understanding and consciousness and their preparedness, and the government's isolation. Such slogans would isolate us from the people and hand over the masses to reformist disruptors.

Equally wrong are they who see only the disunity of the popular forces, only the offensive of reaction and advocate a policy of retreat in the name of regrouping of forces, of eschewing all militant actions on the plea that this will invite repression. Tactics based on such an understanding of the situation will lead to betrayal of the masses and surrender before the enemy.

We have to lead the struggles of the people in the context of a sober evaluation of the situation. While it should not lead us into adventurism, we must also not forget that the crisis is not being solved but is growing. Hence we cannot take a leisurely attitude and behave as if no deep crisis is moving the people and furious struggles are not looming ahead. Because insurrection and civil war do not exist, some would like to move and work as if they are living

in a democracy with rights and liberties and nothing need be done to protect the party and the leadership of mass organisations from onslaughts of the law run mad. With such an outlook, we shall get smashed and will be able to build nothing.

But because the crisis is growing, and even a simple food procession like the one in Cooch-Bihar leads to firing and brings thousands on the streets, some would like to do away with the daily humdrum task of running mass organisations. Taking fascism to be inevitable or already in power, they would scoff at parliamentary elections or fighting for civil liberties, for which broad sections of the people can and should be mobilised.

We have to realise that although the masses are getting fast radicalised and moving into action in many parts of the country, the growth of the mass movement has not kept pace with the growth of discontent against the present government and its policies and methods. To ascribe this to repression alone would be wrong. This weakness of the mass movement is due, above all, to the weakness of our party and the division in the camp of progressive forces. The party therefore must strive to overcome this division and must stress the supreme need for unity of all progressive forces, build this unity in action and itself grow into a mass party by drawing into its fold the best elements from the fighting masses.

We must fight the parliamentary elections and elections in every sphere where the broad strata of the people can be mobilised and their interests defended. We must be wherever the masses are and would like us to be.

ROLE OF WORKINGCLASS UNITY AND THE PARTY

The party has to build the unity of the working class and make it conscious of its tasks in relation to our entire people. The existing split in the workingclass movement which hampers the development of workingclass struggles

must be overcome at all costs in the shortest possible time and united mass organisations of the working class built.

The class has also to be made politically conscious. Only a united and politically conscious working class can fulfil the role of the leadership of the people.

We have to rouse all sections of the peasantry, including rich peasants, for the struggle for agrarian reform and in the course of this struggle rebuild the mass peasant organisations, basing ourselves firmly on the agricultural workers and poor peasants who together constitute the majority of our agrarian population.

It must be understood that because of the vast expanse of our country, because of the uneven development of the agrarian crisis and of the workingclass and peasant movement, and the uneven state of organisation and consciousness of the peasant masses and the influence of the party, peasant movement will not develop at the same tempo everywhere and different forms of organisation and struggle will have to be adopted depending on the maturity of the crisis, the degree of unification of the peasant masses and their mood, the strength and influence of the party, and other factors.

All these tasks call for the most intense, patient and daily work among the masses, continuous agitation on our basic program and immediate simple demands of the people, a concrete working out of such demands for every section of the people according to general and local conditions, practical leadership of mass struggles, a combination of various forms of struggles, and a systematic building up of a network of mass organisations.

Above all, it is necessary to build up through patient struggle a communist party, equipped with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, a party mastering strategy and tactics, a party practising selfcriticism and a strict discipline and which is closely linked with the masses.

The mass organisations and the party that are built up must also be able to withstand the fire of repression to which the government continually subjects them and the people's movement.

STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

One of the key tasks that faces us in defence of the people is the building of the peace movement. The struggle for peace must become an integral part of our work in all mass organisations, on all platforms. We have to bring it to the active consciousness of masses that the ruling classes, in order to preserve their power, will ever be ready to embroil us, the people, in a war so that we may give up our war against them. We must bring to the consciousness of the people the immense danger of the outbreak of a third world war and the possibilities of averting that danger, if the people will it. We must bring into the consciousness of the people that while we support any move of any class or group including this government for preserving peace, yet we must not forget that this government under the influence of imperialist warmongers, landlords and profiteers follows not a consistent and honest policy of peace but plays between America and England to gain from their rivalries and also plays between the peaceloving countries and warmongers. Such inconsistency must be overcome by the action of the masses. We must fight for a pact of peace between Pakistan, India and Ceylon, for banning of the atom bomb and reduction of armaments and military budget. We must above all fight for the conclusion of a pact of peace between the five great powers. The peace movement must be made real to the masses in terms of their own problems of land and bread, work and wages, and prosperity for all.

The peace movement must mobilise widest opposition to the colonial wars waged by British, French, Dutch and American imperialists in Southeast Asia and prevent all direct and indirect support to these imperialists given by the present Indian government.

* * *

The program that the Communist Party has placed before the people is a program which conforms to the in-

terests of all progressive forces and classes in the country, of all sections who desire India to be free, happy and strong. We shall therefore strive to unite our entire people for the realisation of this program and build their unity in action on on all issues facing them. We shall strive to develop the struggles of all sections of our people and merge them into the common movement for freedom, democracy and peace.

While carrying out these tasks, we must learn skilfully to combine the struggles of workers, peasants and other classes and sections in each province and district, and in the country as a whole. From all these struggles, the her fighters that will come forth must be transformed into the makers and builders of the party, which then alone will become a real mass party and yet a wellknit party of tested and tried revolutionaries. With the perspective and path clear, and immediate tasks outlined, we shall surely succeed in our liberation struggle against our feudal and imperialist enslavers and replace this antidemocratic government by a government of people's democracy.

4. Communist Party Ready for Negotiated Settlement in Telangana

In certain sections of the party as well as in circles which have been friendly to the struggle of the Telangana peasants, questions have been raised regarding the policies and methods to be pursued in the struggle going on for the last five years.

The central committee wishes to stress that while it is the right and duty of comrades and party units in all parts of the country to make suggestions to the CC about the tactics to be adopted in the Telangana struggle, it is primarily the masses, the people of Telangana, who began, fought and suffered in their great fight against feudal oppression for land and liberty, who have to decide the issue.

While the Communist Party of India is proud to state that it stood with the people and led them in their heroic resistance to oppression, it cannot act like the high com-

Here two documents are given dealing with the issue of Telangana struggle. The first is the resolution of the central committee giving the minimum conditions for arriving at a settlement, which was published in *Crossroads*, 15 June 1951. The CC appointed a committee of three to conduct the negotiations consisting of A. K. Gopalan, Muzaffar Ahmad and Jyoti Basu. This committee met the representatives of the Hyderabad government and the Telangana leaders in jail and also contacted the home ministry of the central government between 18 and 23 July. The Hyderabad government took a totally hostile stand, refused Gopalan permission to visit Telangana or even address meetings in Hyderabad.

The second document is Gopalan's press statement of 23 October in which, on behalf of the CC and the Andhra committee of the CPI, he declared that the party advises stoppage of partisan action in Telangana so as to create a favourable atmosphere for holding free and fair elections in the state of Hyderabad. The text is as printed in *Crossroads*, 26 October 1951.

(f) Withdrawal of ban on the Andhra Mahasabha and the Communist Party; restoration of civil liberties.

(g) Constituent assembly elected by universal adult franchise to decide the future of the nizam dynasty and the dissolution of the Hyderabad state into linguistic provinces of Andhra, Maharashtra and Karnataka and complete regional autonomy to tribal areas.

A. K. GOPALAN'S STATEMENT

The public is well aware of the fact that the central committee of the Communist Party of India, as early as the first week of June 1951, in its resolution on Telangana had preferred its hand for a negotiated settlement of the Telangana issue with a view to establish peaceful conditions in Telangana and to create a congenial atmosphere in the state of Hyderabad for free and fair elections.

Not content with this public declaration, a delegation on behalf of the central committee also approached the Hyderabad state government as well as the central government to explore ways and means to restore peaceful conditions in Telangana.

The congress government has time and again publicly professed its desire for peace in Telangana and even sent peace missions comprising personages such as Shri Sunder Lal, Shri Ramanand Tirth, Shri Vinoba Bhave and others.

But actually it has arrogantly rejected the offer of a negotiated settlement and is determined to continue its ghastly military rule on the Telangana peasantry and the entire people of Hyderabad.

The Communist Party has placed before the government the most reasonable, just and minimum terms for a peaceful settlement of the issue.

They are, in short, two demands on the government: one; to stop all types of eviction of the peasants from the land and restoration to them of the land forcibly seized from them and amnesty for all peasants and communist partisans whether they are in jails, underground or in the field.

The central committee and the Andhra provincial committee (Vishala Andhra) are of the opinion that the rejection of these two just demands by the congress government is nothing but a rejection of the offer for the restoration of peaceful conditions in Telangana and a blatant refusal to concede the barest minimum demands of the peasantry on the one hand and a shameless rejection of the lawful rights of participation for the people and their genuine political parties in the general elections on the other.

This rejection of the most just and democratic demands tantamounts to a refusal on the part of the Congress to face the electorate in Hyderabad in a free and fair electorate battle but continue the military regime in Telangana, thus perpetuating the landlord collaborationist rule of the congress government.

The congress government, to hide the truth from the public and duge the people, is claiming that it is ready to conduct free and fair elections in Hyderabad state, but that the partisans' armed resistance and 'violence' alone are responsible for the absence of an atmosphere conducive to the holding of free and fair elections.

The Communist Party as well as other parties and the people conversant with the developments in Hyderabad state are fully aware of the facts that the Congress Party and its government there have completely lost their face and stand thoroughly isolated because of their betrayal of the people. It is so open and clear that even the blind can see it.

At the time of police action the government declared that its aims were to liquidate the nizam's autocracy and save the people from it.

But what it has been liquidating in practice during the last three years is the Telangana peasant, his land and his democratic movement and what it has been saving is the

nizam and his feudal retinue from the rising people of Telangana.

The Communist Party and the people of Telangana are determined not to allow the Congress Party to run away with the false propaganda of 'communist violence', which aims at depriving the people of their legitimate rights to participate in the general elections in the state of Hyderabad and are bent upon defeating the Congress Party at the polls.

With a view to help in restoring peaceful conditions in Telangana, the central committee as well as the Andhra committee have decided to advise the Telangana peasantry and the fighting partisans to stop all partisan actions and to mobilise the entire people for an effective participation in the ensuing general election to rout the Congress at the polls.

In order to make the present decision widely known to the partisans and people of Telangana it is absolutely necessary that the communist detenus in the various jails in Hyderabad are released forthwith and warrants of detention against others withdrawn. Such a step on the part of the government is also necessary to stop the activities of certain antisocial elements who are taking advantage of the existing state of affairs in Telangana.

As the Communist Party has repeatedly emphasised, the question of Telangana is actually the question of land. If the congress government is interested in restoring peaceful conditions in Telangana then it must simultaneously take steps to stop the eviction of peasants from the land.

The central committee and the Andhra provincial committee appeal to all the democratic sections, parties and their leaders to force the hands of the government to release all political prisoners, withdraw all warrants and cases against the partisans, restore full civil liberties in the Hyderabad state by withdrawing all military, thus ensuring a free and fair election, and above all to stop eviction of peasants from their lands.

5. Election Manifesto of the Communist Party of India

A few months hence, 18 crores of our people will be called upon to go to the polls. They will be called upon to record their verdict on the present government and the policies and methods it has pursued for the last five years. They will be called upon to declare whether they want the present regime to continue or be replaced by a new regime.

The leaders of the present government have come out with their manifesto. They parade their great achievements—achievement of freedom, of merger and integration of states, of land reform, of grow-more-food campaign, of hydroelectric schemes. They declare they have done their best. And they promise to do still better if the people renew their trust in them.

What have they really done? What are their real achievements? What is the meaning of their promise to do still better?

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE CONGRESS

The answer can be read not merely in figures given by the government—figures that can be juggled with, nor in

The election manifesto was finalised on 6 August 1951 and printed twice in August and October. The central committee had earlier at the end of April appointed a committee of seven— S. A. Dange, A. K. Gopalan, Bankim Mukherjee, Muzaffar Ahmad, Jyoti Basu, Z. A. Ahmad and Sohan Singh Josh, (a) to carry on negotiations with left parties for formulating united front election programs and organising joint election campaigns, (b) to see that party's campaigning in elections conforms to the party's election manifesto, and (c) generally to assist the party's election campaign.

the voluminous reports giving details about the wells dug, trees planted and rupees spent on the various plans and schemes of the government. The answer can be read in the sunken cheeks and emaciated bodies that meet one's eyes wherever one goes. The answer can be read in the tattered clothes with which men and women can barely cover their naked bodies. The answer can be read in the daily reports appearing in newspapers of men and women being driven to suicide because they could not feed themselves and their children.

The answer can be read also in the firings and teargas attacks, lathicharges and mass arrests, bans and prohibition of meetings that take place in every part of the country where people fight against inhuman conditions of life imposed on them.

Five years of congress rule—four of them after the attainment of 'freedom'—have brought our country and our people to the verge of disaster. The production of food, cloth and every necessity of life has declined. Famine rages in Bihar with a crore of people facing slow death. The vast mass of peasants, the bulk of our people, continue to groan under the burden of rents, debts and taxes. The agricultural workers, their number ever swelling as a result of the eviction drive of landlords, eke out a miserable existence unable to satisfy even their hunger. The condition of workers worsens every day—their wages lagging far behind the soaring prices. Teachers, clerks, office employees and workers swell the ranks of the jobless and even those who retain their jobs find their real income constantly dwindling. Students, unable to pay the rising cost of education, leave schools and colleges. Artisans, small manufacturers and traders are compelled to join the ranks of paupers in face of the growing scarcity and rising price of raw materials and cornering of all available goods by profiteers and blackmarketeers. Millions of refugees from Pakistan, uprooted from their homes, roam in streets and lanes unable to find food, shelter and work.

All these are matters of common knowledge and need no narration. Everyone has begun to see that freedom has

come to mean freedom for the common man to remain starved and naked, illiterate and backward, diseased and shelterless.

What lies at the root of these miseries?

Congress leaders claim they have ended foreign rule, they have stopped the looting of our people by the British imperialists. They admit there is misery and starvation but these, they say, are the inevitable birth-pangs of a new order. In order that people may have more, they must produce more. They must work hard, they must sacrifice—above all, they must cooperate with the present government. All classes and sections must suffer today in order that all may have more tomorrow. Such is the principle of sarvodaya, the principle that guides the Congress.

Each one of these arguments is false, each one of these assertions is a lie.

The leaders of the Congress have not won freedom for our country. They have betrayed our freedom struggle. They have allowed the foreigners and the reactionary Indian vested interests to plunder and loot our people just as they did in the past. They have themselves joined in the loot.

A GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL BETRAYAL.

In violation of every pledge, in violation of every solemn declaration to implement which tens of thousands laid down their lives, the Nehru government made India a part of the British commonwealth of which the British king is the head and in many areas of which Indians are treated worse than pariahs. Our navy and air-force are commanded by Britishers, our army is controlled by their advisers and experts, our arms are modelled and manufactured by the British.

Britishers continue to own or control our mines, our plantations, our oil-wells and refineries, our jute mills, many of our engineering works and other concerns. They

control our foreign trade, our banking and finance. With their investment of 600 crores of rupees and through their managing agencies, they net millions of rupees as profits and hold our economy in their death-grip, throttling all development, keeping us backward and dependent, refusing to supply us with capital goods with which we could develop our industries. They looted our people of goods and services worth Rs 1600 crore in the war years promising to pay them back which they never did. They scaled down the sum to less than half and refused to release even the balance in accordance with our own requirements.

They framed the Colombo plan the avowed aim of which is to keep India backward and dependent—a market for British goods, a source of cheap raw-materials and cheap labour.

To all this, to this continued hold of Britishers on our economy, to this colossal looting and swindling of our people, to this continued colonial status of India, the Nehru government has been a willing party. Instead of confiscating British capital in India it has begged the Britishers and Americans to invest more capital and assured them that they can ship out the profits. It has refused to break the tie with the British and Americans or even establish close trade relations with the democratic countries who could supply us with the capital goods we need. It has accepted the plan of imperialists and called it the Nehru plan.

Tied to British and American imperialists, the Nehru government has taken no steps whatsoever to develop the heavy industries of India—the mining industries, the machine-tool industries, the iron, steel and engineering industries, the chemical industries—that alone could make the country strong and independent and create the basis for real advance. The so-called automobile and locomotive industries that have been established in India are merely plants for assembling parts imported from Britain and America. They ensure rich profits to the foreigners and their agents in India and can feed the war machine of imperialists but cannot help us to become industrialised. The

The Nehru government is mortgaging the manganese mines of India, the richest in the world, to the American imperialists.

In view of these facts, who can call India a really free country and its government a government of national freedom?

The Nehru government has not merely permitted the British imperialists to hold sway over our country's economy and loot its wealth. It has also permitted the princes, the landlords and the Indian monopolists and financiers to continue their plunder and loot. It has maintained the whole system which the British created to perpetuate their own rule. What has come is not freedom. What has come is the replacement of a British viceroy and his councillors by an Indian president and his ministers, of white bureaucrats by brown bureaucrats, and a bigger share in the loot of Indian people for the Indian monopolists collaborating with the imperialists.

GOVERNMENT OF LANDLORDS AND MONOPOLISTS

The Nehru government has not abolished the rule and exploitation of the princely autocrats but given them a new lease of life through its schemes of merger and integration. It has come to the aid of the princes and feudal autocrats where the people, as in Hyderabad, rose in revolt against them. It has intervened in the neighbouring state of Nepal in order to bolster up the corrupt regime of the ranas with the aid of the treacherous leaders who posed as the champions of the people of Nepal. It has not confiscated the wealth and properties of princes but allowed them to retain them besides allowing them to draw privy purses running into crores of rupees. It has not broken up the states to form linguistic provinces. By its policies it has intensified national animosities instead of uniting the people.

The Nehru government has preserved the system of feudal exploitation which pauperised our peasants, ruined our

agriculture and caused catastrophic fall in our food production. In the name of zamindari abolition it has hatched plans to pay the feudal parasites, sworn enemies of our people and traditional agents of the British imperialists, the stupendous sum of four hundred crores of rupees as compensation while at the same time leaving in their hands millions of acres as private land. Instead of handing over land to the peasants, freeing them from feudal exploitation and the grip of the moneylenders and thus destroying the fetters that hamper the growth of our agriculture, it has squandered one hundred and fifty crores of rupees extracted from the people in the farcical 'grow more food' campaign which has produced nothing and merely enriched the ministers, bureaucrats and a few firms connected with them and with the foreign imperialists. It has spent the staggering sum of 538 crores of rupees to purchase food from foreign countries, especially from America, on terms which mortgage our sovereignty to the most aggressive imperialist power in the world. In all this it has been guided not by the interests of the peasantry and the people, but by the interests of the landlords and their masters, the foreign imperialists.

The growing poverty of the peasantry, a direct result of imperialist-feudal loot, makes it impossible for them to buy even the barest necessities of life. On industries are declining. The big industrialists who own our factories are reducing output of goods in order to create scarcity and make big profits in a shrinking market. While millions go naked, the textile magnates work their factories at far less than even the existing installed capacity and export 80 crores of yards of cloth abroad. Similar methods are followed by big monopolies in other branches of production, causing stagnation and decline of our industrial output, while at the same time increasing the bank-balance of the monopolists who mint money out of people's misery and refuse to pay living wage to workers.

The situation comes as a boon to the profiteers and blackmarketeers who corner all the available stock and pile up fortunes. Ministers of the Congress, their friends

and relatives, high-placed bureaucrats all join in the mad hunt for money and still more money and quarrel about the share of the loot. Through the device of inflation, the rich grow ever richer by robbing the poor, by taking from their mouth their last morsel of food.

While millions go homeless, the extensive palaces and mansions of the princes, landlords and the rich are not requisitioned, housing accommodation is not rationed and landlords are permitted to fleece the people through exorbitant rents, 'pugrees' and 'salamis'.

Corruption and bribery have become the hallmark of the congress regime. The much-boasted government schemes have become schemes for plundering the state budget in the interest of foreign firms and their Indian agents. The white cap has come to mean graft and profiteering. The events that led to the dismissal of the Punjab ministry have revealed to the whole world the real face of those who preach morals to the people. No less a sum than 5 crores of rupees, it is believed, was appropriated by the congress ministers of Punjab and their relatives in their four years of rule. The squabbles in Bengal and Madras, the shameless swindling by congress ministers of Bihar and UP are known to everyone no matter how much the Nehru government tries to whitewash them with white lies. The jeep scandal whose echoes have not died down to this day and the shady deals carried out by certain embassies throw revealing light on the doings of those who represent India abroad on behalf of the swaraj government.

It is not true therefore to assert that all are suffering in Nehru's India, that freedom has brought suffering to all. Even a glance at the income-tax figures, which too are faked, will give the lie to such assertions. The imperialists, the princes and the landlords, the big monopolists and financiers, the speculators and blackmarketeers—all of them are prospering. Freedom has meant freedom for them to rob and loot the people and freedom for the congress ministers to join in the loot.

GOVERNMENT OF LATHIS AND BULLETS

In order to uphold this regime of colonial slavery and starvation, this joint loot of our people by the British and their allies and friends, the Nehru government has established a reactionary regime as ferocious and ruthless as any that India had seen even in the days of the direct British rule. It has not only resurrected all the lawless laws of the British, it has enacted new and worse repressive laws, gagged the press and placed the life and liberty of the people at the tender mercy of the police. It has promulgated an ordinance to crush the railway workers who demanded that the government should honour its pledge—the pledge to implement the recommendations of the pay commission appointed by the government itself.

Streams of blood have flowed in every city, every town, every village whenever the starved and naked have demanded human conditions of life and dared to fight for them. The working class, which stood in the forefront of the battles of 1945-46 that enabled the Congress to come to power, has been sought to be chained by antilabour laws and its struggles for wages drowned in blood. Even before the advent of 'full freedom' the congress ministers shot down the heroic leaders of Amalner workers, unleashed terror to break the strikes of the South Indian Railway workers. The attack continued and intensified till every workingclass centre came to be placed under the iron heels of permanent police rule. In the great Bombay strike of 1950, thirteen workers fell before the bullets of the police and homeguards. In 1951 the people of Cooch-Bihar, asking for cheap rice, were greeted with murderous volleys whose echoes resounded in the whole land. The heroic youth of Calcutta, standard-bearers of hundreds of battles, were shot down scores of times to keep in power the corrupt ministry that rules West Bengal with the blessings of Pandit Nehru. Four women were killed by the police in Calcutta on a single day in 1949. The students of Cuttack whose only crime was that they protested against the raising of fees were attacked by armed forces of the police.

The peasant masses of Telangana who fought against the savage gangs of razakars, at a time when congress leaders had entered into a stand-still agreement with the nizam and were supplying him arms, were rewarded with mass murders and gallows, the dishonouring of their mothers and sisters and reimposition of the hated rule of the landlords, with the aid of Nehru's army which entered Hyderabad on the pretext of helping the people. In Andhra and Malabar, in Patiala and Ballia, in Tripura, Manipur and Kakdwip, in every area, the Nehru government has come to the aid of landlords and suppressed the struggle of the peasantry. Scores of workers, peasants, students, teachers, office employees, men, women and even children have perished at the hands of the police, military and homeguards of the present government, thousands bear the marks of lathis and bullets as souvenirs of the non-violent regime that the Congress has established.

According to its own admission, the government jailed 50,000 of its political opponents and shot down or wounded 13,000 in the first three years of its rule. And as all know these figures tell only a small part of the truth. The repeated attacks on political prisoners that culminated in the ghastly West Bengal and Salem massacres in which nearly thirty prisoners were killed in cold blood show the length to which the government has gone in suppressing those who fight it.

No wonder therefore that police and military budgets go on mounting from year to year while the government pleads lack of money where the needs of the people are concerned. Eighty per cent of the central budget goes to maintain the army and the bureaucracy. Far more is spent on the police than on education by the state government in a country where ninety per cent of the people are illiterate.

GOVERNMENT'S FOREIGN POLICY—NOT A POLICY OF PEACE

A government tied to imperialists, a government that establishes a reactionary regime at home cannot pursue an

independent and progressive foreign policy, a genuine policy of peace.

The issue of war or peace dominates the whole world today. It is the key issue facing every country, every people.

The aggressive imperialists of America and their allies and satellites, the British, French and other imperialists, are planning to plunge the whole world into war to destroy the freedom and independence of all countries and enslave them. Every success scored by them in any part of the world is a menace to the freedom and independence of all countries, a menace to the peace of the world.

Our people want to be free and independent. They want foreign troops to withdraw from all countries so that all countries may be free and independent. They want to establish close friendship and fraternal relations with their great neighbour China that after years of slavery and degradation has freed herself and is building a new life for her people. They have been thrilled by the epic struggle of the Korean people who defied the might of the American imperialists and defended their country in face of overwhelming odds. They hate the British imperialists who ruled us for hundreds of years and sympathise with the people of Malaya who are fighting against the same enemy.

Our people love and respect the Soviet Union where the workers and peasants have freed themselves from all exploitation and showed to all peoples the path forward. They know that on every issue the Soviet Union has upheld the cause of the colonial people fighting for freedom.

Our people want to live in friendship with the people of Pakistan and settle the issue of Kashmir by peaceful and democratic means which will enable the people of Kashmir to decide their own destiny without interference from imperialist powers that dominate the UNO.

Above all, our people love peace and hate war. They remember the horrors of the man-made famine in Bengal which claimed thirty-five lakh victims. They have seen how the war in Korea was utilised by big business in India to raise prices and worsen the already wretched conditions

of the people. They have seen how every war imposes fresh burdens on them and enriches their enemies.

Can any one say that the Nehru government has carried out a policy which is in conformity with those desires of our people? One cannot.

It has sided with the Anglo-American imperialists on most issues in the UNO including the sanctioning of American aggression in Korea. It expressed its 'humanitarianism' by sending an ambulance corps to the murderers of the Korean people. It has not condemned the indiscriminate bombing of Korean cities and villages. It has given the French transport facilities to wage war against the people of Vietnam. It has given direct support to the British imperialists in Malaya by permitting them to recruit gurkha troops. It has shipped arms to the aid of the reactionary Thakin Nu government against the Burmese people. It has curtailed trade with China and has prohibited export of certain goods to China because of American objection. It has not developed extensive trade with democratic countries like the Soviet Union and people's democracies preferring trade relations with the imperialists who want to keep us dependent on them. The recent wheat deal with America throws revealing light on the real nature of the 'neutral' and 'independent' foreign policy of the Nehru government.

Sometimes, under the pressure of the people and due to its own weaknesses, the Nehru government opposes those measures of the imperialists which may immediately plunge the whole world into war but its basic policy remains one of tie-up with the British imperialists, one of playing between peace and war.

The Nehru government took the issue of Kashmir to the UNO and paved the way for the machinations of the imperialists who have created a most dangerous situation of tension between India and Pakistan. Nehru rejected the UNO proposal for arbitration in Kashmir but welcomed Graham who is now busy playing the imperialist game of provoking 'incidents'. The reactionary communalists, who hold power in Pakistan and who are faking conspiracy

cases to murder the best sons of the Pakistani people, have utilised the situation, to pose as defenders of the sovereignty and independence of Pakistan and mislead the Pakistani people.

Instead of deposing the maharajah of Kashmir, introducing genuine agrarian reform, giving land to the peasants, expelling the UNO arbitrator, removing the issue from UNO and making concrete proposals to end the military partition of Kashmir to enable the entire people of Kashmir to decide their destiny freely and jointly, the Nehru government has followed a policy of seeking aid from imperialists, who want India and Pakistan to remain at loggerheads so that both may be weakened and the strategic area of Kashmir may be used for war against the Soviet Union and China.

Thus both in its home and foreign policies, the Nehru government has proved to be a government of the enemies of the people of India.

It has revealed itself to be a government of landlords, princes and the most reactionary sections of the Indian capitalists who have betrayed their country to foreign imperialists for a mess of pottage.

Therefore this government must go. It has forfeited every right to remain in power. The people have to develop a mass movement which will shatter its power, shatter the very state system it has maintained and take all power into their own hands. They have to replace the present government by a government of people's democracy.

The Communist Party warns the Indian people not to be cheated once again by the promises of the congress leaders, their manifestos and plans of reconstruction. Those who broke every pledge for four long years will break them again.

WHAT WOULD A PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT DO?

The government of people's democracy will be a government of all democratic parties, groups and individuals

representing workers, peasants, middle classes and the national bourgeoisie, the bourgeoisie that stands for genuine industrialisation of the country and for the freedom and independence of India.

In its draft program, the Communist Party has already outlined the tasks that such a government will carry out.

It will break with the British empire, expel British officers from our forces, confiscate and nationalise all British capital in India. It will take effective steps to crush the resistance of those who join the imperialists and feudals against the people.

It will cancel peasants' debts and transfer all lands and implements of landlords and princes, without payment to the landlords, without any price, to the tillers of the soil, taking care to provide for the poorer sections of landlords and without harming the interests of the rich peasant. Agricultural workers will be assured adequate wages besides land. Freedom from feudal exploitation and with their demand for land satisfied, the peasantry will be able to increase production of food and raw materials, build dams and irrigation works, stop flood with their vast manpower, feed the cities and towns and change the very face of the country as they are doing in China.

It will develop the industries of India with the aid of the nationalised capital and by enlisting the cooperation of the private industrialists who will be assured legitimate profits and protection of their interests. It will put an end to inflation by drastic reduction in the police and military budget, by effective price control and by currency reform. It will aid the artisans and small manufacturers with credit, implements and raw material. It will welcome the assistance of such private capitalists and foreign governments as are prepared to invest capital on terms that are in conformity with our national interests.

It will grant living wage to the workers, recognise their trade unions and the rights of collective bargaining, introduce social insurance at the expense of the state and capitalists against every form of disability, sickness and unemployment. Similar measures will be taken in relation to

all employees, whether of the state, or of private concerns. Profits will be controlled and joint production councils set up.

It will create a national army closely linked with the people, and create human conditions of life for the common soldiers who suffer today under brutal and soulless discipline, inadequate allowances, bad food and corrupt practices which cheat them even of their miserable earnings. Soldiers will be granted full rights as citizens and be allowed to participate in political activities.

It will abolish the police force, dismiss such of its personnel as have earned notoreity as oppressors of the people and form a people's militia. It will establish full civil liberties and establish full freedom of speech, press, assembly, strike and combination.

It will form national states by the abolition of the princely states and reconstruction of the present provinces, grant them wide powers including the right of self-determination and create a united India by the voluntary consent of the nationalities and tribal peoples. It will grant regional autonomy to tribal people and national minorities wherever possible.

It will protect the rights and interests of all minorities, penalise incitement to communal hatred and discrimination, and help the oppressed and backward sections to register rapid advance. It will end caste oppression, penalise untouchability and all practices based on caste inequality.

It will eliminate all social and economic disabilities from which women suffer and help them to attain full freedom and equality. Working women will be paid equal wages with men for equal work, maternity leave with full wages and special measures will be taken to protect their health.

It will introduce free and compulsory primary education. It will also take steps to develop secondary and higher education on a wide scale and raise the cultural level of the people.

It will establish people's health services all over the country and medical centres to fight disease.

It will provide land, implements and employment to the refugee population and give them facilities to develop their life in their own national way.

It will establish trade and economic relations with all countries on a basis of full equality and for mutual benefit.

It will fight for a pact of peace between all the great powers of the world, for prohibition of the atom bomb, for progressive disarmament, for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from all countries and the right of every nation to be free and independent. It will establish a pact of friendship and alliance with Pakistan, Ceylon and Nepal.

Basing itself on the power of the people and guided by their interests a people's democratic government will solve all the problems that face our country, harness its vast natural resources and man-power for the regeneration of India, for the transformation of India into a free and democratic, happy and prosperous country, paving the way to socialist society—a society free from all exploitation of man by man.

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY—ORGAN OF PEOPLE'S POWER

What guarantee is there, many will ask, that the people's democratic government will do all these things? Did not the Congress also make many promises which it all broke?

The people will be justified in asking such questions.

The answer is that the people's democratic government will be, above all, a government of the common people and not a government of the rich few. Therefore the very structure of the state will be such that it can ensure effective rule by the people themselves. Organs of struggles of the united people waging battle against the present regime and ending it will themselves become the basis of the new state power.

The Congress has maintained the rule of the bureaucrats and the police just as the British did because it wants to

maintain the same system of plunder and exploitation which the British created. A people's democratic government will do away with the whole existing structure of the state and with it the rule of the bureaucrats and the police.

All organs of the people's democratic state from the lowest to the highest will be elected by the people who will have the right to recall any representative who betrays their trust.

All the powers of the state will be vested in these elected organs. There will be no officials imposed from above, no police force standing above the people, irresponsible and irremovable. All officers from the highest to the lowest will be elected by the people, be responsible to them and removable by them. Their salaries will be determined by the people themselves. The police force will be replaced by a people's militia, raised, guided and controlled by the people themselves through their organs of power.

These organs of power with the active cooperation of the mass of the people will raise taxes, mainly from the rich and spend them in a way that serves the interests of the people. They will ensure the carrying out of the program to distribute land equitably, increase production and effect proper distribution, ration housing accommodation, build new houses by requisitioning and building material, resettle the refugees, root out disease and illiteracy, free women from economic and social thralldom, protect the minorities, suppress people's enemies and stamp out corruption and vice.

A government based on local organs of power will be a government for the people because it will be a government by the people. Such a government will not live in constant dread of the people. It will be able to cut down the vast expenditure on the military, the police and the bureaucracy and devote its resources mainly to improve the condition of the people.

The Communist Party does not come before the people with big promises of what it would do if it is put in power,

with detailed plans and elaborate schemes that it would implement and carry out if people vote for it. It tells the people that in order to put an end to their misery and degradation, in order to build a happy life for themselves and their children, they must establish their own government, they must take power into their own hands.

Enemies of the people will shout that the passing of all power into the hands of the people's committees will mean the breakdown of society itself. They will say that no government can do away with the high salaried bureaucrats and the all-powerful police without destroying 'law and order' and plunging the whole of society into chaos and anarchy.

It is with such talks that ruling classes always seek to keep the people away from revolution. The society they want to maintain is their society—a society based on plunder, the law and order that they want to preserve is law and order to perpetuate the rule of the propertied classes.

Such talks can no longer frighten the people.

We have before us the glorious example of China which under a government of people's democracy has registered an advance that has amazed the whole world. It has freed the peasants from feudal shackles and increased food production by ten million tons. It is fast building its industries and roads, stamping out epidemics, spreading education in the remotest areas. It has liberated women from centuries of bondage, put an end to national animosities and united the people as they have never been united in their entire history. China, enslaved by foreign imperialists, robbed by her corrupt native rulers, backward and dependent, has given place to a new China—free and strong, a mighty world power, an inspiration to the entire people of Asia.

All this has been done in less than eighteen months.

And it should not be forgotten that China was more backward than India, had to support a far bigger population and its economy was shattered by decades of war and devastation.

Congress leaders lie when they say there is no alter-

native to congress rule, that the lot of the people will be worse than it is even today if they overthrow this government. This is how Chiang Kai-shek also tried to frighten the Chinese people. What actually followed the end of Chiang's rule in China was not ruin but happiness and prosperity for the whole people.

What the people of China did we can also do. The ending of the present regime and the establishment of a people's democratic government of India would mean the beginning of a new era for our people.

The Communist Party will fight relentlessly for the fundamental democratic transformations outlined above. It will never cease to explain to the people that without such transformation there can be no real improvement in their conditions, no real advance for the country.

At the same time the Communist Party declares that to begin with it will strive for the realisation of those items in the above program which will immediately relieve the distress of the people even to a limited extent and for such demands as the quitting of the commonwealth and removal of all Britishers from the armed forces, the abolition of princely states, stoppage of all allowances to the princes, formation of linguistic provinces, repeal of all repressive laws and release of all political prisoners, fifty per cent reduction of rent, moratorium on debts, a steeply graduated land tax, reduction of taxes whose burdens fall on the common people and increase in the taxes on the rich, living wages for workers and other employees and recognition of trade-union rights, reduction in school and college fees, rationing of housing accommodation, effective measures to solve the food problem and to stabilise prices and enforce controls, prompt and effective steps against corruption, assistance to backward communities, protection to minorities, wider powers for local selfgovernment institutions, a nonaggression pact with Pakistan, the removal of the issue of Kashmir from the UNO, expulsion of the UNO arbitrator and settlement of the issue of Kashmir by peaceful and democratic means and a consistent policy of peace. It will cooperate with other democratic

parties in building a powerful mass movement for the realisation of these demands. And if a government is formed by a united front of genuine democratic parties, the Communist Party will support the government in so far as it implements such a program.

UNITY—THE NEED OF THE HOUR

Only the united struggle of the people can realise this objective. Only their united action can shatter the power of the present rulers and compel them to quit.

The coming days must see the forging of this unity—unity to break the hold of imperialists over our country, unity to give land to the peasants, unity to provide bread and work for all, unity to build a powerful peace movement, unity to establish a government of the people. The elections must become a mighty rally of the people behind these demands, a nationwide mobilisation to realise them, a demonstration of the united will of our people to smash the shackles of slavery that hold us down.

Big steps towards the building of popular unity have been already taken. The textile workers of Bombay, by their historic decision to form one union, have set the example before the entire Indian working class. On the issue of civil liberties, on the issue of food, on the issue of peace and opposition to imperialist intervention in Korea, a vast number of people, following all parties, have campaigned and struggled together. The victory of the progressive forces in the election in Howrah, Rajnandgaon, Burdwan and Chandernagore indicate the developing strength and sweep of the unity movement. Through bitter experience of the last four years, the people's forces are uniting against the common enemies.

This process must be carried forward. United organisations of workers, peasants, students, youth and women must be forged everywhere and the broad masses drawn into them. The fight for adequate wages and dearness allowance, against landlord exploitation and police terror,

for the right of education and for the release of all political prisoners must be intensified.

Millions of signatures must be collected to the peace appeal and the message of peace carried to every home. All the warmongering propaganda against Pakistan must be combated and the people roused against the instigators of communal riots. Committees must be formed in every centre to bring about unity of action between democratic parties and individuals on all issues facing the people.

All these are essential to forge the fighting unity of the people—unity which alone can ensure victory of the democratic forces over their enemies. The unity thus built will be a powerful weapon in the electoral battle itself.

The Congress knows that it has lost the support of the majority of our people. It knows that it is looked upon by them as a party of exploiters and betrayers. It knows that its appeal and exhortations no longer move them.

But it hopes that the democratic forces opposed to it will not be able to close their ranks, will fritter away their energy in mutual strifes and conflicts and will not be able to present a united opposition to its rule. This hope must not be allowed to materialise.

The Communist Party appeals to all democratic forces in the country to realise that the building of the democratic unity of the people is the supreme need of the hour. The task of each democratic party is not to paint before the people alluring pictures of what it would do if the people vote it to power but to develop a powerful united mass movement which alone can break the power of those who rule over us all. The electoral battle is not merely a battle of programs which could all remain paper programs, as long as the present government remains in power; it is a battle to mobilise the entire people, the entire mass, against the present government.

Under the present constitution, the people have the right to record their vote but not the right of recall if those whom they vote for turn to be traitors to the pledge they gave. Hence the people must not be deceived by false promises but examine the record of those they are called upon

to vote for. The people want not a change of masters; they want to be masters of their own fate.

The Communist Party calls upon the entire people of India to build a mighty movement and return the candidates of the progressive and democratic parties. It appeals to them not to be deceived by the pretensions of the reactionary vested interests and their parties like the Hindu Mahasabha which today are mouthing democratic phrases, nor by those who promise reforms without a radical change in the entire social system, without ending the very class rule which is responsible for the present misery. The people must judge each party and each candidate not only by their profession but by their actual record, the class they serve and their deeds on issues facing the people.

The task of the common people is not merely to record votes at the polls. The task is to see that all democratic parties, groups and individuals come together, stand together and fight together. Their task is to see that the enemies of the people are not able to use the divisions in the camp of the people. The people must enter the scene not as passive recorders of votes but as active participants in the battle for freedom and unity.

Those in power today will use every device to prevent fair elections. They will use the weapon of terror, intimidation and demagoguery, they will use the power of money, they will use the pressure of landlords and big business. They will incite communal feelings, they will point to war-tension between India and Pakistan as reason why people should support the Congress. They will stop at nothing to prevent the people from recording their verdict. All this the people must be prepared to face and defeat.

Repeatedly during the last two years the government promised to hold elections on the basis of adult franchise and repeatedly they broke that promise. They pleaded technical difficulties, difficulties in the preparation of rolls. The real reason lay elsewhere. It lay in their growing apprehension of the outcome of elections. The results of the

recent local-board elections in several areas have increased that apprehension. They may try again to postpone the elections on the plea of 'national emergency'. That must not be allowed.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY—THE PARTY OF FREEDOM
AND DEMOCRACY

The Communist Party enters the elections under serious handicaps. Thousands of its leaders and members are in prison and the Nehru government refuses to release them even now. Thousands of its members, including most of the members of its central committee, cannot come in the open and have to remain underground. Many of the organisations of the party are illegal to this day. Military and police terror rages unabated in the areas where the party is strongest, making participation in elections virtually impossible. The names of most of those who could stand as candidates of the party have been left out of the electoral rolls.

The Communist Party will fight the elections despite these handicaps. It is proud that it has earned the hatred and hostility of the present rulers of India as it earned the hatred and hostility of the British. It is proud that it was the first to expose before the masses the real nature of the 'freedom' that the Congress had won for India and lead the people in the battle against it which made the party the first target of attack by the government. Ever since its formation, the party has stood by the people. It has proved by its deeds that it is the party of the working class and the toiling peasants, the party of the exploited masses. It was communists who laid the foundation of the great workingclass movement, led numerous strikes, won the eight-hour day and compelled the ruling classes to accept the principle of living wage and social security. It was they who planted the red flag on Indian soil, brought socialism to the working class and linked it with the international workingclass movement. It was they who brought

the working class into battles for freedom from imperialist rule and democracy for the people. Tens of thousands of communists have been thrown in jails and detention camps, thousands have been tortured and killed but the red flag has never been lowered before the oppressors.

The communists were the first to make the peasantry conscious of the need for their own organisation to wage the battle for land. In every part of India they have led battles of the peasants and agricultural workers against the inhuman exploitation of landlords and capitalists. They have led the peasants in the great battle for 'tebhaga' in Bengal, in the battle for paddy in Malabar, in the battle for land in Telangana. They have been with the students, with the teachers and employees, with the writers and journalists, with the refugees and the homeless in every struggle. The party and its members have helped our people to realise the menace of a new world war and mobilised millions against it and against its instigators, the Anglo-American imperialists. They have waged an uncompromising battle against communalist reactionaries and defended the lives of the people threatened by communal frenzy at the risk of their own lives.

While waging all these fights, the communists have not been free from errors and mistakes. But as serious fighters they have always publicly admitted their mistakes and corrected themselves. Never have they left the masses to the mercies of the oppressors. They have always stood by the masses ever defending their interests, even at the cost of their lives and properties and in face of inhuman torture at the hands of the British imperialists and the present congress rulers, their inheritors. They have ever demonstrated their readiness not merely to teach the people but also to learn from them.

The Communist Party comes before the people as a party of national freedom and people's democracy, as the party pledged to unite our people in the noble task to win freedom and independence, land and bread, democracy and peace—as a party born out of the most heroic and self-sacrificing struggle of the people themselves, as a party

which has drawn into its fold the most militant sons and daughters of the workers, the peasants and the intelligentsia—all democratic sections and elements of our society. It calls upon the people to support its candidates and the candidates of democratic parties.

In millions the people of India rose in the years after the war to shake British rule to its very foundation. In millions they must rise again to end the rule of the Congress which has preserved the very order against which they, the people, fought.

- All to the polls!*
— *To rout the Congress!*
— *To make the people's candidates victorious!*
— *To establish a people's government!*

6. The Results of the General Elections and the Tasks before the Party

BACKGROUND OF THE ELECTIONS

...These elections were the first general elections on the basis of adult franchise and the first elections after the transfer of power. They were taking place in the background of worsening economic conditions of the people, growing disillusionment with the Congress and mounting opposition to its rule, in the background of heroic struggles of the people in many of which the Communist Party had played a leading role, in the background of suppression of civil liberties, police and military terror in many parts of the country, in the background of growing disintegration of the Congress and desperate manoeuvres (like Nehru's becoming the president) to arrest this disintegration.

Disillusionment with the Congress was universal. Hatred against the Congress was mounting, especially in areas where big struggles had taken place and people had seen the real face of the Congress. More and more masses were ranging themselves against the Congress.

Further, the elections were taking place in the background of immense strengthening of the forces of socialism and democracy, freedom, independence and peace led by the Soviet Union, in the background of epoch-making victories of the Chinese people, the cracking up of imperialist bases in Southeast Asia, the deep ferment among the peoples of the Middle East, the fiasco of imperialist war policies in Korea and Vietnam, the rising tempo and sweep of the

Excerpts from the election review printed in *Party Letter*, No 9, April 1952. This report was prepared on the basis of the discussions that took place at the CC meeting at the end of March. It was released on 5 April.

world peace movement, desperate efforts of the American imperialists to stem and defeat the movement and intensify the drive towards war.

All these events had exercised profound influence on our people, drawn them towards the democratic camp, roused their hatred and hostility against the imperialist warmongers, made them increasingly see that the real cause of their poverty and degradation lay not in 'natural calamities' but in the class rule that prevailed in the country.

The question of the power had come to the forefront, especially in areas where the democratic movement was strong, the question of removing the present government from power, the question of forging an alliance to effect this removal, the question of establishment of a government that would solve the problems facing the country and make India play a worthy role in the battle for freedom and peace...

WHAT THE ELECTIONS HAVE REVEALED

Inevitably, in vast country like India, where conditions are different in different parts, where the popular movement is marked by its extremely uneven development, no generalisation can be made which would hold true for all areas. Nevertheless broad generalisations are both possible and necessary. Possible, because we have enough facts, enough knowledge of the history of the last 5 years, enough data. Necessary, because a revolutionary party has to base itself on the masses—not only on the existing level of their movement, on their existing consciousness but also on the **shift in their position** in order to work out a correct policy.

SHIFT AWAY FROM THE CONGRESS—SHIFT TOWARDS STRUGGLE

What are the broad facts that the elections reveal?

First and foremost, they reveal that vast mass of people have shifted away from the Congress, have lost confidence in its ability or desire to ensure for them land and bread, work and adequate wages, civil liberties and freedom from police oppression. The fact that Congress which only a few years ago enjoyed unrivalled prestige and influence, could this time secure only 43 per cent of the votes cast—this cold fact gives the lie to Congress claims to represent the country. Except in 4 small states—Coorg, Delhi, Saurashtra and Bhopal—nowhere could the Congress secure a majority of votes, not even in UP.

Even this, however, does not give full indication of the loss suffered by the Congress as an organisation in prestige and influence. The factors that operated in favour of the Congress were not merely the traditional influence of the Congress—unlimited resources, the power of the press, the pressure of the administrative machinery, intimidation of muslim voters, social and economic pressure brought about by landlords and rich peasants, especially in areas where a broad peasant movement has not yet developed, largescale corruption and suppression of the Communist Party in its strongest bases. There was also the disunity of the left forces which made it appear to many people that there was no alternative to the Congress. There is no doubt that Nehru's assumption of the presidentship of the Congress on the eve of the elections created new illusions in many sections, disrupted the KMFP, temporarily arrested the swing away from the Congress and exerted a powerful pull on the muslim voters. Finally, there was the psychological factor—many people desired that the Congress should be defeated but did not believe it was possible to do so. Hence they either abstained from voting or willy-nilly voted for Congress.

Due to all this it can be safely asserted that the real loss in the influence of the Congress is far greater than that indicated by the voting figures. The Congress has suffered **the biggest political and moral defeat in its entire history**. This of course should not lead one to the conclusion that the Congress has now lost all influence and

is relying solely on repression to maintain itself in power. Even when all factors are taken into account, the Congress still has greater following than any other single party in the country. But its mass base is cracking up—and cracking up rapidly all over the country.

Secondly, on the whole the shift away from the Congress has been a **shift not to the right** but to the left, towards democracy and struggle and not towards counter-revolution—a fact which is of decisive importance not merely for a correct estimation of the events of the last five years but also for working out of correct slogans and tactics for the future.

The three all-India parties whose following can be broadly described as democratic and left—the Socialist Party, the KMPP and the Communist Party and parties allied to it in the UFL and PDF of Cochin-Travancore and Hyderabad—together won 49 seats in the parliament and 385 seats in the state legislatures. They polled 20.9 and 16 per cent of the votes cast respectively.

The Jana Sangha, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Ram Rajya Parishad, parties of Hindu communal reaction, backed by landlords, princes and some of the most reactionary elements of the big bourgeoisie, won only 10 seats in the parliament and 87 seats in the state assemblies. They polled 4.5 and 7.3 per cent of the votes cast respectively.

Of the 87 seats won by these parties no less than 51 are situated in the princely states of Rajasthan and Madhya Bharat where the democratic movement has always been weak and where congress policies of appeasement of the princes and jagirdars enabled them to strengthen their position. The same happened in Orissa where another party of feudal reaction, the Ganatantra Parishad, which assumes a 'noncommunal' garb, won 31 seats in the Orissa assembly and polled 7.6 lakhs of votes, securing its most impressive victories in the districts of Sambalpur, Koraput, Bolangir and Kalahandi where even the Congress never had any influence. In Punjab and PEPSU, where parties of hindu and sikh communal reaction expected to score their

biggest victories and even form the government, they actually secured only 12.4 lakhs out of 63 lakh votes polled.

Feudal and communal reaction, still retains considerable hold in its traditionally strong bases, has capitalised anti-congress discontent to some extent in UP, CP and parts of West Bengal but has failed to make significant headway in areas where it was not already strong.

Further, forces of communal and feudal reaction triumphed precisely in areas where the peasant movement led by the Communist Party was either weak or non-existent. They were routed where a militant peasant movement, a broad popular movement had been developed by the Communist Party. The contrast between Rajasthan and Hyderabad, between Cochin-Travancore and Madhya Bharat, between the Orissa states and Tripura is not only an eloquent commentary on the real nature of the 'bloodless revolution' effected by Sardar Patel, it also delivers a smashing blow against the Nehruite thesis that feudal reaction can be defeated by supporting the Congress.

The masses, it is evident to all today, are moving away from the Congress. They are moving towards the left, towards the democratic camp, towards struggle. Failure to see this, failure to understand its significance, failure to make this the basis of our work would lead to trailing behind events, to being taken by surprise, to right-opportunist deviations in relation to mass struggles.

This process, however, is not taking place in a simple and uniform way, nor is it expressing itself in the same form everywhere. Failure to realise this would lead to deviations of an opposite nature.

Local parties have come into existence in many parts of the country, parties most of which were formed on the eve of elections and together polled nearly 90 lakhs of the votes. Among these are parties like the Tamilnad Toilers' Party that professes a progressive program, parties that express the urge of the tribal people for a homeland like the Jharkhand Party, parties led by feudal princes like the Ganatantra Parishad, parties that profess congress ideology and declare that they oppose the Congress only on specific

issues like the Lok Sewak Sangh, the Tamilnad Congress of Travancore etc.

Another marked feature of the elections has been the very large vote polled by 'independents'. Taking the country as a whole, they polled nearly 20 per cent of the votes in the assembly elections—a figure much higher than that polled by any party other than the Congress. In most provinces and states, the total votes polled by the independents were only next to the Congress. The exceptions are Cochin-Travancore, Hyderabad, Andhra, Malabar and Tripura.

This phenomenon is significant. Equally significant are the exceptions.

They reveal on the one hand the **disintegration of the mass base** of the Congress, the rift in the Congress itself—many former congressmen standing as independents in order to capitalise the anticongress discontent; they show on the other hand insufficient development of political consciousness among large sections of masses, their vacillations, the weakness of organised all-India parties in many areas which enables local men of influence and local parties formed on the eve of elections to utilise mass radicalisation. Also they are a reflection of the existing disunity of the popular forces which bewilder many who hate the Congress and make them repose their trust not in any party but in the men they 'know'.

It is a fact worth noting that in states and areas where the Communist Party is strongest and where a broad united front was forged, unattached independents not merely failed to win many seats but even polled poorly. A number of independents in these areas who were either formally or in practice integrated in the democratic front won on the basis of progressive support and are standing firm even after the elections.

All this shows the complex and tortuous process that is going on in our country, the divergent forms which the break up of the Congress is assuming, the strength and weakness of the popular forces. While the basic shift is clear and unambiguous, the specific extent and nature of

the shift in each area, the classes it involves, the form in which it expresses itself—all these must be concretely studied by provincial units of the party in order that oversimplification is avoided and correct tactics are evolved in relation to parties and movements.

EMERGENCE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY AS A MAJOR POLITICAL FORCE

Not merely have the broad masses moved away from the Congress, not merely have the majority of them moved to the left, but inside the camp of the democratic masses, the Communist Party has become the strongest single factor, the most powerful challenge to the Congress. Even the worst enemies of the party are forced to recognise this. The party stands forth today as the first party of the Andhra people, as the most powerful force in Kerala, as the party that has the backing of the overwhelming majority of the people of Tripura, as the party which constitutes the main opposition to the Congress in Bengal, as the party which is rapidly growing in Orissa and Punjab, as the party which people **all over the country** consider to be the party of the future.

This is a factor of decisive significance for our country and our people. The Communist Party has carved out for itself a place on the political map of India.

If this had not happened, if the Socialist Party of India which claimed at one time that it would capture 'at least 800 seats' had emerged as the main 'opposition' to the Congress, it would have tried to capitalise its victory not in order to fight the Congress but in order to bargain with it. It would have sown new illusions among the people and tried to organise them for antistruggle, antiunity and anti-Soviet, anti-China policies. It would have diverted the democratic movement into disruptive, professedly anti-communist but in reality antidemocratic channels and served the interests of American imperialists.

No genuine democrat, therefore, need shed tears over the Socialist Party's debacle in the general elections...

These facts show that the Communist Party and the united front have not merely emerged as the strongest opposition to the Congress but also that their successes have created a qualitatively new situation in Indian politics. They have created a serious crisis for the ruling classes, have created possibilities for the **defeat** of the Congress in several states, have shattered the myth of the invincibility of the Congress and destroyed the **monopoly position** which the Congress enjoyed in the political life of the country. All this is bound to exercise a profound influence on the masses even in areas where the Congress has won the overwhelming majority of seats, and draw them towards struggle, towards unity and thus undermine the position of the Congress throughout the country.

Already the eyes of the masses of all states are focused on the south—on Hyderabad, on Cochin-Travancore, on Madras.

The 'instability' that has developed in these states is not just **governmental** instability, which occurs when rival parties of the ruling classes are evenly balanced. It is **political** instability caused by changed correlation of class forces—the emergence of the party of the working class as a major force. It may mark the beginning of a political crisis for the ruling classes. Therein lies the reason of their panic.

Therein also lies the reason for Dean Acheson's plea for 'aid' to India and his speech of 13 March in the course of which he said: "India is fighting a desperate battle to save herself from communism... India is a most striking example of the need for urgent and effective action... the unexpected strength shown by the Communist Party in the recent national elections..."

The significance of the victories won by the Communist Party and the united front must not, therefore, be measured merely in terms of seats won and percentage of votes secured. The significance lies deeper.

All this is being stated not in order to create sectarian arrogance in our comrades, not in order to induce them to make the false claim that 'not socialist but we are the alternative'; but in order to stress that history of the Communist Party is not 'merely a history of deviations' as cynics think but a history of bold leadership of mass struggles, in order to point out the new situation in Indian politics and the role the party has played in creating this situation.

ODDS AGAINST THE PARTY

For four years the entire power of the state was directed against the party and the movement led by it. Party units were banned, mass organisations were suppressed, tens of thousands were thrown in prison without trial, thousands involved in cases of murder, dacoity, arson and rioting, and thousands shot. Terror was let loose against people in areas where the party had its main bases and struggles led by the party were drowned in blood. Military and police terror reigned in Telangana and other areas; women were subjected to worst indignities. A virulent campaign of lies and slanders was launched against the party; a campaign in which the socialist leaders fully participated.

Even when elections were being held, hundreds of the finest cadres of the party remained in prison, warrants continued against over a thousand in Hyderabad, arrests, beating up and even killing continued in Telangana.

The victories that the party and the united front have won show clearly that the government offensive against the party has failed. The areas of mass struggles stood firm like rocks. Those who slandered the party as a party of bandits and murderers have been silenced. Telangana has acquired a new meaning in the eyes of the democratic masses in our country in general and of the oppressed peasantry in particular. No longer is it associated with 'communist atrocities'; today it is associated with the mass peasant movement for land which all the might of the government

failed to crush, with resounding defeats suffered by the Congress, with the victory of the communist candidate Comrade Ravi Narayana Reddy, who polled the highest vote in India.

Not merely has the policy of repression suffered fiasco but the vaunted morality of the congress leaders also stands exposed. They stand exposed as hypocrites and liars, as organisers of mass butchery.

How did the party and the united front win such victories in face of such overwhelming odds?

This question will be taken up later but here it is necessary to point out one thing. Nothing would be more harmful than any attempt to explain the victories won by the party in the states of the south, in Bengal and Tripura, in Orissa and Punjab by basing oneself on the events of the last 3-4 years alone or the events of any particular 'period'. Such 'explanations' would lead to wrong conclusions and wrong practice. What we have to understand is that in the result of the elections stand revealed, though within limitations, the entire work carried on by the party ever since its formation in various states and provinces—the struggles it has led, the classes on which it has based itself, the causes it has championed, the organisations it has built, the links it has forged with the masses by selfless and sustained hard and patient work.

LESSONS OF THE ELECTIONS

Not merely communists but all genuine democrats, all classes except the monopolists and landlords, desire the removal of the present government and its replacement by a popular government. It is necessary, therefore, for all of them to examine the causes which led to the defeat of the Congress at the hands of progressive forces in certain states and areas and not in others. The general national and international factors, sketched earlier, which include the food crisis, operated in all parts of the country and played a big role in weakening and disintegrating the Con-

gress everywhere. The very fact, however, that the democratic forces succeeded most in **specific** areas shows the need to examine the **specific** factors that led to their victories.

The 'theory' put forward by congress leaders and their henchmen that Congress lost where the food shortage was acutest and where, therefore, 'mischiefmongers' could turn the wrath of the people against the government—this theory has no basis in reality.

If this theory were correct, then the worst famine-affected province of Bihar would not have returned the Congress Party to power with such majority. If this theory were correct, then the Congress would not have lost heavily in the Krishna, Guntur, East Godavari and West Godavari districts of Andhra, in the Tanjore district of Tamilnadu—all of which were surplus districts—and done comparatively better in other districts in the same province where the food situation is far worse.

The leaders of the Congress put forward this 'theory' because they want to make out that communists want famine and starvation, for through that alone they can win the support of the masses. This is on a par with the other bourgeois theory that communists want unemployment, chaos and war, for that alone would create the situation in which they can 'capture power'.

Study of the election results shows that the most impressive victories were won by the democratic forces—

(1) Where the party boldly led mass struggles in face of terror and repression, where it established its claim to be the leader of the people by determined championship of the cause of the masses, unflinching courage, utter devotion to the cause of the people, selfsacrifice and heroism.

(2) Where the party had developed a broad peasant movement uniting the entire peasant masses and on the firm foundation of unity of agricultural workers and toiling peasants. Also where the party had built a powerful tradeunion movement.

(3) Where flexible united front tactics were adopted, the Communist Party coming before the people as the party of unity, as the party giving concrete expression of the popular urge for unity, as the party subordinating everything to the supreme task of defeating the Congress.

(4) Where the election campaign could be developed into a broad popular movement, with the slogan of an alternative government as the key slogan.

(5) Where provincial units of the party brought out their own manifestos based on the central manifesto, where agitation was positive and concrete and such concrete factors as the **national** factor, the factor of unification of the nationality into linguistic provinces, were effectively utilised (the contrast between Andhra and Kerala on the one hand and Maharashtra and the others is striking).

(6) Where the weakness of organisation was overcome by developing mass initiative, rank-and-file initiative to the utmost extent, drawing the masses into the electoral battle as active participants in selection of candidates, in planning work through broadbased united front committees at all levels.

(7) Where the party was strongest; where the party was unified and went into the struggle as a team.

All these factors must be taken together and in their totality. Any attempt to isolate any single factor and focus attention only on that factor would lead to wrong conclusions, to deviations of right-opportunist and left-sectarian nature.

Long before the elections—in the policy statement and in the election manifesto—the party had pointed out that the Congress had lost the backing of the majority of our people and was relying on popular disunity to maintain itself in power. Hence the key task before the party, before all the democratic forces, was to forge unity in order to defeat the government.

The elections have proved the correctness of this analy-

sis. They have brought home to the people the urgent need for unity.

They have done something more. They have shown that the unity that can defeat the Congress must be unity for **developing mass struggles**, unity not merely of top leaders of parties but unity of the masses, unity to build a **mass tradeunion and mass peasant movement** on the firm foundation of agricultural workers and toiling peasants, unity to create linguistic provinces, unity to fight for the demands of all classes and sections—workers, peasants and students, teachers, office-employees, shopkeepers, artisans, youths and women and build their **mass organisations**. They have shown that the masses have to play an active leading role in the struggle against the government and their initiative has to be developed to the utmost extent. They have shown that only united mass organisations and broadbased united front committees at all levels can be the firm foundation of the united front movement. Finally, they have shown that only a politically and organisationally unified mass Communist Party can be the builder of the united front.

The elections, therefore, have not merely stressed the need for unity; they have also shown what kind of unity is needed, which classes must form its basis, what form it must take, which force can build it.

The lessons that the elections teach are valuable not merely for 'future elections'. They are valuable for every struggle, for the entire democratic movement, for the establishment of a popular government—a movement of which the general elections were only a part. These lessons must guide us in all our future work, these lessons should be made a part of the consciousness of all **democratic parties and elements**. All of them desire that the Congress should be defeated. All of them must know **how** the Congress can be defeated.

UNITED FRONT TACTICS DURING ELECTIONS

Complex and varied were the problems facing the party in forging electoral alliances with other parties and groups and their tackling demanded the utmost flexibility. Despite the absence of effective directives from the centre, in the majority of provinces the comrades tackled these problems effectively demonstrating thereby the maturity they had attained.

The chief obstacle in the path of united front was the rightwing leadership of the Socialist Party of India which contested no less than 1786 assembly seats and which refused to ally itself not only with the Communist Party but with any democratic party while preferring alliance with Dr Ambedkar and notorious careerists, many of whom it adopted as candidates. Its leaders went to the length of saying that they preferred victory of the Congress to victory of the Communist Party in any constituency. And they actually ensured victory for the Congress in hundreds of constituencies by splitting the democratic votes.

In view of the antiunity policy of the Socialist Party, in view of their record of sabotage of mass struggles and moral support to the Congress in the suppression of the militant struggles of workers and peasants, in view of their hostility towards the Soviet Union, People's China and other democratic countries, and in view of their open subservience to the British and American imperialists—it was perfectly correct on the part of the Communist Party to lay down that there should be no **general support** to Socialist Party candidates—even in constituencies where the party or the united front were not contesting. Such support, no matter what name was given to it, would have meant in practice acceptance of the Socialist Party's claim that they and they alone are the 'alternative' to the Congress. It would have meant tacit support to the antipeople and pro-American policy of the rightwing leadership of the Socialist Party.

It was also correct that where we or our allies were not

contesting, we should support such socialist candidates as were prounity, prostruggle and not anti-Soviet.

However, it was also necessary to stress that where a top leader of the Congress or a hated minister could be defeated only by supporting the socialist candidate in the constituency, such support should be given despite the fact that the socialist candidate could not be placed in the category of progressive socialists. Experience has shown the galvanising effect of the defeat of top congress leaders on the masses.

This omission, however, was corrected in most of the constituencies where such a situation arose before the polling.

It was also necessary to point out that in bases of workingclass and peasant movement, the unity of the movement should be preserved and that if the socialist candidate was one who was looked upon by the masses as their real leader, if he enjoyed their confidence and thus he alone had reasonable possibilities of winning—in such places the party should support the socialist candidate as against the Congress, while demarcating itself from the policies of the Socialist Party. Such tactics would have helped to strengthen the movement against the Congress and drawn the honest elements of the Socialist Party, especially rank-and-file workers and peasants into the unity movement.

With the Left-Socialist Group, the party worked in closest cooperation in almost all constituencies where the group existed. Cadres of the Left-Socialist Group as well as their leaders wholeheartedly supported the party in the election struggle.

The party achieved electoral agreement with the Forward Bloc (Marxist) in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, with the Kamgar Kisan Party in Bombay and several parts of Maharashtra and the Marathwada region of Hyderabad. In several constituencies of Maharashtra, the party and the Peasants' and Workers' Party opposed each other though they worked together at Sholapur. In Uttar Pradesh, the party and the UP RSP worked together. In Punjab, the party had united front agreement with the Lal Communist

Party. The failure to reach agreement with the Forward Bloc in Punjab had adverse effect on the election in several constituencies.

The united front of the Communist Party with the Revolutionary Socialist Party and the Kerala Socialist Party which led to the formation of the united left front in Cochin-Travancore had a galvanising effect on the entire people of the state and created the conditions for broad united front committees on a local basis into which all democratic elements were drawn.

The people's democratic front of Hyderabad also was in essence a united front of left parties and groups with its main base in Telangana where the communists have become the undisputed leaders of the peasant movement.

The specific feature of these united fronts were that they were in the nature of agreement between left parties that accepted the goal of socialism, parties most of whom claimed to be Marxist. Such united fronts were necessary and desirable. But they were not broad enough to draw the vast masses into the movement, they were not strong enough to defeat the Congress.

The party, therefore, tried to build a broader united front—a united front which would exclude the parties of communal reaction backed by feudal and counterrevolutionary elements but include all parties, groups and individuals who opposed the Congress from a progressive and democratic standpoint—even though the opposition in many cases was not firm and consistent.

In Tamilnad where the main base of the party lay in workingclass areas and among the peasant masses of Tanjore, the party supported the Toilers' Party candidates in Arcot district, a number of progressive independents, and strove for a provincewide united front with the Dravida Kazhagam. While the latter as an organisation did not join the united front, most of its leaders and cadres supported the party and left candidates and played a big role in the defeat of the Congress.

In Andhra, even after attempts to reach agreement with the KMPP and the KLP had failed, the party did not con-

tent itself merely with 'exposing' these parties and opposing them everywhere; it supported and worked for a number of candidates set up by KMPP to ensure the defeat of the Congress. United front on a local basis was arrived at in several areas and no less than 11 KMPP candidates elected to the state assembly from Andhra had the backing of the party. Gopala Reddy and Kala Venkat Rao have openly ascribed their defeats to the support given to their opponents by the communists.

In Malabar, the party succeeded in achieving a united front agreement with the KMPP, a united front which played a big role in ensuring the rout of the Congress.

In Bengal, a united front embracing the Communist Party, Forward Bloc and the KMPP and covering the whole province could have inflicted a crushing defeat on the Congress. Such a front did not come about mainly due to the insistence of the KMPP on contesting too many seats. The party was late in giving the slogan of an alternative government and could not also develop a sufficiently strong unity movement.

Certain mistakes committed in our approach to the Scheduled Castes Federation have been dealt with in a resolution of the central committee.

It can be seen from the above that while some successes were undoubtedly achieved in achieving united front agreements, on the whole the slogan of the party that all progressive forces must unite to defeat the Congress remained unfulfilled. Even left unity was not fully realised in most provinces.

What was this due to?

Some would ascribe this solely or mainly to sectarian approach on the part of the Communist Party towards other parties. Such explanation would lead to the wrong conclusion that once the party adopts a 'correct approach', unity will be achieved.

Undoubtedly a correct approach is necessary. Undoubtedly we have to get rid of all sectarianism, remnants of which are still very strong among us and is hampering the development of the united front movement. But the

real causes as to why effective united front could not be forged in the elections lie deeper.

They lie first and foremost in the **weakness of the party** itself. Only the Communist Party, as history of all countries has proved, can be the leader, builder and driving force of the united front movement.

Sectarianism itself is both the cause and the result of the weakness of the party. Without ridding ourselves of sectarianism, we cannot take effective steps towards the development of a broad mass movement. Without developing such a movement we cannot root out sectarianism.

If the party were strong among the masses, above all strong in its own class, the working class, it could have brought them on the streets with the demand for unity, it could have developed a mighty unity movement whose very strength would have convinced all democratic parties and elements that unity was necessary and possible and that this unity could defeat the Congress. It was the independent strength of the party, its independent mobilising power, **combined with correct approach** that made united front between the Communist Party and the KMPP in Malabar possible.

Secondly, before the elections most of the other parties with which we sought united front **exaggerated their own strength** and influence and refused to recognise the strength and influence of the Communist Party, which though far less than what the situation demanded was far greater than what the bourgeoisie thought or wanted to make out. Accustomed to methods of bourgeois parties, other parties looked upon appeals for unity made by the Communist Party as a sign of its weakness, as recognised on the 'fact' that the party was 'played out'. Hence, while professing to stand for unity, many of them laid down conditions to accept which would have meant liquidation of the party's own bases.

Thirdly, the issue of united front came to the forefront only on the eve of elections and united front itself, therefore, could not but be only an electoral agreement. It was not as though a united mass movement had been

developed for the realisation of the immediate demands of the people, united mass organisations built as the organ of the movement and the election struggle looked upon by all as part of this movement, as a means to establish a government which would carry out the minimum accepted program of the movement. Inevitably, therefore, disputes arose not on any basic issue but on which seat which party should contest.

Due to all these reasons the united front realised during the elections could neither be sufficiently broad nor sufficiently firm.

A new situation has developed after the elections. Not merely the urge for unity has grown but also its possibilities have increased immensely. All can see today that no single party can defeat the Congress and dislodge it from power. All can see today that the Communist Party is a major force, that the Congress suffered its heaviest defeats precisely where the Communist Party is strongest; that therefore **only a united front which includes the Communist Party** can replace the Congress. All can see today that mere discontent is not enough, that this discontent has to be given concrete form and direction through **mass struggles** and consolidated in **mass organisations...**

WEAKNESSES REVEALED

The elections have also revealed serious weaknesses of our movement which have to be overcome with the utmost rapidity.

One common failing, a most serious failing almost in every area, was the complete ignoring of the issue of peace and also to a great extent the issue of solidarity of the Indian people with Vietnam and Malaya, with Egypt and Iran. It was inevitable that issues of food and cloth, of wages and employment, of police terror and suppression of civil liberties would figure prominently in our agitation. But together with them, it was also necessary to popularise the struggles that are being waged against

imperialists in other lands, to denounce the atrocities of the imperialists against the peoples of these countries, to develop international consciousness in our people, to make them conscious of the menace of world war and to demand that India should play a leading role in bringing about a pact of peace between the great powers. It was necessary to expose the role that the India government is playing by refusing to take a firm stand on peace. It was necessary to warn the people that the continuation of the Nehru government in power meant increased penetration of American capital in India, increased dependence on America which has revealed itself as the enemy of freedom and independence of peoples of all lands.

Not that all this was not done at all but as comrades will admit, that this was not done with sufficient vigour and effectiveness.

This is being stated here not merely in order to point a serious weakness of our agitation but also in order to emphasise the importance of the resolution on peace adopted by the central committee and in order that serious attention may be paid by party units to implement the directions of that resolution as well as of the circular on peace and solidarity with the colonial peoples.

The weaknesses that the elections have revealed, however, are not confined to this and certain other aspects of our agitation and organisation only. There are other basic weaknesses also.

The most serious weakness which the results of the elections showed is the weakness of the party in the working class, the weakness of the tradeunion movement, the deep split in the working class.

Except in some of our tradeunion bases of Tamilnad, in Kolar goldfields where Tamilian workers predominate, in the small industrial areas of Kerala, in Sholapur and in predominantly Bengali workingclass areas of Calcutta and suburbs, we fared poorly in industrial areas. In most of the **major industrial centres**, the party failed to win seats. It failed to win a single seat in Bombay which had first hoisted the red flag, it failed to win seats in Nagpur,

in Kanpur, in Delhi, in Ahmedabad, in Tatanagar, etc. The overwhelming majority of the seats in all these areas were captured by the Congress, including most of the seats in the mining belts of Bihar. Hindustani-speaking workers of Bengal voted for the Congress.

The serious state of affairs that these results reveal need not be dilated upon. The policy statement adopted by the party has stressed the importance of the industrial working class in our economy and in our political movement, has pointed out that the leadership of the workingclass movement has to be established not merely through the leadership of the party but also primarily through **action by the class itself**. Due to the position which cities like Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kanpur, etc. occupy in the political life of our country, the party cannot become a national political force without becoming the major force in these cities, in the working class of these cities.

Explaining how mass action of the proletariat transformed "slumbering Russia, into a Russia of the revolutionary proletariat and revolutionary people", Lenin drew attention to the striking fact "the bigger the city, the more significant was the role the proletariat played in the struggle".

The weakness of our workingclass movement, the weakness of the party in the major industrial centres, is the key reason why we are unable to give concrete expression to the popular hatred against the government in an effective manner, why we are unable to develop a powerful movement against rise in the price of foodstuffs, against suppression of civil liberties, against imperialist atrocities in Korea. The party can be constantly before the people, appear as their tribune and champion, rally the democratic masses under its banner only if it is able to move the working class into action on national and international issues.

To overcome the disunity of the working class, to develop a powerful workingclass movement, to create political consciousness in the working class—this, therefore, is the key task facing the party today. This must not re-

main a pious wish as in the past but be translated into deeds.

Equally weak is the state of the peasant movement in most provinces. In Maharashtra, where the party has been working for many years, small workingclass centres of Amalner and Dhulia voted mostly for the party but due to our weakness in the surrounding peasant areas, we failed to win seats.

It is not a question of elections alone. By confining its work to small industrial areas, by not spreading out in the surrounding rural areas, the party would isolate the working class in such centres and render it impotent in face of government attack. This holds true even for relatively large workingclass centres of the north, many of which are industrial islands in a vast agrarian sea.

The party in Maharashtra has also to take up the issue of **Samyukta Maharashtra** in right earnest. The ignoring of this issue by the party is a serious failing which has nothing in common with the Marxist principle that the party of the proletariat has to fight for unification of national homelands. The relative strength and stability of the Congress in Bombay and Madhya Pradesh states is due, among other reasons, to the fact that the movement for linguistic province has remained weak. Further, the demand for disintegration of Hyderabad state can never acquire irresistible strength as long as the Marathwada regions are not drawn into the struggle for a united Maharashtra.

While the mass base of the Congress is disintegrating all over the country, the disintegration is not proceeding at the same rate in all areas. Nor should we draw the conclusion that mere weakening of the Congress necessarily means the strengthening of the democratic movement.

In Rajasthan, Madhya Bharat and Madhya Pradesh, the Congress has secured a majority of votes polled but in all these states the democratic parties too have done poorly and the combined strength of the Congress and the parties of communal and feudal reaction is many times more than that of the democratic parties. In Punjab,

PEPSU and Orissa, the party has made considerable headway in recent years, but reactionary forces are still in a dominant position there. The struggle in all these areas and Delhi is not a struggle against the Congress alone. It is simultaneously a struggle against feudal and communal reaction. To forget this would lead to the worst type of opportunism, to entanglement with parties of reaction which would strengthen them and help the Congress leaders to retain their influence on the democratic masses.

In the vast Hindustani-speaking region which stretches from Ambala to the borders of Bengal, the region of which the Uttar Pradesh forms the heart and core, the Congress is still an immensely powerful force. The Communist Party failed to win a single seat in this whole region. Even the Socialist Party which claimed this area as its stronghold fared badly—much worse than anyone expected. So did the KMPP. The democratic movement in this area is extremely weak—weaker even than in many other areas where too the Congress secured only a minority of votes...

In all these states, the basic task is to develop a mass peasant movement, in close cooperation with all democratic parties and elements, paying special attention to the agricultural workers and poor peasants, vast masses of whom have not yet been drawn into the kisan sabhas. This alone will shatter the base of the Congress in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, this alone will defeat the efforts of the communal and feudal reactionaries who are diverting the anticongress sentiment of the people into disruptive and counterrevolutionary channels. Feudal remnants are still immensely strong in most of these regions, caste and social oppression rampant—against which the party must mobilise democratic opinion.

Further, the party has to pay special attention to the disabilities from which the muslim minorities suffer—the suppression of Urdu, the discrimination against muslims in services, etc., the open or veiled intimidation to which the muslims are frequently subjected.

It should also be noted that in several regions, especially in the Chotanagpur regions of Bihar, the movement for a tribal homeland has gathered immense strength. The spectacular victories of the Jharkhand Party which swept the polls, especially in the tribal districts of Singbhum and Ranchi, and won 32 seats in the Bihar assembly are phenomena to which utmost attention has to be paid. Failure to evolve correct slogans and tactics and conduct vigorous work among the tribal people would mean leaving them in the hands of their present leaders who are striving to use them for purposes of bargain with the congress leadership and who will use their just aspirations for disruptive purposes. The causes of the failure of the party in Darjeeling and the success of the Gurkha League must be studied.

It must be clearly realised that at the present stage when events are marching rapidly, when the ruling classes are facing a crisis, the uneven level of our movement, the extreme weakness of the democratic forces over the greater part of the country constitutes a serious menace to the entire democratic movement.

At the same time, it must be remembered that it is not as though in areas where the Congress and extreme right-wing have triumphed, the base of reaction is firm and broad. On the contrary, the base is weak and is disintegrating under the impact of the victories of the democratic forces in the south, under the impact of growing mass opposition and due to dissensions in the congress camp itself. There is no need, therefore, for defeatist outlook and demoralising conclusions. What is needed is intensive work, overcoming of weaknesses that the elections have brought out.

From all that has been said above, it should not be thought that special efforts are needed on the part of the party only in states of the north, that in the areas where the party has scored its biggest victories the Congress has been **smashed**, that no unevenness of the movement prevails in those regions.

Such conclusions would be wrong. They would lead to complacency and sliding back. They may also lead to left-sectarian tactics. . .

The unevenness which the elections have revealed is not merely a **geographical** unevenness. It is something far more serious. In the greater part of the country, we have yet to acquire firm base in the proletariat and in the most oppressed strata of the peasantry—the classes that alone can constitute the granite foundation of a proletarian party.

While we have every reason to be proud of our achievements, proud of our party, we cannot also afford to ignore the serious weaknesses which are not the weaknesses of the party alone but of the entire democratic movement. They must be overcome by the **united effort** of all those who desire our country to be free and independent, happy and prosperous.

SITUATION AFTER THE ELECTIONS

The results of the elections have given immense confidence to the masses. It has, as already pointed out, created a critical situation for the ruling classes. It has made the imperialists panicky.

Frightened by the growth of the democratic movement in India and frightening the Congress with the red bogey, the American imperialists are striving to effect economic and political penetration into our country, by 'loans', 'aids' and 'agreements', and transform the India government into their subservient tool—an instrument for violent suppression of the democratic movement, an instrument of war against the democratic countries.

"The USA believes it necessary", said Dean Acheson in a statement before the American congress on 19 March, "to stop and reverse a trend in the recent Indian elections in which the communist vote increased to a very great extent. If this trend should continue, you will have a growth of communist strength in India and a very dangerous situation in Asia."

Every patriotic Indian must be made to ponder over the significance of these words which presage shameless interference in the affairs of our country by the American

imperialists. "The USA believes it necessary to stop and reverse" the trend to the left. The means which the Americans adopted for this in China and Greece and even in countries like France and Italy, what it meant for those countries—for their freedom as well as economy—all this must be explained to our people.

The party has to come before the people today as the party of full national freedom, as the party that defends national independence and national sovereignty, as the party that wages determined battle against those who are selling our country to the foreign imperialists.

Faced with the deepening economic crisis and the growing food shortage—products of their own policies—the ruling classes are resorting to standardisation, to wage-cuts, to raising the price of foodstuffs. As always, they are shifting the burden of the crisis on the workers, peasants and toiling intelligentsia, 30,000 workers of Ahmedabad have been thrown out on streets, thousands in Bombay are facing the same threat.

The party has to come before the people as the party that resists these attacks of the ruling classes, as the party that defends the day-to-day interests of workers and of all sections of the people, as the party that organises them for struggle to defend their right to live.

Having suffered serious political and moral reverses in the elections—the Congress is striving to forge alliance with the most reactionary elements (release of razakar ministers of Hyderabad is an instance), disrupt the growing unity of the people (Nehru's overtures to the KMFP and Socialist Party, move to form 'National Kisan Sabha' on the lines of the INTUC), isolate the revolutionary forces led by the party, continue repression against the party and launch a new terror drive against the party.

All these efforts of the government can be defeated today. The Congress is weaker than it was at any time. It is torn with internal dissensions—dissensions that will again come to the surface. The appointment of a counsellor in Travancore-Cochin has evoked a protest even from congressmen in the state and the crisis which developed after

Congress defeat in the state has deepened. In Madras state, the crisis that developed as the result of the defeat of each one of the top Congress leaders, is being sought to be overcome by bringing back C. Rajagopalachari who, however, has not been able to find suitable 'colleagues'. In Hyderabad, the precarious majority is being sought to be maintained by extending the number of ministers, by creating jobs for congressmen who threaten split. Such is the state of the Congress!

The democratic movement is stronger than ever before; the party is not merely stronger than ever, it has learned many lessons from its own history and the history of the mass movement.

The party has learned that the "first task of every party of the future is to convince the majority of the people that its program and tactics are correct" (Lenin), that for this propaganda and agitation, though essential, are not enough but also experience is needed, experience which the masses can acquire only through struggles.

The party has learned that "in its struggle, the proletariat has no other weapon but organisation" (Lenin) and that even the most revolutionary situation will lead to revolution only if the main organisation—the party—is firm in discipline, flexible in methods and deeply embedded in the masses.

The party has learned that one deviation cannot be corrected by jumping into another deviation, that deviations both of the right-opportunist and left-sectarian types have to be **simultaneously** fought, that both result very often from failure to see a complex situation in its entirety and from focusing attention only on a part and not the whole.

The party has learned that it must neither be cowed by repression nor fall victim to the tactics of provocation resorted to by enemy but develop the whole movement in a resolute, planned and coordinated manner on the basis of sober assessment of the situation in order to defeat the enemy.

Above all the party has learned that it is today a major force, that millions follow its lead, that millions more

sympathise with it and are coming towards it and all this imposes on it heavy duties and responsibilities, failure to discharge which will mean greater setback than ever before.

The party has to give concrete expression to the popular urge for unity which expressed itself during the elections, which got strengthened after the elections and place the movement for unity on firm basis.

The party must not get dizzy with success and propagate the wrong thesis that the Communist Party is the 'alternative' to the Congress. Congress rule which represents the rule of landlords and monopolists can be replaced only by a government of **democratic coalition** of all anti-imperialist parties, including the Communist Party. An attitude of sectarian arrogance towards other parties like the KMPP, the Forward Bloc and others, towards nonparty democrats, and towards the ranks of the Socialist Party and honest followers of the Congress who still number millions, would disrupt unity and prevent us from carrying out our tasks.

Due to the victories won by the party and democratic forces in the states of Madras and Cochin-Travancore and the serious reverses suffered by the Congress a new situation has developed there and new possibilities have opened up. In these two states, especially in the state of Madras, the possibility has arisen of the formation of a government of the united democratic front.

The specific features of the situation in these states are:

(1) A big majority of people have taken up a position of opposition to the Congress which is in a minority even in the legislature (Madras 152 in a house of 375, Cochin-Travancore 44 in a house of 108).

(2) The opposition on the whole is a democratic opposition.

(3) Communist Party is the single biggest force in the opposition.

Such is not the situation in a state like PEPSU where too the Congress is in a minority but where main force

opposed to the Congress is represented by the Akali Party, a party of feudal and communal reaction and the Communist Party is not a major force. Nor does such a situation exist in Orissa, where too the main opposition consists of the Ganatantra Parishad—a party formed and led by princes. Hence there can be no UDF government in these states at present.

The formation of a government of the united democratic front in Madras and in Cochin-Travancore would be a gigantic step forward. Such governments would press for the formation of linguistic provinces, undertake measures to give relief to the peasantry, the agricultural labourers and the workers as well as to the middle classes, combat blackmarketeering and corruption, restore full civil liberties and would thus help the people in their struggle for a better life. Such a government would be a government of struggle against the monopolists and the feudals and a champion of the common people.

At the same time, one must remember the limitations of the present united democratic front.

It is a product of electoral defeats suffered by the Congress and represents a coalition of those who inflicted these defeats and came together only when the possibility of a noncongress government arose. It is not a product of a victorious mass struggle in which the constituent units have stood together and fought together. The present UDF has not been forged in the fire of mass struggle. It does not, therefore, yet represent the fighting unity of the masses.

As such the UDF itself is not yet sufficiently firm, nor sufficiently united. It is only a rapid growth of the mass movement, mass pressure and united mass organisations that can give it stability, unity and firmness.

Was it then premature for the party to make efforts to form a government of the UDF?

Not in the least. When the possibility of forming an alternative government arose, it was the duty and the responsibility of the party to make every effort to translate this possibility into reality. Masses want an alterna-

tive government. They want the noncongress parties and individuals for whom they voted to form such a government. Only by giving expression to this mass urge, only by taking steps for its materialisation, the party could unite the masses and develop the mass movement. If a government of the UDF comes about it will be a great step forward. If, for any reason, it does not come about, the masses will have known whom they can trust and whom they cannot. They will know whom to hold responsible for the reimposition of the congress rule over them.

Petty-bourgeois 'lefts' may shout about 'opportunism', 'betrayal of revolution' and 'watering down of program'. The ruling classes know better. Hence their desperate efforts to form coalitions, to buy over independents, to work up anticommunist hysteria—to do everything to prevent the formation of a government of the united democratic front.

MAIN TASKS FACING THE PARTY

What are the main tasks facing the party today?

Broadly speaking, they are:

(1) Revive the trade unions and kisan sabhas as united organisations by not merely uniting the existing organisations but also by drawing into them workers of the Forward Bloc, KMPP, socialists and rank-and-file congressmen.

(2) Develop a broadbased mass movement for civil liberties, for withdrawal of warrants, release of detenus and lifting the ban on the party in Hyderabad; for release of detenus and withdrawal of warrants in Bengal, Punjab, Bombay, Tripura; for defence of the accused in Hyderabad, Madras state, Cochin-Travancore and Uttar Pradesh (Balia); for repeal of the detention act, for full freedom of the press, for TU rights.

(3) Intensify the movement for linguistic provinces in Andhra and Kerala and draw all elements, including congressmen, into the movement. Develop similar movement in Maharashtra and Karnataka. Demand ending of com-

missioner's rule in Tripura and other part C states and conferring of the right of legislative assembly on the electoral college.

(4) Develop a mass movement for peace, for a five-power peace pact, for solidarity with colonial peoples fighting for freedom, for friendship with Soviet Union, China and other democratic countries, for close economic relation with them, against germ war in Korea, against suppression of Indians in South Africa, for withdrawal of the Kashmir issue from UNO.

(5) Build a united movement for help to the people in the faminestricken areas, force government to give relief, mobilise people for adequate rations and against rise in prices of foodstuffs.

(6) Place all these movements on the firm foundation of united organisations and united committees. Form UDF committees wherever necessary in order to broaden the movement. Develop a passion for organisation and overcome lag between movement and organisation.

(7) Wage determined struggle against parties of feudal and communal reaction while drawing masses under their influence into united mass organisations.

(8) Transform our newspapers into powerful instruments of mass education, mass agitation and mass mobilisation (all comrades must study chapter five of the **History of the CPSU (B)** which describes what a bolshevik mass newspaper must be); create mass literature in the form of cheaply-priced pamphlets on current national and international subjects.

(9) Undertake education of party cadres and draw cadres into the party (first as candidates) so as to build a mass party which alone can fulfil the tasks of the mass movement.

(10) Overcome all dissensions that still exist inside the party in certain areas, fully unify the party and tighten up discipline.

Due to strengthening of the democratic forces, it is possible today to give every movement a mass character. It is possible to develop a broad movement of writers, artists

and cultural workers, a theatre movement, movements of all sections, all strata of our people and to draw into them all honest and progressive elements.

The growing hatred against the British and American warmongers, the immense sympathy and goodwill among our people for the Soviet Union and China that have been expressed in enthusiastic reception to the cultural delegations that visited our country are a powerful factor for peace and for brotherly relations with our neighbours. The fiasco that the slander-propaganda carried on by American imperialists against these countries has suffered, the contempt with which those who reveal themselves as American agents are looked upon by our people is an indication of the profound democratic sentiments of our people. Basing themselves on this sentiment, the democratic forces can today decisively defeat the war plans of the imperialists and enable our country to play a worthy role in humanity's struggle for peace.

The election of a large number of communists to the legislative assemblies and parliament have imposed new responsibilities on our party. In order to discharge these responsibilities in a befitting manner, in order to fulfil the hopes that people have reposed in them, in order that they may effectively champion the cause of the people, our comrades have to take their parliamentary duties seriously—as seriously as they take their extraparliamentary work. Every PC and parliamentary fraction must see to it that comrades maintain live contact with the people of the constituencies which elected them, go there frequently, address meetings reporting on what they have done and are doing in the legislatures. Also it is necessary that rules and procedure are studied and mastered, that each comrade equips himself for effective participation in the debate. The practice of bourgeois parties in which a few 'leaders' do all the work in the legislature and most of the members merely raise hands—this practice must find no place in our party groups in the assemblies and parliament.

In the forefront of all tasks stands the task of reorganising and rebuilding the party itself.

It must be recognised that never was the lag between the influence of the party on the one hand the organised strength of the party on the other so great as it is today. It is evident today that with a little more preparation, the party could have contested many more seats, especially in its strong bases, and polled at least 8 million votes. The membership of the party, however, is not even a minute fraction of this. Perhaps in no other country of the world is there such a lag between the influence of the party and the organised strength of the party. This lag must be overcome by a bold policy of recruitment to the party and measures to educate the cadres.

A necessary step towards the overcoming of this is the setting up of an effective party centre which will run the central journal, bring out a theoretical monthly, prepare educational material and give political guidance to the party as a whole. We do not have such a centre today. We did not have a centre throughout the election period—a failing which affected our election campaign seriously.

Provincial committees too must put an end to the present chaotic methods of work, stabilise their finance, set up fractions and fraction committees, guide the provincial journals and help the DCs to function the party units.

Organisation has always been the most neglected subject in our party. Again and again we have seen what this neglect leads to. Not merely repression takes us unawares and severs our links with the masses but even during a big struggle or a campaign party units cease to function in an organised manner.

With the loosening of the political grip of the Congress over the people and because of the worsening conditions of their lives, big struggles are going to break out in near future. The party will be overwhelmed by the immensity of the tasks that these struggles will create unless it overcomes its organisational weaknesses and grows into a mass party.

Above all, it must be kept in mind that reaction will not take its defeats lying down. It is planning a new onslaught—an onslaught which we shall be able to face and defeat

only by strengthening our party and striking deep root in the masses. Any complacency, any slackening of efforts, any illusion would be fatal.

A period of tremendous possibilities has begun. The relative 'political stability' of the last five years is over. The 'stability' was based not on mass support for the government but on the fact that while the masses waged many economic and even political struggles, the Congress enjoyed a monopolist political position in the country and the vast masses did not see any alternative to congress rule. Today the united front constitutes a political challenge to the Congress in a vast area.

This is a new factor in the Indian situation. It is a factor of immense significance for our country and for the whole world because of the position which India has come to occupy in international politics. It is a factor that is exercising profound influence on the people of the whole country.

Hence immense responsibilities rest on our shoulders. We shall discharge them only by fully unifying the party politically and organisationally, overcoming all weaknesses in our work and resolutely fulfilling the tasks that our movement demands.

7. On the Indian Trade Union Movement

1. THE ECONOMIC PLAN AND PERSPECTIVE OF THE BIG BOURGEOISIE AND THE GOVERNMENT—THE THREAT TO THE COUNTRY AND THE PEOPLE—THE REPLY OF THE WORKING CLASS

Introduction

Our party workers on the tradeunion front have not met for a long time. The last meeting on an all-India scale was held in May 1949, at the time of the Bombay session of the AITUC.

Since then a number of things have happened which demanded a meeting of the party leadership on the TU front. In 1950 January, the party was openly and publicly informed by our friends that it was following a wrong course. The discussions following from that ultimately resulted in the party adopting at the all-India party conference a new program in October 1951 and reorganising its work in accordance with it.

From 1948 onwards many of our trade unions had been illegalised and hundreds of our TU workers had been thrown into jails. The congress government and the bourgeois-landlord cliques thought that the militant working class and peasantry, their leaderships and the party had been smashed.

The adoption of the constitution in 1950 rendered some of the laws of the congress government ultra vires of the

This pamphlet, containing S. A. Dange's reports to convention of Communist Party members working in the tradeunion movement in Calcutta, 20-22 May 1952, was published in October 1952. The convention held according to the decision of the CC and attended by 300 delegates endorsed the reports.

new constitution. That allowed some of our TU organisations being released from the clutches of the police and some of our members from the prisons.

The desire of the congress government to appear democratic to stabilise itself in the minds of the people by holding adult-franchise elections, its confidence in its own victory, the belief that it had smashed the militant workers and peasants and also the fact that we had made some changes in our methods of approach and tactics—all this secured for us a certain amount of respite from total persecution and illegalisation.

A review and reorganisation of the TU front was delayed by the overriding demands of the election battle. No doubt, workers' struggles were being fought and demanded guidance from the party as a whole. But an all-India meeting as this was not possible at the time.

The election victories of the party, the advance of the democratic masses and their rejection of the absolute leadership of the Congress which was reduced to the position of a minority in votes at the polls has greatly changed the situation for us, both in relation to the people and in relation to innerparty situation. Elections showed to the people that the criticism by the democratic left of the bourgeois-landlord regime of the Congress was correct and tallied with the opinions of vast masses of the people. It has given us courage to find that repression has not smashed us and that the people remember our sacrifices and forgive us our mistakes.

The elections have confirmed the reading of the situation as given by the preamble to the program of the party. The crisis of the landlord-bourgeois system in India is coming out in a more severe form since the elections and is showing the real character of the present government and its inability to save the people from poverty and hunger.

The Postwar Situation

The postwar situation was characterised as one in which, with the victory of the Soviet Union, the forces of demo-

cracy and socialism had become stronger and the forces of imperialism and reaction had become weaker. It was a situation in which the rivalries between the two remaining imperialisms, American and British, were becoming sharp and the liberation movements of the colonial people were on the rise.

With the end of the war, peace-time economy should have been introduced, the people who had been starved of goods during the war should have been supplied with their necessities. Prices should have gone down, taxation reduced, consumer goods supply increased, the devastated regions reconstructed and backward countries helped to build industries. Peace should have reigned and war banned. People wanted all that in order to save them from the usual postwar crisis, whose memories they carried from the experience of the first world war.

But this was against the interests of the narrow monopoly finance groups of Britain and America. Because it would have meant increasing wages at home, lending capital goods abroad for peaceful construction and being satisfied with ordinary normal profit. It would have meant giving the colonial people freedom to build their life as they liked. Hence the imperialists rejected the road of building peace economy.

With the end of the war the Americans started their bid for world domination forgetting the fate of Hitler. Their first attack jointly with England was to blockade trade with the USSR, foment conspiracies to overthrow the new people's democracies and defeat the Chinese revolution. On this basis they hoped to redivide the world and prolong the life of dying capitalism.

All the three schemes failed.

US Bid for World Domination

Their another scheme was to subordinate England and the other capitalist countries in their orbit to the status of colonies through the Marshall plan.

Under the Marshall plan, by exporting its worthless goods and armaments to the Marshallised countries, the American imperialists hoped to enslave those countries economically, ruining their home industries through Marshall imports, and enslave them politically by installing Marshallised governments tied to American loans and subsidies.

All these schemes could not stave off the crisis of American imperialism or their satellite countries.

Utilising the bait of loans, the threat of cutting off supplies, and by directly buying off the colonial puppets of the British colonies, the Americans tried to oust Britain from its markets and sources of raw materials.

But many of these markets and sources of materials, as in Malaya, were enveloped in liberation struggles. If the struggles succeeded these countries would be altogether lost to any imperialism. Hence in their ultimate class interests the American, British, French, Dutch, Portuguese united to fight the colonial people's liberation struggles in Malaya, Indochina, Burma, Indonesia, Iran, Tunisia, Egypt etc., though their international imperialist rivalries continued within the framework of their counterrevolutionary alliance.

Deepening of the Crisis of Capitalism

By 1950 it was clear that nothing could save the Anglo Americans from a crisis which was already creeping on them, and for which they used the deceptive name of 'recession'. Neither the Marshall plan nor the threats of war and atom bomb, nor the suppression of the colonies was going to save them from a crisis. Hence they launched the Korean war in June 1950 and thereby hoped to usher in a boom.

The boom came but only for a time. The war industries made profits. As Stalin had warned, the adventure misfired and failed to solve the crisis of imperialism.

Two years after the Korean war, the slump has begun.

in the capitalist market of England and America, and all those whose economy is tied up with them are hit by the slump.

The slump is an inevitable concomitant of the capitalist system. A war-economy boom cannot overcome for good this manifestation of the crisis of capitalism. The all-pervasive power of the monopolies and their interference through the state machine may disturb the influence of the slump from appearing in all branches with equal force. But it cannot avert the crisis.

Curtailement of civilian production, mounting prices and taxation resulting from the arms drive constrict the market for civilian goods and make a crisis in consumption of civilian goods inevitable.

Unemployment is rising in America. Textile and woollen mills are closing down. Workers faced with a fall in standards of living by rising prices are resorting to strikes for increased wages. Even armymen are refusing to go to war and the news of the strike of airmen in America is confirmed officially.

The same is the story in England and the other marshalled countries.

Strengthening of the System of Socialism and People's Democracy

Only the Soviet Union, people's democracies and China are not hit by any crisis. Their peace economy is growing and standards of living are rising.

The strength of the system of socialism and people's democracy, its refusal to be drawn into armaments drive by threats of war, the peace movement in the world, the resistance movements of the colonial people, and finally the heroic struggles of the Korean people backed by the Chinese have been the main factors in the setback to the Anglo-American imperialist schemes of world domination for the present.

India after August 1947

In the context of these world events, what has been the fate of India, its ruling classes and its people?

Faced with the postwar liberation struggles the British arrived at an understanding with the leadership of the National Congress and installed it in power, after dividing and weakening the country and inciting communal massacres to disrupt the united struggle of the people for liberation. The direct rule of British imperialists ended.

But this independence did not lead to any improvement in the conditions of the people. The fundamental features of semicolonial economy were retained by the Congress Party in power, because its leadership was drawn from the landlord-bourgeois classes.

British capital remained intact in the vital branches of production and drew its profits as before. Our trade and finance remained tied up as before. Our armed forces were officered and commanded by the British as before. Our industry had no machines to make machines, no capital goods, for which it depended on the British as before. Our land and food production remained backward due to the hold of feudal landlordism, the moneylender and the capitalist market, producing cheap raw material for the imperialist industries, as before.

Taxation rose, prices went up, inflation continued, consumption declined, famines came. The peasant fought for land, the worker for wages. But the congress governments spent more than half of the revenues on the military, police and bureaucracy instead of spending on relief to the people.

We need not recount the whole story. When the people protested, the workers struck work and the peasants fought, what had the government to say?

It pleaded for time to plan and to execute the plan.

It demanded faith from the people in its bona fides and goodwill and claimed that it was being solely guided by people's interests and not class interests.

It attributed the major economic evils to the legacy of

past British rule and proposed the five-year plan as its solution.

It proclaimed aloofness from any bloc in its foreign policy and denied its tie-up with the Anglo-American group.

Proclaiming faith in gandhism and nonviolence, while indiscriminately shooting down striking workers and starving peasants, it asked the working class for cooperation with capital and rejection of class struggle.

It did all these because it claimed that it was not a government of any one class but of a welfare state.

Landlordism and capitalism, it said, would vanish gradually and peacefully, if the working class and the peasantry worked hard, produced more, consumed less and saved in order to maintain the state and its budget and build the plans for the future.

These are in short the main lines of government policy. If the working class and the peasantry resisted this line, it would be suppressed by force.

Policies of the Congress Government:

The policy has been put into effect, and the results so far show that it is the same landlord-bourgeois policy that has proved bankrupt everywhere in solving people's problems.

After their compromise with the British, the congress ministries have ruled for six years in the provinces and four years at the centre. They have had time enough to show their true character. What class nature have they shown?

They tried to take off all control from food and cloth in the interests of speculators and monopoly financiers and ruined the poor consumers and small traders. Only strikes and hartals by the workers and the people restrained the ministries. The subordination of the government to the big monopoly syndicates in cotton, sugar, jute, cement is too well known to need description.

As soon as they came to power, the accumulated reconstruction funds in each state were squandered by the bureaucrats in league with their henchmen. A large section of the congress bureaucrats and leadership enriched themselves at the expense of the people.

They played with the demand for abolition of landlordism and under the plea of abolition, enriched themselves, the landlords and a few rich peasant farmers.

In their exports and imports control and licence policies, they have fed their favourite monopoly bankers and traders, at the expense of the people and genuine traders.

By their open attack on workers' struggles, by the application of ordinances and bans, they have shown that the congress government is a government of the exploiting class of landlords and big bourgeois monopolists. Their government and the state serve and strengthen the interests of these classes alone.

What economic perspective does the government hold before the people and where is it leading them to?

The economic platform of the monopoly bourgeoisie is its much-advertised five-year plan. In essence it is a platform of financial bankruptcy of the state, high prices, low wages, ruin of genuine industry and trade, misery of the people and the ultimate strengthening of the hold of foreign and Indian monopoly capital over our economy.

The plan does not visualise any basic expansion of industry and agriculture. It proposes to spend about 1500 crores of rupees in rehabilitating the economy and restoring our capacity just to the level it was before the war. The schemes of industrialisation drawn even by the Tata-Birla plan or the 1937 schemes of the planning commission are no longer there.

Invitation to Foreign Capital— Offensive Against Working Class

Who is going to find the money for it? The monopolists with high range of incomes are not to be taxed to provide the capital. The plan says:

"Although disposable incomes left after taxation in these ranges are too high in India relating to the general level of incomes in the country, any material increase in direct taxation is at this stage like to affect the capital market adversely" (**Five-Year Plan**, p 22).

The planners admit that even the present taxes are evaded and black market evades them successfully. They say: "There is a considerable leakage on account of non-declaration of profits made in black market" (ibid).

But what can the poor government based on gandhian nonviolence do against these immoral monopoly racketeers, not a small number of whom belong to that very sect itself?

But capital must be found. So, a portion will be borrowed from the **American monopoly banks**. For this they must be assured good conditions. The assurance is that: (a) They will never be nationalised, (b) they will be allowed to export all their profits and capital and in their own currency, (c) Indian capital will not get any special favourable conditions as against their competition (**Gist of Policy Statement of April 1949**, p 160).

But that alone is not going to give us all the capital for development. The bulk has to be found from those who produce. It is the working class which produces profits, which again become further capital for industry. So the working class has to contribute more for this. How? The mechanism is simple. For increased production or against rising prices which make profit for the bourgeoisie it should not demand and should not be paid more wages. **More production, less wages, high prices—is the formula for finding capital for the five-year plan.**

In para 63 the plan says that "inflationary pressures will continue to operate in the economy". That means government has no plan for hope of reducing prices.

But they demand more production, under the plea that thereby they want to reduce prices for the consumer and improve the standard of living. Production is dependent not only on the bourgeoisie; the working class is the main

agency to fulfil the plan in this respect. But what is to be its reward, its share in the growing wealth?

The plan prescribes that they must work more under rationalisation and accept larger workloads.

"The object is to facilitate the workers attaining a living wage standard through acceptance of rationalisation" (p 192).

A living wage standard by today's wages in terms of today's prices is impossible. Therefore the plan admits that wage increases and larger earnings are justifiable. But "any upward movement of wages at this juncture will further jeopardise the economic stability of the country, if it is reflected in the cost of production and consequently raises the price of the product". **Hence workers must accept wage freeze or wage-cuts.**

Similarly on bonus demands, the plan says "no payment should be made in cash on this account, while the inflationary situation lasts" and inflationary situation, they say, will last throughout the period of the plan (p 188).

Thus the five-year plan of the monopolists promises high prices of goods and taxation for the people, rationalisation, unemployment and wage-cuts for the working class, and enormous profits for the monopolists and foreign financiers.

For encouraging larger production of food and raw materials the plan does not visualise largescale abolition of landlordism and giving land to the peasants, as, it frankly admits, it will rouse serious "social antagonisms" which in other words means that it fears the landlords.

Such are the plans and perspectives of the congress government and the big landlord and finance groups that guide it.

The Direction of Trade

The crisis of Indian economy is not denied by the ruling classes and their Congress Party. In fact it plays upon it by blaming the whole crisis as being due to the results

of British rule and thereby uses the anti-imperialist sentiments of the people to gather their support for its present antipeople policies.

The fact that in the past imperialists kept us in semi-colonial conditions and thwarted our development should have led us to break away from our moorings in their economy. We should have changed the direction of our trade and broken the monopoly of British finance over it. On the contrary we find the following admission by the government regarding our export-import trade.

Mehtab, minister for commerce and industry, at the import advisory council, gave the following figures for July-December 1951, in crores of rupees.

	Imports	Exports
Sterling area	200.4	202.3
Dollar area	161.7	78.1
Nonsterling nondollar area	112.9	66.9

The monopoly financiers thus refused to get out of the trade links of the Anglo-American bloc.

We should have taken hold of their capital investments here since they have refused to return our sterling loans to them. That would have given us the best paying key industries, which earn 40 crores of profit per year, on their own admission.

In our capital borrowings we should have refused to tie ourselves to one or the other imperialist country.

Penetration of American Capital

The financial policies of the government of India are, however, leading it to mortgage the country to America in addition to the hold that Britain has already got over our economy.

The American drive to capture the colonial markets of Britain is in full swing in India and Pakistan.

Utilising the failure of the India government to solve the food and production crisis in a democratic way, the

American monopolists are offering more and more loans to India. The loans help the American monopolists to sell their unsalable goods at high prices to India. They allow their financial and technical advisers to penetrate the country's economy. They get a hold over the government machinery and they help to pass the effects of the crisis of the imperialist system on to the backs of our people.

In the end the loans tend to draw the India government more and more in grip of the warmongering bloc and into enmity with the democratic and socialist countries.

The government of India has already drawn 200 million dollars from the American monopolists as food loan, nearly 75 million from the World Bank, and proposes to contract further debts of over 1000 million dollars.

It claims that by these loans, it will reconstruct Indian economy, carry out vast irrigation works and solve the crisis of food and production in the country.

We have to tell the people and the working class that these claims are totally false and will not solve our crisis. We must tell them to reject the economic plan and perspective of the congress government and its landlord-bourgeois philosophy because they cannot solve our problems.

Two years back the government and the ruling classes were harping on shortage of consumer goods as the reason for high prices and scarcity of goods.

They demanded 'industrial truce' from the working class, which meant that it should not strike against the monopolists who were profiteering to secure rise in its wages. The government admits that the truce has worked. The strike wave also shows that whether because of truce or not, the number of strike struggles did go down for various reasons. The year 1951 was a year of lowest mandays lost in strikes. In 1947 we had 16.5 million working days lost in strikes, in 1948, 7.8 million, in 1950, 12.8 million, in 1951 only three and half million.

The bourgeoisie itself admits that production in 1951 had increased tremendously. The general index of production shows the following rise in some of the commodities.

	1948	1950	1951
Cloth	100	93.8	104.3
Engineering	100	203.5	265.8
Sugar	100	105.8	119.2
Coal	100	110.8	118.8
Steel	100	111.2	115.9
Cement	100	169.4	207.4
General index	100	105.2	119.6

That shows that our working class has been producing on the upgrade, that the shortage of production was being overcome.

What relief did the consumers, the public and the workers get from this?

Hardly had production gone up than a crisis of 'over-production' developed. When prices began to go down the bourgeoisie complained of losses and threatened to close down factories.

The Slump

The government, which so long clamoured for production, supply of goods and reduction in prices, began to sanction heavy exports of cloth, sugar, iron ore, coal, etc. in order to curtail supplies to the home market and push up prices.

It stopped subsidies on food in the name of saving deficits in the budget and attacked the livelihood of 50 million people in the cities and rationed areas, i.e. mainly the working class and the middle class.

Thus the myth that shortages for the people can be overcome by industrial truce, more production by workers at less wages, has been blown up.

The attack of the slump on our economy has proved how we are in the grip of the Anglo-American economy. It has proved how the people impoverished by landlordism and monopoly capital are unable to buy even at falling prices. It has proved how the landlord-bourgeois state run by the Congress Party refuses to reduce the top heavy bureaucratic police structure of the state which is absorbing over fifty per cent of the taxes and thereby impoverishes the people and hampers trade and production.

Once before, the government blamed natural calamities for the ills of the people. Now it blames the slump also as a natural calamity.

The slump is neither natural nor unforeseen. Apart from being the inevitable outcome of landlord-bourgeois economy, this slump has visible birthmarks of its Anglo-American parenthood, with its nursery in the Indian economy and agency in the governmental machinery.

The slump began as a financial crisis in the export commodities and the stock-exchange market, in oils, jute, leather, tea, etc. These export commodities were just those which the Anglo-Americans were piling for war purposes. The Indian big bourgeoisie and the government instead of building stable trade in these commodities in the stable market of the people's democracies boycotted those markets and turned to the war markets.

The defeat of the Americans in Korea curbed their wild war-schemes. The financial crisis of Britain and America forced them to unload hoarded goods and stop stock-piling. Inflation, war-boom, high prices and taxation had impoverished their home market. And the slump came. Their crash hit the Indian economy, first in the export market and next in all commodities.

Such a crisis hits the colonial markets far more quickly than the metropolitan, because the monopolies of the colonies are weaker compared to those of Anglo-American finance. The chronic poverty of the colonies reveals the crisis in all its severity.

People's Solution

What solution can there be for the crisis?

The bourgeoisie is trying to throw the burden on peasantry by cutting down the purchase price of raw materials, on the working class by wage-cuts, unemployment and rationalisation, on the small traders and manufacturers by refusing them credit and a protected home market. The congress government is trying to save the big monopolies by giving them relief in export duties, reducing taxes, advancing loans, and lending state funds for partnership in their ruined ventures, thus saddling the people with the losses of the monopolists.

The people's solution is quite different from this. We must demand opening of trade with China, the USSR and the people's democracies, who are ready to buy what we want to sell without dictating any terms and who are ready to supply us capital goods for industrialisation. The international economic conference at Moscow has convinced the genuine traders and manufacturers of the need for such trade.

We must insist on the British supplying us capital goods in exchange for the loans they have appropriated from us. We must ask the Americans, not for loans, but for supplies against barter of our surplus goods, if they are so anxious to help us, as they say.

We must refuse to produce in accordance with the requirements of the warmongers.

We must scale down the excise duties and sales tax that make the goods dearer for internal consumption of our people.

We must refuse to export goods primarily needed for our consumption, such as cloth, sugar, etc.

We must reduce the expenditure on the state machine and drastically cut down taxes on consumer goods, which are imposed to maintain that expensive machine.

Credit in the hands of monopoly speculators must be frozen and given to small and medium producers first.

The taxes on monopoly profits must be progressively and steeply increased.

The workers must be protected from wage-cuts and closure of factories.

The peasantry must be given relief from rent and interest.

These measures alone can mitigate the evil effects of the crisis on the people.

The slump enables us to convince the people of the disastrous effect of linking our economy to war-markets of the imperialists and thereby to strengthen the desire for peace and freedom in the minds of the people. The enemies of peace on the contrary make the people yearn for more war which is painted as a conveyor of boom, production and profits. People's experience must be used to expose this vile lie of the profiteers who benefit by people's miseries and war.

Bourgeois Analysis of the Slump

The bourgeois propaganda about the causes of the slump is designed to sidetrack the attention of the masses from the crisis of the imperialist system and its colonial allies. It is designed to mislead the people into believing that crises and slumps are god-given natural calamities and punishment for sins, decreed by the unknowable. Such a view kills the initiative of the masses to struggle against the oppressors for bettering their condition.

In order to counteract this propaganda, we must study the facts and put them before the people. We must show the origin of the slump and our misery in the imperialist, landlord-capitalist economy in which we are enmeshed. We must be able to show from facts and figures how the landlords and monopolists are responsible for it and are using it to enrich themselves at the expense of the masses.

Various sections of the bourgeoisie according to their own interests prescribe their own solution for the slump.

Seeing that the slump hit the export markets in jute and oil-seeds, the export houses howled for lowering of the export duties, to which they ascribe the slump. The

strongest of them, i.e. the jute magnates, got their demand and their duty was reduced from Rs 1500 to Rs 275.

Jute is owned by big landlords, British bankers and big Indian millowners. It is an item of war exports as also an item of peacetime economy. When prices rose due to war in Korea, the government was in no hurry to raise the export duties and enabled the monopoly holders to mint millions until the duty was raised. But when the foreign market demanded a reduction, the action was quick.

The next big bourgeoisie to get relief was the cotton magnates. They got relief on cloth exports and credit on American cotton imports. The sugar syndicate was allowed to export sugar, although, only a few weeks before, a minister had solemnly asserted that it would not be allowed.

The speculators wanting credit from banks and unwilling to unload black money attributed the slump to tightening of credit and dearer money. They wanted to hide the fact that they had been speculating on the difference between the bank rate here and the bank rate in England and that the government had only decided to share the superprofits of the war boom by raising the bank rate. Dearer money was only a symptom and not a cause of the slump.

The big manufacturers attributed the slump to high wages and cost of production, alleging that that made the products dearer and hence unsalable. If so, then they should have welcomed the fall in prices and it should have led to sales. But just the opposite happened. Even at falling prices sales would not go up. The manufacturers began to curtail production and close the factories in order to push up prices. And above all, they demanded removal of all controls.

A year back they all attributed high prices and want of goods to underproduction. Now they all attribute our ills to overproduction and fall in prices. They ask for underproduction again and high prices. Thus they oscillate in their own contradictions of capitalist economy.

In relations to people's needs there is total under-production. But those who are in need of goods are not allowed to labour and earn in order to buy and consume the goods. Those who labour are not allowed to retain the gains of their labour in order to be buyers of what is produced. Hence we say that the solution to our ills is not this or that financial measure but complete change in social relations, a change in the direction of people's democracy and people's economy from landlord-bourgeois economy and its autocracy.

Multipurpose Schemes & Our Attitude

Taking advantage of the crisis the American monopolists have opened a fullscale offensive to dig into our economy and among our people. Many political parties, groups and individuals including many government ministries are aiding and abetting this conspiracy to enslave our people to the Americans in addition to the slavery of the British.

It is propagated that the American loans for building the multipurpose schemes will help us to improve agriculture and industrialise our country. Some tradeunion organisations (viz the Hind Mazdoor Sabha convention in Bombay) have even undertaken to support the six-year plan of government, i.e. to support the attack on living standards of workers, already openly announced by these plans. In view of this, it is necessary for us to be clear in our attitude to this question. (

Our attitude to these schemes and plans is not determined by the fact that they are being done on loans from England and America. We have already shown above how the plans are being built on the basis of starvation of the people and enrichment of the rich. More than this is the fact that a large part of the plans is sheer robbery of the state funds by those in charge, in league with the foreign monopoly financiers. This robbery predetermines the failure of these schemes and plans and in the end bankruptcy of the state.

Reports of the Sindhri factory, the Hirakud dam, the Damodar valley project show that the original costs are doubled or trebled once the schemes are launched. The suppliers, seeing that government treasury is committed, raise prices, charge huge commissions, nepotism becomes rampant and even what is supplied in tools and machines turns out to be mere scrap. The Sindhri factory was estimated to cost 10 crore. It cost 24 and yet it is not fulfilling production targets.

The working of Damodar Valley Corporation during the last two and a half years has been criticised in parliament. Criticisms based on the auditor's reports show that "(a) the estimate has been enormously exceeded; (b) heavy expenditure was incurred even before the appointment of a suitable chief engineer and before the rules and regulations were drawn up; (c) wastage and overhead costs have been too excessive; (d) contracts were given by negotiation without competitive tenders being invited and there was no approved schedule of rates for the execution of works at the various work sites; and (e) some of the projects might prove uneconomical and might have to be dropped".

"The auditor's report mentions two other instances which reflects no credit on the corporation. One relates to the loss through deterioration of a large quantity of cement estimated to cost about Rs 3 lakh; the other is in connection with the scheme to transfer the corporation's headquarters from Calcutta to Ranchi. On the latter, more than Rs 7 lakh were spent on preliminary arrangements alone. Subsequently, however, it was decided to abandon this proposal" (from a pamphlet by the Employers' Association).

The story of the other projects is no better and those projects are estimated to burden us with over five hundred crores of rupees' debt.

The American penetration in joint partnership with the British on the oil refinery projects, the Japanese penetration, which again is partly American, in the iron ore mines in Goa and export of our pig iron to Japan, the

various community projects built up as centres of Americanism and Hollywood gangster culture should tell us that it is not a healthy growth that will result from government policies but just mortgaging of our economy to foreign imperialist exploitation.

It is futile to expect that the incoming famines and crisis of production are going to be overcome by such measures. At best their manifestations may be mitigated, zigzagged and a little delayed but never averted.

In order to meet the threat to our people, to the independence of the country, the working class has to come forward to defend the people's interests. We must reject all attempts to saddle the people with the burdens of the six-year plan to enrich the monopolists. We will put forward our platform of reconstructing the economy of our country. We will not accept rise in prices, fall in wages or bonus and wage-freeze in the name of fighting inflation. We will not allow our rights to be curtailed to demand improvements in our standard of living. We will formulate our charter of demands for the people and for the working class and fight for it. We are threatened with famine, crash of our economy and further impoverishment of the people. Our trade unions must mobilise to meet the crisis, to save the gains that the working class, the people have fought for and won, to go further.

2. ON THE ADVANCE OF OUR WORKING CLASS AND THE IDEOLOGICAL-ORGANISATIONAL OFFENSIVE OF THE BOURGEOISIE

In 1952 today, it is hundred years since the first factories began to work in India and the new working class was born.

How far has it advanced in these hundred years?

In the early days the peasant, forced out of his land and village, ruined by landlords and moneylenders, with his handicrafts forcibly destroyed by the British government and later by competition, resisted with uprisings, with guns in hand led by peasant partisan heroes; but he was

beaten. He flocked to the new towns on the sea-coast, Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, etc. where the British and their Indian agents found suitable conditions to build factories.

*Jungle Law, Unlimited Working Day,
Child Labour, No Rest*

From 1852 on to 1880, the working class in these factories was exploited most inhumanly and without pity. Arrogant Britishers, pious hindus, religious moslems, all combined irrespective of their religion, nationality, language or country in bleeding men, women and children in these slaughterhouses of capital. There was neither law nor moral scruple to protect these millions, dazed by the new order, the new machines, the new unheard of ways of work and new masters, from the cruelties of capital in its birth on Indian soil, in a country conquered by a foreign imperialism and ravaged by its own landlords and monied traitors.

In those days, it was jungle law that prevailed. There was no limit on hours of work. Men, women and children were herded in the dens of capital to work from 12, 16, 18 and even 23 hours per day. There was no Sunday, no holiday, no starting and closing time. Children of five and six years of age worked full time as the grownups. And when they died or were maimed in the machines there was no value for their life or limb.

Who then brought capital to its senses and secured some law, some decency in the life of the worker and his exploitation? The whole history of workingclass struggles the world over shows that the bourgeoisie never yielded any reform, any wage-increases or improvement to the workers without the workers waging determined struggles. The Indian bourgeoisie is no exception to the general characteristic of that class as such.

The protests of the working class in the early days were feeble and did not take to any strike struggle. When the cheap child labour of the Indian factories, run by the

British and the Indian owners, competed seriously with the cotton textiles of Lancashire, the British owners in England demanded that the India government prevent **excessive exploitation** of the Indian worker. The demand was not motivated by any pity for the women and children. It was a demand arising out of the needs of British capital to prevent undercutting of its price of production by the cheap labour of Indian children by capital in India. The first factory commissions to enquire into conditions of labour were thus born out of the quarrel among the thieves. The commissions recommended Sunday holiday, and limit upon the age of children and night work by women. By 1890 Sunday holiday came into existence and child labour below 9 years was prohibited.

But that was only in the letter. Sunday holiday was nullified by calling workers to clean machinery on that day; child labour continued as before, with the change that every working child was given the certificate of being of the required age. There was yet no legal limit to hours of work.

Indian industrialists say that they had to struggle against the British competition to survive. But that struggle they conducted by means of children's labour, unlimited working-day of men and women and wholesale robbery of the earned wages of lakhs of workers. Not their heroism and money but robbery of our toil and our suffering that built them up. This they don't say.

The Fight for the Shorter Working Day

Following the crisis of 1905-7 and the political upheavals in which the working class began to take interest as shown in the political strike of 1907 in Bombay, the government of India appointed a commission and in 1911 limited the working day to 11 hours.

But all such limitations remained ineffective because, in the absence of an organised and conscious working class, the bourgeoisie would never give up its jungle-law and club-rule.

The first world war and the Russian revolution brought the first wave of class-consciousness and strike struggles to the Indian factory worker, in the big cities and towns. The fight for higher wages, dearness allowance, bonus, and shorter hours of work began to figure in the demands of the workers from 1917 onwards. In 1920 the workers of Bombay on their own demanded 10-hour day and threatened to strike. The government and the employers acceded to 10-hour day in 1920 and the law was enacted in 1922. It was in this period that the tradeunion movement arose, gathered strength and became a mighty weapon of the working class, to achieve its demands.

Since 1918, when the workers began their struggles not only on individual factory scale but industry and area-wise against the employers, what have been the gains of the working class and how did they achieve them?

To the working class of today 18 hours' work would look a horror. A child of 7 years to stand by the machine for 18 hours would bring today a whole factory on strike. Workers today strike for weeks against the arbitrary dismissal of even a single worker. They know the time by the clock and come and leave by it. They demand and will have their pay within 7 days of the month end. And above all the greatest thing is that they have the 8-hour day—their biggest achievement. The fight for the normal working day is the beginning of the liberation struggle of the working class.

The strike struggles of 1920 brought the 10-hour day. The struggles of 1930-34 gave us the 9-hour day and the postwar upheavals made the congress government give effect to the 8-hour day in 1946.

One hundred years ago, out of 24 hours the worker had not even 6 hours of his own. All his time was labour time to produce profits for the bourgeoisie. Now 8 hours are labour and 16 hours his own.

The Fight for Living Wage

Along with the fight for the normal working-day, the workers had to fight for a living wage. That fight is not

yet won, but the TU movement today is on the way to it. Until the first world war, the movement for higher wages had not taken an organised form. The bourgeoisie till then refused to accept that the worker had a family and not only himself. To the bourgeoisie, each member of the worker's family was merely a 'hand' to be put to use at his machine, whether it be of the woman or the child.

It is during the twenties that the movement for higher wages and bonus payments arose with a force and some gains were made. But living wage as such till today remains to be achieved.

The anarchy of wages in the same industry and same place was first beaten down by the workers' struggles for the **standard wage** in any industry. The fight for the standard wage was a fight for a uniform wage and elimination of competition among the workers themselves. It was a fight to build their industrial and class solidarity.

This fight even helped the bourgeoisie to restore order in its cost-structure and thus provided capital also with uniform conditions of exploitation in relation to one another in the matter of the purchase of labour-power.

The fight for the standard wage remained essentially a matter located to particular industries and areas. Standard wage had been proposed by the bourgeoisie in Bombay mills in 1897, but strike of 1928 demanded and won it.

The standard wage led to questions of **minimum wage**, and the **living wage**. In a number of places and industries, the minimum for a job was obtained as in Bombay textiles. Even the principle that the wage of the worker must be based upon the admission that it is his wage as the earner of a family, that it must be a family wage and not individual wage was being gradually recognised.

The principal gains in this matter came as a result of the struggles in the period of the second world war.

That there should be a minimum sum of money below which no one should be paid for his day's labour and that that minimum should be valid for the whole country

—this principle was forced on the government and the bourgeoisie through persistent struggles. The admission of this principle ultimately came through the central pay commission of the government of India. As the largest employer of labour on the railways and salaried employees, it admitted Rs 30 as the minimum to be paid on a **national scale** to every employee in its service. This set the standard for all private employers also. All unskilled workers demanded a relative grading up of their wages. The central pay commission had been appointed only for government and railway employees. But by an irony of history, not visualised by the government or the bourgeoisie, it became in a way the **central propagandist** of the workingclass demand on a national scale for a **national minimum**. It sanctioned and sanctified the principle of a national minimum.

The thirty-rupee minimum certainly was not a minimum living wage. But the struggle for the living wage was being disrupted by the disunity of the TU movement and the shrewd manoeuvres of the bourgeoisie. Instead of the living wage, the congress government passed the fake legislation of the **minimum wage act** prescribing minimum wages in sweated industries. That is only a manoeuvre in the interest of the big bourgeois monopolists to help them against the small, though it is done in the name of the workers. The minimum wage law in no way gives us the living wage, i.e. the wage that would permit a worker to live a civilised decent life with his wife and children.

In the early days even the earned wages were mulcted by way of fines, arbitrary deductions and confiscations. The passing of the **payment of wages act** in 1936 reduced the robbery of workers' earnings by limiting fines to not more than 3 per cent of the earnings and compelled the bourgeoisie to pay the workers' dues within seven days of their falling due at the end of the month. Till then the employers used to keep two months' wages on hand, thus forcing the working class to give the bourgeoisie free credit of two months' labour, and allowing them to trade on these vast

advances free of interest, while the workers had to enter into debts for food, rent and other necessities. That was one more blow to curb the robbers.

The Fight for Social Insurance

A normal working day and a living wage are incomplete without **social security**, i.e. social insurance against old age, sickness, accident, unemployment and maternity leave.

These questions were not raised in a general form in the early days of the TU movement. In the period after the first world war, demand was made and the law was passed providing for compensation against injury and accidents. That was surely an achievement, as the worker's life and limb got a value to be paid for by the employer, not only when it produced profits for him, but also when it was lost by the worker in the service of the employer. By that law the worker came to be recognised as a human being and ceased to be valued merely as a piece of machine. In fact machines were better looked after than men.

The bourgeoisie, however, refused to accept responsibility for sickness, unemployment and old age. To accept that the employer must pay for the maintenance of the worker when he is sick or old, unemployed or when a woman worker goes to hospital for motherhood was to accept fundamentally **new principles** of workingclass life and social organisation. It was to accept the fact when the workers had ceased to produce due to old age, sickness, unemployment or maternity they had a claim on social wealth or the part of it held by the bourgeoisie to maintain them, that when they were in production, they had produced so much surplus and contributed so much to the social fund and bourgeois property as to entitle them to claim maintenance even when they ceased to produce and that every producer of wealth, every unit of labour-power today was so productive as to claim such maintenance.

The bourgeoisie naturally resisted with all its might the admission of such principles. But outside India, the working class in Europe had already fought these battles and

forced bourgeois society to accept the principles of the political economy of the working class. Social security legislation was forced on the bourgeois state by the working class. The stand of the bourgeoisie that the worker produced as much as he was paid in wages and that his relations with the product and its owner, the bourgeoisie, ceased as soon as he had ceased to produce was smashed by the workingclass movement in Europe long ago. Thus when the workers in India raised the question of **leave with pay**, i.e. the right to rest at the expense of the bourgeoisie and social insurance bourgeois resistance did not take its stand on the basis of **principle** but on the **capacity** of the industry to bear the costs.

The fight for social insurance is an uphill one. **Compensation** for accident and injury was established by the 1923 act. But they would not agree to pay wages during sickness or unemployment. Partial compensation for **involuntary unemployment** arose during the second world war in the jute industry because the jute millowners were afraid of losing their labour force during stoppages, as the war afforded alternative employments and at better wages than in the jute industry. Thus for the first time unemployment of a type came to be partly paid for. **Maternity benefits** became general during the war in order to attract female labour when male labour ran short or when the employers did not want to pay men's full rates for the job to women. **Leave with pay** systems existed in some undertakings for office workers, but it had not been applied to factory workers. Annual holidays with pay were introduced at the end of the war in some industries. **Sickness insurance** was discussed in 1944. The employees' state insurance act to provide insurance against sickness, accident and maternity and the provident fund act to cover old age and retirement have been passed but are not yet effective due to the sabotage of the employers and the government.

The bourgeoisie refuses to agree to these measures. And where it agrees the greatest shortcoming of these measures is that they are applied only to a few industries and the workers are made to contribute a part of their wages to

these insurance funds, on which the employers' contribution is made conditional. The insurance is hedged in with so many conditions and bureaucratic obstruction that their full value ceases to reach the needy workers.

The Right to Form Trade Unions

Another achievement of great value that requires to be recorded is the right of TU organisation. The right of the workers to form trade unions and conduct strike struggles was challenged by the British and Indian bourgeoisie aided by its law courts in the days of the first world war in the Madras case. But soon the wave of strike struggles and the rise of trade unions silenced the government and the employers, who then considered it advisable to pass the TU act of 1926 and thus legalise the organisation of TUs and the strike struggles.

Thus in hundred years we advanced from a state of jungle law to some order in the world of exploiters. We have secured the acceptance of certain principles and laws embodying them, though their effective observance depends on the strength of the working class. We have secured:

1. 8 hour day.
2. Sunday rest.
3. Interval rest for meals.
4. Prohibition of child labour.
5. Compensation for accident.
6. Maternity benefits and leave.
7. Leave with pay.
8. Timely payment of wages.
9. Limit on fines and robbery of earned wages.
10. Provident fund act.
11. State insurance act.
12. The minimum wage limit.
13. Right to bonus.
14. Wages linked to prices or cost of living.
15. Compensation for involuntary unemployment.

This short review of the principal achievements of the working class will show us how we have fared since the new industrial worker was born in Indian society, how from a hunted animal, beaten, flogged and forced to work in mines, plantations and mills, with his wife and children, young and old, in the grinding wheels of rapacious capitalism aided by the British bayonets and the moral beatings of the Indian bourgeoisie he has come to be a man standing up in defence of his rights as man and worker, as the builder and pillar of our society. To know this should give him confidence in his strength, his struggles and his victories. What lessons for the future does he give us and what now are the tasks before him?

From the review of the struggles and achievements of the working class and TU movement certain lessons stand out, which the working class must note in its further march. These lessons may be roughly outlined as follows:

The first thing to be noted is that all these gains of the workers came as a result of struggles and sacrifices. There were strikes, in which thousands and lakhs participated, hundreds were killed and sent to prisons, before the bourgeoisie yielded. Not without furious class struggle was anything gained.

Second thing to be noted is that it is not only the foreign British government that opposed these rights being given. The British and the Indian big bourgeoisie joined hands in fighting the working class and its demands for better living and working conditions.

The third thing to be noted is that not until the workers began to unite and struggle as a class, irrespective of their caste or communal divisions, did they become effective.

The fourth thing is that not until the workers entered into the political battles against the ruling class and were led by political parties guided by the class outlook and philosophy of the working class did they make any substantial gains.

The fifth is that while the initial mass battles of the working class and their trade unions were led by com-

munists and their friends, it is only when the communists and noncommunists formed a united front and maintained the unity of the working class and the trade unions irrespective of their political differences that onslaughts of the bourgeoisie could be defeated and effective gains made.

The sixth is that with the increasing violence of the ruling class against the workers, the need of combining the workers' struggle with that of the peasantry and other working people has become apparent and where such alliance comes about the disruption of the struggles of the workers and also that of the peasants is becoming difficult for the enemies of the working class.

The seventh thing to be noted is that the struggles of the workers in India have always been helped by the class-conscious workers of other countries, that the international solidarity of the working class of the world has always been a factor in the success we have achieved. It is only since the Russian revolution and now the Chinese that the arrogant bourgeoisie has been brought to respect the rights of the workers, despite the ferocious hatred it bears towards them.

That, in short, is what the history of the hundred years of development of the workingclass movement in India teaches us. Every phase of our struggles illustrates for us one or the other of the above seven lessons. We must carefully study how these conclusions arise and what they mean for us today.

The bourgeoisie and its agents in the working class are organising a powerful ideological offensive against the organised working class. The aim of the offensive is to eradicate the above seven lessons from the minds of the working class and the consciousness that its gains have been made because it fought struggles, which alone bring out those lessons.

The organised TU movement is faced with the urgent problem of the ideological building up of the working class, which we have to take in hand immediately.

Challenging us ideologically, the bourgeoisie is building up rival TU organisations, and disrupting workingclass

unity in order that we may not be able to advance further in winning better working and living conditions and achieving people's democracy.

With a working class ideologically tied to the bourgeoisie through the Congress and the reactionary rightwing socialists, and organisationally divided, the landlord-bourgeois government hopes to pass the burden of the crisis on to the backs of the toiling masses and thereby save the exploiting monopolists and their rule.

It is, therefore, necessary to understand our TU movement in the past and organise it in the future in the light of the above lessons.

3. TRADE UNIONS, POLITICAL PARTIES AND UNITY

The mass tradeunion movement in India is mainly the creation of the Communist Party. It is the communist pioneers who first brought the class outlook to the trade unions. It is they who first united the workers irrespective of caste and communal divisions, irrespective of political creeds. It is they who first built the biggest trade unions in India, brought the outlook of international solidarity of the working class into the trade unions. The union as the instrument of militant struggles of the working class and of collective bargaining, run by the workers' own leadership, came into the field through their work.

The British imperialists and their Indian partners tried their best to stop this growth. But they failed.

Offensive Against the Working Class

Since 1947 the Indian monopolists led by the National Congress have launched the most determined offensive against the working class organising itself with the outlook of its own class. The offensive took the form of dividing and disrupting the AITUC nationally and internationally or directing the workers under the influence of Anglo American leadership, of preaching class-collaboration and

suppressing the strike struggles either by laws of compulsory arbitration or by direct state force.

In this the big bourgeois monopolists are aided by the rightwing socialists. In recent days, the hand of the American Federation of Labour, the America CIO, the British TUC, Yugoslav agencies in guiding, financing and staffing the socialist leadership and the INTUC is directly and openly visible. Their main burden of attack is that the Communist Party has never built the TU movement as such, that it has always used the TU for its party politics, that internationally it puts the TUs at the service of Russia. Hence they have to build a separate TU movement.

It is necessary that this Anglo-American offensive aided by the congress government, the INTUC and the right socialists is fought energetically, and the working class apprised of the role of the CP and other political parties in the TU movement.

Communist Pioneers

There were no communists in India before 1921 and socialists in India before 1934, whether in group or party form. There were no trade unions in India before 1918 and no central organisation. The AITUC was founded in October 1920 not in order to coordinate TU activity but mainly in order to elect 'workers' representatives' to the ILO which was founded in 1919. But once founded the AITUC tended to become the central mouthpiece of the trade unions.

It was the communist group in Bombay that brought the 'labour problem' before the National Congress. From 1921 to 1924 the Bombay Provisional Congress, the biggest congress unit in those days, and the AICC were constantly being moved to **establish committees to organise the working class**. Committees were established and funds allotted but never to work in the working class. The national bourgeoisie did not consider it seriously. They considered it safer not to encourage the worker to become organised, either in TUs or in political parties.

'Principles' of Majoor Mahajan

Not that the bourgeois leadership had no ideas as to what the TUs should be, if they did come up.

When the Ahmedabad workers struck for wages, Mahatma Gandhi took the lead and established the Majoor Mahajan, the union which for all these years since 1920 is being hailed as the model of tradeunionism. Why is it a 'model'? Some facts are worth noting in this respect.

The Majoor Mahajan's subscriptions from the workers were realised for it by the millowners at the pay counter. This practice continued till 1936.

The Ahmedabad Millowners' Association made donations to this 'union', to help its 'social work'.

The Majoor Mahajan preached that the capitalists were their trustees as they were more clever and the workers ignorant. The capitalists were necessary for society. Capital and labour were two wheels of the social chariot, on which life moved.

Hence it decided to solve all disputes by arbitration and not by strikes. It is recorded in the Mahajan's proceedings that one dispute had been pending in arbitration for 17 years.

The Mahajan never affiliated to or formed any central all-India body of trade unions. Even when Lajpat Rai and C. R. Das were presidents of the AITUC in 1920-22 or Nehru and Subhas Bose were presidents in 1929-30, the Mahajan declined to join the AITUC.

It was their principle that the workers should not look beyond their factory or their town.

The Mahajan was organised on a craft basis. It was their principle that the workers should not unite even on the basis of an industry as a whole. To unite on an all-India scale was dangerous.

Naturally the Mahajan never joined any international organisation. To combine internationally was still more dangerous.

The Mahajan would not participate in political actions, or conflict with any government, not even the British.

Such were the 'model' principles on which the Majoor Mahajan was built.

Formation of INTUC

Anyone now looking into the 'principles' on which the INTUC is run will be struck to find that on these essential matters, the INTUC has changed its Mahajan line.

The INTUC by its very formation now wants a national central body of trade unions. It now sits in the Anglo American international, the ICFTU. It does not oppose forming unions on industrial basis. It puts its unions at the service of a political party and politics, i.e. of the National Congress.

Thus gandhian tradeunionism has thrown overboard certain of its 'principles'. Why have they done so? They have done it because the working class refused to accept their line of division and disruption. Hence the bourgeoisie advises the INTUC to accept the workers' outlook on these matters, in order to disrupt it effectively. It is the communists who adhered to and effectively brought the questions of national central organisation, of international solidarity, of political outlook to the workers. The others now accept it—only to use it against the working class.

As stated above the communists tried their best to persuade the National Congress to organise the working class. But they failed. From 1921 to 1930 the national bourgeoisie underestimated the role of the TUs.

Communists Build Mass TUs

The pioneer communist groups of 1920-28 led determined strike-struggles against wage-cuts and rationalisation, won big victories and built big mass trade unions. All these unions were in the AITUC. None of them preached class-collaboration. They fearlessly championed the demands of political freedom. They joined in international solida-

rity. They were industrial unions. They were bringing forward workingclass leadership.

In the strikes of 1923-24 the communists came forward with the slogan of working class as the creator of values, with slogans of socialist outlook. In 1927 they brought the question of international solidarity, through the defence of the Sacco-Vanzetti case, in which these two innocent workers were hanged by American imperialists on faked charges.

The great May Day celebrations were begun in India in 1927 by the communist pioneers who made it a mighty movement during the strikes struggles of 1928-29.

On International Affiliation

But the communists did not raise the question of international affiliation on their own in the AITUC. They did not think the movement was ripe for such an advanced step. Moreover they were sure the other groups, especially the group of N. M. Joshi-V. V. Giri, would not agree to affiliation with the Red International of Labour Unions (RILU), the international of the militant working class. The Joshi-Giri group was with the British TUC and the International Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU). The IFTU had deserted the struggles of the working class and opposed the struggles of the colonial people for freedom. Hence we did not support the IFTU, neither did we move for affiliation with RILU.

Who forced the question on us first? It was the British TUC and the Joshi-Giri group. The British TUC sent Purcell and Halsworth, two labour reactionaries, to India at the AITUC session in Kanpur in 1927 in order to secure the AITUC affiliation to the IFTU, because the Chinese movement had gone and affiliated to the RILU. On a world scale, the bourgeoisie had launched an offensive through the IFTU to divide and capture the working class for its schemes of warmongering and suppression of the liberation struggles of the colonial people. The same game is being repeated now by the ICFTU.

The IFTU move was defeated by us at Kanpur and at the Delhi executive meeting of the AITUC in 1928. We then proposed a countermove to affiliate with the RILU. As a result, the Joshi-Giri group with the consent of the others dropped the question of affiliation with the IFTU and we dropped our proposal.

What was the role of the congress leadership in these moves? It may be noted here that C. F. Andrews and Lala Lajpat Rai who represented congress ideology at these meetings and in the AITUC encouraged the IFTU and the British TUC though on national questions they expressed anti-British sentiments.

Another question of international solidarity that arose in this period was that of expressing friendship with the Soviet Union and China. The communists frankly told the working class that the Soviet Union was a country of the working class and as such a friend to be defended. The question of the Chinese revolution came when the British gunboats attacked Shanghai, Hongkong and Canton workers' strikes and the revolution. We openly told the workers to support the worldwide "Hands off China" movement of that period.

But while doing this on the platform of the party, we did not pose the questions as an issue on the TUC platform, if the others would not agree. **We never wanted to divide the AITUC on political questions.** But we also refused to keep the working class and TUC aloof from political questions as such.

Thus we built the TU movement in India from 1922 onwards.

Socialists Enter TUs

The socialists came in 1934. But they were not yet in the TU movement. They entered it in company with the royists in 1936. For what? Mainly in order to guide the working class into the fold of the National Congress. The socialists were 'congress socialists' then.

The tremendous growth of the TU movement and the

leadership of the communists therein had frightened both the big bourgeoisie and the British government. The British had attacked us in 1924 and 1929 by launching the Kanpur and Meerut conspiracy cases and wholesale arrests of tradeunion workers. But the attack had failed to dislodge us.

The national congress leadership refused to support any struggle of the workers. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel had refused our offer to send 10,000 volunteers to the Bardoli peasant satyagraha in 1928 from the textile strikers of Bombay. Mahatma Gandhi refused to allow the Ahmedabad workers to give any relief to the Bombay workers, who were on strike for six months.

In 1937 the communists entered the stronghold of the Majoor Mahajan in Ahmedabad and brought about a general strike of 36 mills. Sardar Patel was surprised, because the strike took place despite his ban. That set the bourgeoisie thinking. With the first share of power in the ministries of 1937, the national bourgeoisie organised a determined offensive through their Hind Mazdoor Seva Sangh to capture the working class throughout India and suppress the militant TU movement.

The socialist leadership along with the royists controlled the AITUC. But they would not organise the workers against the offensive of the bourgeoisie and the Congress. We bore the brunt. Rajagopalachari and Munshi and Pant and all threatened us. Rajaji even made a statement that he carried a pistol in his hand against us if we dared to fight. We did not flinch. We have not become Rajaji's enemy No 1 only today. We became so since we conducted the strikes of workers against the Harveys of Madura and Chettiers of Coimbatore despite Rajaji's threats in his first honeymoon days of ministry and power.

That was how the big congress bosses and the socialist leaders behaved at the first taste of power.

In those days the TU movement spread far and wide, became all-India one. Former backward areas came swiftly to the forefront of struggles.

In 1947 with the mass backing that the Congress and

socialists had secured during 1942, they tried to capture the AITUC and TU movement through it. The Hind Mazdoor Seva Sangh of Sardar Patel allotted a lakh of rupees to enrol bogus membership of unions inside the AITUC run by congressmen and right socialists.

They tried their best to capture the AITUC at the Calcutta session in February 1947. They measured their strength by proposing a resolution to support the bills, brought forward by congress ministries which banned strike and imposed compulsory conciliation. The resolutions were defeated by overwhelming majority.

Soon after Sardar Patel established the INTUC in May 1947. The Sardar was not ready to give the socialists their price. The socialists soon followed the Congress and split away from the AITUC and started the Hind Mazdoor Sabha.

Gandhian leadership had so far not worked an all-India central body for the working class. Now they had it—in order to support the antiworkingclass bourgeois state.

Who Split the AITUC and Why?

In 1950, though the INTUC and the socialist HMS claimed to differ with each other, they agreed to join hands in affiliation with ICFTU, the Anglo-American international splitaway from the WFTU.

Both the Congress and the socialists accuse the communists of having caused splits in the AITUC, of using TUs for party politics, of joining with foreign countries like Soviet Union and China. What do the above facts show?

The communists in the AITUC never committed the AITUC to any political resolution on the question of the war, about which so much is said. The communists never pitched the AITUC and TUs in the elections behind their party candidates.

The first split in the AITUC in 1929 was caused by the Joshi-Giri-Chamanlal group because they wanted cooperation with the royal commission on labour which the AITUC had disapproved. Even Nehru who was the presi-

dent of the AITUC then had to admit it and criticise the tactics employed by these gentlemen.

In 1947 it was the congressmen and socialists who started new rival organisations and split from the AITUC.

The communists never forced any political affiliation on the elections. The Bengal INTUC split on this issue from the central body.

The HMS unions rallied behind the Socialist Party which openly wants affiliation of trade unions to the Socialist Party on the model of the British where the TUC unions are affiliated to the Labour Party and pay levy for party funds.

It is only the communists who do not want the union to affiliate to any party. They did not want the unions to line up behind any party. Only if the overwhelming workers of a union demanded, the unions in some cases joined democratic fronts, formed from several progressive parties and groups.

Anglo-US TUs Quit WFTU

Internationally also the British and the American TUs who had first joined in the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) wanted to commit the WFTU to accept the Marshall plan, which was a plan of the American government to enslave the European countries. The TUs of the Soviet Union, France, Italy, China, India etc. asked that the Anglo-Americans should not raise the question in the WFTU and demand a vote. They could in their national centres, if they liked, take their own decision. But the Anglo-US leaders insisted. The Soviet tradeunion centre made the following statement on this issue, which is worth noting:

"The AUCCTU considers that the international unity of the working class in the World Federation of Trade Unions is based on the free and voluntary cooperation of trade unions which are nonparty organisations of the workers and pursue the aims of improving the standard of living of the working class.

"The Soviet trade unions, therefore, consider that it is impossible to turn trade unions, which are nonpolitical organisations, into an arena for political games and political machinations" (February 1948).

But the Anglo-American TU leadership had lined up behind their imperialists. They lost in the vote and hence left the WFTU.

They agreed on walking out of the WFTU but could not agree for a long time on forming a united body of their own because of Anglo-American rivalries. Only latterly, a semblance of agreement on the ICFTU was arrived at and the INTUC and HMS joined them from India. They have lined up behind the Marshall plan. Hence it is no wonder that the socialist HMS has lined up behind the five-year plan and the American aid and community projects.

Who then put the trade unions at the service of foreign countries? The communists, who refuse to divide the TU on political questions or the Congress and socialists who divide the working class and line it up behind Anglo-American schemes of world domination?

The Communist Party has built the TU movement, fought its battles, made tremendous gains for the working class, organised it nationally and in solidarity with the international working class, has given it socialist ideology, class outlook and a revolutionary make-up.

It is very difficult for the bourgeoisie to smash the organised working class from this position.

Workingclass Unity

It is true that the communists made mistakes and failed to establish the working class in India as the leader of the national-revolutionary freedom movement and that this failure was used by the bourgeoisie to weaken the party and the working class.

But despite this the working class has been so well embedded in its class position that the bourgeoisie has been forced to launch an all-round offensive with the aid of the INTUC and the right socialists to prevent it from uniting,

to keep it divided, to demoralise it ideologically and win it for the monopoly bourgeoisie and its Anglo-American helpers.

Hence it is our most important task to unite the working class and the TU movement. No amount of sacrifice should be spared for it.

The crisis of the colonial economy of the capitalist system and the successes of the socialist and democratic systems are making our task easier.

When the congress government in order to enrich the monopolists lifted controls in 1948, the working class led by the socialists and communists unitedly struck and forced the government to restore controls. In several towns and industries, even when the trade unions do not formally unite, the workers carry out united strike struggles, as in Bombay in 1950 and Nagpur in 1951. But the division in the leadership prevents the workers from reaping the benefits of their united action.

Among the working class a tremendous urge for unity exists. Wherever a united call goes, the workers and even the middle classes in sympathy with them, act unitedly and successfully.

Such unity halts the government in its offensive against the working class and enables it to protect its standards of living.

The AITUC has always proposed to the UTUC, the HMS and even the INTUC joint actions on agreed questions affecting the economic interests of the working class, even though the organisations may not agree politically or unite organisationally. But they have persistently refused our offers, the story of which need not be recounted here.

Unity cannot be achieved unless the AITUC unions work hard and lead the workers in struggles. We have to work for unity from below as well as from above. Where and in what conditions the one or the other or both should be the startingpoint depends on the state of the organisation, the mood of the masses and the make-up of the dissenting leaderships.

Unity has to be constantly worked for, setting aside party political questions, or personal likes or dislikes and notions of false prestige. At the same time, we should not compromise on fundamentals or agree to surrender the working class to the leadership of the bourgeoisie and its agents.

4. THE MAKE-UP AND TASKS OF OUR TU FUNCTIONARY

In the conditions and tasks facing our TU functionary he has to reorganise his make-up and reequip himself. The conditions of TU work are no longer what they were six years back. While strike struggles have to be led and fought, strike-leadership alone is not enough to unite and organise the working class. The bourgeois attack takes various forms, in reply to which a strike alone is not sufficient. We have to meet the attack according to the means employed by the bourgeoisie.

We must be under no illusions that government's economic plan or American aid is going to lessen the crisis for food, consumer goods, industrialisation and markets. The food crisis is a permanent one until the land is handed over to the peasant and landlordism abolished. The American loans may delay the impacts of famines here and there. But these very loans will ultimately intensify the crisis. Either by buying over whatever industry we have our national resources, or entering into partnerships with British and Indian holders, the American entry into our markets will ruin our industry and trade and make the situation worse, by accelerating the concentration of money and national wealth in the hands of big monopoly groups.

Therefore we must always be prepared to be with the workers in their struggles against rising living costs, unemployment and rationalisation.

Our TU functionary must know at least a short outline of our struggles and achievements so that he can give an outlook of confidence, class-consciousness and victory to

the worker and can draw on past experience to help in the present struggles.

Our enemy distorts our history and misleads the worker. We must be able to combat this distortion.

Industry & Its Development

Our TU functionary must know not only the general trends of development but also those in each industry where he works to be able to lead the worker correctly.

The increasing growth of monopoly is ruining the small producers and genuine industrialists. The hold of British capital, for example, has closed the whole leather industry in South India throwing out thousands of workers, and ruining hundreds of employers who are clamouring for aid against the power of the British market. The import of British power-engines of small calibre threatens to ruin the industrial units manufacturing such engines in India and render thousands unemployed.

Therefore, while fighting for the workers' demands, we must learn to combine the demands of the worker with the demands of the employer in such cases and defend our national interests against foreign monopoly capital. Hence we must know the trends in each industry, where we work.

Our TU functionary must know the markets for the products produced by our workers, the prices therein, the causes of their rise and fall. It is necessary because the government and the bourgeoisie try to set the consuming public against the worker by attributing high prices to our wages and create antagonisms between the working class of the towns and the peasantry in the countryside.

Technique of the Trade

Our TU functionary must know at least the rudiments of the technique of the trade in which he is running the union, so that he can understand the problems of wages and work-load, of speed-up and piece-rates better and can represent them with correctness. The best teacher in this

is the worker in the trade itself. We must not neglect to learn from him.

Our TU functionary must pay serious attention to the application of the laws on industrial matters. There is a tendency to consider all the laws as attacks on the working class and hence requiring no attention except to combat them in a general form. But it is forgotten that there are two sets of laws. One is an achievement on our part and to demand and supervise their realisation and application is a task of the trade unions. Laws such as payment of wages act, compensation for injuries, sickness insurance, maternity benefits, factory acts have been fought for and won by us in the teeth of opposition of the bourgeoisie, which does not wish to apply these laws in their full effectiveness. Therefore we must build the TU movement around the application and enforcement of laws which are in the interests of the workers.

Conciliation & Arbitration

The other set of laws—mainly those concerning conciliation, arbitration, recognition—are laws which are imposed on us to curb and devitalise the class solidarity and action of the working class. Therefore we must build the TU movement around the struggle against such laws as are against the interests of the workers.

In the early days of its rule the congress government allowed the conciliation and arbitration tribunals to concede the demands of the working class. Thereby it hoped that the workers would line up behind it, abjure strike actions and give up the class-outlook.

But very soon, when the bourgeoisie wanted to withhold concessions, the workers threw overboard the conciliation and tribunal acts as in the 1950 Bombay textile strike. The reaction of the workers has been so swift that even the INTUC has demanded an overhauling of the machinery of the arbitration tribunals, and the interference of the central-appellate tribunal in revising

awards of lower courts which turned favourable to workers.

The scandal of the bank tribunal has shattered even the faith of the middle class, which was most critical of our hostility to these acts and manoeuvres of the congress government.

Though the workers have thus come to the point of defying these laws, the acts still remain in force and have to be skilfully used by our trade unions.

Hence the legal branch of our TU work has become a very important one. The fight in the wage boards, conciliation and arbitration tribunals has become a part of the class struggles.

The TU lawyers of the AITUC have done excellent work in many areas, with the result that workers belonging even to the INTUC and HMS unions demand the services of AITUC lawyers.

That becomes a starting point for united work. Hence industrial law and TU lawyers have to be given special attention.

Welfare & Cultural Work

Our TU functionary must not neglect the organisation of social service, cooperative and welfare work, and cultural needs of the working class. There has been a tendency, and it exists even today, to label all such activity as 'reformist'. That is so because all reformists emphasise welfare work to the detriment of struggles of the workers. But because reformists misuse welfare work, social service and cultural work, it is no reason why our TUs would condemn it, instead of giving such work its proper place in the organisation. The bourgeoisie deprives the workers' entertainment, makes it too dear for them. Nowadays the congress government, with the aid of the British and American funds and organisation, is undertaking organised corruption of our national and class traditions and culture. It is the task of the trade unions to organise good entertainment, good cultural education

of the workers. The famous example of how the Rangoon dock workers by simply taking up cooperative housing for the homeless docker, became a mass force and a big union uniting the divided workers is worth studying.

Caste & National Composition

Our TU functionary must know the caste and national composition of the workers in his union and trade, their customs and traditions, their approach to life and the antagonism that the bourgeoisie foments on the basis of caste, community, tribe and linguistic national groups.

The worker coming to industry under the grinding wheel of capitalism, carries with him all the ideology, traditions and loyalties of his tribe, caste, village, religion, etc. The new class solidarity takes a long time to mature in him. In fact many a caste, village or national bonds act for him as protection against sickness, family difficulties and such other needs. Before he can learn to go to the union for his difficulties, he turns to his jamat.

We must learn to evaluate these relations of his and how to prevent them from cutting across his new class needs and loyalties. The caste, nation, tribe in the worker must be harnessed in the service of building the class outlook, solidarity and tradeunion unity of the worker as an exploited man, where the exploiter stands above him irrespective of caste, tribe, nation and religion.

If we neglect to evaluate this factor correctly, the bourgeoisie will succeed in dividing our unions and struggles and preventing us from achieving our aim.

Women & Child Labour

In view of the special hardships imposed on the women not only as workers but as women in the conditions of our economy, the TU functionary has to pay special attention to the problems of women in matters of equal pay for equal work, maternity benefits to working women, care of their children, etc.

As regards young workers, he must pay special atten-

tion to the question of apprenticeship laws and education, sports, etc. after working hours.

Child labour which is extremely scattered in domestic and plantation industries requires immediate study and attention.

Unemployed

Our TU functionary must carefully study the mood of the employed worker primarily and not judge the pressure for action only relying on the unemployed workers, who come into contact with the unions more easily than the employed. We must learn to develop the unity of the employed and unemployed against the common exploiter who uses one against the other for his own aims.

Cadres

We must learn how to build up new cadres inside the factories, fearless and militant, watchful and wise, to take the lead of the workers' struggles.

We must learn to keep some of the cadres unexposed. Or else, the victimisation by the employers will throw all our best leaders and men from the real field of work, i.e. the factory, shop and office.

Some people think that because our unions are now legal, we bring all our cadres to the forefront. We have to remember that the unions are legal but the crisis of capitalism is not over. The bourgeoisie does not hesitate to attack us when we lead workers' struggles.

Learn from the Masses

Our TU functionary must learn how not to run ahead of the masses nor lag behind them. This he can do only by experience and study. He has sometimes to restrain the inexperienced masses while at other times, he has to rouse them into correct action.

In this task our functionary is suffering from the legacies of the past. At one time we banned all strikes in the

name of a political line. At another time we called strikes on everything without caring to know if the masses were ready or not.

As a result, even where workers are ready to act we now hesitate lest we may burn our fingers again. And when workers act on their own, controversies flare up among us, calling each other names. This results from not keeping our ears to the ground and sounding the mass mind through correct mass tradeunion work.

We must remember that there is no such thing as a period of 'no strikes' or a period of 'all strikes'.

So long as we have not achieved people's democracy we will have to struggle, and there will be strikes. In the present crisis of imperialism and its colonial economy there is no such thing as 'partial stabilisation' leading to a period of relative peaceful growth of industries. The warmongers' boom is always a temporary one and each one leads to a more severe crisis than the preceding one. Hence there is no question of one or the other slogan. We must know how to assess the situation, the mass mind and the correct type of struggle that will take us ahead.

Our TU functionary must know the various tactics of mass struggle from past experience. He must know the local traditions of struggle and its forces and must also learn from them. Readymade rules of struggles will not serve the purpose except in the general approach.

Our TU functionary must know the peasant around his factory if it is in the countryside. In such areas the worker lives in the village and works in the factory. Under such conditions, strike struggles are directly linked with the peasantry around.

We must learn how to get the peasant's help and also how to render him our help. In the sugar plantations, tea gardens, in mining and new factories spreading out into the interior to secure cheap labour and land, the sympathy and ties with the peasant are a great factor in the success of the TU struggles.

Our TU functionary must have the overall world outlook of Marxism and in the present period must know how

to link up the peace movement with the struggles of the masses. In this respect every economic evil today can be read in the wise words of Stalin which explain the crisis and peace as the solution of it.

"What does placing the economy of a country on a war footing mean? It means giving industry a onesided, war direction; developing to the utmost the production of goods necessary for war and not for consumption by the population; restricting to the utmost the production and, especially, the sale of articles of general consumption—and, consequently, reducing consumption by the population and confronting the country with an economic crisis."

There has been a tendency either to neglect the peace movement or to present it mechanically as a duty. That arises out of the failure to understand the present phase of the crisis, as described by Stalin.

Our TU functionary himself must develop culture, must be modest and patient with the masses. Even while negotiating and dealing with the 'enemy' at the conciliation and negotiation table, he should be polite and dignified, though sharp and firm in his approach. Rudeness is not an attribute of the class struggle.

If we succeed in producing such a functionary and boldly champion the cause of the workers, without jumping into false sectarian boldness or reformist lack of confidence, we shall revive our TU movement; we shall take the lead of the people's struggles on all issues and take the path of achieving the demands of the workers and 'the people.

5. SOME OF OUR MISTAKES AND THEIR CORRECTION

We have seen the economic perspectives put before the people by the government and their disastrous effects on the people and the working class. We have seen the achievements of our class and its future needs. We have seen the way the political parties work in the working class and TUs. We have seen the disruption and division

that the bourgeoisie has carried out in organisation and unity of the working class. We have seen the tasks that our TU leadership has to carry out, the key task being to work for and achieve unity.

In carrying out the tasks, the crux of which lies in building the unity of the working class and the trade unions, besides knowing the moves of the ruling classes, the struggles and achievements of the working class and their lessons, as stated above, it is also necessary to understand how the party and the trade unions led and advised by it functioned, where and how they behaved correctly and where they made mistakes.

TU Unity

In building TU unity it is also necessary to understand the character of the organisations and their leadership with whom we try for organisational unity. It is necessary to lay down the **dos** and **don'ts** in achieving unity from below as well as from above.

It is more or less an acknowledged fact that the communist pioneers with the help of the noncommunists built the early mass TU movement in India and achieved many a great gain for the working class.

The ideas of class consciousness, national and international solidarity of the working class and duties following for them were consciously built up from an early period.

Mass trade unions were brought into existence and the initiative of the workers by building workingclass cadres was developed.

Unions were built on industrial basis and democratic mass functioning developed through mill committees, departmental groups and leaders, etc.

Political education and action of the working class was organised through the party.

At the same time the party as such did not become a mass party of the working class, drawing upon all the gains of the struggles and the growing industrial and political consciousness of the masses.

Our Isolation

The political leadership of the masses in the national-liberation movement was not seized by the pioneers and the party due to inadequate understanding of the program and tactics in relation to the national struggle, the role of the bourgeoisie and its parties and the democratic front.

The trade unions led by the party got isolated or split because of the organisational-political mistakes and the onslaught of repression from the British government and its bourgeois allies in India in the period of 1930-35.

The lessons of the split of 1929, the split of 1930 between the AITUC and the Red TUC are worth noting in this respect.

The tactics of eliminating reformist influence over the working class, of boldly leading its struggles when workers from below are ready while the reformist leadership hesitates and gets isolated and tactics on the question of building the revolutionary tradeunion movement, as laid down by the RILU, were wrongly understood and applied in the AITUC and the Red TUC in this period.

Breach Healed

But soon the corrections were made, a unity movement was launched, and the development of united struggles of workers and correct approach to the reformist and national-bourgeois leadership healed the breach in 1938.

As a result, on the eve of the second world war in 1940 the AITUC and its TUs were highly organised, they had a mass base, membership and good cadres. All political parties except the Congress stood inside the fold of the TU movement of the united AITUC organisation, though differing with each other and struggling against each other on political and even industrial matters.

Tactical Differences During War

The second world war and the differences in tactics among the political parties in relations to the war and

the role of the working class again threatened with division and disunity on TU questions.

The congress bourgeoisie and its wing in the TU movement were not prepared to fight for the defence of the working class against the burdens of the war, while the CPI and other parties and groups were conducting such struggles for the defence of the working class.

When the war switched over to a new phase in 1941 and the CPI called for the defence of the socialist state of the world's working class—the Soviet Union—no party openly took an opposition position. Even the congress leadership had to advocate support to the defence of Soviet Union and China in their 1942 resolution. But the differences arose on the question of the application of this position.

On tradeunion questions, on the question of strikes in defence of workingclass interests, serious differences arose. The CPI advocated a line of not encouraging strikes or settling them as quickly as possible if they arose in order to facilitate the defence against fascism.

However, in practice, the slogan of defence against fascism was mechanically applied, because the party leadership underestimated the strength of the USSR and the resistance movements overestimated in panic the strength of imperialism, forgot to note that while mouthing phrases of support to their Soviet ally, the Anglo-Americans sabotaged aid to the Soviet Union and were only guarding and trying to strengthen their colonial bases against the postwar crisis.

Reformist Deviation

The mistake lay in not combining the defence of the interests of the working class and people with the interests of the defence of the Soviet Union and the antifascist war.

As a result, in the TU field, when the national bourgeoisie and the British attacked the workers' standards of living and the workers demanded leadership from us in

their defence, we either lagged behind or gave wrong slogans or in some cases even deserted the struggles.

Our mistakes in tactical application of our line, our mistakes on the TU front in the matter of the defence of the interests of the workers weakened our TUs and lost us many of our large bases of the working class.

The bourgeoisie and its right and left parties, the socialists and others took advantage of our mistakes in order to isolate us from the working class.

But even in this period, where we stuck to mass work, in relation to famine relief, rationing of food, demands for dearness allowance and occasional strike struggles, which broke over our heads, we retained our mass bases.

But these were retained generally in areas and industries where we had not led furious class battles before and where the workers had only recently come to consciousness and organisation, as for example in some areas of the south.

Our serious losses were in the areas and industries where we ourselves had imbibed the class anti-imperialist outlook into the worker and had led determined mass battles on his behalf, as for example in Bombay, Kanpur, etc.

Thus the division in the working class, our isolation from the class in major areas followed from our political line and its working out in the TU field.

Reformism was the main deviation in this period.

At the end of the war, the leadership of the Congress utilised its new influence in order to attack the party and destroy it.

Wartime Strike Wave

At the same time, the working class rose into determined struggles in order to overcome its losses during the war. The biggest strike wave began.

The new strike wave put forward demands of quite a farreaching nature.

They demanded not only wage increases and bonus but also living wage, 8-hour day and social security.

All trades and strata of workers were drawn in these struggles.

They were extremely militant in their character.

In some areas, as in Travancore, they even defended the worker with arms in hand, as in Punnapra and Vayalar.

As a result of the weakening of imperialism and the rise of the colonial liberation movement, even the armed forces composed of Indians sympathised with the strikes.

The economic and political strikes got combined and in many cases the whole population joined in the strike struggles by hartals as in the post and telegraph strikes and the Calcutta hartal.

Though the party had jumped into the new strike wave it still suffered from the remnants of the previous reformist outlook.

Hence we did not react swiftly to the new situation to put the party and the TUs in fighting trim.

As a result, the rightwing socialists or trotskyites and other elements stole the leadership as in the case of the Madras Binny strike. But the lag was soon overcome.

The serious strike wave frightened the bourgeoisie, because it immediately began to affect its profits. While it wanted to use the masses for a compromise with imperialism and for destroying the CPI, it also wanted to stop the advance of the working class both economically and politically.

The AICC of 1946 sympathised with the demands of the working class but warned it against strike struggles.

What was the workers' attitude to us in these strikes—economic and political?

They would strike unitedly and as our party cadres were the best and fearless organisers, they would welcome them. The typical remark of welcome would be: "Now quarrel is over. We can join in the common struggles, though for your own political reasons, you left us before."

A serious innerparty struggle had to be waged to overcome reformism but there were no serious difficulties in the way as the upsurge was helping us to overcome it.

The development of the upsurge, however, to its logical conclusion was hampered in many cases.

Sectarian Adventurism

After the Calcutta congress of the party, the leadership failed to assess the situation correctly and in the name of bold leadership of workingclass struggles and its hegemony, it took to **sectarian adventurism, which became the main deviation of this period.**

It was facilitated by the fact that the strike wave had not subsided. The bourgeoisie opened an offensive of suppressing the workers' struggles by the industrial disputes acts, essential services acts, the detention act, etc. Firing, killing, prisons and police rule was the main weapon of the congress leadership to suppress the workers.

At this time, we should have been doubly careful in guarding unity of the working class because (i) we had not overcome the distrust of the masses towards us born out of the war period, (ii) the right socialists and the Congress had disrupted TU unity by starting rival organisations, (iii) the workers had national-bourgeois illusions about the Congress and the socialists, (iv) sufficient time and opportunity had not been given for the worker to disillusion himself about the role of the congress governments, (v) the new worker in the industry had not gone throughout the fire class-battles and had not tested by his own experience the various parties and their leaders, (vi) the bourgeoisie when faced with strikes was making concessions to the workers, which still further bred national-bourgeois illusions, viz the concessions to railway workers in 1946, the grant of bonus payment of 4½ months' wages as in Coimbatore, Bombay, etc., the application of DA scale in various areas. These were gains the influence of which we underestimated.

The leadership of the party turned sectarian and bureaucratic. Where TU comrades reported the mood of the masses correctly, it instituted a militarist-bureaucratic discipline in place of democratic voluntary discipline. The

failure of strike slogans was attributed to failure of individual cadres to act; the latter were expelled and thereby the party and TUs weakened.

The outstanding example is 9th March 1949.

Weakening of Party and TUs

Unions were split in the name of isolating the reformists without seeing whether the masses walked out with us or remained with the reformists and rightwing socialists.

The concessions made by employers and their actual influence were never assessed in order to give lead to the workers.

Slogans were subjectively evolved and did not flow from assessment of objective conditions.

Tradeunion and party work was almost made identical forgetting the warnings of the International.

The lessons of the RILU were perverted and wrongly applied as in the February 1949 document.

Mass TU work was given up in the name of **p~~o~~liticalisation** of the working class.

Unity of the workers was made a phrase, by giving calls of joint actions in terms of most rude, hostile, bitter criticism of those very forces with whom we called for unity.

To give a call of strike at all costs alone was considered the attribute of revolutionary tradeunionism, without reference to the preparedness and mood of the masses, and the state of organisation, and the objective justifiability or appropriateness of the call

These, in short, are some of the mistakes on the TU front made by the party which, coupled with the violent suppression by the congress government, led to the disruption of our trade unions and the setback to the working class.

Attempts at Correction

The correction came in 1950. The left-sectarian adventurism was removed from the leadership.

But sectarianism in understanding of the situation and tactics appropriate to it had not been properly nailed down. The pronouncements of the Asian conference were sought to be mechanically and wrongly applied and hence the innerparty struggle continued.

The reflection of this partial correction and partial continuation of the sectarian deviation can be found in the December 1950 letter on trade unions to party ranks.

While calling for reorganisation of TU work and struggles of the working class, both in its legal and illegal forms, it held the perspective of illegal union work as the main form, advocated the 'lie low' policy in the towns in view of 'fascist repression'. This kind of approach was facilitated by the fact that savage repression against the party and the trade unions led by it continued in the congress regime.

The letter, therefore, while opening the way for correct reorganisation of TU work left enough room both for sectarianism by allowing emphasis on mainly illegal TU work and on the otherhand for reformism by talking of 'lie low' policy.

New Program & Tactics

The adoption of the new program and tactics of the party and the events following from it have now cleared the way for correct and proper work in the TUs.

At the same time one has to be watchful because in TU work the reflection of the innerparty struggle, the remnants of the various deviations, persists due to the absence of unification of ranks and common understanding being not yet achieved.

This reflection takes various forms. Because we have not yet been able to get the TUs of the AITUC going with live, direct contact with the masses, which was formerly broken, we are not able to assess the mass mind correctly and in

time. Because the party has been deprived of cadres, we are not able to measure the situation in time and quickly by our contacts, by our studies of industry, finance, etc. Because of lack of mass contact, we are not able to measure the exact influence of the INTUC and the rightwing socialists and many a time have to depend on the spontaneous action of the masses in order to know the trend of their mind and the grip of certain demands and slogans.

This inability is used by the remnants of the various deviations in the party for factional ends. It hampers TU work, and repels new cadres coming to the party and the TUs.

When to Launch Struggles

Having seen the disastrous effects of irresponsible strike calls of the sectarians in the past, the genuine party worker wants to exercise **caution** before launching such a call and struggle. Knowing the disruption and disunity in the TUs and the division of the workers under the three main organisations, INTUC, HMS and AITUC, our genuine worker wants to wait and see what the leaders of the other two organisations reacting to.

In the absence of real mass contacts and organised TU work, he does not know where this waiting and this caution should end and a struggle launched on his own, or where he should support others, because he is doubtful, if even the others know the masses and are honest in their defence of workers' interests.

In such a situation when the masses act spontaneously or the other leaders launch struggles and masses respond, the sectarians come out of their hiding and use the caution of the TU leaders to attack them as reformists, deserters, etc. They use this not in order to see how to devise new means to correct **overcaution**, the legacy of their own adventurism, but to use it for factional ends. This is one malady.

Another malady is that when the genuine worker, seeing the crisis, wants to advance slogans of struggle and

action in reply to the attacks of the bourgeoisie and the government, the remnants of reformists oppose him as sectarian, taking advantage of the fact that sectarians in the past have used struggle-slogans most irresponsibly. And when a struggle is launched but fails, the reformist attacks the genuine workers as sectarian-deviationists and uses the fact for his factional ends.

This happens because neither the hardened sectarian nor the hardened reformist has cured himself but uses this or that mistake of the genuine worker for his factional ends.

Since 1950 there is no main deviation in the party. But in one or the other unit, union, or area, the remnants of both trends being there, TU work does suffer from them.

Live Mass Contact

What are the mistakes we are likely to commit now? Not having live mass contact and organised cadres working right inside the factories on a large scale, we are not able to feel the pulse of the workers and know their grievances in concrete. Hence we do not react swiftly when the masses want us to lead them in struggles. This can be corrected only by genuine TU work on a mass scale, in the residential areas, where we cannot enter the factories, and in the factories where we can get entry, if not by recognition at least through our TU membership.

Having the sectarian adventurist effects still in mind we are likely to be **overcautious** in leading the workers' struggles and **lag behind**.

The need for struggles forced on the workers by the attack of the crisis of the economy may again throw us into the arm of sectarian adventurers. The need for rebuilding TU organisation, trying for unity before struggles are launched on our own, the need for using legal means of the industrial laws before acting in defiance of them, the need for readiness to negotiate and conciliate where possible and win demands even through arbitration, is likely to be overlooked and land us into **running ahead** of the workers and the people.

Thus both mistakes have to be guarded against. However we cannot at present say that any one deviation is a main deviation in the party or that the party leadership in the TUs is suffering mainly from a deviation. Our main task is, therefore, to evolve correct methods of mass work, TU functioning, defence of workers' interests and struggles on the basis of unity as the key weapon as well as an immediate aim.

What steps should we take in order to correct the situation, build a strong TU movement and achieve the demands of workers?

All TU cadres must get into close contact with the workers, employed and unemployed, through mohalla-basti contacts or factory.

Formulation of Demands

Cadres must lay down minimum daily tasks on TU front, including all aspects of the workers' life.

They must equip themselves as outlined before.

They must keep track of the mass mind in its reaction to the **food situation** and the **crisis** and their day-to-day demands.

Demands in each trade and industry must be carefully formulated. Formulation of extravagant demands must be avoided.

In the name of **fundamental questions** and exposure of the bourgeoisie it is the sectarian habit to frame demands which are not reasonably attainable and make the worker look ridiculous in the eyes of his allies in the people.

All available means of unofficial and official conciliation should be tried and if possible a settlement achieved to mitigate the effects of the crisis on the workers' standard of living, employment and wages.

Not to settle on any account and to push the workers into strikes at all costs in the name of **steeling the workers in the fire of struggle** was the sectarian habit which led to fruitless strikes in some cases though it must be remembered that not all failures of settlement or strikes were due to that line alone.

Legal Formalities

The legal existence and formalities of a union must be guarded with care, though impossible and antiworkingclass conditions must not be agreed to secure recognition under the law—such as agreement to compulsory arbitration and no-strike clauses.

It may be remembered that in 1948 we lost the valuable recognition of the MES unions because under the influence of sectarians we refused to accept the obligation of holding a ballot before strikes and agreeing to certain other conditions in view of the services being concerned with military engineering.

In the event of failure of conciliation, measure the readiness of the workers for further action by means of meetings, or ballot, or where these are not permitted by consultation with leading cadres, and if they agree do not hesitate to launch a strike. If they do not, do not launch a struggle just because you feel otherwise.

Before launching a struggle observe all the necessary laws if they are applicable to your industry regarding notice, etc

Before and after launching the struggle cultivate non-workingclass opinion in your support. This must be carefully done especially in such trades as municipal services, transport, domestic, lighting, etc.

After launching the struggle keep ready for negotiation and try on your own to open avenues for it.

Whether the strike has to be half day, one day or prolonged depends on the preparedness of the workers and the unity of the leadership.

Be vigilant against blacklegs and provocateurs.

Guard the Cadres

Nowadays every strike is followed by banning of meetings, arrests of leaders, etc.

We must guard our cadres and leaders. Who and how many should depend on the state of the organisation.

Even in ordinary TU work cadres have to be guarded.

Even when we have legal unions and do legally permitted work, there is victimisation by employers, unlawful detention by government etc. We must be vigilant against these attacks also, especially when workers launch strikes for their demands.

In strike meetings exaggerated reporting should not be done. Handbills should be sober, educative, simple, not jargonised, and to the point. They should be full of confidence and of militant and rousing nature but this should not amount to hurling boastful challenges, using language which can easily haul us under the law, as some of our handbills have been in the past.

When we are trying for unity, we have to be doubly careful in criticising the leaders and members of the rival organisations, or those who differ from us on the given tactic. The resolution of the working committee of AITUC of May 1949 on the deserters is a model of how such a resolution should not be.

Defend the workers' struggle fearlessly but do not hesitate to settle or call off when necessary. False notions of prestige or victory and defeat should not blind us to the mood of the workers and their strength. There should not be a premature panicky call-off nor a pig-headed sectarian stick-on. The situation for one or the other has to be measured by experience and skill. There is no readymade rule for this.

Defence of workers' interests includes defence against police terror and violence of the employers' gangs. How to do it depends on the particular situation, readiness of the people to suffer and to act.

Armed clashes with the state forces should, however, be avoided under present conditions.

Forms of Struggle

Importation of satyagraha forms in strike struggles should not be encouraged, though today in some cases the workers and the middleclass employees under the influence of past traditions easily take to such suggestions. If in certain circumstances such forms can help to initiate mass mobi-

lisation, we should not hesitate to use them but with caution and care.

We have to guard against the provocateurs who try to disturb disciplined peaceful action by anarchic action to facilitate government repression.

But just because we ask for peaceful conduct of strikes and resistance, it does not mean, we should preach the principles and theory of nonviolence, as the bourgeoisie wants us to do.

Above all, be guided by the masses, by their experience and skill while giving them also guidance from the standpoint of ours as a leadership.

Differentiation Between Big and Small Industries

In formulating and fighting for the demands of the workers do we make any difference between the Indian employer and the British, and also between the small and the big?

Under the present circumstances, our first task is to defend the worker's standard of living and conditions of work, his wages, employment, etc., against every employer whether British or Indian, big or small. The starting point and level of demands is always conditioned by the fact that the employer is big or small, because the technical and employment conditions of largescale industry and its profit capacity are generally better than that of small-scale industry. But the crisis affects the small more quickly and severely than the big.

In struggles, however, the big resists more severely than the small and can last out. The government machine protects the big more than the small. Our tactics must be guided by this but only as tactics to win demands and with as little suffering for the worker as possible.

Hence in order to win relief for us quicker, to move the public towards us and in order to defend the general interests of the country and the people, we should where necessary combine the demands of the employer against the state or the foreigner with our demands against him and

propose joint campaign etc. But the political antagonism between the big and the small, between the Indian and foreigner as also our organisational-ideological prestige and strength have not advanced today to that level, where the national bourgeoisie will combine in a united front with us on the basis of common understanding. Hence we should not go into mechanical generalisation and application of experiences elsewhere regarding the differentiation between big monopoly and small industry or national bourgeois and foreign. Though we may not neglect to take note of the antagonism as in the case of leather, mica, small-power engines, etc., today we must concentrate on protecting the worker and his interests first. Only when the workers grow strong and powerful will the bourgeoisie come to ask for differential treatment, which should then deserve our serious consideration.

We must remember that the antagonisms which raise the question mentioned above flow under conditions of Anglo-American drive for war.

Hence the crisis and its solution, our demands and their fulfilment raise directly the question of the peace movement. For this each industry and trade and each demand and struggle has to be properly placed in the context of the general class economy and specially the war economy and its effects, and our demand for peace and trade with all countries without discrimination.

Worker-Peasant Alliance

The question as to how to relate the workers' TU struggles with those of the kisans depends on the area and industry and the state of organisational and ideological preparedness of both the workers and the peasants concerned. While we should bear in mind the necessity for this and also the other points mentioned in the previous report, we need not elaborate on the question further in this report.

It must be remembered that no amount of detailed instructions can ever take the place of mass experience and the ability and skill to use it in building TU and defending the demands of the working class.

7. Some of Our Main Weaknesses

During the six years that have elapsed since the ending of direct British rule, India has witnessed events of far-reaching significance. In the program of the Communist Party, the election manifesto and the review of the general elections, the most important of these events have been dealt with.

The last general elections revealed that the Congress Party, which only a few years ago enjoyed unrivalled prestige and authority among the people, had lost the backing of the majority. This process has continued, becoming accentuated in the months that have passed since the general elections, as pointed out by the political bureau of the Communist Party at its meeting held in August (1952).

Further, the movement of the Indian people for defence and extension of national freedom, for the complete destruction of the imperialist grip and of feudal exploitation, for a life of happiness and prosperity is becoming more and more linked with the battle which progressive humanity is waging for peace. The great response which the peace congress of the countries of Asia and the Pacific evoked among all sections of the people, the successful observance of the 'Asia Week' in many parts of the country, the collection of 50,000 peace signatures in Bombay within 10 days, the gigantic peace rally at Madras, the big peace conference held in August and September in several provinces, culminating in the all-India peace conference held at Jullunder—all these are indicative of the growing strength and sweep of the peace movement.

Opposition to the policies and methods of the govern-

Article by Ajoy Ghosh in *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy!* (7 November 1952) was later published as a pamphlet.

ment has spread to new strata and sections of the people, including sections of the national bourgeoisie itself. Mass struggles are growing in volume and intensity. The ruling party, the Congress, is in the midst of a deep crisis. Conflicts inside the Congress have sharpened.

Reviewing the events that have taken place since the elections, the political bureau of the Communist Party of India stated that "the developments of the last six months are not fortuitous. Nor can they be considered of a temporary nature. They will continue and grow, for they arise from deep-rooted economic and social causes."

From what has been said the conclusion should not be drawn that the enemy is already on the verge of defeat or the tasks confronting us are comparatively simple. On the contrary, the enemy still holds much of the balance of power, still wields immense influence. He has still immense reserves and immense capacities for manoeuvring. His strength lies not only in the direct influence of the Congress Party itself, but also in the influence that feudal and communal reaction still exerts in many parts of the country. Further, its strength lies in the constitutional illusions that set in after the general elections, illusions about the possibilities of the ballot box, illusions that are being strengthened by the newly formed Praja Socialist Party which is trying to form a bourgeois-reformist 'oppositional consolidation'.

The tasks facing our party are therefore immense. They have been described by the political bureau as "broadening the mass movement by helping the people win their immediate demands, of building their mass organisations and of enlisting the best sons and daughters of the people into the party while carrying out these tasks".

The political bureau points out that the difficulties confronting the party today are of a specific nature. They are connected with the growth of the mass movement, with the growth of the influence of the party and therefore with the growth of the responsibilities which the party has to fulfil.

Today, with the growth of the mass movement, with political awakening spreading to new strata, new sections, new areas and with the immense growth in the influence of the party, our tasks and responsibilities have grown manyfold. We have to lead the people in the struggles for their immediate demands. We have to organise workers, peasants, agricultural workers, as well as youth, students, women, middleclass employees, artisans and handicraftsmen. We must wage struggle on the cultural front. We have to champion the cause of the people in parliament and in the legislative assemblies. We have to run a large number of daily and weekly journals. We have to produce literature on current national and international issues. We have to negotiate with other parties for a united front, to negotiate with the government and local authorities. We have to participate in elections to local boards and municipalities. We have to work among and establish contacts with all strata and sections of the people in order to formulate and champion their demands in conformity with the basic interests of the Indian people, with their democratic rights and national independence. We have to organise relief for the unemployed and the famine-stricken. We must develop a powerful movement for peace. All this work must be coordinated, directed and helped by party units in every area.

It would be no exaggeration to say that today men from every social strata who are moving in step with their people look to the Communist Party for help and guidance. Even in areas where no Communist Party units exist, people know the Communist Party as the party that fights for the poor, for the common man. They approach us to organise them, to tell them what to do.

To discharge even a fraction of the new responsibilities, to carry out even a part of the immense tasks, the party needs cadres—a vastly enlarged number of cadres. And here it should be remembered that the party is strong not only in the number of its members, but especially in their quality, in their devotion to the party and in ideological training. We need effective agitators, journalists for party

organs, educators, organisers of the people and their movements—cadres ideologically developed and politically trained who have capacity for initiative and leadership, who are able to apply the general line of the party in a flexible way in each area and constantly to raise the political and organisational level of the masses.

Of such cadres we have too few. And those few are overburdened with work. The result is we cannot undertake and carry out many of the innumerable tasks confronting us.

It must be realised that today we have reached a stage when success in organising the popular movement is inseparably linked with and even **dependent upon** the planned, organised growth of the Communist Party itself, its strengthening in those areas where it already exists, its spreading to new areas where as yet it does not exist. Without this the popular movement cannot be appreciably strengthened and even the existing movement cannot be properly guided and its achievements consolidated in the form of mass organisations. Today organisation becomes a most important political factor.

What we need today, above all, is a strong party—strong in its expanding membership, embracing a truly large number of cadres prepared to fight selflessly in the ranks of our party, strong in discipline, strong in politics—a party firmly entrenched among the masses, linked with them through a thousand ties forged through multiple forms of activities; a party with live and active units in factories and workshops, in villages and localities, in each section of our people. These units must function in a way that they will be looked upon by the people among whom they work as their leaders in every sphere of life. Without a sufficiently large, sufficiently firm and sufficiently developed party core in every province and area, on every front of struggle, leadership of the masses is impossible of realisation. Most of our difficulties today arise from the absence of this.

The present position can be appreciated from the fact that even in Madras state where we polled 2.6 million

votes in the general elections and could have polled much more if we had contested more seats—even in this state our party membership is far less than 1 per cent of the votes polled by us. A similar situation prevails in other states. And even this membership is not properly organised and only a fraction of it is ideologically-politically developed.

This is the biggest single problem facing the party. As the political bureau stresses organisation more so than ever before has become a major political factor. It determines the tempo of the growth of the mass movement itself.

This is not yet clearly realised by most of our comrades. Many of them tend to look upon our present difficulties in the same way as they looked upon our past difficulties. In the past whenever difficulties arose in our work, whenever we received a setback or failed to advance as rapidly as we wanted, the explanation was sought mainly in terms of immediate political slogans and forms of struggle. The result was that while some slight progress was made with correct slogans and correct forms of struggle, the basic weaknesses, the weakness of the party itself, remained as before. Even the advance registered could not be consolidated.

Today, however, the difficulties are of a different nature. They arise primarily and above all from our organisational weakness. They arise **despite** correct immediate slogans and correct tactics as outlined in the political bureau resolution. Therefore the organisation problem itself has to be tackled as the biggest political problem before the party.

For this it is first of all necessary to achieve theoretical clarity with regard to party organisation and abandon the wrong ideas, the wrong notions that have prevailed till now.

It has been incorrectly held—though never specifically expressed—that organisation—party organisation—is a **byproduct** of economic and political struggles. i.e. if we give correct slogans and wage struggles correctly, the party will grow, almost automatically.

An equally wrong notion is that the party will grow along with and as a result of the 'growth of the movement'. It is not realised that the 'growth of the movement' itself can take place in the correct manner and in the correct direction only under the leadership of the party and that this leadership itself can be exercised only if the party itself grows, in other words, that the growth of a real mass revolutionary movement depends to a great extent on the growth of the party, that without this the movement itself ends in defeat.

Another notion is that the party grows by building mass organisations of workers, peasants, etc. Our own history shows how wrong this notion is. Many times did we build mass organisations but we could not expand them, could not even maintain them in face of repression in most areas because we lacked sufficiently big, sufficiently firm and sufficiently developed Communist Party cores in the basic units of the organisations.

Still another notion is that the growth of the general anti-imperialist consciousness—which takes place in a colonial country almost spontaneously—is a sufficient basis for the growth of the Communist Party itself, that if the party deepens this consciousness, if it appears before the people as the most militant anti-imperialist party, that itself will enable the party to grow. It is not realised that the Communist Party can grow not merely by basing itself on anti-imperialist and national-revolutionary consciousness, but by **taking it further**, by imparting a **specific** consciousness to the working class and the advanced masses, Marxist-Leninist consciousness, socialist consciousness, which requires sharp ideological struggle against the theories and ideas of the bourgeoisie and mass popularisation of the all-conquering ideas of Marx and Engels, of Lenin and Stalin.

Many wrong concepts about the party have appeared. This has led to the notion that the party's sole task is to conduct agitation on immediate issues and lead strikes and demonstrations. The organisational implication of this concept is that practically the entire day-to-day work of the party is carried on by 'wholetimers', the bulk of party

members having little to do except in periods of big mass struggles or big campaigns. This leads to bureaucratisation at one end and organisational looseness at the other. It leads to fossilisation of cadres and arrests their growth. It arrests the growth of the party itself.

Utterly wrong concepts about the nature of the tasks and role of the party are widespread. Mass political education on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, concrete exposure of the government, rousing women against their social degradation, mass popularisation of the five power peace pact appeal, creation of mass literature on current issues, expansion of the sale of party journals, working in and forming cultural, educational, sports and other bodies and associations, and even the building up of mass organisations and of the party itself—all are looked upon by many comrades not as struggles but only as certain 'activities'—and not of a revolutionary kind.

What is the source of all these wrong ideas? Where are their roots?

Basically they arise from the worshipping of spontaneity. They arise from a narrow, restricted, non-Marxist concept of class struggle. This narrowness is not something new. It existed in the past also.

If we broadly review the struggles waged by us in the past, we get the following picture. As in all other countries of the world, the struggle that developed in our country had three aspects, three fronts—economic, political, ideological.

On the **economic** front the working class and the peasantry under the leadership of their militant class organisations and the Communist Party waged numerous battles—in some of which the participants numbered hundreds of thousands. They displayed heroism, initiative and capacity for sacrifice in face of ruthless terror. Important demands and concessions were won as a result of these struggles and mass organisations were built in many areas.

On the **political** front, despite the many political actions organised by the working class, despite the struggles for

basic agrarian reform and political rights that developed in Telangana and Tripura, despite the growing influence of the Communist Party, the advance registered was far less striking. In the days of direct British rule even the working class in many important mining and industrial areas remained under bourgeois and petty-bourgeois influence and went into political action only under the direct impact of the national movement led by the Congress.

But it was on the **ideological** front that our weakness, the weakness of the movement led by us, was most strikingly manifested. Not only was Marxist-Leninist ideology not inculcated in the working class but also the bulk of the working class understood even national freedom in the way that it is preached by the bourgeoisie—the ending of direct British rule. With regard to the content of national freedom, with regard even to such a key issue of democracy as the structure of a democratic state, no mass political education was carried on by us. We not only failed to expose the treacherous character of the leadership of the national bourgeoisie but on many occasions glorified it in the name of building the 'united national front'. No ideological struggle worth the name was carried on against the pernicious theories of gandhism.

It was assumed that political propaganda and agitation among the masses should not go beyond the general democratic framework, that Marxist-Leninist ideas are meant only for those who join the party or become sympathisers of the party. In practice even the latter were not adequately educated.

We translated a number of the works of Lenin and Stalin into Indian languages but without such introduction as would make them comprehensible to the worker or peasant. The literature produced by us in India was exclusively of an agitational nature. No attempt was made to produce literature on Indian problems from the Marxist point of view. Current events were evaluated only and exclusively from a general democratic point of view; their importance from the point of view of the ultimate

aims of the working class were not taken into account. We did not even produce the history of the tradeunion and peasant movements in the country, history of the struggles which we ourselves had led, did not draw lessons from those struggles and equip our own cadres with those lessons, did not combat the bourgeoisie ideologically in their effort to obliterate in the working masses the real lessons of the struggles.

The result of all this was that not only the working class, but even a large number of our party members failed to develop Marxist-Leninist consciousness. Inevitably our work on the economic and political front also suffered; because, not merely must the class struggle be conducted simultaneously on all fronts, not merely are the three fronts of class struggle interrelated but also the ideological front occupies a key position in this interrelationship.

Almost all our weaknesses today, including our organisational weakness, can be traced to this failure, failure to pay attention to ideology, failure to emphasise the role of consciousness and organisation.

As Comrade Stalin teaches:

"It must be accepted as an axiom that the higher the political level and the Marxist-Leninist knowledge of the workers in any branch of state or party work, the better and more fruitful will be the work itself, and the more effective the result of the work; and vice versa, the lower the political level of the workers and the less they are imbued with the knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, the greater will be the likelihood of disruption and failure in the work, of the workers themselves becoming shallow and deteriorating into paltry plodders, of their degenerating altogether."

Correct political slogans, correct united front tactics, correct forms of struggle—all these are essential. But they are essential not merely for the higher committees but also for each unit of the party. This itself requires the ideological-political development of the entire party.

Moreover correct political slogans, correct united-front tactics and correct forms of struggle, while they extend our mass influence and forge our links with the masses, do not themselves develop the party as such.

The party grows by raising the ideological-political level of its cadres. The party grows by inculcating Marxist-Leninist consciousness in the working class, among the agricultural workers, poor peasants and among the revolutionary intelligentsia who constitute an extremely important section in our country. The party grows by conducting political education among the broad masses in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. The party grows by conducting a sharp battle against all varieties of bourgeois ideology. The party grows by conducting struggle on all fronts and among all social strata.

The ruling classes and their spokesmen preach salvation for the country by means of their five-year plan and community projects. They parade their foreign policy as a policy of independence and dynamic neutrality. They create illusions about the efficacy of the ballot box. They try to efface from the memory of the people the lessons of the workingclass and peasant struggles of the past. Many of them join in the chorus of denunciation of the Soviet Union and People's China as 'dictatorships' where 'no freedom exists' in contrast to the capitalist countries. They sow hostility between people speaking different languages and divert the democratic movement for linguistic provinces into disruptive channels. In all this they are aided by the rightwing socialists who have given up all pretence to Marxism and present the exploded ideas of the bourgeoisie in a new garb in order to deceive and mislead the masses. The need for ideological struggle is therefore greater today than ever before.

But the strengthening of the party and its growth are not merely an ideological question, not merely a question of equipping our cadres ideologically and of conducting ideological struggle among the masses. It is also an organisational question, a question of restoring party forms and party discipline, which were seriously undermined in

the period before the adoption of the program of the party. On the question of organisation also, as on the question of the importance of ideology, wrong, anti-Marxist, anti-proletarian ideas are prevalent at all levels—ideas which Lenin combated in his celebrated work **One Step Forward, Two Steps Back**.

Party forms are looked upon by many comrades as something mechanical and bureaucratic. Anarchistic concepts of innerparty democracy manifest themselves in many units and in an extremely harmful way. Many comrades regard their individual views as more important than the view of the unit to which they belong and even the view of the higher unit and freely express their differences outside the unit. Some comrades speak in the unit only in order to convert others to their own point of view and not in order that they themselves may also learn and get converted to the point of view of others. Some comrades, if their views are not accepted by the unit draw the conclusion that the unit is wrong and fail to cooperate wholeheartedly in implementation of the majority decision.

In many areas either no reporting is done by higher committees to lower committees, or reporting is done only in general body meetings which become a substitute for the basic units of the party. Campaigns and struggles are not promptly and adequately reviewed, their lessons drawn and the party unified from issue to issue.

In some units past prejudices, a legacy of the period of innerparty struggle, stand in the way of unified functioning, prejudices which colour the outlook in determining organisational questions. This leads to lowering the quality of work.

Very often there is planlessness in work, failure to coordinate activities on various fronts, the tendency to entrust a few leading comrades with more work than they can do, the tendency to substitute in practice leadership of committees by leadership of individual comrades. Even in this way many jobs get done but without developing rank-

and-file initiative, without developing the party units as the real leaders of the masses in the locality, without training and developing party cadres which is essential in order that the party may expand rapidly and grow into a mass force.

Therefore together with the task of developing the party we have simultaneously to undertake the task of organisational strengthening of the party—organisational checkup, organisational purification.

Of all this we have done too little till now. Hence our difficulties. Not to see this, leads to attempts to discover shortcuts. Some people argue that if somehow or other we could form a united front with other parties in all the legislatures in the form of a bloc, abandoning the leadership to nominees of other parties, if somehow or other, by means of this or by means of other tactics, we could organise a few 'effective' actions, then the problems confronting us would get solved. They fail to see that such 'solutions' are not solutions but lead to the liquidation of the party itself. Others, while they talk of organisation, understand organisation in a narrow 'practicalist' sense, understand the organisational and political problems confronting the party in the old way, exclusively or mainly as a problem of 'forms of struggle', and in practice advocate tactics of passivity on the plea of organisational weaknesses. Their mental digits, their basic outlook, are the same. Hence, while speaking of the need for organisation, they fail to do anything concrete.

All these tendencies must be combated and rooted out. What Lenin taught in his immortal work **What Is To Be Done?** and in **One Step Forward, Two Steps Back**, what Stalin teaches on the role and importance of the party—must be made a part of the consciousness of our entire party. On this basis, on the basis of the **History of the CPSU (B)**, on the basis of the works of Comrades Mao Tse-tung and Liu Shao-chi and the documents of the fraternal parties, on the basis of the lessons of our own movement, work must be started inside our party for the re-education of the entire party, for the liquidation of all

bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideas with regard to the role and function of the party, with regard to organisation, and, in keeping with this, to change our methods and style of work. All this must be done with the utmost rapidity and while intensifying mass work, as emphasised in the resolution of the political bureau. Struggle for immediate demands has assumed exceptional importance and must form the pivot of our mass activities.

We must ensure that all party units discuss not only their immediate tasks but also broad political issues such as the peace movement, the manoeuvres of the ruling classes, the tactics and slogans of other parties, the question of languages and linguistic provinces, the question of the united front, etc. We have to reintroduce reporting at all levels of the party, from lower committees to higher committees, and from higher committees to lower committees. We must see that each party unit regularly reviews its activities, assigns suitable work for each comrade, checks up the work and improves its functioning by criticism and selfcriticism. We must put an end to the present planlessness in work, an end to the looseness of discipline and to the scant regard for party forms.

Our journals must not simply be agitators but must also educate the masses in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism on all the problems facing the people. We must take steps for party education on a big scale and in every area, make education a key job for all party units and produce suitable literature for the purpose.

We must follow a bold policy of promoting cadres, of selecting cadres for the jobs which they can do best, of each unit checking up the work done by each of its members, of improving their work and of even removing from leading positions those who prove incapable of improvement.

We must activate the entire party and all its units and remove those who cannot be activated or refuse to do the assigned day-to-day work.

What has been said should not be taken to mean that we

have no achievements to our credit. The party would not have been what it is today—a major force in our country—if its history had not been a history of bold leadership of mass struggles, of unflinching courage in face of heavy odds, of determined championship of cause of the people. The party could not have withstood the fierce onslaught of the government and frustrated the attempt to crush it if its cadres had not been deeply entrenched among the masses in many areas, had they not won their love and admiration by selfless and hard work. No party in the country can boast of such cadres as we have. Our discipline, our organisation, our devotion to work are the envy of every party.

But we cannot afford to ignore the fact that irrespective of our superiority to the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties in our own country, our record falls far short when compared to the record of the glorious communist parties of the Soviet Union and China, our achievements are far behind the achievements of the communist parties of France and Italy. Nor can we afford to ignore the fact that an economic and political crisis is rapidly maturing in India, that the responsibilities and tasks confronting us today are more gigantic and more complex than ever before, that they will become more complex and more gigantic in future.

Also we cannot afford to ignore the fact, as emphasised in the central committee's review of the elections, that despite the big headway we have made in the recent period, our position among the working class, among the agricultural workers and poor peasants—the classes which constitute the granite foundation of the proletarian party—is still extremely weak, that in the greater part of the country we have yet to secure a firm foothold, that even in those provinces where we are a major force, our effective strength is still confined to certain districts. Hence there can be no complacency, no sliding back, no resting on our oars. On the contrary, our efforts, our work must be intensified a hundredfold in all directions, in all areas and on all fronts. And for this, the party itself must be

purged of all weaknesses and reforged in the fire of criticism and selfcriticism.

· This alone will enable us to carry out the responsibilities facing us.

9. The Extended Plenum of the Central Committee

The extended plenum of the central committee was held in Calcutta from 30 December 1952 to 10 January 1953. It was attended by members of the central committee, members of the central control commission and 61 delegates from the provinces.

This was the first all-India gathering of the central leadership together with representatives of the provincial committees since the all-India party conference held in October 1951. That conference was the first positive step towards taking the party out of the serious innerparty crisis in which it found itself since 1950. Though a big step towards unification, that conference had left unresolved several points of controversy which, it was felt at that time, could be solved only on the basis of acquiring a certain amount of experience in practical day-to-day activity.

The plenum was meeting fourteen months after the all-India party conference. In this period the Communist Party had won a leading position in the political life of the country and had come to be considered by the masses as the spearhead of the democratic opposition to the Congress. The influence of the party had grown steadily among all sections of people and in all areas. The party was now confronted with tasks and responsibilities bigger than what it had ever faced in its entire history.

These tasks had to be carried out and these responsibilities had to be discharged at a time when mass opposition to the government and to the reactionary vested interests had reached greater heights than at any period since 1947, at a time when the economic crisis had deepened and famine and mass unemployment were spreading all over the

country, at a time when, against the machinations of the imperialist warmongers who were striving to spread the flames of war, the peoples of the world were holding the mightiest rally for peace at the historic conference in Vienna.

Some of the developments that had taken place in the national arena since the all-India party conference were as follows:

1. The entire party went into the election campaign immediately after the conference. Not only party members but tens of thousands of supporters and sympathisers plunged into the election campaign, popularising the achievements of the party and its present slogans, rallying millions of people.

The successes of the party in the elections showed how profoundly mistaken they had been who had seen only frustration and demoralisation among the people and who had thought that the party had been isolated from the masses.

2. The manner in which the Congress manoeuvred itself into office in the states of Travancore-Cochin and Madras as well as the skilful tactics by which it sought to confuse the masses and divide their ranks showed that there was no ground whatsoever for the facile assumption that the Congress was finished. It had still immense influence, immense manoeuvring capacity. Advance could be made only by resolute exposure of the Congress, resolute struggle against its policies and methods, resolute building of popular unity in action.

3. In order to maintain itself in power the Congress was counting not only on its own influence and its own manoeuvres, but also on the disruptive tactics of the Praja Socialist Party. Further, the Congress was being objectively helped by the tactics of a number of other parties, who, after the elections, adopted a pronouncedly anticommunist stand, thereby harming the democratic movement. Some of these parties even went to the length of lining up with notorious communalists for voicing the demagogic demand

of 'sanctions against Pakistan', in an effort to gather support for themselves.

4. Despite all this, however, the very deepening of the economic crisis and the policies of the government that accentuated the crisis and threw increasing burdens on the people in order to help the landlords and monopolists, were rallying increasing sections of people against the government and the reactionary vested interests. Never since August 1947 had there taken place so many mass actions, never was the urge for fight and for unity expressed in so many struggles, never was mass unity forged so spontaneously, wherever effective lead was forthcoming.

5. A characteristic feature of the struggles had been that new strata of people and new areas had gone into action. Even when the plenum was meeting, three significant struggles were going on—the all-in struggle of the people of Saurashtra against the sales tax measures, the strike of teachers in the Punjab, the strike of policemen at Madras. No reason existed to think, as some people thought, that after the elections the mass movement had received a setback, that reaction had seized the initiative.

6. The agrarian crisis had deepened as never before. The purchasing power of peasants had fallen catastrophically. Famine conditions were spreading from one province to another. And on the industrial sector, not only the small industries had been ruined but even big industries were now affected. Mass unemployment had become a common phenomenon. This was the result of the government policy of trade dependence on Britain and America, of inflation which enriched the rich and robbed the poor, of refusal to lighten the burden on the peasantry.

7. Instead of reversing the policies that had led to these disastrous results, the government was continuing these same policies. It was moving towards closer collaboration with imperialist powers—now with Britain, now with America—increasing its dependence on them as revealed in the agreements with the American imperialists and in the decisions of the commonwealth conference. It was imposing

fresh burdens on the people. Its five year plan was not a plan of national reconstruction but a plan which would maintain India's semicolonial economy intact, intensify the agrarian and industrial crisis and impose colossal burdens on all sections of people including industrialists and merchants, middle classes and artisans. It was the monopolists' way out of the crisis, a plan of throwing the consequences of the crisis on the shoulders of the common people.

8. All these were intensifying and would intensify still further the conflict between the narrow clique of landlords and monopolists on the one hand and the mass of people on the other. It was also leading to sharp conflicts inside the government circle itself. Possibilities were growing, therefore, of forging the broadest united front.

9. In face of the attack of the government and the vested interests, in face of the growing danger to India's sovereignty, the masses were building unity in action—against the food policies of the government and for famine relief, against unemployment, against rising school and college fees, against evictions, for linguistic provinces, etc. Organisations of workers, peasants, students were reviving in all parts of the country.

10. Confronted with popular unity and due to its weakening base, the government had on many occasions been compelled to make concessions and beat retreat before the people. The latest example was the declaration about Andhra province. It was a serious mistake on the part of the party not to fully publicise the victories won and use them for enthusing the masses, for instilling confidence in them, for demonstrating concretely that popular unity and popular struggle can hurl back the attack of the vested interests and the government.

11. Despite the big advance made in the postelection period it was also obvious that on the whole the mass movement had still remained weak and was characterised by great unevenness. Most of the struggles still remained on the sectional plane, although possibilities are greater than at any time before of mobilising all sections of people

for support to each action. A real national upsurge for full freedom and democracy has yet to be developed. This has not yet happened, has not yet been made conscious of its leading role and because the party still remains weak, its effective strength is still confined to relatively small areas even in the states where it is a major force.

12. The developments in India were taking place as an integral part of the developments in the international arena whose features have been described with masterly precision and lucidity by Stalin in his latest work and elaborated in the reports of the historic congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. As explained by Malenkov, the task of fighting against the warmongers and of preserving peace is the key task before the entire progressive humanity, a task which is inseparably linked with the fight for defence and extension of national freedom.

It was under these conditions that the plenum was convened.

1. PRESERVATION OF PEACE

The plenum held that the task of fighting for peace is the key task before the Communist Party of India no less than the communist parties of other countries.

It would be wrong to think that because of the growing crisis in the capitalist world and because of the growing conflict between imperialist powers, the danger of a world war, the danger of a counterrevolutionary war by imperialist states against the USSR and peoples' democratic states has receded. The fact is, as made clear in Malenkov's report, that the danger of world war continues and must be fought.

It is also wrong to state as was stated in the **Crossroads** version of the article "Stalin Illumines the Path" by Ajoy Ghosh that even with imperialism remaining strong, world war is "fully preventible". The term "fully preventible" can only mean that there can be a guarantee against such war even if imperialism remains. Such a formulation

would lead to minimisation of the danger of war and therefore minimisation of the importance of the struggle for peace.

In order to play its due rôle in the struggle for peace, in order to become a bulwark of peace and freedom, India must free itself. And freedom means freedom from the shackles of British rule. A dependent and backward India, an India which is linked with the British empire, can get easily dragged into war. It also becomes an arena of Anglo-American rivalry both of whom want to keep India backward and dependent. Hence it is necessary to intensify the struggle for severance of links with the commonwealth and for confiscation of British capital. These must no longer remain abstract and general slogans but must be vigorously popularised and concretised in each area in relation to specific industries. Quit commonwealth must be made a key slogan in political demonstrations. Also more opposition must be roused against participation in commonwealth conferences, the forthcoming coronation, ruination of India's industries by British imports, etc. All this helps the cause of peace.

At the same time it is wrong to think that by doing this alone we make our contribution to the cause of world peace. Such an understanding amounts to repudiation of the peace movement itself. Quit commonwealth cannot be the key slogan of the peace movement even in India. The key slogans of the peace movement are five-power peace pact, cessation of war in Korea, etc. We have also to take up such specific questions as recruitment of gurkha troops on Indian soil, transit facilities to them and use of Indian aerodromes and ports by French imperialists for war in Vietnam.

It must not be forgotten that the main instigator and organiser of world war is American imperialism, that this imperialism is not only threatening war against the Soviet Union and democratic states, not only enslaving one country after another but is also penetrating into our own country, striving to convert India into a war-base and threatening our national sovereignty. Hence the struggle for peace

as well as the struggle for defence of national sovereignty demands vigorous exposure of and determined opposition to American penetration into our country. This struggle has to be waged here and now, not after we have liquidated British rule.

In recent months the peace movement has made big advances and has secured the support of people from many walks of life. It should be noted, however, that party units and mass organisations have done very little in the struggle for peace. They have not gone into action even on such issues as germ war in Korea, massacre of war prisoners. This is the key reason why the peace movement has remained weak. This must be remedied immediately.

2. INDO-SOVIET AND INDIA-CHINA FRIENDSHIP

Inseparably connected with the tasks of preserving world peace is the task of ceaselessly working for the forging of fraternal relations and close contact between the Indian people on the one hand and the peoples of the Soviet Union, China and other socialist and people's democratic states on the other. For one of the main instruments of the warmongers in their aggressive designs of drawing the Indian people into the aggressive bloc is to spread lies and slanders against these socialist and people's democratic states. It is, therefore, the task of the Communist Party and other democratic parties in India to consciously organise a broad movement for popularising the achievements of the socialist and people's democratic states as well as their peaceful intentions. Further strengthening of the Indo-Soviet Cultural Association, India-China Friendship Association, etc., through the formation of the units of these organisations in factories, villages, towns, etc., is therefore of urgent importance.

3. FOR FOOD AND FAMINE RELIEF

India is today faced with an acute crisis of the production and distribution of food. Chronic famine has seized

vast areas of the land; tens of thousands of people are unable to purchase rations even at the very low quantum that is offered in ration shops. It is therefore the task of the Communist Party together with other democratic parties and elements to organise a broad movement for the securing of an adequate quantity of foodgrains at prices that are within the reach of the common people; the party should come out with the demand that the government should make proper arrangements to see that foodgrains are supplied to all sections of the people at rates that are within their reach; in the case of those areas and regions where famine has reached menacing proportions, the government should be asked to give free rations to the people. It should be borne in mind that the struggle against famine, the struggle for adequate food at fair prices has become a struggle of all-national importance.

4. URGENT RELIEF FOR PEASANTRY

As part and parcel of the struggle for food and against famine should also be launched struggles for urgent relief to the peasantry from the exorbitant burdens that have been imposed on them by way of rent, interest and taxes. For at the root of the present crisis in food production lies the fact that the overwhelming majority of peasants are so rackrented, so overburdened with debts and taxes that they cannot afford to carry on profitable cultivation. It is to cover up this crucial factor in the agrarian situation that the Congress is indulging in the demagogic talks of 'abolition of landlordism' and gigantic plans of increasing agricultural production. The only effective answer to this demagogic talk indulged in by the Congress is to mobilise the entire peasantry for stoppage of evictions, drastic reduction in rent, reduction in the interest and tax burdens and other forms of urgent relief for the peasantry.

5. FOR EMPLOYMENT, AGAINST WAGECUTS

The party should also launch a mass campaign against the growing unemployment and against the efforts of the employers to transfer the burdens of the crisis on the shoulders of the workers. For the intense crisis that has already affected all the small and medium industries and has started affecting the big organised industries as well, is as menacing a factor in the country's present economic situation as the crisis in agriculture and food production. While it is a crisis affecting the industries as a whole and where therefore the employers are as much interested in solving the crisis as the employees, the employers are averse to adopt a policy of demanding those urgent steps which alone will save the industry; their effort on the other hand is to see that their own skin is somehow saved by resorting to a policy of wagecuts, increasing workload and other forms of attacking the workers. The party will, therefore, have to come out both as a champion of the defence of the interests of the employees as well as the fighter in the cause of protecting the national industries. This it can do only if it combines the struggle against retrenchment, wagecut, increase in workload and other forms of attack on the working class with a nationwide campaign for the reversal of the present policy of the government of helping the foreign imperialists and Indian monopolists and ruining the medium and small industrialists. The entire workingclass has to be mobilised not only in defence of its own specific interests, but also in defence of the interests of the industry as a whole.

6. EXPOSURE OF THE GOVERNMENT'S FIVE-YEAR PLAN

The struggle for food, famine relief, agrarian reforms and unemployment is inseparably connected with the task of exposing the government's five-year plan as the Indian monopolists' way out of the crisis, a way of solving the crisis at the expense of the workers, peasants, petty bour-

geoisie, traders, industrialists, etc. A sharp struggle should be waged against the idea sought to be spread among the people that this plan will solve the food shortage and that it will pave the way for the further industrialisation of the country; people should be made aware of the reality that, far from solving, the plan will intensify the food crisis; that, far from facilitating, the plan will put obstacles in the way of industrialisation.

In carrying on this campaign of exposing the plan, care should, of course, be taken to see that it does not become abstract or negative: such specific projects as help the people in a particular area (like irrigation projects) should be taken full advantage of; demands for the inclusion of such projects in the plan (as Koyna, Nandi Konda, Ganga barrage, etc.) should be supported; corruption, nepotism etc., in the implementation of these projects should be exposed and sought to be removed.

While doing all this, however, it should never be forgotten that the plan as a whole is an antipeople, monopolists' plan and that mobilising the people against this plan is part and parcel of the struggle for food, famine relief, agrarian reform and employment.

7. FOR INDO-PAK FRIENDSHIP

A vital question that is of great importance in the struggle for food and for employment is the campaign for free and equal trade relations with Pakistan. For the partition of India into the Indian Union and Pakistan, the prolonged state of tension between the two new states, the reduction in the mutual exchange of Indian and Pakistani products to the mutual interests of the peoples of both of these states—these are some of the very important factors which have led to the intensification of the agricultural and industrial crises of the two countries. These factors which lie behind the present shortage of foodgrains and raw materials in India are sought to be further intensified by the slogan of 'economic sanctions against Pakistan' advo-

cated by reactionary communal interests. A systematic campaign against this slogan and for the improvement in the economic relations between the two states is therefore of the utmost importance.

8. FORMATION OF LINGUISTIC STATES

The government of India's recent declaration regarding the formation of Anthra state is one of the significant victories of the democratic movement during the post-election period. It shows the great possibilities that have been opened out for the attainment of the long-cherished goal of the peoples of various linguistic areas for the formation of their respective linguistic states. It has also encouraged the peoples of these and other areas to further strengthen their movement for the formation of linguistic states. The party should come out wholeheartedly in support of this demand and strive to make it as irresistible as was the Andhra movement.

9. OTHER TASKS

Apart from the above tasks of international and national importance, the party has also to seriously take up such questions as the demands of the refugees, those of scheduled castes and other oppressed minorities, etc. For these are the sections of the people which the reactionaries of all sorts (including the Congress and its government) are striving to make use of in their disruptive game of dividing the democratic movement. Hence the party together with other left and democratic parties and elements should take the initiative in winning these sections of the people away from the reactionary communal leadership and to draw them into the democratic movement.

The party should also take up such questions as the defence of civil liberties; not only should be introduction of new repressive legislation be opposed, but a broad campaign should be built up for the withdrawal of the already existing repressive legislations.

The party should, furthermore, take full and effective part in all activities of an ameliorative or social service character. For these are the activities through which thousands of people who are anxious to serve the masses can be drawn into the democratic movement. These are some of the most effective vehicles through which a sense of self-confidence can be created in the common people.

10. REORGANISATION AND STRENGTHENING OF THE PARTY

None of the above tasks can, however, be fulfilled if the party itself is not properly organised. The tasks of ideologically tempering and steeling every single party member and sympathiser, the tasks of restoring and further strengthening of the sense of organisational unity and iron discipline of the party, is the key task. Furthermore it is a task which should be taken up as an independent task, not as a task which will come by itself. Indifference to this task will cost the party and the democratic movement dear. Attention of comrades is drawn in this connection to the article "Some of Our Main Weaknesses".

It is necessary here to dispose of an argument usually advanced against the immediate taking up of this task. It is argued in certain circles that this task cannot be undertaken at present because the party is not yet completely unified politically. The fact is that already sufficient basis for political unification of the party has been availed in the documents of the central committee and in the policy articles which have appeared in the **LPPD**, **New Times**, **Crossroads** and **New Age**. The task is to carry forward this unification. Failure to see this would mean that unless and until every minute detail of day-to-day tactics is worked out to the satisfaction of every single party member, individual party members should be completely free to speak and act as they like—the 'principle' which has nothing to do with the Lenin-Stalin principle of party organisation. For as Lenin and Stalin have repeatedly made it clear, the struggle for a correct political and tacti-

cal line is itself to be carried within the framework of a well-organised, disciplined party organisation.

This task of restoring and further strengthening the unity and discipline of the party is inseparably connected with a systematic and principled innerparty struggle, struggle against wrong ideologies, incorrect tactics and nonproletarian forms of organisation and personal behaviour. It should never be forgotten that real and lasting unity of the party can be brought about, real proletarian discipline enforced, only on the basis of systematic and principled innerparty struggle, which, as Stalin has emphasised again and again, is the basic law of development of the communist party.

Extremely important in this connection is the need for the conscious development of the process of criticism and self-criticism, particularly criticism from below. Heavy responsibility lies in this connection on the shoulders of party leadership at all levels, above all of the central leadership of the party, in consciously organising systematic criticism and selfcriticism. Not only should the ranks be formally allowed to express their opinions; not only should they be encouraged to freely and fearlessly express their views, suggestions, complaints and criticisms; the leadership should also take careful note of every such view, suggestion, complaint and criticism made by the ranks and make use of them in improving the policy, tactics and style of work of the leadership.

10. Political Resolution

1. In the first week of October 1952, appeared J. V. Stalin's classical work, **Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR**, a work which armed the international workingclass movement with a clear understanding of the world situation, of the basic laws operating in socialist and presentday capitalist societies, of the tasks ahead and of the way these tasks are to be carried out. Events that have taken place since then have brilliantly confirmed the analysis made in this work and in the documents of the nineteenth congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union guided by and based on this work.

2. The unity of the socialist world has been further consolidated, its might has further increased, further advance has been made along the path to communism in the USSR. The worldwide mourning on the occasion of the sad death of Stalin—the brilliant continuer of the work of Marx, Engels and Lenin and leader of progressive mankind—was, at the same time, a most impressive demonstration of the solidarity of the socialist and democratic forces, their determination to strengthen the battle for socialism, democracy and peace, their determination to carry out the behest of their departed leader.

The deepening crisis of the capitalist system finds direct expression in declining production even in America and Britain and in decline in volume of international trade. Inside the imperialist camp conflicts and contradictions

This resolution was adopted by the central committee of the Communist Party of India in its meeting of March 1953, in the light of the discussion in the extended plenum held at Calcutta in December 1952 and in the light of further discussion in the central committee. It is to be made the basis for immediate work and for discussion at the forthcoming party conferences.—CC Note

have sharpened still further—as revealed in the inability of the American imperialists to make the bourgeois governments of Europe accept all their terms for the formation of a 'European army', in the British commonwealth conference and its appeal to America to reduce tariffs, in the exclusion of Britain from the America-New Zealand-Australia talks. A number of dependent semicolonial countries which in the past obediently carried out the orders of the American imperialists are now, under the pressure of masses and in face of growing economic-political difficulties, showing signs of resistance. The trade agreement between Ceylon and China, between Egypt and the socialist countries, the nationalisation of tin mines by the Bolivian government, the measures taken by Burma against the Kuomintang bandits, the refusal of Iran to yield to threats, are some indications of the change that is taking place. Nehru's concern at the attempt to include Pakistan in the MEDO, his condemnation of the NATO are also significant pointers.

3. The liberation movement of the enslaved peoples has recorded new victories as in Vietnam, has extended and deepened and is striking heavy blows at the entire colonial system. The struggle intensifies in Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco. All efforts on the part of the British to crush the struggle of the people of Kenya have failed. Malaya continues to defy the British. The fight for human rights continues in South Africa. The struggle against colonial oppression rapidly spreads, embraces all progressive sections of the colonial peoples, increasingly assumes the character of war of national liberation in several countries, with the communist parties playing a growingly important role. The struggle gets more and more closely linked with the world struggle for democracy and peace. The rapid advance of China in every sphere exercises profound influence over the countries of Asia and Africa, over the entire colonial world.

4. The immense successes registered by the world peace movement, its ever-broadening sweep, were demonstrated in the Peking conference and in the congress of the

peoples for peace held at Vienna, the most representative of all peace conferences ever held, whose declarations embodying the worldwide aspiration of peace are finding increasing support from all strata of people in all countries, including India, where the peace movement has made significant advance in recent months and is being joined by people belonging to all political parties and to all walks of life. The universal condemnation of the American move to use the Kuomintang troops for attack on People's China shows that not merely the broad masses but even a number of bourgeois governments view with apprehension measures calculated to extend the flames of war. The bold and concrete proposal made by premier Chou En-lai to end the war in Korea has evoked such universal response that even the American imperialists, who only a few weeks ago talked about making Asians fight Asians, have had to reckon with it and reopen negotiations.

5. All this, of course, does not mean that the drive towards war has already been halted or the war-plans have been given up. On the contrary, that drive continues, those plans continue to operate—as seen in the attempt to intensify the embargo on trade with China, the increased American aid to the French imperialists in Vietnam, the ruthless measures of the British in Kenya, the pressure by America on European countries to speed up their 'defence' preparations, the provocative acts by British and American air forces over Democratic Germany and Czechoslovakia, the American attempt to frighten peaceloving people by successive atom-bomb explosions, etc. The war-danger is still great and the struggle for peace continues to be the key task, a task that has to be continued with even greater vigour. For it must not be forgotten that the crisis of imperialism is getting deeper, the fiasco of their policies is making the imperialists more desperate and attempts to solve the crisis by means of war will be intensified. At the same time the fact must be noted that the difficulties in the path of imperialists have increased, the contradictions in their camp have sharpened, the dependent countries show more and more resistance, the colonial liberation move-

ment has spread and become stronger, the fight for peace has won the support of immense sections—all of which increase the possibility of maintaining peace, increase the possibility of ending the war in Korea, increase the possibility of giving the peace movement a still broader sweep, of isolating the most adventurist elements in the imperialist camp and of foiling their plans.

6. The cessation of war in Korea, the banning of atomic weapons and germ-warfare, the conclusion of a pact of peace between the great powers will immediately lead to the easing of international tension, the utilisation of world resources for peaceful purposes and the development of world trade. This will help all peoples, including the Indian people, to rebuild their economy. It will lead to a steady fall in the prices of necessities of life and be a big step towards mitigating the present situation of starvation, high prices and scarcity.

7. India's struggle for peace is inseparably linked with the struggle for India's full and unfettered national freedom which means, first and foremost, freedom from control of the British, who continue to be the dominant imperialist power in India. Only as a fully independent country can India make effective contribution to the cause of world peace and act as a bulwark of freedom and democracy. India's continued membership of the British commonwealth, the holding of key positions in India's armed forces by British officers and 'advisers', India's participation in the so-called defence deliberations, the granting of training and transit facilities on Indian soil for gorkha soldiers recruited by the British—all these not merely constitute infringement of our national sovereignty and restrictions on it, but also a grave danger to peace. Britain is not merely an imperialist power; Britain is also the partner of American imperialism in the aggressive North Atlantic Bloc and is itself waging war against the Malayan and African peoples. Further. British control over India's economy, keeping it backward and dependent, facilitates the penetration of American imperialism into India, converts India into an arena for the conflicts of the imperialist powers and enhances the danger

of India's being dragged into war. Hence it is essential to intensify the struggle for a break with the commonwealth, for the expulsion of British officers and 'advisers' from the Indian army, for liquidation of all vestiges of British control over our economy through the confiscation of British capital. While carrying on general campaigns on these issues, each concrete manifestation of subservience to and link up with the British must be exposed and people rallied against it. The forthcoming coronation of the British queen is an occasion when mass opposition must be organised against India's participation.

8. While waging this struggle against British imperialism and as an inseparable part of the fight for peace and defence of national sovereignty, India must also resist the rapid penetration of American imperialism that is taking place in various spheres. Aspiring to secure world domination by unleashing a world war, the American imperialists are striving to bring the government of India under their control by means of 'aids' and agreements and are also linking themselves up with extreme reactionary elements and with rightwing socialist leaders. They are buying over corrupt politicians, securing control over a number of newspapers, poisoning the cultural life with decadent literature and films. They are carrying on a virulent campaign of lies and slanders against the USSR, New China and people's democratic countries through agencies like the 'democratic research service' and 'freedom of Asia' societies. They are also penetrating into some vital sectors of India's economy like oil and are trying to get a foothold in strategic industries. A large number of American specialists have been imported although there is no dearth of suitable Indians for the work. They have even been granted diplomatic immunity and are paid huge salaries. A vigorous campaign of exposure against all this, as well as against the importation of American agents in the garb of 'experts', has to be carried on.

9. The struggle for peace has to be directly linked with the democratic and anti-imperialist traditions of our national movement—which expressed themselves in the stand

taken by us on the issue of fascist aggression in Abyssinia, Spain and China—with the demand that the policy of the government of India today must be the continuation of that policy. We have yet to undertake a concrete and thorough exposure of the policy of the government of India in relation to the war in Korea. Immediate and broadest mass mobilisation is needed behind the demand that the India government must give full support to premier Chou En-lai's proposal. It must be clearly recognised that it is not enough to rouse the people against those moves of the imperialists which threaten to extend the war. As long as the war in Korea continues, the danger of extension of the war, the danger of the world being taken by surprise and plunged into war, will remain. Hence the need to rally the people behind the slogan that the government of India must demand immediate cessation of the war in Korea. Equally important is the task of rallying the people for the demand to stop transit facilities to the British and the French in their predatory war against the Malayan and Vietnamese people.

The vicious propaganda carried on against the Soviet Union and China by imperialist agents and rightwing socialists must be combated, a powerful movement built for friendship with these countries. The spontaneous homage paid to Stalin by all sections of the people in India shows the volume of sentiment of friendship with the USSR that exists in our country—a sentiment which is a powerful asset in the struggle for peace and democracy. The tributes paid by delegates who visited the USSR and China also show the immense possibilities that exist of broad mobilisation and consolidation of the friendly sentiment of the Indian people for the new world against which the imperialists are striving to unleash war.

10. An integral part of the struggle for peace, as well as for national independence and national sovereignty, is the struggle for the development of trade relations with socialist and democratic countries. The onesided trade of India, its linkup with the crisis-ridden economy of Britain and America, the unequivalent trade imposed on India by

these countries, are leading to the deepening of the crisis of Indian economy, failure to get the much-needed capital goods and perpetuation of our colonial conditions. The government of India hypocritically declares that it has 'no objections' to the development of trade with the USSR and China, but that it is for individual businessmen to establish such relations. The fact, however, is that no largescale development of trade between India on the one hand and the socialist and people's democratic countries on the other is possible unless trade agreement is arrived at a **governmental level**. This is precisely the kind of agreement that was reached between People's China and Ceylon—an agreement which has been of immense benefit to the Ceylonese people. This agreement resulting from the visit to Peking of a trade mission, headed by the trade minister for Ceylon, enabled Ceylon to procure rice from China and sell rubber to China on mutually advantageous terms. Hence it is necessary to give wider publicity to the trade agreement between Ceylon and China, to explain how the agreement came about, the role played by mass organisations and the common people in this.

11. With the deepening of the world capitalist crisis and the shrinking of the capitalist world market, the exploitation of colonial and dependent countries by imperialists has been intensified and they have become arenas of sharp conflicts among the imperialist powers, above all, between Britain and America. India, where British imperialism continues to hold a dominant position and where American imperialism is effecting fast penetration, is one of the main arenas of this conflict.

12. As a result of India's trade and economy being linked with imperialist powers who are interested in keeping it backward and dependent, India is ruthlessly robbed and plundered. Through British investment in key sectors of India's economy, through British control over exchange banks, insurance and shipping companies, through imperial preference and India's membership of the sterling bloc, Britain continues to drain away the wealth of India. The weapon of unequal trade is wielded both by Britain and

America to further impoverish the Indian people, deny them capital goods and ruin their industries. The steep fall in the prices of commodities which India exports, without a corresponding fall in the prices of commodities that it has to import from Britain and America, has accelerated this process, has ruined vast masses of people, especially the primary producers, the peasants. Huge quantities of raw materials have to be exported at ruinous prices to meet the interest and profit charges of British capital in India, to pay for the food imports from America, to pay for military equipment, rolling stock and other goods which India has to buy. This is leading to an ever-widening gap between exports and imports, squandering of the sterling resources and increasing dependence on foreign powers. The entire economy is cracking up.

13. India's main export commodities—jute and tea—are facing a catastrophic situation. The price of raw jute has fallen steeply hitting the peasants. The deepening crisis in capitalist countries and India's tie-up with their economy have led to the sealing of part of jute looms, reduction of hours in the jute mills, and closure of a large number of tea gardens. The British, who dominate these industries, are trying to solve the crisis at the cost of the workers.

14. Crisis manifests itself not in these industries alone, but in practically every industry—especially industries producing consumers' goods which constitute the bulk of our industries. All these years, the India government, controlled by landlords and monopolists collaborating with imperialism, argued that the crisis of India's economy was a crisis of **underproduction**, that there was scarcity because there were not enough goods, the way to India's prosperity lay through 'harder work', that what were needed were not basic social changes but more sustained labour. 'Produce or perish' was their slogan. All these myths are being exploded by hard reality. The handloom industry, which produced over one-third of the cloth consumed in this country and which supported nearly 10 million people, is facing extinction because it is unable to

dispose of the cloth that has been produced. The large-scale textile industry, which maintained itself by the ruination of the handloom industry and by huge exports, whose production has not reached even the 1938 figure, is already facing difficulties due to the accumulation of stocks. This is happening when the per capita consumption of cloth stands at less than 10 yards as against over 16 yards in 1938. In other words, long before even the 1938 level of consumption has been reached, symptoms of a crisis of 'overproduction' are visible. Same is the situation in sugar, footwear, coir, engineering and many other large and small industries.

15. Mass unemployment is becoming the characteristic feature in all industrial centres affecting not only the industrial workers but also middleclass employees. The British and Indian monopolists are resorting to restriction of production in order to maintain high prices, increased workload and rationalisation, forced leave and shorter hours, lockout and retrenchment. The attack on the working class has been intensified. The government has come to the rescue of big business by heavy reduction of export duty, direct subsidy of Rs 4½ crore out of state exchequer to the sugar magnates, reduction in the price of sugarcane. It has abolished the food subsidy, withdrawn cheap food-grain concession to tea-garden workers and resorted to drastic curtailment of credit facilities during the busy season to bring down prices of raw materials. It has refused to promote a price policy which would enable the people to buy manufactured articles at cheaper rates. It has even refused to take measures to prevent foreign monopolists who have invested capital in India from competing with and killing Indian industries. It has permitted free flow of foreign goods which are ruining many Indian industries. All this further deepens and intensifies the crisis.

16. At the root of the crisis of 'overproduction' lies the catastrophic crisis in our agrarian economy. The production of foodgrains per acre has sharply declined, according to the report of the planning commission itself. Famine

conditions have become chronic in many parts of the country. Scarcity conditions prevail in vast areas. With prices of commercial crops having fallen steeply, with subsidiary industries like handlooms having been ruined, the distress of the peasant masses has intensified. Indebtedness of the peasants has increased to colossal proportions. Tens of thousands of peasants have sold away and are selling away their land, their cattle and all their belongings at incredibly low prices due to scarcity and famine conditions. Their properties are passing into the hands of rapacious landlords and moneylenders. On top of this the government in many states resorts to coercive measures and sells away by auction the lands of the peasants who are unable to pay arrears of land revenue and debts.

The crisis in agriculture is also seen in the huge accumulation of stocks of fertilisers with the state and central governments because the pauperised peasant masses are unable to buy and use them. This is leading to further stagnation and decline of agriculture.

All this has meant a rapid shrinking of the home market and the complete collapse of the market in many areas. The fact that food prices continue to remain high due to shortage of production, the fact that the mass of the people have to spend the bulk of their income to purchase food, the fact that the prices of manufactured articles are kept at a high level—all these further intensify the crisis.

The agrarian crisis has grown into a national crisis. It has meant shortage of food for the nation, shortage of raw material for the industries, widening gap between exports and imports, increased dependence on foreign powers and increased threat to our national freedom and sovereignty. It has facilitated the penetration of aggressive imperialist powers into our country.

17. Thus, at the end of the six years of congress rule, the country faces a situation as serious as ever in its history. This situation is the direct result of the policies of the Nehru Government—of its refusal to break with the British commonwealth and confiscate British capital, of its

refusal to undertake basic agrarian reform. The much-boasted five-year plan which is being implemented by the government does not mean a reversal of these policies. It is a continuation of those very policies and an effort to solve the crisis at the cost of the people and in the interest of foreign imperialists, Indian monopolists collaborating with them and landlords.

18. Refusal to mobilise India's resources in money, which have accumulated and are accumulating in the hands of the princes, landlords and monopolists, refusal to stop the drain of India's wealth by the imperialists by means of unequivalent trade and export of huge profits of British capital invested in India, have made it impossible to undertake really big plans for the rapid development of India's industry, and agriculture, so very urgently needed to overcome centuries of backwardness and arrested development, and fight poverty, unemployment and famine.

The demagogic claim that the five-year plan seeks to create a firm basis for India's economic development by first concentrating on the improvement of agriculture is belied by the last two years of its operation. The plan refuses to make fundamental democratic transformations in land relations, which alone will smash the fetters on agricultural production and release the creative energies of India's millions of peasants. The land policies advocated in the plan will lead and are leading to largescale evictions of peasants from their lands. All these will accelerate the pauperisation of the peasantry. The plan provides for the continuation and execution of new irrigation projects which had already been undertaken by the state governments as part of the postwar reconstruction schemes planned by the British imperialists. Even those projects in the plan which, taken by themselves, are useful, are proving so costly to build, thanks to bureaucratic inefficiency and rampant corruption, thanks to the employment of a large number of costly American 'experts' and refusal to utilise and encourage the talents of Indian engineers and technicians, that the bulk of the people will not be benefited from them.

The plan leaves the entire field of industrial development to private capital. But just because it not only fails to solve the problem of the internal market but actually intensifies it, and also because of its abject dependence on British and American imperialism for capital goods, there cannot be any real industrialisation. On the other hand, as the experience of the last two years of the working of the plan has clearly demonstrated, these policies cannot even prevent the stagnation and underutilisation of existing production capacity and save the existing industries from collapse. Under the plan, the imperialists and monopolists are free to intensify their attacks on the workers and our people and other industrialists. They are free to continue to make huge profits by the systematic loot of the entire people and to mount attacks on the workers by freezing wages, dearness allowance and bonus, by rationalisation and other methods of intensification of labour.

Above all, the financing of the plan is to be done by increased taxation on the common people, by foreign borrowing and by deficit-financing. All this would lead to increasing burdens on the common people, and to increased grip of the foreign imperialists and Indian monopolists on India's economy.

In a number of states even the execution of the schemes already undertaken has come up against the wall of lack of finances, and work on many schemes has been slowed down, and many more minor irrigation schemes have been altogether abandoned. The crisis reflects itself in the budgets of the states and the centre, which have already become deficit. It reflects itself in the steep fall in the passenger and goods traffic earnings in the railways as a result of which even the program of rehabilitation of the railways to a level that the existing volume of passenger and goods traffic can be effectively served is being given up.

19. In every sphere the government continues the reactionary policies of the past. It refuses to abolish the princely states and reconstitute the provinces on the linguistic basis on the false plea that this will lead to the breakup

of the unity of the country. It refuses to concede the demand of part 'C' states for representative government. It increases the cost of education compelling many students to discontinue studies and making it impossible for the poorer classes to receive education. It permits foreign concerns in India to discriminate against the Indian personnel and treat them as inferiors in relation to whites. It postpones enactment of the hindu code bill. It spends colossal sums for the military and police and gives repeated concessions to big business but has no money for the upliftment of the people. It imposes new burdens on the people on the plea of financing its plans and projects. It reenacts the security measures in the teeth of popular opposition and wants to set up, as in Bengal, special tribunals to try political cases. It resorts to ruthless terror to suppress the people whenever all other methods fail and the masses refuse to take the new burdens lying down.

20. Against these policies and methods of the government, against the growing offensive of landlords and monopolists, against the attempt to shift the burden of the crisis on the people, mass resistance has grown rapidly during the last one year. Innumerable struggles and mass actions have taken place in this period—greater in volume and intensity than at any time since August 1947. Actions have taken place not merely on economic issues and against tax burdens, but also for civil liberties, for linguistic provinces, for cheap education, etc. The participants in the struggles have been not merely workers and peasants, but also students, teachers, patwaris, sweepers, government employees, policemen, merchants, industrialists, etc. Further, struggles are breaking out even in areas like Saurashtra where the democratic movement has hitherto been weak. Almost in every struggle broad popular sympathy was revealed. Workingclass struggles have not only been numerous but in many of them workers following different tradeunions stood together and fought together. The unemployed workers' immense demonstration at Calcutta rallied workers belonging to various organisations and was supported by all sections of people. Doggedly fought peasant actions

have taken place in several provinces together with mass demonstrations of peasants in cities. Mass organisations of workers, peasants, students are growing all over the country and united factory committees have been formed in several places. Popular urge for unity is also expressed in united famine relief committees. In Bengal the opposition parties have organised a number of joint demonstrations. Popular opposition to the government expresses itself in the speeches of communist and democratic deputies in the legislatures, where even many congressmen have started taking a critical attitude towards several of the measures of the government.

21. A specific character of the struggles today is not merely that they are the result of worsening condition of the life of the people but that they are taking place in the background of growing isolation of the Congress, its rapidly weakening mass influence. Vast numbers of those who hitherto followed the Congress evince sympathy for the struggles and even directly participate in them as in the linguistic province movement in Andhra and anti-sales-tax agitation in Bombay and Saurashtra. In several states congressmen have opposed the tax measures of the government and sharp conflict has developed inside congress committees on the policies of the government. In the Praja-Socialist Party—whose leadership has abandoned all pretence to Marxism, is pursuing an antistruggle policy and is striving for coalition with the Congress—a growing number of rank and file are getting drawn into united action. Due to its weakening position and due to growing mass opposition, the government has been compelled on several occasions to concede popular demands, to beat retreat and refrain from carrying out its antipopular measures. The fact that in the budgets presented in February-March this year there has been generally absence of fresh taxation proposals, despite growing deficits, is entirely due to the opposition to taxation measures of the last year. In many instances sentences of death on political prisoners have been commuted, punitive police posts removed and political prisoners released. In many centres

workingclass and peasant masses have been able to beat back the economic offensive and win concessions.

22. The deepening economic crisis, the worsening conditions of the people because of the policies of the government, and the growing opposition of the people against the policies of the government, have their repercussions inside the ruling classes and their party—the Congress Party. Conflict between the central and state governments over allocation and share of the revenues is growing, despite the increase in the states' share as a result of the recommendations of the finance commission. The reactionary stand of the government over the question of formation of linguistic states together with the significant victory of the Andhra people not only have given impetus to the movement for linguistic states, but has led to many congressmen coming out openly against the policies of the government and the congress leadership. As a result of the abolition of the office of rajpramukh in Kashmir, the demand has been more and more loudly voiced even by congress elements for the abolition of the office in all the states where it exists. The growing discontent of the masses is also intensifying the conflicts among the factional groups inside the Congress. As a result vacillation and indecision grows in the ruling class.

23. What we are witnessing today is not merely the maturing of an economic crisis, but along with it the initial stages of the development of a political crisis. The conflicts that are developing within the ruling classes and inside the Congress are but the symptoms of that political crisis that is developing. The various methods adopted by the Congress—manoeuvres like decontrol, minor concessions, attempts to create illusions through the five-year plan and community projects, etc.—are all getting rapidly exposed.

The Congress finds it already difficult to rule the old way—on the basis of promises for the future. With the deepening crisis, with the development of mass opposition to the present policies of the government, conflicts will sharpen on the issues as to which policies to follow or with

whom to forge alliance, etc.

24. The weakening influence of the Congress, however, has not, in all areas and states, led to a corresponding strengthening of the democratic forces. In several parts of India, where democratic forces are comparatively weak, communal parties, allied to feudal reaction, have also gained ground and are striving to divert mass discontent into disruptive channels. With the demagogic slogan of sanctions against Pakistan, they utilised the just indignation of people against the communal policies of the Pakistan government. Utilising the sentiments of the people for the unity of India, they mislead them into the belief that the instrument of accession of Kashmir is disruptive of this unity and with the slogan of 'full accession' they seek to reimpose on the people of Kashmir the rule of the maharaja and to nullify the agrarian reform.

The activities of these communal reactionaries constitute a menace which should not be underestimated. They have farreaching plans of a counterrevolutionary character—plans to impose on the government even more reactionary policies, both in the national and international spheres. There are powerful groups inside the Congress sympathetic to them, who, frightened by the growing opposition of the masses, would like the Congress to compromise with the communal reactionaries in order to build a 'united front' against the democratic movement. Ruthless and systematic exposure of the communal parties, and united front of all democratic forces, including congressmen with progressive views, to wean the masses away from the 'movements' launched by them must be undertaken in order to combat this menace.

25. The recent talks initiated by Nehru with Jayaprakash Narayan with a view to form a coalition with the Praja-Socialist Party are the result of the growing crisis inside the ruling classes. Nehru, who only a year ago refused to countenance the idea of a coalition and claimed that the Congress alone represented the country, took the initiative for such a coalition because of his realisation of the growing weakening of the mass base and influence of

the Congress.

In the face of the failure of the Congress, by its manoeuvres, to prevent the weakening of its influence, it is an attempt to widen its influence in order to continue its reactionary policies directed against the people and the democratic movement.

The PSP leadership is also anxious to effect such a reactionary coalition because it is also facing a crisis and all the manoeuvres of the leadership—the praja and socialist parties' merger, etc.—have only accentuated the crisis instead of resolving it. It seeks to camouflage its reactionary aims by putting forward a program. But the program itself exposes its reactionary aims. It does not demand the abolition of landlordism without compensation and distribution of land to the agricultural labourers and poor peasants. It does not ask for reduction of rents and occupancy rights to the peasants. Instead it asks for compulsory consolidation of holdings, which will only lead to largescale eviction and expropriation of small holders. It does not demand the recognition of trade unions but compulsory amalgamation of trade unions under government auspices. It does not demand minimum wage, stoppage of retrenchment and unemployment relief, but speaks of trade unions becoming socially responsible agencies. It does not demand linguistic states or greater provincial autonomy; instead it negates them with the demand for units based on language and also administrative, financial and economic convenience, and of regional (multistate) governors, regional high courts, etc. It keeps silent over the question of repeal of repressive acts.

With the record of breaking of all its pledges to the people by the Congress, and with the policies it is pursuing, no coalition with it can be thought of by any party that is interested in serving our people and fighting for democracy. Equally wrong is it for anyone to think that such a coalition can fight the communal reactionaries. For communal reaction derives its strength from the antipopular, antidemocratic policies of the government and it cannot be fought successfully without simultaneously fighting and de-

feating the reactionary policies of the congress government.

26. Experience of the last one year shows that the ruling classes cannot shift the burden of the crisis on to the masses without launching a ferocious attack on their democratic rights and civil liberties. This is precisely what is being now advocated by the most reactionary sections and elements in the Congress—sections and elements many of whom sympathise with the forces of communal reaction and would like the Congress to forge 'united front' with them with the object of launching a vigorous attack on the people, suppress mass organisations and the Communist Party. The struggle for the defence of civil liberties, the struggle to end the repressive and antilabour laws and measures, therefore, acquire immense importance in the present situation.

27. It is necessary to abandon all complacency about the present situation and get rid of erroneous ideas with regard to the development of the mass movement. As already stated, numerous struggles have taken place in recent months, but it will be a mistake to focus attention only on them, to select examples of the big struggles, collect them together and make this the basis of the assertion that the mass movement has already extended far and wide, has already reached a high level. Such methods will lead to wrong conclusions and wrong tactics. The growth of the mass movement cannot be measured merely in terms of individual struggles, strikes and demonstrations or the number of participants in these struggles. There is no doubt that, with the worsening condition of the people, struggles will break out in all parts of the country. Despite this, however, the mass movement as a whole will remain weak unless these individual struggles are coordinated, fought vigorously and in such a manner as to bring about the broadest democratic mobilisation, united mass organisations built on their basis and led so as to become part of a developing nationwide struggle for reversal of the policies of the government. With the maturing of the economic crisis, with the maturing of the political crisis, the

issue of replacing the present government by a government of the united democratic front will assume increasing importance. It is this perspective that has to guide us today in our entire activity.

28. It must be remembered that, despite its weakening mass base, the Congress has still immense influence and is by far the single most powerful political organisation in the country as a whole, that our effective influence is still confined to limited areas, that our position in the working class, and especially in major industries, is still weak, that mass organisations, though stronger than before, are not yet either sufficiently strong or sufficiently widespread, that a powerful democratic front has yet to be built, that the party itself has yet to overcome the weaknesses which prevent it from carrying out the role of unifier and leader of the democratic movement. It would be a dangerous illusion, therefore, to think that mere deepening of the economic crisis and mere worsening of the condition of the masses will give rise to a powerful mass movement.

29. The three inseparably linked tasks on the carrying out of which will depend the success of the democratic movement are—the building of the democratic front, the building of mass organisations, the building of the party. In the measure that these tasks are carried out in an integrated and coordinated manner, the attempts of the government to shift the burden of the crisis on the people will be defeated, the mass movement will strengthen, grow and achieve its aim.

30. The growing burden on the people, the worsening condition of their life, the increasingly antipopular policies of the government both in national and international spheres, as well as the attempt of communal reactionaries to utilise the popular discontent for disruptive purposes, make it essential that all democratic and progressive parties and elements come together. The possibilities of such unity are immense today and a key task of the Communist Party is to translate these possibilities into reality. This demands, above all, the abandonment of sectarian outlook and sectarian methods—in relation to slogans, in relation

to attitude towards nonparty elements, in relation to method of running mass and democratic organisations. The very fact that the Communist Party has acquired a key position in the political life of the country, that it is looked upon as the most powerful force in opposition to the Congress, demands that the party acts as the unifier of the people, gives expression to their deep urge that all democratic forces must come together and fight unitedly in defence of their rights and demands. The galvanising influence of united front even on a limited basis was revealed during the elections and every effort must be made to see that united front between opposition parties is forged, even in areas where it has weakened since then. Further, the development of the united-front movement involves drawing into struggles and into common activities the large mass of congressmen, PSP followers and progressive individuals. Too little of this has been done as yet. The tendency to look upon all those who do not yet support all our slogans or participate in mass actions organised by us as reactionary, the tendency of not evolving such forms of activities into which all who want to serve the people and relieve their distress can be drawn, the tendency to ignore concrete issues on which immediate unity irrespective of political views is possible—all these tendencies persist and hamper the development of a broad united-front movement in every province and every area.

31. Further, the development of united front through widening of the mass movement is hampered because of the abstractness of our agitation, the habit of substituting concrete exposure by general denunciation, the indulgence, quite often, in stereotyped speeches in assemblies, parliament and from public platform, stereotyped writings in our papers. Too often we speak only for those who are already convinced that the present government is a reactionary government. Too often we fail to make use of existing legislations—tenancy legislation, social security act, payment of wages act, etc.—to ameliorate the conditions of the masses and secure for them concessions, forgetting that these legislations have been enacted as the result of mass

struggles and are a weapon in the hands of the people. Too often the tendency is to narrate only the hardships that the people are suffering and to ignore the successes that their struggles have won in the mistaken belief that reference to such successes will breed 'reformist illusions', while the reality is that, in order to inculcate confidence in the masses, confidence that unity and struggle can win demands, it is essential that each success won by the people, no matter how small, is widely publicised and made the basis for further advance. There is also the tendency to pay scant attention to such work as adult literacy, cultural and sports activities, cooperatives, medical relief, etc.—work which is absolutely essential, work which can mobilise vast sections and enable the party and mass organisations to forge close links with the people. It is very often forgotten that in Tripura, one of the most powerful bases of the party today, it was on the basis of a literacy campaign that the party grew in the first stage. Similarly in Malabar literacy campaign played a big role in the growth of the party and of the kisan movement.

In areas where famine-conditions prevail not only is it necessary to demand relief from the government and organise relief on the basis of unity of democratic organisations, but it is also necessary to mobilise the people for such work as deepening of wells, repair of tanks, etc.

It is necessary for every provincial committee to undertake a critical examination of the plans and projects undertaken by the government in the province, make a factual and concrete exposure, put forward the demands for such projects as will help the people, and mobilise them for their implementation.

It must be noted that, despite the various laws that have been enacted, the untouchable masses are in practice denied equal rights even now. Hitherto many party units have paid little attention to this issue. It is necessary not merely to agitate for more comprehensive laws against untouchability, but also to wage a concrete battle against all forms of discrimination.

32. Struggles for the immediate demands of the peo-

ple through all forms—petitions, signatures, strikes, hartals, demonstrations, marches, civil disobedience, etc.—struggles against the attacks of the government and landlords and monopolists are the most important tasks facing the mass movement and the most effective weapons for building the democratic front. Through these struggles are to be built the mass organisations with their units embedded in that people. In these struggles will be trained and steeled cadres coming from the masses.

The rapidly deteriorating situation on the agrarian front where big struggles are looming ahead demands that utmost attention is paid by every provincial committee to the task of strengthening the kisan-sabha organisations and forming agricultural workers' associations wherever necessary. Broad peasant unity has to be built in action against eviction, against unjust taxes for reduction of rent, for moratorium on debts, for adequate wages, for relief against famine and drought, for fair price for agricultural products, for specific irrigation projects and similar demands.

Workingclass struggles, especially struggles in major industries, against the offensive of monopolists acquire increased significance in the present situation. Vigorous defence by the working class of its rights, vigorous struggle by the working class against retrenchment, wagecut and other forms of attack encourage all classes and sections to wage their own battles. Also mass action by the working class gives form and direction to the growing radicalisation of the people as already seen in several provinces. It is a most powerful weapon to forge the democratic front.

On the workingclass front, despite the growing struggles in the recent past, despite the growing sense of unity of the working class, the full unfolding of the tradeunion movement is prevented by the existence of parallel unions in the same factory and industry. The fight for tradeunion unity and for the realisation of the slogan of 'One union in one industry and one central tradeunion organisation' has to be waged. The existing united factory committees must be strengthened, and such factory committees must be organised in every industry. In the struggles that are break-

ing out more and more, the question of united resistance to the offensive of the government and employers will come to the fore, and must be fully utilised by the setting up of joint elected committees for the conduct of struggles and negotiations. The question of recognition of unions assumes tremendous importance and must be fought for. An integral part of the struggle for recognition of trade unions is the struggle against the industrial relations acts in Bombay, Madhya Bharat and Madhya Pradesh. The development of a wide movement against the acts in these states in particular and in the country generally is a major task on the workingclass front.

There is a widespread tendency to neglect important and vital industries in industrial areas and to concentrate on small and diffused industries. This tendency must be given up and the party units must immediately undertake planned work in major and important industries.

The problem of combating mass unemployment has become a key problem before the working class. The development of a wide movement, by means of rallies and conferences, marches and demonstrations, hartals and strikes is the most important task. United committees for fighting retrenchment and unemployment must be organised. Such a wide movement cannot unfold itself fully unless the organised working class employed in factories are brought into the movement. Apart from mobilisation, it is of utmost importance that relief and solidarity campaigns are organised.

In these campaigns and struggles, political consciousness must be inculcated in the working class—the consciousness of its role of hegemony. It must lead to the working class coming out in action in support of the struggles and demands of other sections of the people—peasants, students, industrialists and merchants. This will forge popular unity and defeat the attempt of the government to crush the struggles of workers as well as other classes in isolation.

33. Each struggle, each campaign, each mass action must be used not only to popularise slogans but also and above all, to build organisations—of workers, peasants, stu-

dents, youth, women. It must be remembered that one of the main reasons why the growth of mass movement is lagging behind the growth of mass discontent is that such organisations are still weak and in many places non-existent. It must be remembered that united mass organisations form the basis of the democratic front and that without such mass organisations being formed all over the country, it is impossible to develop a countrywide mass movement.

In the past a key weakness of organisations of workers, peasants and other classes has been the weakness of the basic units like factory committees, primary kisan sabhas. The strength of mass organisations depends not only on their total membership but on the manner in which this membership is organised—above all, on the firmness and organised functioning of the basic units. Without them neither the mass base of the organisation can be expanded nor even the existing base activated. Hence the necessity to focus attention on this work and draw into organisational work rank-and-file workers, peasants, agricultural labourers.

Further, the waging of struggles and the conducting of campaigns have to be coordinated with the work of increasing the circulation of party journals and sale of literature. At present at all levels and in all units of the party there is total underestimation of the importance of this work—an underestimation which springs from idealisation of spontaneity, from minimisation of the role of consciousness. This expresses itself in the tendency to look upon the work of journals and literature as not the work of the party as a whole and of all its units but only of comrades specifically entrusted with that work. This tendency must be sharply combated.

34. The party has also to bring to the forefront in every state alternative immediate slogans and demands which will rally all democratic sections, parties, groups and individuals, unite them and become the common program of the united front. In order to ensure the democratic participation of our people in all activities in the state and in

order to unleash their creative energies, the program should demand the repeal of all repressive laws and the release of all political prisoners, the immediate formation of linguistic states, the abolition of the office of rajpramukh, the break up of the former princely states and the integration of their various linguistic regions into the adjoining linguistic states, the abolition of all distinctions between part 'A', part 'B' and part 'C' states by the conferment of full legislative and executive powers on the elected representatives of part 'B' and part 'C' states, and the abolition of the upper houses in the states as well as at the centre.

The program should include the banning of the import of all those goods that compete with the indigenous goods. We should demand a ceiling to be put on profits—of six-and-a-quarter per cent as was accepted by the Congress itself. We should demand that all export of profits by foreign firms be banned and that the profits of the industry be ploughed back into the industry determined by the government. Prices, wages and profits in protected industries should be fixed. Minimum wages must be fixed statutorily in all industries and unemployment relief must be afforded to the unemployed workers. We should demand that long-term trade agreements be concluded with the Soviet Union and other democratic countries.

A number of trade unions have already formulated proposals whose implementation would help the industry. It is necessary to do this in relation to all industries and to concretise these proposals further, to popularise them vigorously among the workers as well as among the general public.

In the field of agriculture, we should demand that the compensation that is being paid to zamindars and jagirdars be stopped immediately, that all rents paid by peasants to landlords be substantially reduced, that all evictions be stopped and all peasants evicted from land be reinstated, and that the landlords shall not be given the right of resumption of cultivation. We should demand that the tax burdens on the peasants be reduced.

The program should include the demand that military expenditure be reduced by 50 per cent and that expenditure on security and administrative services be substantially reduced, both at the centre and in the states.

We should demand that, with the resources thus mobilised, a big program of irrigation and development of industries be immediately undertaken by mobilising the creative energy of the people, by encouraging the talents of Indian engineers, technicians and workers.

35. It must be admitted that, despite the fact that many party units have recently taken up the question of struggle for peace seriously, there is still a gross underestimation of the key importance of this task. There is widespread belief among the masses that due to the immense sentiment in favour of peace in India, due to the widespread sympathy of the Indian people for the USSR and China, and due to the declared policy of the Nehru government of remaining neutral in case of war, the danger of India being dragged into war is not serious. Such a belief is wrong. It is based on an underestimation of the desperate measures which imperialists and their agents will adopt in case of a serious international crisis or when their war-plans have advanced further. Reliance on spontaneity in this, as in other matters, will be fatal. What the situation demands is active mobilisation of the Indian people for peace, active mobilisation of the organised working class and peasantry in the peace movement, transformation of the vast peace sentiments into a powerful movement for peace and a network of peace committees, enlisting of the people of India to play a positive role in stopping the existing wars. Failure to do this will mean not only failure to discharge our international duties, but also betrayal of national honour and interest.

36. The imperialists and reactionaries are fully conscious that trade wars and conflicts between India and Pakistan enable them to further tighten their grip on these countries and hence they do their utmost to embitter relations between the two countries.

It is a victory of the progressive forces that, despite all

the attempts of the imperialists and feudal reactionaries, both outside and inside the Congress, an Indo-Pak trade pact has been arrived at.

But the party must be vigilant and take the lead in fighting for maintaining and strengthening this pact, forging peaceful relations in all spheres, opening up ways of freer movement and cultural intercourse between the two countries. It is along this path that imperialist conspiracies against peace and democracy can be fought, reactionary communal forces defeated and democratic unity of the people ensured.

37. The work of our comrades in the state legislatures and the parliament has strengthened the mass movement. Nevertheless it has suffered for lack of coordination with the mass movement and struggles outside. This weakness must be rapidly eradicated by our comrades inside the legislatures by bringing to the fore the issues of the mass movement in such a way that our legislative work is a reflection of and a direct aid to the mass movement outside. For this purpose it is necessary not only to undertake concrete exposures of the policies and legislative and executive measures of the government, but also ourselves initiate legislation on the burning problems of the people. The introduction of such bills can and must become the rallying point of a wide mass movement in support of them. Our comrades have been returned to many municipalities, local boards and panchayats. Despite the limited powers that these bodies enjoy, it is necessary to pay serious attention to them and utilise all possibilities for helping the people. The provincial committees must help in the drawing up of program for whose implementation our comrades must fight.

38. Despite the growth of the general influence of the party, our effective organised influence is confined in almost all states to a few areas and districts. Without a countrywide party, without a wide kisan sabha, without a firm base in the most important workingclass areas, it is not possible to grow into a countrywide national-political force. While strengthening our position in the areas

where we are already a force, it has become urgently necessary to spread to new areas and sectors. Provincial units must carefully and urgently plan out and execute this task.

It is necessary to create mass political literature and transform our newspapers into national-political journals, reporting not merely struggles in their own provinces, but in other provinces as well.

The fulfilment of all these tasks demands the rapid strengthening of the party and the undertaking of political education as a key political task. For the development of the party is the key factor in determining the growth of the mass movement. It is of utmost importance that the entire party be armed with the perspective of the fast maturing of a profound economic and political crisis, of the struggles that are looming large and of the perspective of coordinating them into the political struggle for the replacement of the present government by a government of the united democratic front. The party must acquire a correct understanding of the direction in which things are moving, a sense of urgency, revolutionary zeal and passion and give up all complacency and sense of selfsatisfaction.

The party must become the decisive national force—politically, geographically and in a class sense—i.e. by party units in each area and state acting as the leader and organiser of the people, by the party spreading to new areas, and by its basing itself and drawing its main strength from the working class and the toiling peasants. Advance is to be measured no longer, as in the past, in terms of the 'general political influence' nor even in terms of mass mobilisation on specific issues only, but in terms of the growth of organisation in general and growth of the party in particular, in terms of circulation of literature and newspapers, in terms of collection of funds, in terms of the strengthening of mass organisations and the party itself.

It is only through such all-round growth that the party will be able to discharge its duties and responsibilities to the people.

11. Some Problems of TU Unity

I

The mood of the workers in the past few months shows that they are increasingly mobilising in order to fight against unemployment and rationalisation. In this struggle, the workers are tending to unite in factories and areas, without caring for the division in the leadership and the central TU organisations. Unity from below is growing and in this the unions and leading cadres of the AITUC are on the whole taking initiative and helping.

It has been a noticeable feature that the working masses are becoming increasingly conscious of the need for mobilisation and action in defence of their interests against the attacks of the crisis and the desire of the employers to pass the burden on to the workers.

The action of the central government in retrenching over 2000 workers in the defence industries, the awards of the textiles and the banks which plainly admit that the policies of the five-year plan demanded that no wage-increases be given to the workers, the closure of some factories due to foreign competition and the consequent squabbles in the various sections of the big bourgeoisie and also the government are leading the workers to the conclusion that they have to mobilise and fight unitedly to save themselves, the people and the country.

This was evident in the vast mobilisations that were

At an AITUC fraction meeting held in Poona in May, the problem of TU unity was discussed, especially with reference to the position of the INTUC. The TU subcommittee of the CC summed up the discussion on which there was unanimous agreement. This document represents the agreed views. It was published in **Party Letter**, No 7, 8 July 1953.

seen on May Day this year and in the strike and protest actions in the various states and industries.

The demonstrations and actions exhibit certain characteristics. The masses come in vast numbers. They come most where the demonstrations are led on a united platform of the AITUC, the HMS, the INTUC and the UTUC. Where there is no unity, this year the masses have gathered much more under the banner of the AITUC than that of any other organisation. There have been more united actions this year than before. The vastness of the mobilisation under the united or the AITUC flag in preference to others was on a scale not expected by the leadership of any organisation.

II

Thus, while the working masses are moving towards unity from below and in action, the problem of organisational unity of the national centres and of the unions has remained unsolved. In this field fullfledged action is hampered by certain questions which have got to be cleared and which prevent the AITUC cadres from taking correct steps in certain cases.

The question that has become dominant in the field of organisational unity is the question of the INTUC and relations with its leadership and its unions. In this field certain significant changes have taken place in the last two years. The full import of these changes has to be taken into consideration in order to evolve steps in the direction of TU unity.

The changes that require to be studied here are in relation to the four central TU organisations—namely, the AITUC, the INTUC, the HMS and the UTUC. If we look into the relative strength of these organisations in the working class, what picture do we get? If we look into them from the point of view of organised paid membership, the growth of cadres, the spread of their influence and ideology and their role in struggles, what do we find?

We find that the correlations of forces in these matters,

in the field of trade unions and workingclass activity, have undergone a radical change in the last years, i.e. since the middle of 1951.

What was the situation before 1951? The AITUC unions were illegalised, many were smashed due to repression, some due to our own mistakes. The AITUC was in a state of disorganisation and in some measure in a state of isolation from its own class in many industries and areas.

The organisation that dominated the scene and possessed the initiative was the HMS. Their contact with the masses was live, they had good young cadres. Their trouble was their rightwing leadership.

The INTUC was trying to establish itself with the help of the government, the industrial law operating in its favour, the employers, who favoured them, and the nationalist congress illusions of sections of the working masses. But the INTUC could not secure the field for itself and become the dominant TU organisation in the field.

We need not go into the question of the UTUC as for quite a while it has been limiting itself to certain areas and was generally ready to cooperate with all TUs. It was not out to challenge the status of the other three organisations.

Does the same situation prevail now? It does not. The relation of forces has changed. What is the outstanding characteristic of this change? It is that the unions of the AITUC have revived and have begun to take increasingly the leadership of the struggles of the working class, the AITUC unions have overcome their state of isolation on the basis of correct policy and work, the AITUC is fast winning over the allegiance or sympathy of the working masses, not only in the old trades and areas where formerly it had worked but even in new trades and areas, and the AITUC-centre has begun to function. That is the outstanding characteristic of the change in the situation.

The second characteristic of the change is that the HMS is no longer in its old position. It has lost its initiative, its

big unions (viz in the Bombay textiles) and its good cadres.

Who then has made gains out of the losses of the HMS? The union cadres and masses of the HMS have in part gone over to the AITUC and in part to the INTUC. Some have been neutralised but not a very big part.

Thus it can be said that the AITUC and INTUC have advanced from their positions in 1951 and the HMS has lost. In the tradeunion field the AITUC has now to reckon mainly with the forces of the INTUC. Such are the changes that have taken place in the last two years.

The outstanding examples of these changes are the textiles and the railways. The merging of the AIRF in the INRWF is the surrender of the HMS to the INTUC. In the textiles, the split in the HMS textile union in Bombay and the unity between the HMS group and the Girni Kamgar Union meant the strengthening of the AITUC and its advance and not that of the INTUC. Similar illustrations can be given from many trades and areas.

III

While there is no doubt that this shift in the working class originates in the economic crisis and in the fact that the policies adopted by the right-wing leaders of the HMS and the INTUC do not conform to the interests of the working class and are being increasingly opposed by them, one has also to note how they are reflecting certain changes in the political, ideological approach of the workers.

It is recognised that the split in the tradeunion movement in 1946-47 was engineered by the bourgeoisie, that it was carried out by taking advantage of political differences and ideologies among the workers and that it could achieve some success because tradeunionism as such and class solidarity had not developed to a high level. With what outlook and approach did the various sections of the workers align themselves with the three organisations in that period?

The big bourgeoisie, led by its representatives in gov-

ernmental power, used the temporary bourgeois-nationalist illusions of the working class that it was the Congress that had won them freedom from foreign rule and that the leading groups of the AITUC were opposed to them in this battle. It was the nationalist-minded worker, devoid of any class outlook, that became the mainstay of the INTUC in the belief that the bourgeoisie, having solved the political problem, would now solve its economic problems also.

On the basis of these illusions, the bourgeoisie expected to build a regimented tradeunion movement and organisation, which would abjure class struggle and rely on compulsory arbitration, consider the national bourgeoisie as its own leader, the Congress as its own political organisation and the INTUC its trade union.

But the crisis of its economy would not permit the bourgeoisie to satisfy even the ordinary demands of its own following. In the proportion that the bourgeoisie failed to solve the crisis and began to attack the working class, the INTUC following began to question its leadership and its policies. Their agreement with the political policies of the ruling bourgeoisie could not keep them off from serious conflict with its economic policies. Large sections of the INTUC began to shed their illusions and to adopt the standpoint of their own class. The Congress began to get divorced from and opposed to the tradeunion actions of many sections of the INTUC itself.

The HMS leadership gathered its following on a different basis. Like the INTUC leadership, it admitted that the national bourgeoisie had won freedom and agreed to support it in its plans of 'rebuilding the country's economy', and promised the bourgeoisie workingclass support to do it. But at the same time, it had raised the slogan that now that its fight against imperialism was won, the fight against capital had to begin.

With this slogan, the HMS leadership was able to gather the following of those workers who had distrust in the big bourgeoisie and would not agree to line up with the INTUC. While agreeing with this antibourgeoisie stand-

point of the HMS leadership's slogan, these workers were not conscious of the international solidarity of the working class, or of the traditions of the class struggle in their own country. Thus they disagreed both with the INTUC as it was openly and directly supported by the big monopolists, and with the AITUC, despite their growing class outlook. They thought they could synthesise both the outlooks in the HMS.

But can rightwing socialism remain aloof from its bourgeoisie and its international allies in the bourgeois camp when the crisis deepens fast? The transformation of the Socialist Party into the PSP was the logical sequence of its desertion of the class outlook and the working class, and its desertion of the battle for bringing about people's democracy in our country. Its lineup with the ICFTU, and against China, the USSR and progressive workers' organisations, led to its weakening in its own bases, where the HMS worker was fast moving away from the bourgeoisie, away from bourgeois illusions and towards his own class, nationally and internationally

Naturally as large numbers of workers got disillusioned through their direct experience in dealing with the congress government and employers, they moved towards the AITUC. Because, whatever its mistakes, the AITUC had not deserted its class, nationally and internationally.

But not the whole disillusioned mass went over to the AITUC. Some went over to the INTUC, because they, having been cheated by the pseudosocialism of the HMS, recoiled to bourgeois nationalism. The HMS leadership also helped in this process by handing over its unions to the INTUC in the name of unity and merger, and with the open avowal of fighting the AITUC.

Hence, in this period, the AITUC began to recover its leadership, break its isolation and become the lever of the unity of the working class and the defence of its interests. The HMS weakened and lost to the AITUC and partly to the INTUC. Hence it is that the INTUC has now emerged as the main force opposed to the AITUC. This

is a very important shift in the relative forces in the TU movement.

IV

Can we conclude from this that the shift has taken place mainly because of political reasons and that its tradeunion character is purely formal? No, it is not so. If it had been so, the relative growth of the INTUC should have signified the growth of the Congress. But the Congress, on the contrary, has lost many large sections of its masses and is sunk in factional squabbles of its own bourgeoisie. Similarly one cannot say that the loss of the HMS means that the ideology of socialism has lost or that the merging of the Socialist Party in the Praja-Socialist Party will also mean the lining up of the unions of the HMS behind the PSP bourgeoisie.

Nor does the strengthening of the AITUC mean a reflection of the growing strength of the Communist Party or other parties and groups in the AITUC. Independent of the fate of the political parties, broad masses of workers are changing from one national centre to another, from one union to another, according to their experience in the field of their struggles against their employers and the results thereof. Therefore while political struggles have affected the TU organisations, it would be wrong to conclude that they have been the dominant factor in this period in changing the relative forces in the TU field. In fact the movement towards unity is taking place on the very condition that the uniting forces do not give up their political or party platforms and differences. It is not political unity that is leading to tradeunion unity. It is the tradeunion struggle of the workers for the defence of their immediate interests that is the main driving force of TU unity from below. Hence it is that both the Congress and the rightwing socialist leadership find it difficult to retain the INTUC and HMS unions as direct tools of their politics inside the working class. The Bengal split of the INTUC is an indication.

From the point of view of the working class, has the situation changed for better or for worse? Obviously the situation has changed for the better despite a certain advance registered by the INTUC.

The changes in the correlation of forces shown above pose some new questions in the matter of tradeunion unity. In the postwar period our main concentration in the matter of unity was on winning over the HMS. We had practically no approach to the INTUC, except a formal one. In the new situation this has to change. While not giving up our efforts to unite the HMS workers and unions with the AITUC, the INTUC now demands serious efforts and attention from us. This has become all the more necessary in view of the HMS leadership merging its organisations with the INTUC, as in the railways. Our efforts at TU unity now demand an examination of our approach to the INTUC, and our method of work in relation thereto.

V

In order to determine our approach, the first question that must be categorically answered is: Is the INTUC a tradeunion organisation and to be treated as such or is it a bourgeois organisation of gangsters, strikebreakers and employers' hirelings?

A section of opinion holds the latter view and would evolve our tactics in relation to the INTUC on the basis of this view. But it is rather surprising that even those who hold this view do not object to giving slogans of unity with the INTUC.

Obviously they look upon the slogan of unity as a tactic. This is a wrong understanding of the question of unity. The WFTU considers the question of unity as a basic principle. It advances the slogan of unity not as a matter of tactics, but as one of fundamental principle for the tradeunion movement.

From where does such an opinion proceed? It proceeds from the fact that the INTUC has not come into existence nor built itself up from the spontaneous needs of the work-

ing class. It has grown mainly because of the patronage of the government and the employers and the protection it gets from the law and the police.

For example, had the tea-planters not opened the gardens to the INTUC and given its organisers all the facilities, there would have been no INTUC there. Had the government not hastened to recognise the INTUC unions on the railways, had the labour office of the government of Bombay and the employers in mills not lent all their services to the INTUC, there would have been no INTUC in Bombay textiles possessing 'representative character' according to the industrial relations act and having the exclusive right of representation. The INTUC claims 60,000 members in Bombay textiles, but it can hardly mobilise 5000 for its policies. Despite its opposition, there have been complete strikes in factories in many trades and areas, where government and the employers have chosen to recognise the INTUC as the sole representative organisation. These facts lead many to conclude that the INTUC is not to be treated as a TU organisation.

Though it is true that the INTUC carries out the policies of the Congress and the big bourgeoisie, yet it is a fact that it has some mass basis for carrying out its policies, that not in all cases are its unions devoid of genuine membership.

From where does the mass basis of the INTUC arise? From those factors which we analysed above, from the fact that in India the main weakness in the TU field is that the majority of the workers are not in any organisation and have no deep tradition of tradeunionism and class solidarity and hence quite substantial sections follow the INTUC, from bourgeois-nationalist illusions and a desire to get things done through the patronage of the government and the INTUC rather than through struggles.

The AITUC has not yet succeeded in winning over this mass ideologically and organisationally. This task would be further hampered if we hold the view that the INTUC is merely a gangster-employer agency and has no mass basis either subjectively or objectively.

VI

The second question that is posed is: Is the whole leadership of the INTUC a direct agency of the bourgeoisie, and even of the imperialists because of its affiliation with the ICFTU, or is it only the main hardened leading core to be treated as such?

The same line of reasoning as above would show us that while a small hardened core of the INTUC leadership is a direct agency of the bourgeoisie and some elements through their links with the ICFTU are serving foreign imperialist interests, the whole leadership, despite its wrong or reactionary policies, cannot be characterised as such. Even in the ICFTU only some hardened people like Irving Brown have been found to be and are denounced as direct FBI agents of American imperialism; but not all of them. For example, though Farhad Hached went with the ICFTU and broke with the WFTU we did not denounce him as an imperialist agent. And in the factional squabbles of the imperialist stooges in the ICFTU he was assassinated.

The fact that sections of the INTUC leadership are only misguided people, and as such, are yet capable of being influenced by their own masses gives rise to that phenomenon where, under workers' pressure, the INTUC unions in many places have to take up workers' struggles, despite the bans from the top. Hence not all but only some elements of the INTUC leadership are bourgeois agents; while many of them, especially in the local centres, are just misguided elements amenable to improvement.

VII

The third question that requires to be cleared is: Are all unions of the INTUC to be treated as real trade unions because of the above view, or are there some unions in the INTUC which, by themselves, are only gangster-bourgeois governmental agencies?

While the INTUC is a tradeunion organisation as a whole, it is possible that some of its unions are mere gangster

agencies of the employers. Where they are so, they should be treated as such. But even there they continue to exist as such, despite the absence of any mass base, because of the neutrality or apathy of the mass of workers around, who do not actively fight and uproot the gangsters.

We thus arrive at the conclusion that the INTUC as a whole should be treated as a tradeunion organisation, though not all its unions may be real trade unions and some of them are mere narrow circles of gangster-bourgeois agents.

We also conclude that not the whole leadership of the INTUC is a hardened group of reactionary bourgeois agents; but some individual leaders are so and some of them occupy leading positions in the organisation.

These two conclusions lay down before us the line of our approach to the workers and leaders of the INTUC and its unions. They also should tell us the tactics and slogans that we should pursue in general and also particular cases of unions and leaders.

In general we seek united work with the INTUC unions and their leaders. But in some particular case, where the union is no union at all and the small ring of leaders is thoroughly discredited, call for unity with such leadership or organisation has no meaning for the workers. But such cases are very few and the general line of approach is valid in today's conditions in almost all places.

VIII

The problem of unity in the context of these conclusions raises the vital problem of union-to-union relations, the question of dissolution and merger of unions.

Under what circumstances should we agree to dissolve our union and direct our membership into the INTUC union? Under what circumstances should we break away from an INTUC union and start our own? Under what circumstances should we seek unity from below only by strengthening our own union and breaking the rival one

or both by strengthening our union and also working inside the rival union? Such questions also face our comrades in many places.

It must be clearly stated that unity of the working class cannot be achieved by merely dissolving our unions and liquidating the AITUC as an independent organisation of the working class, as our opponents desire. Mere liquidation of the AITUC only means handing over the working class to the bourgeois leadership and depriving the workers of their best weapon of defence against the onslaught of their enemies. Unity of the working class organisations does not mean one-sided liquidation of this or that organisation, but merger and unity achieved by a process of struggle and agreement on the basis of a program. Hence there is no question of working with a perspective of the dissolution of the AITUC as a national trade union centre.

IX

But there are situations where an individual union in a trade may have to be dissolved to make way for unity and greater consolidation of working class strength.

Such a situation exists, for example, in the railways. There, due to the nature of the employer and the employment, the traditional way in which the unions have evolved and some happenings in the recent past, it may be necessary to unconditionally dissolve our unions and direct our membership to join the unions of the AIRF or the new amalgamated federation.

The leaders of railway unions of the AITUC have taken such a line. At the same time, this conclusion was not applied to the Southern Railway Union, where we decided to continue to work for the greater consolidation of our union, despite the absence of recognition. Similarly the Western Railway comrades report that their union is in some position to secure recognition and, if so, it should continue that effort. These cases, especially that of the SR, are exceptions and not a general policy.

The position of our railway unions, in today's conditions.

does not at all justify the proposal by some comrades to call for a new independent federation of railway unions comprising the SR and other unions.

X

Quite a different situation exists in textiles, engineering, etc. In Bombay, for example, we should refuse to liquidate our Mill Mazdoor Union, despite the fact that the INTUC union there has secured in terms of the industrial relations act exclusive representative capacity, which debars our union from any right to deal with any collective grievances of any section of the textile workers.

Has the INTUC union any real influence over the textile workers in Bombay? No. It has not. Here is a case of the law, the boss and the police all combining to give the INTUC an exclusive monopoly status. Still the INTUC cannot stop any of our strike calls nor can it rally the workers by itself.

Yet the MMU is not able to enrol the mass of the workers on its rolls. The INTUC has full rolls but no influence, the AITUC union has influence but not full rolls.

The reason of our weakness is that, when we have been shut out by law from collective bargaining, we have not taken to systematic organised work on problems of social security, education, housing, which vitally affect the worker and have not tried to build up organisation on the basis of factory and mohalla for these purposes.

Our own organisational lag, the failure of the most advanced and experienced cadres and leaders to unite and mobilise correctly for this work, has been responsible for this situation.

There is also the wrong idea that the failure of the INTUC union to break us in Bombay means a victory for us or a sign that the INTUC has no masses of its own in Bombay textiles. Hence we have made no approach to its masses at all. We denounce its leadership in a mechanical manner, which does not go down well with the INTUC workers. And we also neglected to work from within their union while developing the MMU.

It is time to change our approach in this very vital sector, where we have a working class with long traditions of class battles.

The INTUC is learning its lessons also. It does not behave in Bombay as it does in Ahmedabad, though its policy and makeup is the same in both the places. In Bombay, the majority of the workers do not belong to it and have great traditions of class struggle. Hence in Bombay the INTUC union speaks the language of struggle, fulfilment of demands, strikes and has not openly ratified major agreements of rationalisation permitting largescale unemployment.

This is no doubt a victory for us, but if we do not seriously reorganise our work and approach, we will be outdone.

XI

There are areas where the INTUC leadership has access and recently acquired influence and where we cannot step in easily. For example, tea plantations and mines. Except for a few patches, we have not been able to establish any big union or bases in these areas. The bourgeoisie, in order to avoid us and unable any longer to shut out the will of the workers to have trade unions, allowed the opening of INTUC bases in these trades and areas. The conditions there and the pressure of the workers have in many areas transformed the character of the committees of the INTUC unions from being one of total stooges of the employers to one of committees of workers, leading the struggles but still under reformist influence. In such cases our main emphasis should be to work in these unions, strengthen them and the workingclass elements therein and develop them as genuine trade unions.

There are cases where some of the workers and leading organisers, disgusted with the bureaucratic functioning of the INTUC leadership and its desertion of struggles, wish to secede from the INTUC union and start separate rival unions. Sometimes even the workers press for such

secession because, despite the overwhelming mass discontent, it becomes technically impossible to oust the INTUC leadership. Under such conditions one must know if the discontent of the masses is temporary, arising from a particular grievance, or is a sustained one arising from continued experience. Then one must also know if the seceding people would be able to withstand the attack of the employers, especially where the employer is the state and the industry is such a one as a defence establishment. Thus it is clear that not in all cases is it wise to secede and start a new union.

We have argued so far about the INTUC because, as stated above, it has become the major problem. There is no point of controversy regarding united work or unity with the HMS and the UTUC.

XII

The movement for TU unity is expressing itself very strongly in the attitude of some unions and federations, who refuse to join any of the central organisations, and choose to remain neutral or unattached.

Many unions and federations of government employees, of middleclass workers of offices, banks, insurance companies, etc. take the stand that they would not join in any central TU organisation, as joining one or the other divides their ranks. Such federations and unions are becoming quite a big force and our work with them and within them must take note that this is a genuine feeling among the workers and is not merely a manoeuvre of a few leaders. It was a noticeable feature, for example, in Bombay at the end of the war in 1946 that strike meetings where workers of the Congress and the AITUC had united in joint struggle would be held without any flag, lest the red flag or congress flag divide their unity and struggle. We developed this form in order to maintain unity, until experience led the workers to choose the AITUC.

This was a temporary phase but it was there as a stage

in unity. Many a time such an attitude of the masses is really an expression of their desire for unity.

XIII

Despite this desire to remain neutral or unattached to any of the four national centres, what is most noticeable and positive is the fact that the trade unions belonging to all the four central organisations come together and form an independent trade federation. In the recent period have been formed, the All-India Cement Federation, Airways Workers Federation, Oil and Petroleum Workers' Federation, and the biggest of them all, the Defence Employees' Federation. Besides these are such big all-India organisations as the Bank Employees' Federation, the Union of the Post and Telegraph Workers. Workers and unions owing allegiance to all the national centres, i.e. the INTUC, the AITUC, the HMS and the UTUC have joined in these trade federations.

From this it can be seen that all is not a picture of disunity and that workers are forging unity in various ways.

Our task in these federations is to develop them as genuine united democratic mass organisations of their particular trade. We should not hustle them into joining this or that national centre or try to capture posts or positions, but concentrate on the struggles and demands of the trade concerned, as the bank, the oil, the defence workers are doing.

XIV

One more noticeable feature of unity is that some organisations, who would not unite here in India would join hands in an international delegation and show sympathy or agreement with the aims of the WFTU. Such a phenomenon was seen among the delegation from the HMS, the UTUC and the AITUC who were invited to Peking for May Day. With the experience of the international gatherings, many shed their prejudices about us and the way to unity was made clear.

XV

On these matters the report of the executive of the WFTU has some remarks to offer from which extracts are quoted below for study and guidance.

Noting the position of the AITUC in the past and the present the report says:

"In countries such as Japan and India there has never been a period of real organic tradeunion unity on a national scale. Up to 1947 the tradeunion organisations belonging to WFTU contained the majority of the organised workers.

"During succeeding years, changes have taken place. The majority of the organised workers are no longer in organisations affiliated to the WFTU. This majority is now in the tradeunion organisations not affiliated to the WFTU.

"Here the problem of united action and tradeunion unity is now set against the fact that the tradeunion organisations belonging to the WFTU do not now include the majority of the organised workers of these countries, though they exercise a real influence in the national tradeunion movement."

XVI

As to the plank on which TU unity should be worked for, the report says:

"PRINCIPLES FOR UNITED WORK

"We have pointed out above the way in which some tactical problems arise for the advancement of united action as a means of struggle for the immediate demands of the workers in the capitalist and colonial countries.

"For all these countries it must be noted that the appropriate tactical methods must take into account the following principles with a view to making unity work possible and move fruitful:

"(a) To reveal the spirit of initiative, to develop this spirit among the masses, and to learn from the masses their real possibilities for action.

"(b) To eliminate feelings of false superiority when facts show the weakness of the organisation and the workers note the failure of this work; to be specific and objective.

"(c) To prove in daily actions and in the facts themselves the desire to eliminate sectarianism and opportunism other than by more or less theoretical speeches and writings.

"(d) To bring about the effective democratic functioning of the trade unions, to fight for tradeunion democracy when it is violated, to organise collective work within the tradeunion leadership.

"(e) To organise the mass work and to wipe out tradeunion bureaucracy wherever it reveals itself.

"(f) To consider a tradeunion organisation as a nonparty mass organisation of all the workers, not to restrict its forms of organisation with the aim of making it incorrectly play the role which falls to the political vanguard of the working class.

"(g) To find the most correct organisational forms and to draw up programs for unity activities and of tradeunion demands; when the facts show that the workers are politically divided among different political parties and trends the tradeunion organisation must not, by its methods of action and internal functioning, be exclusively reserved for one or the other group of workers who are temporarily separated from the political point of view.

"To take measures so that the unity composition of the tradeunion organisation is shown in the composition of the tradeunion leadership, which should include representatives of the different political trends existing.

"To attach greater importance to questions of tradeunion recruitment and to call on the unorganised workers to take part in the mass actions planned, in order to prepare them for tradeunion membership.

"(h) To expose to the workers all manoeuvres undertaken

to hinder their unity, and for this purpose to carry out broad work of explanation and information among the workers who are still influenced by the splitters.

“If these various recommendations can be applied in our daily activities, they will enable our local, national and international tradeunion organisations to fulfil their role and to improve their methods of action for rallying the workers for all their struggles and to undertake greater ones.”

12. The Situation in Kashmir

The central committee of the Communist Party of India views with grave concern the reports coming from Kashmir that some leading personalities of the Sheikh Abdullah group and its supporters in the National Conference have made public declarations that the state of Kashmir should be made independent of India and that its new status be guaranteed by India, Pakistan and the United Nations.

It is also stated that the areas of Jammu and Ladakh should be allowed to be fully incorporated in the Indian Union.

It is clear that these declarations mean that the problem of Kashmir is entering a new and very serious phase of its crisis, as serious as when Kashmir was made an object of invasion five years ago.

These declarations first mean that the Kashmir valley separates itself from even the limited but vital ties it has with India which are expressed in the act of limited accession of Kashmir and Jammu to India and the further mutual aid visualised in the Delhi agreement.

Secondly, it means that Kashmir undergoes a new partition in which the vicious principle that predominantly muslim and hindu areas cannot and should not remain together is implicitly admitted.

Such a partition will again encourage those forces of communal reaction and their imperialist inspirers who have so long imposed innumerable atrocities and so much harm on the people of India and Pakistan, Jammu and Kashmir.

Resolution adopted by the central committee, Delhi, 23-29 July 1953.
published in *Crossroads*, 2 August 1953.

The fine traditions of the Kashmir people, who have been immune from the virus, are thus sought to be destroyed to the mutual loss of the people of both India and Kashmir where hindu-muslim amity will be put to a new strain.

The third and the most disastrous outcome of the line is the proposal that the United Nations should guarantee this new independent state of Kashmir from any aggression.

Anyone knowing the character of the United Nations as it is today and the way it is dominated by the Anglo-American imperialist bloc, which has been mainly responsible for fomenting dissensions between India and Pakistan on the issue of Kashmir, will see that the guarantee by the UNO means importing American military forces into Kashmir, and, in course of time, its incorporation in the Pakistan areas which are being made the bases of by warmongering plans of America.

Thus the alluring slogan of independent Kashmir becomes a reactionary slogan that will hand over Kashmir to the imperialist warmongers, allowing their forces to occupy the strategic valley of Kashmir and threaten the peace of all its neighbouring states, including that of India.

The central committee, therefore, calls upon all democratic forces in India and the state of Jammu and Kashmir to prevent this new disaster overtaking our people.

But in order to find the path to prevent this disaster, it is necessary to know how it has come to pass that these leaders, who not long ago were adhering to a noncommunal and democratic standpoint have now taken to such a line against the interests of the people? What has led them to this path?

The people of Kashmir and Jammu are in the grip of the same economic crisis that has overtaken the economy of India and its people, the same crisis that is affecting all the capitalist countries and underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa.

The millions of peasants, artisans, middleclass people,

traders, etc. are suffering from low income, high prices, poverty and unemployment and with no near prospect of any way out of the crisis.

The people of Kashmir beat the raiders back with the help of the Indian army; they fought for a land law that was expected to rid them of the burdens of landlordism; they removed the old maharaja and had their own constituent assembly with power to make their own constitution. But all that has not been sufficient to resolve the problems of life of the people.

The government of Sheikh Abdullah and the government of India have both failed to solve the main problems of people's living, of land, work and trade.

The agents of American imperialists in the guise of the United Nations observers and landlord reactionaries have taken advantage of the dissatisfaction of the people to put forward the idea that a separation from India and independent existence will enable them to solve their problems with the alluring promises of loans and aids from the UNO and the Americans to develop an independent Kashmir state.

An independent Kashmir can also open the trade whose natural routes lie through Pakistan but are now blocked because of Kashmir's accession to India.

With some plausibility these forces argue that if the India government can follow the path of taking loans from the Americans to tide over its difficulties, why should not an independent Kashmir be able to do it.

The leaders of the Sheikh Abdullah group, who have held the reins of government so far, now want to pursue this line in order to hide their failures and divert the attention of the masses from these failures and their real reasons.

The reactionaries fail to point out the fate of South Korea that was occupied and devastated by the UNO-Americans, the fate of the nearest neighbour state of Afghanistan, whose economy has been looted by the Americans and the fate of even India which, because of its

being tied up with sterling and dollar capital, is unable to take its independent road to progress.

In order to save its own narrow interests, this group is utilising the ignorance of the masses, their discontent with the existing government, to sidetrack them into the worst disaster that would follow Kashmir's separation from India and its lineup with the UNO or Pakistan.

The government of Sheikh Abdullah failed because it did not fully implement the land laws that were intended to rid the peasant of burdens of landlordism. It obstructed and suppressed the peasant forces that were implementing the laws with their own action. It allowed unreasonable levies on the peasant producers, and allowed speculators and landlords to get hold of them in the name of feeding the towns.

It failed to prevent corruption in its own apparatus, which in the early stages of the incoming of the new state, had the advantage of being run by the leadership of the National Conference and was not made of hardened bureaucrats.

But when these new rulers themselves began to be transformed into the image of the old rulers, the Sheikh Abdullah government did not allow the democratic masses to bring up their independent mass organisations and forces to correct the newly-rising reactionaries.

It now wants to hide its failures by diversionary slogans of independence to mislead the people.

The reactionaries in the governmental circles in India have also helped in the development by insisting on full accession, on retaining the maharaja and the privy purse, and by trying to grab the economy of Kashmir in the interests of the big monopolists of India and by refusing to help the new state with greater financial aid unless their terms of full financial integration were accepted.

Moreover, the failure of the Sheikh Abdullah group to satisfy the just demands of the Jammu people in the matter of their language, service-employment and administrative autonomy without separation from Kashmir, enabled the landlord reactionaries to use the discontent of

the people, and the help which certain reactionary hindu circles rendered them has enabled some leaders of the Sheikh group to easily sow the idea in the minds of the Kashmiri people of a fresh partition and separation from India.

Under such circumstances, the democratic forces in Kashmir and Jammu must come forward to save the people from these new designs of the imperialists and their conscious supporters or misguided unconscious votaries.

The democratic forces must refuse to separate Kashmir from India as such separation will not mean independence for the people but enslavement and further impoverishment.

The status that Kashmir has today by the act of limited accession, and even the terms of the Delhi agreement, is such that thereby its people not only unite in friendship with India, but they also stand to gain from the vast strength of the economy of India, which is capable of helping Kashmir to grow prosperous, provided the democratic forces on either side were able to make the governments follow democratic policies.

By limited accession, Kashmir retains its right to frame her own constitution, its own fundamental rights, its own laws to abolish landlordism without compensation, its right to remove the maharaja and the privy purse and the right to be independent of the interference of the president of the Indian Republic.

The democratic forces both in Kashmir and India must struggle to let Kashmir retain this status of virtual independence within the framework of the Indian Union to which it accedes in the very sense of limited accession.

The existence of the Indian army must not mean and does not mean the occupation of Kashmir by an alien hostile conquering force interfering in the life of the people.

The Indian army only defends Kashmir against foreign invasion, which task was given to it by the free consent of the Kashmiri people. The Indian army must behave as a friend for defence and not as a police force against the people, interfering in the internal affairs of the country.

The democratic forces on either side must see that the Delhi agreement renders adequate financial aid for solving the crisis in the life of the people and is not used as a weapon to draw Kashmir within the vicious grip of the monopoly financiers of India.

They must resist full financial integration of the two states, as under present conditions the powerful finance circles of India and their budgetary manoeuvres will ruin the weak economy of Kashmir and sow further seeds of suspicion and discontent.

Mutual benefit and development of people's interests must be the key to all agreements and their implementation.

While today Kashmir with its limited accession has all the advantages of independence and autonomy without being a prey to foreign intervention, the new slogans of separation and partition would land Kashmir in the hands of imperialist warmongers and worst looters of its people.

The democratic forces on either side must see that the peasants of Kashmir are helped to rid themselves of the burden of landlordism. We must see that friendly agreements between India and Pakistan are made to help open trade to the benefit of all and that a prosperous peasant and honest trader helps the artisan to get upon his feet again.

The democratic forces must campaign for the rights of the Jammu and Ladakh people, in the matter of language, services, local administrative and financial autonomy and civil liberties.

Only when democratic forces inside and outside the National Conference and the constituent assembly of Kashmir, basing themselves on the kisan sabhas and other organisations of the people, build a powerful democratic front and with the aid of their brethren in India develop a powerful movement and organisation to solve the problem of land, rent, taxes, civil liberties and the development of Kashmir's economy and succeed in thwarting the forces of imperialist intervention, will the state of Kashmir and Jammu progress on the road to prosperity and independence.

13. The Situation in Kashmir Following the Dismissal of Sheikh Abdullah

The dismissal of Sheikh Abdullah by sardar-i-riyasat and the formation of a new Kashmiri government has come as the culmination of recent developments in Kashmir since Adlai Stevenson's visit there.

Sheikh Abdullah fell in line with the American intrigues and came out for an independent Kashmir to be guaranteed by UNO, i.e. the Americans.

The majority in his cabinet and in the National-Conference working committee have opposed this move, as detrimental to the Kashmiri people and stood for continued association with India, under the terms of limited accession and Delhi agreement as the best guarantee of their autonomous status and of moulding a democratic Kashmir, with the help of the democratic movement in India.

In Kashmir, there will be great confusion among the people. The pro-Pakistan elements and American agents will try to utilise this situation to rouse the people against India, even inciting communal feelings. They will utilise every weak spot, every corrupt practice of the government, every economic grievance of the people for this purpose.

It is the job of all democratic elements to be alert and take the initiative to become the champions of people against any antipopular measure or action of the government while exposing the pro-American and communal reactionary elements.

They must be especially on guard against the watering down of the agrarian reforms and curtailing democratic rights and demand greater reforms.

This statement of the politbureau was published in **Crossroads**, 16 August 1953.

The government of India has to thank itself for the serious situation with which they are faced now in Kashmir. They were manoeuvred by Lord Mountbatten to refer the issue to UNO and allowed Anglo-American imperialists to meddle in Kashmir affairs so far.

They have allowed, under the garb of UNO observers, large number of Americans to stay in Kashmir and carry on their nefarious activities for the last six years.

Will the government of India take courage and take drastic steps to remove American agents from Kashmir and declare that the fate of Kashmir shall be decided by the people of Kashmir alone and that they will not allow any British or American intervention, even in the garb of UNC?

Will the government of India do away with the rule of princely autocrats, in the name of rajpramukhs, nizams or sadar-i-riyasats and assure the people democratic government, land and bread to the peasants and to the toiling masses?

The people of Kashmir will continue to be on the side of India only if they see that the government of India and the democratic movement in India are doing everything to relieve their acute economic distress and that their status of autonomy is not interfered with.

Already communal and vested reactionary elements in India like Hindu Mahasabha and Jana Sangh, who by their communal agitation in Jammu and India and for total merger of Kashmir into India have strengthened communal and pro-Pakistani elements in Kashmir valley, are claiming that the dismissal of the Sheikh Abdullah government is their victory and clamouring for total merger of Kashmir with India.

There can be no more suicidal slogans than these. The democratic elements in India must rouse themselves and fight these communal reactionaries and their slogans and actions a hundredfold more strongly, and rout them if we have to defeat the pro-Pakistan and American elements in Kashmir and even more, if we have to save the democratic movement in India itself.

The Communist Party appeals to all democratic elements in Jammu and Kashmir and especially to the workers of National Conference: Realise the grave danger of your beloved Kashmir valley being drawn into the clutches of American imperialists under the garb of 'Independent Kashmir Valley' slogan.

Remember your glorious national struggle waged over the last two decades against princely autocratic rule and against feudalism and for a new democratic Kashmir. Remember the glorious defence you have put up against the raiders who wanted to seize Kashmir in 1947.

Stand firm and fight both against those who want to drag you under American domination as well as against those who want total merger and to destroy the autonomy guaranteed to you.

Forge a broad united democratic movement and organisation to carry on the struggle successfully.

The democratic forces in India shall be with you in your struggle and shall carry their part of the job in routing the communal and vested reactionary interests here in India.

14. Regarding the People's Democratic Front in Hyderabad

We have had to wait so long after our talks at Hyderabad before we could reply to your letter because we wanted to discuss it in our central committee and give you a considered reply. This was so because of the importance of the issues you have raised, viz the character, the form and the method of building the united-front movement in India in general and in Hyderabad in particular. We hope you will understand the delay.

It is natural and correct for the democratic parties to seek clarification of the views and understanding of other parties. We certainly welcome the opportunity for friendly discussion with you on some of the fundamental problems facing the democratic movement in India. But we are sorry to find in your letter that you have not only raised questions of united front, but in doing so have resorted to baseless accusations and the exploded slanders that are the usual stock-in-trade of anticommunists.

It was the Communist Party of India that first put forward the very concept of a united front of all democratic forces in India. We have been advocating and we continue to work for the realisation of a united democratic front. This is so because we firmly believe that only the coming together of all democratic parties, groups and even indivi-

Govindlal M. Shroff (League of Socialist Workers) and Dr M. N. Jaisooraya (Democratic People's Party) sent a letter on 2 September 1953 to the politburo of the CPI expressing dissatisfaction at the way in which the people's democratic front of Hyderabad was being functioned. In the course of this letter they put forward their own opinions regarding the PDF—its character, form, role, etc. In this way certain basic issues and questions were raised concerning the united-front tactics of the CPI. On behalf of the CC, P. Ramamurti replied and answered these questions on 16 November. Both the letters were printed who have letter, No. 1, 25 February 1954. Here only Ramamurti's ad.

duals will enable the democratic forces to defeat the reactionary congress regime—the regime that safeguards interests of landlords, the British imperialists and the monopolists collaborating with them.

We are equally convinced that what India needs today is not single-party government but a government based on a coalition of all democratic forces. Only such a government replacing the existing congress government and implementing a democratic program will be able to solve the present problems of our people, build our national economy and ensure the well-being of our people.

It is this firm faith that has enabled the Communist Party to strive its hardest in Travancore-Cochin, in Hyderabad, in Madras, in Bengal, in UP—in fact in every part of the country to build the united front despite many ups and downs. The recent struggles that were conducted in Bengal are but the latest examples of the strenuous efforts that the Communist Party puts up in order to build the united front for safeguarding and defending the interests of the people.

Before we proceed further, it is necessary to state that we are not in agreement with your conception of the united democratic front. We are convinced that your conception, far from bringing together the existing political parties, will lead to their further estrangement. Far from helping to build the unity of the classes and their united mass organisations, your conception will lead to further disruption of the mass organisations and of whatever unity has already been achieved in them. It will thus lead to the weakening of the democratic movement itself and negate the very objective of the united democratic front, viz the unity of democratic forces.

You advocate that the united democratic front today "must have direct basis and loyalty of mass organisations"; that it must be an organisation "formulating and executing its program and policy democratically and within its own right" and "with its own discipline". You further state: "Today the united front of parties should not be an effective or countrywide proposition. Its main basis be of a

united political front of mass organisations, then the united front should be of countrywide and uniform character."

You further advocate that the political parties "should be represented at all levels of the united-front organisations but the representation of parties should not outweigh the representation of mass organisations".

You want that "the mass organisations should be autonomous as far as their economic problems are concerned; but should be united politically with the united front as the common political expression. They should have major representation at all levels of the united front."

It will thus be seen that your conception is one of another political party, a superparty or a political organisation "formulating and executing its program and policies and in its own right and with its own discipline". Such a concept is not a concept of the united front at all. The very basis of the concept of the united front is the independence of the various parties, groups and individuals but they act together on the basis of agreement with regard to different issues or for a common program.

Communist Party's conception of united front is basically a front of classes. Our party has placed a program before the people with its edge directed against the landlords and against the British imperialists. Our program demands land to the peasant and of freeing our economy from the shackles of British imperialism. We believe that the fulfilment of such a program is in the interest of all classes of our people except the feudal landlords. Although these classes may have mutually conflicting interests, nonetheless the fact remains that imperialism and feudalism constitute the common enemies of all and constitute the biggest obstacle standing in the way of our country's progress. Our concept of united front arises from these common interests between these various classes.

In our country today different democratic political parties or groups exist, some countrywide, some confined to some provinces alone, who have following among these

various classes—to some extent in some classes and to a greater extent in others. These parties have their own ideologies, their own political and organisational conceptions. It will not help us to discuss here which party represents which class most or which ideology or practice is more correct. We have to take this reality of the existence of these parties and groups. Wishing them away will not do.

You demand that all these parties should agree “to a common program and propagate this under the auspices of the united democratic front alone, while each party has the freedom to express its differences from its own platform”.

In other words the independent activities of these parties and groups will be reduced to that of propaganda groups whereas practically all the activities connected with the mass movement must be conducted only by the united democratic front. That means the different political parties will have no right to function independently on the day-to-day issues of the mass movement.

Such a demand will not help in bringing together the existing parties. You will realise that under the existing conditions it is difficult even for the existing democratic parties and groups to agree on a common program for a whole period at the present stage of our struggle. To give only one instance, even parties who profess Marxism like the RSP, Forward Bloc (Marxist), the Peasants' and Workers' Party, disagree on many essential matters—both national and international. Naturally with this disagreement on some of the fundamental problems affecting national and international policies, in actual practice we will have many differences in day-to-day practice.

Apart from these parties it is absolutely necessary to bring together the PSP, and many other groups and even many congressmen who are getting disillusioned with the policies of the congress leadership. In fact, it was because of the failure to see this necessity of bringing together all the democratic elements that the PDF in Hyderabad refused to come to an agreement with the PWP (Peasants' and

Workers' Party) even to avoid triangular contests in the last general elections. We know the consequences.

Insisting on the acceptance of our minimum program or the program of any other party or groups will certainly not be conducive to the bringing together of all the democratic parties, groups and individuals.

Under the existing conditions therefore it is only the coming together of the various groups, parties and individuals on whatever issues and in whatever places they can and leading the masses in their day-to-day struggles that will help in the process of the development of the united front. As a result of the coming together and leading the struggles of the masses common understanding grows between the parties which helps in the process of the crystallisation of the common program. The agreement on such a program itself will become wider and wider as a result of struggling together and leading the masses in their struggles.

We judge everything on this basis. Whatever helps in the development of the united struggles of the masses helps the development of the united front. Whatever hinders the development of the struggles of the masses also hinders the development of the united front.

It will be clear therefore that the building up of the united front is a process which takes into account the existing concrete realities. It is no use bemoaning the fact that there are parties and groups which are not of an all-India character. It is not enough if we build a sort of left unity. The task is to build a broad front of democratic parties, groups and individuals.

We must be prepared to have agreement even on a local scale on issues and demands and act together with whatever political party or groups or even prominent individuals who are prepared to join hands with us. As we have pointed out earlier the agreement may be on one issue or on a number of issues. It is with this kind of united functioning and building the united democratic committees for specific purposes that will lead to greater and greater under-

standing among the various elements, draw them closer and will lead ultimately to a stronger and cohesive united democratic front organisation.

UNITED DEMOCRATIC FRONT AND MASS ORGANISATIONS

We feel that at the present stage and under the existing conditions the UDF can only be a front of political parties, groups and individuals arriving at agreements from place to place and time to time, ever widening the scope of these agreements and it cannot be a mass political organisation to begin with even on a local or provincial scale, leave alone an all-India scale.

Your demand that "mass organisations should be autonomous as far their economic problems are concerned but that they should be politically in the united front as the common political expression" is basically a wrong proposition. Mass organisations are the embodiment of the unity of the class. It cannot surrender its right to any other organisation.

Secondly, the acceptance of such a proposition would lead to the disruption of the mass organisation. Certain congressmen and socialists have set up their own trade unions and other mass organisations. This path has led to the disruption of the unity of the mass organisations.

Working class and other people are realising to a greater and greater extent during the last five years that disunity in their class organisations weakens them in their struggle against the exploiters, and the urge for unity is growing rapidly among them. To follow the discredited path of those who have attempted to disrupt the unity of the mass organisations will be wrong. Such a course, instead of helping the masses to conduct their struggles, would help the exploiters to succeed in their attacks on the masses. Therefore this course today would lead to the undermining of the very foundation of the development of the UDF viz the struggles of the masses.

We feel that today, in the conditions prevailing in the

country, where the unity of the trade unions, kisan sabhas and other mass organisations has got to be fought for and immediately achieved, no mass organisation can be affiliated to the democratic front in any part of our country. Once you make it a condition that the mass organisation—either trade union or kisan sabha or any other—should be affiliated to a political party—be it the Congress, the PSP, or the UDF—no united mass organisation can be built. The Communist Party has never accepted and can never accept the theory of mass organisations being subordinated to a political party. It has always advocated for united mass organisations where its members are free to hold any political view but submit to the democratic decision of the majority of the workers.

UDF' IN ASSEMBLIES AND PARLIAMENT

You have objected to our functioning in the parliament in the name of our own party. On top of it you also allege that Ajoy Ghosh had admitted it to be a tactical blunder.

We deny this allegation against our general secretary as entirely baseless. Our central committee resolution of March 1952 was very categorical and laid down the course we should follow in the parliament. That resolution was openly published and in a meeting of parliament members, which was attended by Dr Jaisoorya himself, Dange explained that resolution. It was not objected to by anyone then.

In pursuance of that resolution we have been attempting to form a coordinating committee of different political parties, groups and individuals in parliament. We have made it clear that each party can function in its own name while on all agreed issues all parties, either in their own name or in the name of the united front, can present a united opposition. It is because of this we have been able to preserve a large measure of unity and agreement so far. Many a time members belonging to the USO, PDF and KSP have made statements and allegations which we would never

have allowed to go on behalf of the UDF without then and there repudiating them.

From all these it will be clear that our approach to this problem of building and consolidating the united front is not based on the Communist Party's desire to impose its will on other parties and groups. We do not insist on their acceptance of our program or demand that they merge into the UDF, but seek to cooperate with them on the basis of that to which a particular group or party or individual agrees.

It will equally be clear that we believe that the only way to build the UDF on a countrywide scale is by way of various democratic parties and groups and individuals coming together on whatever issues and in whatever places they can agree to work and lead the masses in their day-to-day struggles to get their demands and building the various mass organisations as united organs of struggle. As the struggles develop, understanding among the parties will grow, leading and producing the agreement between them. Thus alone it will be possible to set up a countrywide united-front organisation, without sacrificing the independence of particular parties or groups.

The stark reality that has to be faced is that different parties and groups have not come together on the basis of joint and united struggles of the masses over a long period. Only in the recent past they are being drawn together in a number of struggles over wide areas of our country.

In spite of the fact that political unity on a programmatic basis has not been achieved between different political parties and groups, immense possibilities are opening up for coming together on various issues affecting our people and together leading the struggles of the masses on an unprecedented scale.

When an agreement is reached on any issue and a united front is formed, the Communist Party is anxious and will do everything in its power to develop common activity under the auspices of the united front. This is exactly what we do, for example, in the recent struggles at Calcutta and elsewhere.

But it must be clearly understood that the development of such joint activity is not dependent on the Communist Party alone. Other parties and groups also must agree to it. The Communist Party cannot impose its will on the other parties and groups. It can only argue and persuade.

But where the other parties or groups do not agree to such joint activity the Communist Party cannot sit quiet with folded hands. It cannot ask the masses to wait till there is agreement between the various parties.

The party has a duty by the masses and it will mobilise them on every political, economical and social issue irrespective of the fact that it has not been able to achieve agreements with other parties. At the same time, the Communist Party does not stand in the way of other parties doing likewise.

It is that what the central committee resolution of March 1953, which you have quoted, **emphasises**.

The united front does not grow and get consolidated by Communist Party or other parties giving up such mobilisation, but on the other hand, such mobilisation facilitates the coming together and joint activity of democratic parties and groups.

Our approach to the whole problem is based on two factors that are of fundamental importance. Firstly, no party will be allowed to impose its will on others and the independence of each party will be fully guaranteed. Secondly, different parties functioning in the UDF and developing the united mass movement instead of weakening the component parties will only strengthen themselves. We also believe that the stronger the political parties the stronger will be the UDF movement.

It is because of all these considerations that UDF committees at various levels will have to be a front of parties, groups and influential individuals and function as coordinating bodies and cannot become alternative political organisations. No mass organisation should be affiliated to the UDF committees at the present stage.

It is not for us now to speculate when the UDF organi-

sation will develop on a countrywide scale in future, what organisational structure it will assume, whether mass organisations will be represented by means of collective affiliation along with political parties or will have individual membership etc.

UNITED DEMOCRATIC FRONT IN HYDERABAD

All this applies to the PDF in Hyderabad.

Here we have to make one point very clear. In your letter you say "evidence supports the conclusion that in Hyderabad people have thought in terms of the PDF, rather than in terms of constituent parties of the PDF. It matters little to them whether it is a party or a united front". The reality in Hyderabad and especially in Telangana is the other way round.

We would also take this opportunity of clearing the misunderstanding which you seem to have developed as is evident from your statement that "after one year's consideration and hesitation, reserving the unfettered right of the party, they have permitted the PDF some organisational structure and executive function similar to the one adopted by the PDF council as an interim agreement in June 1952". We did consent to the setting up of PDF committees up to taluk level in Telangana; but we were very clear then, as we are today, that no PDF committee can be formed either at taluk or town or any level unless there are other political parties or influential individuals who are prepared to come into a united front committee along with the Communist Party.

You yourself have stated in your letter that "it would be better to have straightway a coordinating front with no day-to-day executive function".

We agree with you that in the present stage of development, the PDF in Hyderabad should function as a coordinating body, which shall meet and discuss various issues and come to agreement between the parties, groups

and individuals for the development of common mass campaign and struggle.

It is not that we are denying the UDF committee's daily functions. But in fact we want every local committee to ever-widen its daily functions day by day, ever-widen the common understanding on a larger number of issues and draw into its activities larger numbers of groups and individuals.

It is obvious that decisions in this committee can only be taken on the basis of unanimity. And where no unanimity is reached, each party is free to take its own course of action. We are not prepared to accept your decision that in local PDF committees decisions can be taken by two-thirds majority, unless all the representatives of a political party unanimously vote against the particular decision.

Our approach is a democratic approach. From our experience at Calcutta, in Hyderabad, in Madras and elsewhere we know what happens. When UDF committees are formed, we give equal representation to every small group or individual along with mass parties. When a mass party disagrees with the particular issue and refuses to give up its stand, the overwhelming majority present can accuse the party as not accepting the 'overwhelming' democratic vote or decision. It is clear that this democratic vote does not represent the overwhelming majority of the people mobilised behind all these parties. But if the same party should insist that these PDF committees be formed on the basis of their respective strength, then it will be a very difficult position for the smaller parties and groups. The mass party would be accused of trying to swamp others. On this basis there would never be a united-front committee.

It is just because of this we insist that the UDF committees take decisions by agreement on the issues that face them.

As far as the legislature of Hyderabad is concerned, the parties and groups and individuals in the PDF should, we think, function as a front on the various questions that come up in the legislature on the basis of agreement. Where

no agreement is reached, each party must be free to take its own stand.

It should be clearly understood that the front inside the assembly is there only for the purpose of legislative activities. They can have a common program which they should endeavour to fight for inside the assembly and campaign for outside unitedly, thus helping the building of united mass campaigns and struggles.

QUESTIONS OF WORKINGCLASS LEADERSHIP

We are amazed at your statement:

"So far the Indian proletariat as such has neither led the struggle of the peasants and other working people, nor has it developed to any tangible extent that social and revolutionary consciousness as the Russian proletariat in 1918. The workingclass leadership therefore in practice means CPI leadership and in our experience they have always attempted to equate leadership with CPI leadership, since the CPI does not recognise any other party than itself as the workingclass party. We may be mistaken, but this is the impression we have gained from the actions and behaviour of their lesser lights with the petty commissar mentality. But, all things considered, the CPI has failed to establish itself in national leadership in the past. It is also admitted that it has passed through, and has not yet completed passing through, a series of serious sectarian periods. In such a background the slogan takes a shape in practice to somehow impose this leadership on every front at all strategic levels. The 'somehow' includes even undemocratic methods and intrigues. That leads to undemocratic functioning and a gulf between the CPI and the other constituents of the front. It must also be pointed out that this call is not merely local but from the centre and probably forms a basic principle."

We cannot write here a history of Indian workingclass movement and its role in the national struggle for freedom, without which we despair to convince you of the fantastic

formulations made in the above quotation. It is the working class that gave the national movement one of the most effective forms of struggle, the mass general strike, which the bourgeoisie tried its best to discourage by placing before the people its own specific 'satyagraha' form of struggle. The glorious part the working class has played by means of its struggles not only on the economic plane but on the political plane as well as was evidenced in 1946 during the days of the RIN mutiny need not be repeated here.

It is also necessary to point out that it is the workingclass struggle that had inspired the organisation of the kisan sabha and other class organisations.

We never stated that by shouting at the top of our voice 'workingclass leadership' it would be established. The role and the leadership of the working class will be accepted as it wages struggles in support of the various other classes, in support of their struggles and demands.

We are convinced that to the extent the working class in alliance with the peasantry builds a revolutionary movement to that extent sections of the middle classes, intelligentsia and later even the national bourgeoisie will rally in the UDF. We will certainly approach the intelligentsia and the middle classes positively and patiently explain to them the undeniable fact that their interests as well as the future of the Indian people lie in their joining the front of the working class and peasantry and not that of the landlords and the monopolists. We can never accept the theory that the basis of the Indian revolutionary movement is the middle class and the intelligentsia. Your interpretation of Chinese history, we must point out, is totally wrong. Instead of depending on stray quotations from people like Jack Belden, we would request you to study the writing of the authoritative leaders of Chinese revolution such as Mao and Liu Shao-chi.

The three-three-three system that the Chinese comrades adopted came not when they started building the united democratic movement but at an advanced stage of the revolution, when the united front had grown in struggles,

and when they elected people's government councils in liberated areas. It was in these councils that they adopted this system.

It is no use quoting that example here when the united front movement is in the beginning stages.

We do not think it necessary to answer here your insinuations of "undemocratic methods and intrigues", "lesser lights with petty-commissar mentality", etc. Suffice it for us to point out that we have functioned more democratically than any other party in the country.

In this connection, we must point out that in spite of our anxieties to continue PDF, it was Shri Dhage, one of your members, under the advice of Shri Jaisoorya, who had joined the "Democratic Party" in the council of states, a party which consists of maharajas and even the ex-razakar minister Shri B. S. Venkatrao.

The path of our party is not a series of sectarian periods. We certainly do not claim to have been infallible. Nonetheless our policies have been far more correct than that of any other political party in the country. Our past has been one of heroic suffering and selfsacrifice while leading unflinchingly the struggles of our people. That is why the people have been turning to us more and more. We do not deny that we have made sometimes serious mistakes. But it is also an undeniable fact that we have woken up to them by our own experience and corrected them. Our whole party literature is a proof of this.

It is true that the Communist Party has to go a long way before its guidance will be accepted by the overwhelming majority of the working class and other masses of our country as correct. We have still to go a long way before we secure the full confidence of the overwhelming majority of our people. But that is no reason why we should give up our understanding of the political situation and our policies and struggles in the interest of the people when they are convinced that they are correct.

CARRY FORWARD NATIONAL TRADITIONS

You repeat the usual anticommunist slanders that the CPI does not find "it advisable to recognise and assimilate the national movement, the best traditions and following of the country and its people".

We are proud of our country and our people's best achievements and struggles. In fact the working class and peasants of our country have laid down glorious traditions under the leadership of the party. We are doing our best to carry forward the best traditions of the national movement in the present conditions, discarding all that is dead and obsolete. It is because of this that the vast majority of the old revolutionaries from the Gadar babas, Babar Akalis, Bhagat Singh's colleagues, Bengal revolutionaries and numberless patriots drawn from the congress movements have already joined our party. And more and more are turning towards us all over the country.

EXTRATERRITORIAL LOYALTIES

It is no wonder after thus repeating the abovementioned slanders you have taken up this one, of all our policies being determined by "Moscow or Comintern or Cominform", in other words by "extraterritorial loyalties". The imperialists and feudal landlords and the monopolists who collaborate with the imperialists have been repeating this slander. The development of our party and the growing support of the people prove that they did not succeed in confusing the people by this myth.

Our loyalty is to our own country, which means to the mass of our people. We have stood and fought for the freedom of India and its people and its unity. We have always exposed the feudal landlords and monopolists, their parties and their leadership, how they have been betraying our national interests, the cause of India's freedom and Indian unity in the interests of foreign imperial-

ists, especially the British imperialists. And we will continue to do it. In fact, our program is the only program which can guarantee freedom and independence of our country and the unfettered sovereignty of its people. And we will fight for it doggedly.

Our theory of nationality and selfdetermination never meant separation of different nationalities in India leading to disruption of Indian unity and partition of India. We have concretised this in very unambiguous terms, in the demand for linguistic states and provincial autonomy in the united democratic people's republic of India.

ATTITUDE TO RELIEF WORK

You accuse the Communist Party of India that "it considers all constructive work as reformism". You then go on to enunciate your profound theory, "relief is the real and immediate thing while revolution is a distant necessity".

No comment on this is required. We have made our position very clear, how party workers must utilise every relief measure and see that it actually benefits the people. In fact, in Rayalaseema, in Maharashtra, in Tamilnadu and in various other states, which are in the grip of famine, it is the workers of the Communist Party that were in the forefront of the relief work. In Bengal, it is the Communist Party that stood in the forefront in mobilising people for the demand for relief against distress.

But we do not think that the people's miseries will be substantially relieved by the existing government. Nor do we consider that revolution is a distant necessity. Unfortunately for us though the revolution is a crying necessity today, we are not in a position to carry it through as soon as we desire or as the crying necessity demands.

VIOLENCE AND NONVIOLENCE

You also accuse us for believing in violence or "armed struggle" and demand that we "eschew it unreservedly".

We have to remind you of the answer to this bogey of violence that the UDF of Hyderabad gave less than two years ago in its election manifesto. This is what you yourself had stated in that document:

"It is obvious that all those who are pledged to the mighty reconstruction of the life of the downtrodden masses, to the regeneration of a new culture of all people, are pledged to stand for democratic methods and can have no love for violence, bloodshed or civil war. It is the attitude and practice of the exploiters of the people, who are determined to protect their interests by total suppression of the people and at any cost, that drive the masses to the different methods of struggle and for selfdefence. It is, therefore, wrongful to indulge in loose talk about violence and nonviolence in dealing with basic problems of life of the people. In fact it is being today used by the vested interests to sidetrack the real issues and perpetuate their tyranny."

We cannot but ask you why you are raising this question to us now? One would have expected you to have raised this issue with the government of Hyderabad, with the landlords there who are indulging in loot and murder and have let loose armed gangs on the peasants. The devastation caused by these armed gangs to the villagers in Telangana are too well-known to be recounted here.

This letter, we hope will clear any misunderstanding. It should help us to work together in developing the mass movement and conducting growing mass campaign and struggles on the various economic and political issues that face our people. By taking up such issues and developing mass campaign and struggles jointly we will be really helping in the development of a firm democratic front. We can and should have faith in our people and their genius to evolve the form of the front in the course of the development of the democratic movement.

15. Political Resolution of the Communist Party of India

1. The signing of the armistice in Korea on 27 July 1953 was a mighty victory for the heroic Korean people and their allies, the Chinese people's volunteers, for the forces of world peace, a great success for the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and other democratic states, and a heavy blow against the aggressive imperialists led by America and their plans for world domination.

2. The American imperialists, when launching the war of intervention against the Korean people, had expected quick victory, which, they hoped, would facilitate extension of the war against the People's Republic of China. They had hoped that the demonstration of their military might would consolidate the aggressive alliance they had forged, cow down opponents, shatter the patriotic resistance of the freedomloving peoples and compel the vacillators to line up behind them, thus making possible the undertaking of new military ventures against peaceloving and democratic states as well as against colonial peoples struggling for independence.

These hopes were shattered by the heroic people of Korea and their allies, the Chinese people's volunteers. Their success has exploded the myth of American invincibility, caused panic and confusion in the imperialist camp and heightened the courage and confidence of the freedomloving peoples. It has been rightly hailed as a great victory for the peace forces in every country. The truce in Korea, concretely demonstrating the possibility

Resolution adopted by the third party congress, Madurai, 27 December 1953 to 4 January 1954.

of defeating the plans of the warmongers, has given a powerful impetus to the world peace movement.

3. The growing might and the powerful peace policy of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the people's democracies, the smashing of the much-vaunted monopoly of the US imperialists in the field of atom and hydrogen weapons, the increasing power and sweep of the struggles of the colonial peoples, the scotching of the American-inspired fascist provocations in Berlin, have further strengthened the struggle for peace.

4. The world peace movement, the independent mass movement of hundreds of millions in all countries, has grown into a powerful and vital force of great importance in the struggle against the outbreak of a third world war. The appeal of the World Peace Council that all disputes should be settled by negotiations and peaceful means is being endorsed by vast numbers of people in every country. The demand for the cessation of the war in Vietnam, the demand for the freedom of the colonial peoples, the demand for the abandonment of measures to rearm German imperialism and for peaceful reunification of Germany on a democratic basis, the demand that the Chinese People's Republic should be accorded its rightful place in the council of nations, above all, the demand that the great powers should meet and resolve all differences peacefully—these are becoming the demands of vast masses in every country.

5. As a result of these developments, as well as the increasingly rapacious demands made by American imperialists who, because of the fiasco of their policies and the growing crisis of their economy, are resorting to more and more desperate and provocative tactics, conflicts and contradictions are sharpening inside the imperialist camp, particularly between American imperialism and the British, and in the relations between the imperialist powers and dependent countries. The American move to form the so-called European defence community with a rearmed Germany as its core, the attempt to convert the UNO into a docile instrument of its aggressive policy, the blatant

support to the gangster methods of its henchman, Syngman Rhee, the effort to sabotage the Korean peace negotiations, the exclusion of neutral Asian nations like India from the political conference on Korea, are meeting resistance not only from the mass of people but even from a number of bourgeois governments. In defiance of the American ban, a number of governments have established trade relations with the USSR and with other democratic countries.

6. Significant in these respects is also the role played by the India government on a number of important international issues in the recent period—a role appreciated by the peaceloving masses and states. The India government's denunciation of the atom bomb, its help in ending the hostilities in Korea, its condemnation of the tactics of Syngman Rhee, its opposition to the American move to transform Pakistan into a warbase, are factors helping the cause of peace.

The cause of peace has been further strengthened by the growing bond of friendship and of cultural relations between the people of India on the one hand and the USSR and Chinese People's Republic on the other. The conclusion of the recent trade agreement between India and the USSR on mutually advantageous terms carries forward this process and can also help to reduce India's dependence on imperialist powers.

7. While there has been in recent months a certain amount of relaxation of international tension and a considerable extension of the possibility of maintenance of peace, it would be a dangerous mistake to believe that the policies of the warmongers have been totally defeated or that the war plans have been abandoned, even temporarily. The fact is that efforts to sabotage the Korean peace negotiations have intensified; the rearming of Germany is being speeded up, creating a centre of aggression in the very heart of Europe; the policy of atomic blackmail is being continued. Further, foiled in Korea, the American imperialists have redoubled their efforts in other parts of Asia as seen in the military coup in Iran and in the in-

creased support to the French imperialists against the Vietnamese people. Above all, the intrigues in Kashmir and the proposed military alliance with Pakistan have brought the preparations for acts of aggression to the very threshold of India.

8. Rightly resented by all sections of people in India, including congressmen, this alliance has far-reaching reactionary aims directed against the USSR and the Chinese People's Republic and also constitutes a serious menace to India. It is also a serious threat to the peace and national independence of Pakistan itself. Entrenching themselves in Pakistan with the help of its reactionary and corrupt leaders, building military bases there and securing control over its economy and political life, over its armed forces, its manpower and resources, the American imperialists want to bring pressure on the India government to compel it to line up with them and give them similar concessions in India also. The success of American attempts in this sphere would inevitably mean India's sovereignty and freedom being reduced to a fiction, colossal war-burdens on the Indian people, a ruthless attack on the forces of democracy and peace in India. Further, it will aggravate the relations between India and Pakistan, will encourage chauvinistic communal sentiments, will be a perpetual threat to the democratic movements in each country and will facilitate the strengthening of the imperialist grip over both. American moves in Pakistan, therefore, constitute a grave menace to the Indian people, a menace against which the entire country must be mobilised.

9. Hence a most important task before the Communist Party and before every patriotic party, organisation and individual today is to expose the manoeuvres of the American warmongers, to rouse the people against the menace that threatens them, to bring about the broadest unity of popular forces on this issue and on its basis develop a powerful campaign to defeat American intrigues against the Asian peoples, to defend the cause of freedom, democracy and peace. Mass organisations, especially organisations of workers and peasants, whose part in the struggle

for peace has hitherto been extremely inadequate, have to play a big role in this task. For it is the active participation of broad masses on which will depend the strength and sweep of the movement. While conducting this campaign it is necessary to guard against the danger of reactionary elements utilising the situation for fomenting hindu-muslim hatred, for sowing hostility against the people of Pakistan and giving such slogans as trade-war against Pakistan. It must be emphasised again and again that it is not the people of Pakistan that are responsible for the military pact, that, on the contrary, they will have to bear heavy burdens as a result of the pact, that democratic forces and elements in Pakistan are opposing the pact and their own reactionary leaders who are leading them into it, that therefore the task of the Indian people is to develop their own campaign in such a way as strengthens the forces of freedom and democracy in both countries and thus defeat the plans of the American imperialists.

10. The rapid penetration of American imperialism that is taking place in various spheres of our economy and political life also constitutes a grave danger. The American imperialists are not merely seeking to exert pressure on India by creating a base in Pakistan; they are also linking themselves up with extreme reactionary elements both inside and outside the Congress and with right-wing socialist leaders. They are buying over corrupt politicians, securing control over a number of newspapers, poisoning cultural life with decadent literature and films. They are carrying on a virulent campaign of lies and slanders against the USSR, China and people's democratic countries through agencies like the 'democratic research service' and 'freedom of Asia societies' and the anticommunist front'. They are also penetrating into some vital sectors of Indian economy and are trying to get a foothold in strategic industries. The importation of a large number of American 'specialists' in India, although there is no dearth of suitable Indians for the work, the granting of diplomatic immunity to them, enhances the danger.

Exposure of all these and rallying of people against them have to be undertaken as part of the struggle to defend peace and freedom.

11. Another menace to India comes from the continuation of foreign pockets on Indian soil, some of which, especially Goa, are being fast built up as war bases. Here again can be seen the hand of the aggressive imperialists of America, who, as part of their aim to secure world domination by means of threats, blackmail and war, are striving to secure footholds in every part of the world and transform them into bases of aggression against the freedomloving peoples. Similarly the French pockets on our territory are being used for the transport of troops and supplies for the dirty war against our brother Asian peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Further, French imperialism in India is directly recruiting Indians to its army for fighting the liberation forces in Indochina.

12. All these developments and the position of key importance held by India in international affairs today bring out sharply the vital significance of the struggle for peace for the people of our country, the imperative need to broaden, extend and strengthen the peace movement, the necessity of India playing a positive role in the effort to end and prevent wars and the need to intensify the campaign for a pact of peace between the great powers, for prohibition of atomic weapons of mass destruction, for settling of all international disputes by means of negotiations, for liquidation of aggressive military bases maintained in a foreign country by any power and for recognition of the right of every nation to full freedom. It is evident today that in view of the aggressive aims and policies pursued by the imperialists, who are trying to secure mastery of the world, no country can preserve its freedom or prevent aggression by a mere declaration of a policy of neutrality and noninvolvement in wars. It must also be pointed out that India's freedom cannot be defended by relying on British imperialism against American imperialism.

13. Certain acts and declarations of the Nehru government in the recent period, particularly since the defeat of

the Americans in the Korean war, have been helpful to peace and all peaceloving people have appreciated and supported these acts and sentiments. This must continue and all acts of the government which help the cause of peace should be firmly supported. Yet the situation does not warrant that democratic forces should give general overall support to governmental policies even in the international sphere. This is because the India government does not follow consistently a policy of peace and democracy. The foreign policy of the government is subject essentially to the influence of British imperialism and is not averse to making concessions to them and also to the Americans in practice, several times even where in words the government expresses disagreement with them, as in the case of the Korean war prisoners. On certain matters it even goes further. It rebukes those who openly denounce American intrigues in Kashmir. Arch-warmongers like Dulles and Nixon are allowed, under the plea of diplomatic usages, to broadcast their message of hatred against the Soviet and Chinese peoples. Above all, the government of India says little about the colonial wars that are being waged by the British imperialists in Malaya and Africa, about the military dictatorship established in Guana by the British in violation of the constitution framed by themselves, about the war against the Vietnamese people. It continues to give transit facilities to the gurkhas who are being recruited by the British for the suppression of the valiant Malayan people. Therefore the necessity, while supporting all the positive measures, to intensify pressure on the India government in order to make it pursue a consistent policy of peace remains and even acquires greater importance than before.

14. It must further be realised that the defence of India's freedom and sovereignty and the foiling of imperialist efforts to drag India into war cannot be effected by mere denunciation of American imperialism and its intrigues. The example of Korea shows the immense strength that even a small country can acquire in a short time on the basis of abolition of imperialist rule and feu-

dalism, a strength against which all the power of the war-mongers proves of no avail. If today, more than six years after the transfer of power, India, a country with vast resources and manpower, is being made the object of American pressure and blackmail, that to a great extent is due to the fact that the American imperialists hope to achieve success by taking advantage of the backwardness of India's economy, the serious crisis in her agriculture and industry, the utter dependence of India on foreign imperialist powers for her defence requirements and capital goods and the British stranglehold over our economy and foreign trade. Also they want to use as their tools the feudal elements—traditional traitors to India's freedom—who still occupy an important position in the economy, political life and military apparatus of India.

15. Thus the question of defeating the war plans of the American imperialists and India's struggle for peace is closely linked with the question of India's struggle for full and unfettered national freedom, which means, first and foremost, freedom from control of the British who continue to be the dominant imperialist power and of liquidating feudalism. This demands a break with the British empire, removal of British officers from India's armed forces, breaking of the British stranglehold on India's economy by the confiscation of British capital and the intensification of the struggle for the complete liquidation of landlordism—through which alone conditions will be created for the rapid economic, political and military strengthening of India. A fully independent and powerful India will be a mighty bulwark of freedom, peace and democracy. Also the serious weakening of aggressive British imperialism, the partner of America and oppressor of the colonial peoples, the building up of a fully free India outside the commonwealth and outside all imperialist influence, will be a great factor for world peace and the freedom of all Asian and colonial peoples. Hence the necessity to intensify the fight against British imperialism, for quitting the commonwealth and for the confiscation of British capital; hence the necessity of op-

position to every manifestation of subservience to British imperialism like participation in economic, political and military conferences under its aegis; hence the necessity of mobilisation of people against British atrocities against the colonial people and the creation of a mass demand that the India government must openly condemn them. Any slackening of this struggle, any failure to conduct it with vigour and determination will mean weakening the movement for freedom and peace.

16. Linked with Britain and America, our country has already felt the impact of the growing crisis in the economies of these countries. There can be no doubt that the effect will be all the more disastrous as that crisis deepens.

Despite every effort made by the imperialist powers headed by America to avert the crisis of their economy by means of militarisation, the artificial boom produced by the Korean war has definitely ended. Stocks are accumulating in America, where the decline in production is no longer confined to consumers' goods alone but has also affected some of the heavy industries. International trade shows symptoms of stagnation and decline. Already a number of bourgeois economists and political leaders are making gloomy forecasts about an impending depression.

With the deepening of the world capitalist crisis and the shrinking of the capitalist world market, the exploitation of colonial and dependent countries by imperialists has been intensified and they have become arenas of sharp conflicts among the imperialist powers, above all, between Britain and America. India, where British imperialism continues to hold a dominant position and where American imperialism is effecting fast penetration, is one of the main arenas of this conflict.

17. As a result of India's trade and economy being linked with imperialist powers which are interested in keeping it backward and dependent, India is ruthlessly robbed and plundered. Through British investment in key sectors of India's economy, through British exchange banks, insurance and shipping companies, through imperial preference and India's membership of the sterling bloc, Bri-

tain continues to drain away the wealth of India. The weapon of unequal trade is wielded both by Britain and America to further impoverish the Indian people, deny them capital goods and ruin even their few established industries. Our export market for raw materials being totally at the mercy of the British and American monopolists, they play havoc with it by manipulation of prices and stocks to suit their interests and the consequent ruin falls mainly on the shoulders of our peasant-producers who are the worst victims of the imperialist manipulations of the market as was seen in the April 1952 crisis. Huge quantities of raw materials have to be exported at ruinous prices to meet the interest and profit charges of British capital in India, to pay for the food imports from America, to pay for military equipment, rolling stock and other goods which India has to buy. This is leading to an everwidening gap between exports and imports, squandering of the sterling resources and increasing dependence on foreign powers.

As a result of this unequal trade, denial of much-needed capital goods, increasing ruination of national industries due to foreign competition and growing penetration of foreign capital in fields where Indian industries already exist, contradictions between imperialism and the Indian bourgeoisie are becoming sharper and even sections of the big bourgeoisie have begun raising their voices on these issues.

18. The crisis manifests itself in practically every industry, especially industries producing consumers' goods which constitute the bulk of our national industries. All these years the government of India, controlled by landlords and monopolists collaborating with imperialism, argued that the crisis of India's economy was a crisis of underproduction, that there was scarcity because there were not enough goods, that the way to India's prosperity lay through 'harder work', that what was needed was not basic social changes but more sustained labour. 'Produce or perish' was their slogan. All these myths are being exploded by hard reality.

As is admitted by both government and employers, production went on the upgrade and in textiles and in sugar reached the targets of the five-year plan. But the result was not abundance of goods for the consumers but accumulation of stocks of unsold goods. Like the textiles and sugar industries, every consumer industry—engineering, soap, edible oils, etc.—faced a crisis of the market, despite millions being in want of these goods. A crisis of 'overproduction' in the midst of poverty has come. As a result, mass unemployment has become the characteristic feature in all industrial centres, affecting not only the industrial workers but also the middle classes.

19. Instead of forcing the monopolists and largescale industries to reduce prices and take less profits in order that the consumer may buy goods and the factories may be able to keep production and employment going, government permitted the monopolies to cut workers' wages, reduce employment, carry out rationalisation and closures. While big business got relief in the form of reduction of export and excise duties, the consumer was left at the mercy of the market. Even the small fall in the prices of their goods was done away with by the abolition of food subsidies, causing price-rises in the market and starvation to many. The government has not even shown courage enough to take measures to prevent foreign monopolists who have invested capital in India from competing with and killing Indian industries. It has permitted a free flow of foreign goods which are ruining many Indian industries—not only smallscale and cottage industries, but also several largescale industries. All this further deepens and intensifies the crisis.

20. At the root of the crisis of 'overproduction' lies the catastrophic crisis in our agrarian economy. The production of foodgrains per acre has sharply declined, according to the report of the planning commission itself. Famine conditions have become chronic in many parts of the country. Scarcity conditions prevail in vast areas. With the fall in prices of commercial crops added to the ruin of subsidiary industries like handlooms, the distress of the

peasant masses has intensified. Indebtedness of the peasants has increased to colossal proportions. Tens of thousands of peasants have sold away and are selling away their land, their cattle and all their belongings at incredibly low prices due to scarcity and famine conditions. Their properties are passing into the hands of rapacious landlords and moneylenders. On top of this the government in many states resorts to coercive measures and sells away by auction the lands of peasants who are unable to pay arrears of land revenue and debts.

21. All over the country the ferocious eviction offensive of the landlords continues, resulting in concentration of land in their hands, dispossessing the peasants of lands and swelling the ranks of the agricultural workers. The government, which pretends to be the protector of peasants and whose ministers give their blessings to bhoodan, refuses to take adequate steps to stop the eviction offensive. Unemployment among agricultural labourers has increased to colossal proportions and it has led to depression of the wage levels of agricultural labourers in the countryside and pressure on the employed workers in the towns. The demand for land for cultivation has also increased tremendously. All this has given the landlords greater opportunity to exploit the tenants and agricultural workers, thus accelerating the process of pauperisation of the rural masses.

All this has meant a rapid shrinking of the home market and the complete collapse of the market in many areas. The fact that food prices continue to remain relatively high due to shortage of production, the fact that the mass of the people have to spend the bulk of their income to purchase food, the fact that the prices of manufactured articles are kept at a high level—all these further intensify the crisis.

22. The agrarian crisis has grown into a national crisis. It has meant shortage of food for the nation, shortage of raw materials for the industries, a widening gap between exports and imports, increased dependence on foreign

powers and an increased threat to our national freedom and sovereignty. It has facilitated the penetration of aggressive imperialist powers into our country.

23. The ruling classes in India had hoped that by means of the five-year plan prepared in collaboration with imperialism, they would be able to solve the crisis at the cost of the people, stabilise their economy as well as strengthen their political position. While the foreign and Indian monopolists have reaped colossal profits as a result of the operation of the plan, their basic aim has not been realised. The failure of the plan is evident to all today, including the framers of the plan who now announce that it will have to be 'revised'. Abandonment of a number of projects earlier undertaken, deficit budgets in most states, a mounting volume of unemployment all over the country, signalise the fiasco of the attempt to strengthen or even stabilise the economy of the country within the framework of the imperialist-feudal system.

24. It is obvious today that abolition of landlordism and removal of the burden of debts by freeing the vast peasant masses of our country from the heavy exploitation of the landlord and usurious moneylender alone will smash the fetters on our agricultural production and release the creative energies of India's millions of peasants. That alone will assure for the national industries a vast expanding market and ensure capital formation on an ascending scale. Abolition of landlordism and handing over of land to peasants and agricultural workers are thus the prerequisites not only for the development of our agriculture but also for the industrialisation of the country.

The confiscation of British capital will not only free our economy from the grip of the British imperialists and ensure the possibility of independent development unhampered by the fetters of imperialist monopolists, but will place in the hands of the state a powerful public sector with vast resources, which will ensure the possibility of effective control over the entire economy and thereby secure the possibility of successful planned development.

A democratic state alone will be able to unleash the immense creative energies of the millions of our peasants, workers and the intelligentsia, and utilise the economic power and resources of the public sector obtained by the confiscation of British capital for a planned development in the interest of the entire people.

The experience of the last three years has fully demonstrated that the prerequisites of planned development of our economy in the interest of the people are the smashing up of feudal relations in our agriculture, confiscation of British capital and the establishment of a democratic state.

25. It is, however, precisely these basic economic and political changes that the Nehru government, dominated as it is by monopolists and landlords, refuses to undertake. It tinkers with the problems confronting the people, imposes heavier and heavier burdens on the masses and abandons, when confronted with the opposition of vested interests, even such moderate measures as fixation of ceiling on existing landholdings. All this leads to intensification of the misery of the people, intensification of the crisis.

26. In every sphere the government continues the reactionary policies of the past. It refuses to abolish the states headed by rajpramukhs and reconstitute the states on a linguistic basis on the false plea that this will lead to the breakup of the unity of the country. It refuses to concede the demand of part 'C' states for responsible government and even refuses to set up legislative assemblies in Tripura, Manipur and Kutch. It increases the cost of education, compelling many students to discontinue their studies and making it impossible for the poorer classes to receive education. Medical and public services are severely neglected. It is not implementing even the restricted social security schemes. It permits foreign concerns in India to discriminate against Indian personnel and treat them as inferiors in relation to whites. It refuses to undertake or shelve the enactment of social reform legislation. It spends colossal sums for the military and police

and gives repeated concessions to big business but has no money for the upliftment of the people. It imposes new burdens on the people on the plea of financing its plans and projects. It reenacts the security measures in the teeth of popular opposition and wants to set up, as in Bengal, special tribunals to try political cases. It resorts to ruthless terror to suppress the people whenever all other methods fail and the masses refuse to take the new burdens lying down.

27. Against these policies of the government, against the growing offensive of the landlords and monopolists, mass resistance has grown rapidly during the last two years. With the living conditions sharply deteriorating as a result of the growing crisis of Indian economy and with the weakening of the political influence of the Congress, people throughout the country have been coming out in struggles against every attempt to impose new burdens on them. This was seen in the sharpest form in Calcutta when the struggle against the increase in tram-fares imposed by the British-owned company developed into a mighty united battle of the entire people. The new phase that has opened in the people's opposition to the reactionary policies of the government and the offensive of the feudals and monopolists has certain specific features which should be noted.

(a) The struggles are mainly taking place on issues affecting the day-to-day life of the people, such as taxes, food subsidy, wages, bonus, retrenchment and victimisation, evictions, rent, famine relief, etc. and are motivated by concrete demands against the state, the landlords and the monopolists.

(b) These struggles are taking place not only in provinces and areas which are politically advanced and where the Congress is weak, but embrace areas and provinces which have been the traditional strongholds of the Congress and areas which had seldom before come out in big struggles against the congress government. The anti-sales-tax struggle in Saurashtra, the struggle in Rajasthan

against octroi tax and the students' struggle in UP are examples.

(c) Not only does this new wave of mass struggles embrace new areas hitherto untouched by the mass movement, but it has drawn in new classes and sections of the people as well, such as teachers, traders, government servants, etc. However, despite this extension of the struggles to new areas and classes, the general character of great unevenness of the level of the movement still remains.

(d) A new feature in this period is the growing participation of women not only in the struggle for existence but in the political fight also.

(e) The struggles, even when they embrace only one section of the people, evoke the sympathy of other sections and sometimes, especially against repression, the entire people of the area move into action, as was seen in the UP university students' struggles, thus transforming it into a militant antigovernment struggle.

(f) The congress masses do not remain unaffected by these mass struggles. Even sections of congressmen break away temporarily from the leadership under pressure of the people to join the struggle. The continued failure of the congress government to solve people's problems, the growth of mass unemployment and distress in the life of the people, the repression and attacks on the working class, peasantry and other sections of the people, the failure to implement a land policy in the interest of the peasants, etc. are all leading to a critical examination of the policies of the leadership by rank-and-file congressmen, which makes possible the widest mobilisation and struggles on concrete issues.

(g) The new wave of struggles is remarkable for the urge for unity among all sections of the people. Anti-communism is no longer able to divide the masses where the issue is understood by all, is concrete and well-justified and where the party is able to take correct steps to forge the unity of the people.

In spite of the split in the tradeunion and student movements, in spite of the fact that large masses of peasants

are outside the AIKS, workers, peasants and students are uniting among themselves in factories, villages and educational institutions, regardless of their political affiliations.

The growing urge for united action and united organisation is making even disruptionist leaders and groups move in the direction of unity in the trade unions, kisan sabhas and united committees on specific issues. All this was seen in the glorious struggles of the working class (defence workers, Burnpur, Assam tea gardens, etc.), in the struggle of the Saurashtra people, in the anti-sales-tax struggle in Bombay, in the anti-tram-fare-enhancement and food struggles of Calcutta and Bengal.

(h) The working class plays an increasingly important part in the new wave of struggles. The struggles of the working class have been the most numerous in the country as a whole. Provincewide and even countrywide struggles of different sections of workers have begun to take place, as in the case of all sections of workers for puja bonus in West Bengal and of the defence workers, teachers, bank employees, etc. Doggedly fought struggles have been conducted by workers in small industries also. On several occasions the working class has also gone into action on general issues affecting all classes as in Bombay against the withdrawal of the food subsidy, but this has not yet become a general feature.

(i) Although as yet the struggles are mainly taking place on the immediate day-to-day demands of the people, struggles for political demands have also developed and are developing. Several big actions have taken place on the issue of civil liberties; in Tripura a powerful movement has grown for a democratic government. The victory of the Andhra people has not only given an impetus to the movement for linguistic states, but has led to many congressmen coming out openly against the policies of the congress government and leadership.

(j) These struggles are being reflected in and carried into the chambers of the legislatures also. Determined opposition to the reactionary policies of the government

put up by the central core of democratic opposition inside parliament and the state legislatures, when backed by the struggle of the masses outside, is often making sections of congress legislators support the demands and sentiments of the fighting people. This has led to situations in which struggles outside have had their inevitable impact on the legislatures and sometimes led to ministerial crises. Rajaji's government in Madras being compelled to give up many of the taxation measures it proposed in 1952, the veritable revolt that threatened to break out inside the congress legislature party in Bombay over the issue of surcharge on land revenue in 1952, the differences in the West Bengal cabinet that came out openly over the issue of the policy to be adopted towards the agitation against the enhancement of tram-fare, are but some of the examples of the tremendous impact of the struggles of the masses on the legislatures and the ruling party.

(k) Due to the unity and militancy of the people and the weakening position of the monopolists, landlords and government, many of the struggles succeed in winning concessions—concessions which, though not big in themselves, heighten the confidence of the masses in their own strength and further weaken the government.

(l) The Communist Party has played an important part in leading these struggles, which has resulted in the growth of the influence and prestige of the party.

Under the impact of these developments, mass political consciousness is rapidly growing and the Congress is losing ground even in those areas where its influence was preponderant only a few years ago. This can be seen in the results of the municipal elections in Uttar Pradesh and in the mass actions that are taking place even in the strongholds of the Congress.

As a result of all this, as a result of the growing fiasco of the government policies, as a result of the increasing strength of the mass movement, contradictions sharpen inside the Congress, congress organisations get increasingly split into warring factions, conflicts develop between

Congress ministries and Congress committees—each blaming the other for the growing isolation of the Congress—conflicts develop inside Congress legislature parties and even inside Congress ministries, conflicts develop between the Congress and its allies, leading, especially in states where the Congress is weak, to governmental instability and even ministerial crisis. The defeat of the government in Travancore Cochin sharply reveals this process.

28. All these make it unmistakably clear that what we are witnessing today is not merely the maturing of an economic crisis but, along with it, the initial stages of the development of a political crisis. The results of the general elections were not merely an expression of the loss of faith of the people in the present government, of the process of people starting to consider it their enemy and of its being returned as a minority party in some legislatures, but also contained the possibility of the growth of a political crisis—a possibility that is growing into a reality as the result of the deepening of the economic crisis, the failure of the government's economic and political policies and the growth of the wave of mass struggles.

29. Faced with this situation, sections in the leadership of the Congress strive for coalition with such a party as the Praja-Socialist Party but as yet these moves have not succeeded.

The attempts made by Nehru to strengthen the government by forming a coalition with the Praja-Socialist Party have ended in a fiasco because the PSP leadership is finding it more and more difficult to carry through its reactionary policies in the face of the growing opposition of the rank and file, and even sections of middle leadership, as a result of the growing struggles of the people and their growing urge for unity with the democratic forces. In these conditions, the persistence by the leadership of the PSP in its policies of disrupting the democratic movement, of manoeuvres to bring support to the Congress rule as against the unity of the democratic parties, is bound to lead to the PSP as a party meeting with further fiasco.

The development of the mass democratic movement has

meant also a weakening of the influence of the reactionary communal parties. In Kashmir, they suffered a serious defeat. In the Punjab and PEPSU, the strengthening of the democratic movement has led to a split in the Akali Party—an influential group, having broken away, is cooperating with the democratic forces on democratic issues.

30. It will be wrong, however, to think that the Congress is already a spent force or that it is no longer capable of sowing illusions among the people. It has still great influence, great reserves and great manoeuvring capacity. In particular we should not ignore the considerable strength that Pandit Nehru's personality brings to that organisation. Note should be also taken of the fact that although the internal policy of the government is getting rapidly exposed among the people as an antipeople policy, through its foreign policy it is still able to gather considerable support. Moreover the powerful influence that Gandhian ideology is still able to exercise over masses of people, including sections of the working class, an influence which expresses itself in various ways such as a belief among some sections in the efficacy of bhoodan, resort to satyagraha forms of struggle as a substitute for mass action, acts as a fetter to slow down the process of mass awakening, restrict struggles and dissipate energy.

The PSP leadership also is still able to create illusions among sections of the people disillusioned with the Congress. Under the cover of 'antitotalitarianism' and neutrality, the rightwing socialist leadership slanders the land of socialism and the People's Republic of China and the people's democratic republics of Eastern Europe. Under the cover of anticommunism it tries to disrupt the united movement of the working people and to prevent a broad alliance of the people against feudalism and imperialism. It tries to stem the tide of growing struggles and the mass urge for unity by launching struggles as in Pardi and Azamgarh, but restricting them to the satyagraha form.

Equally wrong will it be to think that communal forces have lost all influence. By raising communal slogans, as

on the question of Indo-Pak relations and the question of full accession of Kashmir to India, they were able to utilise the discontent of the masses against the policies of the Congress and divert the masses from the democratic movement. Similar attempts will be continued and it will be a mistake to underestimate their danger.

31. Nonetheless the objective conditions are such, the crisis is so deep and the mass urge for unity so great today that these retarding influences can be overcome by the Communist Party playing its role correctly as the bold leader of mass struggles, as the champion and defender of the rights of the people, the unifier of the democratic forces in the country.

Already the party has played a most important role in the last general elections and emerged as the spearhead of the democratic opposition to congress rule. By putting forward and working for the unity of the tradeunion, peasant, student and other movements, by its role in the struggles that have developed in every state since the elections, by the determined and consistent opposition that its members have put up in the legislatures, the party has influenced considerably the course of development since the last party conference in October 1951. In the crisis that has developed in Travancore-Cochin state leading to the dissolution of the legislature, in the crisis that has developed in Hyderabad, in PEPSU and in many other states, the role of the Communist Party and the struggles that its members have led outside the legislatures have been of decisive importance.

32 In order that the party can play its role in the developing situation, it is necessary that there is a clear understanding of the perspective and direction of the movement. In every struggle, even though the demand might be a simple economic demand affecting the day-to-day life of the people such as evictions, rent, wage, bonus, rationalisation and retrenchment, the masses engaged in the struggle see by their own direct experience that the struggle has got to be carried on against the determined

opposition of the government which comes out as the defender of the existing social order.

Not only do the people fight for their immediate day-to-day demands against landlords and monopolists, but they are also coming out in struggles against unjust taxes and levies imposed by the government, i.e. on demands that are directly addressed to the government. Also the consciousness grows among the people that this government which comes to the aid of the exploiters whenever the people rise in struggle, this government which imposes new burdens on the people, is a government which has already lost the backing of the majority of the people.

It is the maturing crisis and the growing consciousness and militancy of the people which must determine the slogans and tactics of the **democratic movement**.

33. With the development of the crisis and the struggle of the masses against the attempts to shift the burden of the crisis on to the masses, the congress governments are more and more resorting to heavy repression as was seen in Calcutta during the struggle against tram-fare increase and in the agrarian struggles throughout the country. Democratic and civil liberties are being more and more attacked. The Congress does not flinch even from establishment of president's rule, dissolution of legislatures and crushing whatever democratic rights the people had won. Events in PEPSU and Travancore-Cochin are clear pointers of the determination of the Congress to maintain itself in power by every means at its disposal—including an attack on democratic forms. There can be no doubt that as the crisis deepens and the economic and political difficulties facing the government increase, the tendency to resort to such methods will also increase. There can also be no doubt that the imperialists will utilise this situation to strengthen their grip over the country and the government.

In these conditions, the struggle for day-to-day demands, the struggle against taxation and high prices, against evictions, against mass unemployment, the struggle for the

preservation and extension of civil liberties and democratic rights, the struggle for defence of freedom and sovereignty—all get more and more interlinked and can grow into the common struggle for the replacement of the present government by a government of democratic unity, a government formed by a coalition of different democratic parties and groups on the basis of a common minimum program to be decided according to the circumstances, which will give immediate relief to the people. Already in states like Travancore-Cochin, Andhra and Tripura it is possible to raise this as a practical slogan. With the strengthening of the mass movement, with the maturing of the crisis in different ways in different areas, situations will arise when this can be raised as an immediate slogan in state after state. It is this perspective that has to guide our activity. Achievement of a government of democratic unity is the objective towards which all struggles of the masses have to lead.

34. It must be remembered that the slogan of a government of democratic unity is a slogan which demands the organisation and unleashing of mass struggles on the widest scale. It will be realised only in the course and as the result of determined struggle to defeat the economic and political policies of the ruling classes and by repelling their attack on the standard of life, rights and liberties of the people. Hence the most important task today is to unfold such a movement on the basis of the struggle for the immediate concrete demands of the workers, peasants, students and other classes and sections and build powerful mass organisations and strengthen the party. The importance of the struggle for economic demands led by mass trade unions and kisan sabhas acquire far greater importance than ever before precisely because of the growing crisis. It is through these struggles, as the history of the last two years proves, that the strength will be generated and the unity forged which alone can be a guarantee of victory. Then only, even the conflicts in the Congress can be utilised to the advantage of the masses. Failure to see this will lead to the giving of abstract slogans, diverting mass

attention from immediate tasks, reliance on top negotiations and manoeuvres and weakening of the mass movement.

35. The three inseparable tasks on the carrying out of which will depend the success of the democratic movement are: the building of the party, the building of the mass organisations and the building of the democratic front. In the measure that these tasks are carried out in an integrated and coordinated manner, the attempts of the government and the ruling classes to shift the burdens of the crisis on to the people will be defeated, the mass movement will get strengthened, grow and achieve its aim.

36. The growing burdens on the people, the worsening condition of their lives, the increasingly antipopular policies of the government as well as the growing threat to the freedom of India demand that all democratic forces are united. The possibilities of such unity are immense and are growing, and a key task of the Communist Party is to progressively forge this unity. For this it is necessary to attain clarity on the nature of the unity that has to be forged and the method of forging it.

37. The democratic front is the united front of all classes and elements whose interest can effectively be furthered only by the elimination of imperialism and feudalism. It can be built only by developing the broadest mass movement on the basis of struggles for immediate economic and political issues confronting the people. It is obvious that at a time when the masses are under the influence of different political parties, when even the working class is split, united-front agreements between parties and organisations regarding demands and slogans of struggle on each issue are powerful factors in drawing people into common action. Such united fronts help in bringing even masses following the Congress into common struggle. Hence it is necessary for the Communist Party to continue and intensify efforts for such agreements on each issue. At the same time it should be remembered that the growth of the united front depends, above all, on the in-

dependent role of the party in uniting and mobilising the working class and the working people.

38. Experience has also shown that the formation of united committees for the specific purpose of conducting of such united struggles, as was formed for example to conduct the struggle in Calcutta against increase in tram-fare, committees whose constituents are the various parties, organisations and elements, and where decisions are taken by common consent, help the strengthening and further unfolding of the mass movement. It also helps the building and growth of united mass organisations of workers, peasants and others. It is this coming together from issue to issue and jointly leading the mass struggles and the working in common mass organisations that will create conditions for a closer united front.

39. Further, united front does not mean merely the united front of the Communist Party and left parties but, above all, united front of the masses, including masses still under the influence of the Congress. Hence the development of the united-front movement demands the drawing into struggles and common activity of the large mass of congressmen, praja-socialists and progressive individuals. The tendency to look upon all congressmen and all PSP members as reactionary because of the reactionary policy of the congress leadership and disruptive policy of the PSP leadership must be combated. With the growth of mass struggles and growing disillusionment of the masses about the policies of the Congress and PSP leadership, possibilities already exist for drawing disillusioned congressmen and PSP followers into struggles and common activity and these possibilities will develop in future.

40. While developing such common activity and while resorting to all forms of mass struggle, it is necessary to guard against one deviation. Instead of endeavouring to transform satyagraha struggles into mass struggles where this form is resorted to by others because of the backwardness of the masses, there has been a tendency among

some party comrades to themselves limit the struggle to satyagraha as an alternative to mass action. This tendency is harmful and dissipates mass energy and should therefore be combated.

41. The development of the united front and unity through the widening of the mass movement is often hampered because of the abstractness of our agitation, the habit of substituting concrete exposure by general denunciation, the indulgence, quite often, in stereotyped speeches in assemblies, parliament and from public platforms, stereotyped writings in our papers and, above all, the failure to distinguish between the platform of the front and the party forum. Too often we speak only for those who are already convinced that the present government is a reactionary government. Too often we fail to make use of existing legislation—tenancy legislation, the social security act, the payment of wages act, etc.—to ameliorate the conditions of the masses and secure concessions for them, forgetting that this legislation has been enacted as the result of mass struggles and is a weapon in the hands of the people. Too often the tendency is to narrate only the hardships that the people are suffering and to ignore the successes that their struggles have won in the mistaken belief that reference to such successes will breed 'reformist illusions', while the reality is that, in order to inculcate confidence in the masses, confidence that unity and struggle can win demands, it is essential that each success won by the people, no matter how small, is widely publicised and made the basis for further advance. There is also the tendency to pay scant attention to such work as adult literacy, cultural and sports activities, cooperatives, medical relief, etc.—work which is absolutely essential, work which can mobilise vast sections and enable the party and mass organisations to forge close links with the people.

42. In areas where famine-conditions prevail, not only is it necessary to demand relief from the government and organise relief on the basis of unity of democratic organi-

sations, but it is also necessary to mobilise the people for such work as deepening of wells, repair of tanks, etc.

It is necessary for every provincial committee to undertake a critical examination of the plans and projects undertaken by the government in the province, make a factual assessment of their effects in consultation with the people directly covered by them and put forward the demand for their correct implementation or amendment or replacement as will help the people and mobilise the masses for their implementation.

43. Despite the various laws that have been enacted, the untouchable masses are in practice denied equal rights even now. It is necessary not merely to agitate for more comprehensive laws against untouchability but also to wage a concrete battle against all forms of discrimination and utilise all the existing laws.

Similarly, despite the equality of treatment guaranteed in law, the muslim minority is in practice being discriminated against in various matters. It is necessary to fight against this and champion their just demands.

Special attention is to be paid to the question of the tribal people, and concrete demands for their economic rehabilitation and cultural upliftment, for democratic liberties and for local regional autonomy are to be formulated and campaigned for.

44. The rapidly deteriorating situation on the agrarian front demands that utmost attention is paid by every provincial committee to the task of strengthening the kisan-sabha organisation and forming agricultural workers' associations wherever necessary. Broad peasant unity has to be built in action against evictions, against unjust taxes, for reduction of rent, for moratorium on debts, for adequate wages and for employment, for relief against famine and drought, for fair price for agricultural produce, for specific irrigation projects and similar demands. The provincial committees must immediately undertake a concrete study of the question of distribution

of land held by landowners above ceiling and put forward concrete demands.

45. In order to save their profits being affected by the crisis of their landlord-capitalist economy, the big monopolists have launched an attack on the wages and working conditions of the workers. With the help of the government, they are thwarting the gains of social security legislation reaching the workers. With the help of ILO experts and foreign advisers, they are introducing rationalisation methods to increase the workload and reduce the total earnings of the workers. With the help of tribunals, they are freezing the payment of bonuses and wage-increases despite rising living costs. They hope to break the resistance of the workers by using the pressure of the unemployed rushing to the towns from the countryside. They hope to use the division in the tradeunion organisations to disrupt the workers' struggles. When everything fails, they use terror and violence.

Under such conditions, the unity of the tradeunion movement, unity in conducting struggles to defend the workers must be worked for and achieved. The struggle for tradeunion unity is hampered on our part by the remnants of sectarian understanding. Though tradeunion unity is accepted in principle, it is looked upon as a temporary tactic and not a fundamental principle of the trade-union movement, without the realisation of which the working class is disarmed before its enemies.

Formal acceptance of the principle of unity and continuation of sectarian understanding results in characterising the unions of the INTUC and the HMS, even where they are mass unions, as gangsters' unions and just agencies of the employers. It is not realised that many of the leaders of the INTUC and the HMS are often compelled to take up positions of struggle because of the pressure from their own following, whose most elementary demands the leaders are not able to satisfy. This attitude has even led to our comrades remaining indifferent to the struggles called by the INTUC and the HMS leaders in certain instances

and has affected the merger and unity of trade unions even where genuine feelings for unity have been expressed in common mass actions.

A firm struggle against sectarianism must be carried on and work in all unions, wherever the masses are, must become the regular feature. The tendency to undertake such work with a view to 'exposing' the leadership, as the primary objective, must be combated as it leads to disruption of the trade union. Instead our comrades working in all mass unions must ceaselessly strive to activate the mass of workers around their immediate demands. Failure to activate the mass of workers, failure to bring even the minimum of tradeunion consciousness to every worker by enrolling him in a union and mere concentration on verbal 'exposure' of the leadership often leads to our comrades demanding the formation of rival trade unions and keeping the unions as closed groups. There is the most harmful tendency that thinks that the building of the party and realising the party program require separate trade unions, directly functioning under party members who make the policies of the unions according to their own fraction decisions, irrespective of the will of the majority in the unions. Such an understanding has led to unions being reduced to party groups, to absence of democratic functioning and, ultimately, to loss of mass basis. All these manifestations of sectarianism must be firmly combated.

The setting up and functioning of united factory committees is part of our work for the development of tradeunion unity. The existing united factory committees must be strengthened, and such factory committees must be organised wherever possible, in the setting up of which even the works councils should be utilised. In the struggles that are breaking out more and more, the question of united resistance to the offensive of the government and employers will come to the fore and must be fully utilised by the setting up of joint elected committees for the conduct of struggles and negotiations. The question of recognition of unions, in present conditions, ceases to be merely a question

of the working class. With the state forces interfering in strikes, meetings and demonstrations, the struggle for the right to strike and recognition of unions becomes a vital part of the struggle for the democratic rights of the people as a whole. The struggle develops into one of combating reactionary government laws such as the industrial relations acts in Bombay, Madhya Bharat and Madhya Pradesh. The development of a wide movement against the acts in these states in particular and in the country generally is a major task of the workingclass front and in the discharge of that task the working class not only defends itself but leads in the defence of the whole people against all reactionary laws, for their rights and living.

46. Workingclass struggles, especially struggles in major industries, against the offensive of the monopolists, acquire increased significance in the present situation. Vigorous defence by the working class of its rights, vigorous struggle by the working class against retrenchment, wagecut and other forms of attack encourage all classes and sections to wage their own battles. Also, mass action by the working class gives form and direction to the growing radicalisation of the people as already seen in several states.

With the development of the crisis, the monopolists and the government resist to the utmost the conceding of even the most elementary demands of the working class. The struggle for the demands of the workers requires, therefore, that these struggles must be mass struggles, struggles of the people in the sense that large sections of the people understand and support them. The mobilisation of the support of other sections of the people for workingclass struggles is of great importance for the success of these struggles. That this is possible has been demonstrated in recent months where whole cities and towns came out on hartals in support of the resistance of workers to retrenchment.

In order to make this possible it is equally necessary that trade unions take up the demands of other sections—of peasants, middle class, merchants, etc.—which are hit by

the offensive of the landlords, monopolists and the government. They must struggle along with the rest of the population and be in the forefront of the struggle against the imperialists who threaten the cause of peace, of national freedom and sovereignty. The working class must come out for the protection of national industries against the competition of the imperialists.

All this requires intense political agitation among the workers, enabling them to see that their own problems, the attack on their wages and living standards, mass unemployment, etc. are inseparable from the larger problems facing the entire people caused by the feudal-colonial social order. The working class must be imbued with the consciousness that there can be no stable improvement in their own living standards and working conditions unless this colonial-feudal setup is broken up and freedom and democracy for all people are ensured.

The task of building the alliance of the working class and the peasantry is of great importance. This alliance can be realised through the working class boldly championing the demands of the peasantry and coming to the assistance of the peasantry through its own action.

There is a widespread tendency to neglect important and vital industries in industrial areas and to concentrate on small and diffused industries. This tendency must be given up and party units must immediately undertake planned work in major and important industries.

The problem of combating mass unemployment has become a key problem before the working class. The development of a wide movement by means of rallies and conferences, marches and demonstrations, hartals and strikes is the most important task. United committees for fighting retrenchment and unemployment must be organised. Such a wide movement cannot unfold itself fully unless the organised working class employed in factories is brought into the movement. Apart from mobilisation, it is of utmost importance that relief and solidarity campaigns are organised.

47. The powerful movement for the formation of linguistic states which gathered further momentum after the formation of the Andhra state has now resulted in the appointment of a commission by the government of India to "examine the question of reorganisation of states". This undoubtedly is a popular victory and it demands further strengthening of the struggle for the constitution of linguistic states by the abolition of states headed by rajpramukhs, the disintegration of multinational states and the redrawing of state boundaries.

In this connection special attention should be paid to the just demands and rights of the national minorities, the tribal peoples and of predominantly tribal areas within each linguistic state. These latter must be drawn into the movement and close links must be forged with them, which can be done only by championing their demands boldly.

While conducting this movement, it is imperative to guard against the danger of disruption of the unity of the working and toiling masses of various nationalities. All tendencies of bourgeois nationalism, tendencies of whipping up national hatred and animosity, tendencies of concentrating on the so-called disputed areas in order to build up a case for their incorporation in one's own 'homeland' will intensify with the appointment of the boundary commission and the ruling classes will utilise them to disrupt the struggles of the masses. Hence all such tendencies are to be specially combated and the banner of proletarian internationalism upheld.

48. Each struggle, each campaign, each mass action must be used not only to popularise slogans but also and above all to build organisations—of workers, peasants, students, youth, women. It must be remembered that one of the main reasons why the growth of the mass movement is lagging behind the growth of mass discontent is that such organisations are still weak and in many places non-existent.

In the past a key weakness of organisations of workers, peasants and other classes has been the weakness of the basic units like factory committees and primary kisan sabhas. The strength of mass organisations depends not only on their total membership but on the manner in which this membership is organised—above all, on the firmness and organised functioning of the basic units. Without them, neither the mass base of the organisations can be expanded nor even the existing bases activated. Hence the necessity to focus attention on this work and draw into organisational work rank-and-file workers, peasants and agricultural labourers.

49. The work of our comrades in the state legislatures and parliament has strengthened the mass movement. Nevertheless the role our work in parliament and state legislatures can play in the development of the mass movement outside has not been fully realised either by the comrades inside the legislatures or outside them. The existence of a powerful mass movement outside helps to make work in parliament effective. But experience has also shown that in some areas where the party and mass movement are weak, our work in the legislatures has helped to draw towards the party and enthuse new sections and organisations whom we could not touch before. Comrades in legislatures therefore have to act in such a way as to strengthen the movement where it exists and also help its growth where it is weak or as yet nonexistent.

Our work in the legislatures has to:

- (i) Reflect the mass movement outside.
- (ii) Popularise the policy of the Communist Party on a nationwide scale and make common knowledge, on an all-India plane, the struggles and victories of the masses in different areas, thereby helping forward the political consciousness of the entire people.
- (iii) Take steps to win concessions for the people, improve the existing legislation in favour of the people and initiate new legislation.
- (iv) Aid the struggle and carry forward the movements

of the workers, peasants and all sections of the people. For this purpose, it is necessary not only to undertake exposure of the policies and legislative and executive measures of the government but utilise all other parliamentary forms such as demand for parliamentary delegations and committees of inquiry and their visits and tours, so as to make them the rallying-point of wide agitation and mass mobilisation in support of them.

(v) Develop unity with sections within legislatures who are getting rapidly disillusioned and help in the development of the united front outside.

In order to improve our work in legislatures, it is necessary that there be:

(i) Closer coordination between parliamentary activity and the mass movement outside.

(ii) Extension of the limited-area outlook and knowledge of our comrades in the legislatures to a national outlook so that they may effectively reflect not only their constituencies, states and fronts but also the areas from which none has been elected.

(iii) A serious effort by comrades in legislatures to develop and master the art of parliamentary work in order to forge out of it a powerful weapon to be wielded in defence of and for winning the rights of the struggling masses.

(iv) An effort to see that our work in the legislatures is widely publicised and popularised and that our journals use the activities in parliament to strengthen the movement outside.

(v) Development of closest links by comrades in legislatures with the masses outside, so that they can effectively act as the tribunes of the people and prove worthy of the faith and trust reposed in them by the people and by their movement.

For this it is essential that the CC and the PCs should give the closest attention and guidance to the work in the legislatures. Together with this, the weaknesses of the mass organisations must be overcome and coordination between them and legislature work established.

50. Our comrades have been returned in large numbers to many municipalities, local boards and panchayats. A correct understanding of our tasks in the municipal and local bodies is of great importance. The municipalities and local boards, in spite of their limited powers and spheres of action but because of their proximity to the very people who elect them and the day-to-day constant contact with the local executive machinery, can be used for the direct benefit of the people by our representatives in many small ways. As such the limitations that are being sought to be imposed on the powers and rights of these bodies should be resisted and every effort should be made to expand them.

The people expect us to use these limited powers to give them some amenities of health and hygiene, roads and water supply, elementary education and such other things as lie within the purview of these bodies. The bourgeois-landlord leadership of the Congress wants these bodies to put additional taxation on the peasantry to pay for these benefits and even the proceeds of this small taxation are mulcted by the local exploiters. It is our duty to see to it that this game is defeated and that these local centres of municipal authority, wherever they are under our guidance, are rid of corruption and graft, that the harassment of the peasantry is stopped and that the dues realised are used for rendering real municipal aid to the people.

However poor and meagre be the powers, these can be used to do good to the life of the people. Our representatives must learn the art of running them properly. They are surely not speech broadcasting houses only. Local self-government must become the platform of strengthening the people's solidarity through the partial services that are possible within the framework of even the existing legislation.

Hence we have to see that our approach in these bodies is even more positive than in the legislatures and that our cadres in these bodies do get serious education in the running of these bodies. The provincial committees must help

in the drawing up of programs for the implementation of which our comrades must fight.

51. Despite the growth of the general influence of the party, our effective organised influence is confined, in almost all states, to a few areas and districts. Without a countrywide party, without a wide kisan sabha, without a firm base in the most important workingclass areas, it is not possible to grow into a countrywide national-political force. While strengthening our position in the areas where we are already a force, it has become urgently necessary to spread to new areas and sectors. Provincial units must carefully and urgently plan out and execute this task.

It is necessary to create mass political literature and transform our newspapers into national-political journals.

The fulfilment of all these tasks demands the rapid strengthening of the party and the undertaking of political education as a key political task. For the development of the party is the key factor in determining the growth of the mass movement. It is of utmost importance that the entire party be armed with the perspective of the fast maturing of a profound economic and political crisis, of the struggles that are looming large and of the perspective of coordinating them into the political struggle for the replacement of the present government by a government of democratic unity. The party must acquire a correct understanding of the direction in which things are moving, a sense of urgency, revolutionary zeal and passion and give up all complacency and sense of selfsatisfaction.

The party must become the decisive national force—politically, geographically and in a class sense, i.e. by party units in each area and state acting as the leader and organiser of the people, by the party spreading to new areas, and by its basing itself and drawing its main strength from the working class and the toiling peasants. Advance is to be measured no longer, as in the past, in terms of our 'general political influence' nor even in terms of mass mobilisation on specific issues only, but in terms of the growth of organisation in general and growth of the

party in particular, in terms of circulation of literature and newspapers, in terms of collection of funds, in terms of the strengthening of mass organisations and the party itself.

It is only through such all-round growth that the party will be able to discharge its duties and responsibilities to the people.

16. Support the People's Movement in French India

The central committee of the Communist Party of India sends its warm greetings to the people of the French Indian possessions, bravely fighting for the liberation of these territories from French imperialist rule.

Despite the brutal terror that had been let loose on the patriotic forces of the people since 1947, the people of these possessions have not been cowed and during the last one month have again launched a struggle for merger with the Indian Union.

Once again the French imperialists, isolated from the people, have let loose an orgy of violence on the common people. Goonda gangs, organised by the French colonial administration, attack the patriots, pillage their houses and destroy the huts of the workers who stand at the head of the movement of the people in Pondicherry.

Even the people living in the Indian Union on the border of Pondicherry are not safe. Violating the territorial integrity of the Indian Union, the police and goondas from Pondicherry have started attacking and firing upon the villages inside the Indian Union.

The continued existence of these foreign bases on Indian soil constitutes an infringement of the sovereignty of the Indian people, but is also a grave threat to the defence of India and to the peace of Asia. The central committee underlines the fact that the French imperialists are using Pondicherry as a port of call and fuelling station to transport troops and equipment for the war they are carrying on against the people of Indochina. With American aid,

Resolution on French possessions in India adopted by central committee, Delhi, 10-18 April 1954 and published in *New Age*, 18 April 1954.

the port is being remodelled at a heavy cost of Rs 1½ crore, and military installations are being planned.

Realising that the struggle of the people of French India is a common struggle of the entire Indian people for safeguarding the independence of the defence of the country, the central committee of the Communist Party of India appeals to the government of India and people all over India to support the struggle in every way.

In view of the repeated violation of the territorial integrity of the Indian Union by the armed police of Pondicherry and in view of the fact that peaceful life has become impossible for our brother people in these possessions, the central committee urges upon the government of India to take firm measures and to support the patriotic people in their struggle.

17. Our Tasks Among the Peasant Masses

INTRODUCTION BY THE POLITBURO

For the last two years we have been trying to concretise our tasks among the peasant and agricultural labourer masses. In the course of these discussions various problems and controversies have come to the forefront. The most important of them are as follows:

(1) What are the features of our agrarian economy and in what direction is the congress agrarian legislation modifying it? Does the congress agrarian legislation keep intact the feudal character of our agriculture or does it weaken it and tend towards development of capitalist mode of production in agriculture? If it is the latter, to what extent and in what form?

Connected with this problem, questions have been raised as to what is the specific character of feudalism in our country's economy; what constitutes the development of capitalism in agriculture and what is the role of imperialist-colonial exploitation in our agrarian economy?

(2) Similarly, questions have been raised as to how far class differentiation has taken place among the peasantry. What are its consequences? What should be our demands and attitude in regard to the various sections of the peasant masses? This inevitably leads us to the study and careful analysis of the class composition in the rural areas and to evolve a concrete program and work out suitable tactics for implementing it.

(3) Another basic question that has been raised is whether, when concretely formulating the demands, there

Resolution adopted by the CC. Delhi. 10-18 April 1954 and published as a pamphlet in June 1954.

is any need to take general propaganda slogans or is it enough to have current agitational slogans only which can be modified into slogans of action from place to place suitable to the needs of the development of the movement.

(4) At the same time, questions relating to ceiling, the 'right of resumption', rent reduction, tax burdens, economic price for the peasants' produce, indebtedness, consolidation of holdings and prevention of fragmentation, co-operative societies, panchayats, irrigation facilities, demands of agricultural labourers, separate organisations of agricultural labourers, and the problems of building and activating kisan organisations, have all become pressing issues before us.

(5) And, above all, the question of our attitude to congress agrarian legislation has become an urgent one.

* * *

This resolution does not take up the basic issues mentioned in paras 1 to 3 above, because the CC has not yet come to conclusions on them. A solution of these controversies must await further study and discussion.

In this resolution only those issues that are enumerated in para 4 above, which are of immediate practical importance in the kisan movement, are taken up. The resolution lay down concrete principles on all the issues, which should serve as guidance for our work in the kisan movement on all these issues.

As for our attitude to congress agrarian legislation, without going into the question of how far it has weakened feudalism or tended to develop capitalism in agriculture, the CC has come to the following conclusions:

(a) Congress agrarian legislation must be looked upon as the product of the growth of peasant struggles and the general development of the democratic movement. Naturally, where the peasant movement is more organised, struggles are more intense and the democratic movement is more advanced, there the concessions are also bound to be more.

(b) The congress governments adopt twofold tactics to meet the growing peasants' struggles:

—on the one hand, they enact agrarian legislation giving some concessions. These enactments, however, leave enough loopholes to enable the landlords to evict the tenants and rob the peasants in many ways. As a result, eviction on a mass scale is being resorted to by the landlords.

—on the other hand, the governments resort to direct police repression and attacks on the peasant masses.

It also raises false issues to create illusions among the peasantry, such as the bhoodan movement, community projects, and five-year plan development schemes. These issues are intended at the same time to confuse the democratic-minded people about the doings of the government.

Our tactics must be:

—use the concessions in the interests of the peasants and fight for more.

—Defend the existing rights against attack.

—Wage ideological-political struggle and expose the false issues and illusions that are sought to be raised and created by the government through such slogans as bhoodan, etc.

It should be clearly understood that the government, faced with the growing peasant struggle, gives concessions, but these tend to be more to the upper section of the peasantry, with a view to divide the peasantry, to create for itself a political base among this upper section, while the government resorts to repression and attack against the peasantry as a whole. So in utilising these concessions, determined struggle should be waged for uniting the peasants, especially the agricultural labourers and the poor peasants, and defeat the government's aim of dividing the peasantry.

The CC warns against a negative attitude towards congress agrarian legislation. It emphasises that it is only by utilising the concession, working out and fighting for more, especially in the interests of the basic masses, that we can develop the full demands of the fighting peasants.

The CC also wants to clarify that it is not possible, nor is it attempted in this resolution to give concrete solutions for every issue that faces us in different provinces. The conditions vary from province to province and even from area to area and it is for the respective committees in close cooperation with the peasant masses to concretely evolve the necessary slogans. The resolution gives the broad guidance and lays the basis for doing it.

* * *

The CC wants to stress one more aspect: The question of formulating the demands of agricultural labourers and organising them in a separate organisation has become urgent. We have been neglecting it in the past, and this is one of our main weaknesses in the kisan movement. Without organising the agricultural labourers and poor peasants, there cannot be a widespread movement capable of defending the interests of the peasant masses, capable of winning their full demands.

* * *

1. OUR TASKS IN THE KISAN MOVEMENT

Our country saw the biggest kisan struggles in the post-war national upheaval during 1946. The heroic tenants' struggle in Kerala, Tamilnad, Andhra, Punjab, UP and Bihar, in Karwar and the Warli area, the tebhaga struggles of the Bengal peasants, etc., were ruthlessly suppressed by the congress and league ministries and the British imperialists. The Telangana peasants' struggle which had begun then, later on developed along the line of seizure of the landlords' land by the peasants and their dogged defence of their gains.

This mass peasant upheaval coupled with countrywide strikes of the working class and the revolt of the RIN in February 1946, followed by unrest and revolts in the armed forces, forced the British imperialists to adopt new methods for continuing their domination in India. They struck a deal with the congress and league leaders who

agreed to the partition of our country and were installed in power in India and Pakistan. The congress leaders, after they climbed to the seats of government continued to follow policies that safeguarded the interests of the princes and landlords, of the British imperialists and of Indian monopolists.

They have gone back on their oft-repeated promises to the peasant masses. They have thrown to the winds the agrarian resolution of the Faizpur congress, which categorically promised immediate substantial reduction in rent, revenue and irrigation rates; fixity of tenure and abolition of arrears of rent and a graded agricultural income tax to replace the present land-revenue system.

But they now speak of zamindari abolition and enact legislations that give the zamindars fat compensation but do not give even the immediate relief that was promised, let alone giving land to the tiller. The Indian constitution itself, framed by them, guarantees the landlords and vested interests 'fair and equitable' compensation.

The policies which the congress government has been adopting during its seven years of rule have resulted in a catastrophic crisis in our agrarian economy. "The production of foodgrains per acre has sharply declined according to the report of the planning commission itself. Famine conditions have become chronic in many parts of the country. Scarcity conditions prevail in vast areas. With the fall in prices of commercial crops, added to the ruin of subsidiary industries like handloom, the distress of the peasant masses has been intensified. Indebtness of the peasants has increased to colossal proportions. Tens of thousands of peasants have sold away and are selling away land, their cattle and all their belongings at incredibly low prices due to scarcity and famine conditions. Their properties are passing into the hands of rapacious landlords and money-lenders. On top of this the governments in many states resort to coercive measures and sell away by auction the lands of peasants who are unable to pay arrears of land revenue and debt" (*Political Resolution adopted by the Third Congress of the Communist Party of India*).

This situation is the direct result of the policies of the government of India—of its refusal to undertake basic agrarian reforms, of its refusal to break with the British commonwealth and confiscate British capital.

But the peasant masses have not meekly submitted to these worsening conditions. During the last seven years of congress rule there have been innumerable kisan struggles against largescale evictions, for rent reduction and against enhanced irrigation and other taxes. The congress governments have been resorting to mass arrests, tear-gas, shootings and terror to suppress these struggles.

In Telangana and Andhra in over five years the congress government imprisoned over 50,000 persons, raided over 10,000 villages, beat and tortured over a million and a half people, burnt down hundreds of villages, uprooted nearly two lakhs of tribal people from their forest abode and drove them into concentration camps, and shot dead about 4000 persons. All this it resorted to in order to seize the lands from the Telangana peasants and restore them to the landlords. Even now kisan leaders are facing prosecution in scores of foisted cases; witnesses are being tortured to make them agree to give false evidence. Nearly a hundred kisan leaders are undergoing sentences of transportation for life. A hundred more are undergoing sentences of various terms of imprisonment.

However the congress government was forced to enact a tenancy legislation, giving certain concessions to the peasants.

In Malabar, in 1948, brutal terror was let loose on the peasants and more than one hundred kisan workers and leaders were shot dead. Their only crime was that they demanded that they be permitted not to pay in kind the rent due to the landlords, but instead pay the landlords' share in kind to the cooperative societies, and pay the landlords in cash. Despite this repression the Malabar peasants have intensified their agitation and won significant concessions in the latest legislation.

In Tamilnad, Bombay, Bengal, Bihar, UP, Rajasthan and PEPSU, repeated raids, arrests, shootings took place where

in large numbers of kisans were wounded and shot dead, when they were resisting eviction by the landlords.

In Punjab alone more than a lakh tenants were deprived of their land, and refugee landlords from Pakistan were settled on it, on the plea of rehabilitating the refugees!

Throughout the countryside, the government is resorting to various penal sections, especially sections 107/144, etc. At the same time the congress government is coming forward with various pieces of agrarian legislation, conceding a few minor concessions in its desperate effort to keep the peasant masses under its influence. It hopes that, by its concessions, it will be able to win over at least a section of the peasantry and thus divide and disrupt the developing kisan movement and the growing unity of the peasants.

The congress leadership has intensified its propaganda drive aimed at diverting the attention of the peasant masses and of the general democratic movement from the real issues facing the people and their correct solution.

It promises to build a cooperative commonwealth and even a classless society, through bhoodan, through its policies of fixing ceilings for holdings of consolidation, and prevention of fragmentation of holdings; through advocacy of family planning to reduce the population which, they allege, is too much for our country. It promises to do this without doing away with the parasitic landlord class, but, on the other hand, with its active cooperation and participation! It promises to build this millennium following this 'unique path', avoiding the 'bloody and costly' path which they say the Soviet Union and People's China had trodden.

The program of the Communist Party points out the only way to solve the agrarian and national crisis. It declared: "To develop our agriculture and our national industries, to improve the conditions of the working class, to work our way out of cultural backwardness and to even make our state stable, it is necessary to create human conditions of existence for the peasants."

To achieve this, it is necessary:

(1) To take land from the landlords and hand it over to the peasants, including agricultural labourers without payment and thus realise the abolition of landlordism without compensation.

(2) To cancel the debts of peasants and small artisans to moneylenders and provide longterm cheap credit to enable them to purchase implements, seeds and manure.

(3) To ensure adequate wages and living conditions to agricultural labourers.

(4) To guarantee economic prices for the peasants' produce and to reduce tax burdens on the peasant masses.

(5) To provide irrigation facilities.

It is for the realisation of these demands that the peasant masses have been struggling and have to struggle further. How do the ruling classes reply to these demands?

2. CONGRESS AGRARIAN LEGISLATION

The Congress claims to have abolished landlordism! The congress governments in various states have enacted zamindari or jagirdari abolition acts, and are proposing to bring in tenancy legislation, or agrarian reforms bills. They are claiming that by these various acts enacted they have already abolished statutory landlordism, like zamindari, jagirdari, inamdari, malguzari, vatandari, biswedari, etc. And when they enact their proposed agrarian reforms acts, fixing the maximum limit of holdings, they will be completing their program of abolition of landlordism and of land to the tiller. All this, they claim, will assure agricultural development and prosperity to the peasant.

The main features of these statutory zamindari abolition acts are:

(1) The right of collecting rents from the peasants is taken away from zamindars, jagirdars, etc., and vested in the government, who will collect the same directly from the tenants. In return for this right of collection, zamindars,

jagirdars and other statutory landlords are paid huge compensations to the tune of hundreds of crores of rupees.

As regards old arrears of rent, the acts provide that they are to be collected from the peasants by the government and paid to the landlords.

In many cases there is no reduction in the rents. Only the peasants have now to pay them to the government instead of the landlords. Thus they become land revenue payable to the government.

(2) Absolute proprietary rights are conferred on the landlords on hundreds and thousands of acres of the so-called sir and khudkhast lands. For the tenant cultivators on these lands no right whatsoever is granted. Neither do they get the land nor even fixity of tenure nor even reduction in the exorbitant rent they are now paying varying from 1/3 to 3/4 of the gross produce; on the other hand, the landlords are free to evict them and they have been doing it on a large scale, fearing any future legislation that may be brought conferring rights on these tenants-at-will.

This right to sir and khudkhast land has encouraged the zamindars to resort to subterfuges to evict even occupancy tenants on a large scale, and seize their land, and claim it to be their sir and khudkhast land.

(3) The government has taken over the rights over forest, irrigation facilities and waste and communal lands from the zamindars. Even here, the rigorous enforcement of government forest laws has made the conditions of tribal people and the people living near the forests worse. Similarly, government efforts to auction cultivable waste lands and lanka lands to the highest bidder, are depriving the poor peasants and the agricultural labourers of even those lands, which in many areas they have been cultivating for years.

We also find that these zamindari abolition acts have not been applied in many states where the old landlordism still remains intact. In states where they are applied big landlords continue to exist as owners of sir and khudkhast land.

Nowhere do these acts give land to the tiller free but all of them impose heavy burdens of compensation and even allow his eviction from his cultivated lands by the landlords.

But in so far as the right of the zamindars to collect rents on behalf of the government is taken away and their opportunities for making various other exactions have been abolished, in so far as their authority and grip on the irrigation sources, on the grazing fields and also on forests have been removed—all this involving the curtailment of the omnipotent powers of the landlords—the peasants do get a measure of relief from the oppression of these statutory landlords.

3. THE LAWS DO NOT GIVE LAND TO THE TILLER

The proposed tenancy or land reform legislation of the congress government will not touch the basic question of giving land to the tiller.

(1) The proposal to fix a ceiling or upper limit for land-holdings is only in respect of future acquisition or for resumption for personal cultivation. Even so, they reject any idea of taking over the land in excess of this limit, and distributing it free to agricultural labourers and peasants, under the plea that such a measure would be contrary to the provisions of the Indian constitution.

This allows a landlord to evict tenants from the lands they are cultivating on the plea that the land with him for personal cultivation is less than the limit allowed. Further they can and are actually dividing their holdings in the name of their children or close relatives in such a way as to bring their holdings within the ceiling. By this device, no excess land above the ceiling will be left for the tenant to exercise the right of buying such land. Moreover, this device would also entitle each one of those relatives of the landlord among whom his land is divided to evict the tenants from his share of the land. Further, these acts

provide that it is for the landlords to choose lands they want to retain which means that the best lands will be concentrated in their hands.

(2) The tenant is given the first option to purchase the land he is cultivating, only if the landlord has already got land or has resumed land to the maximum upper limit. For this purpose, the price of land is fixed in terms of gross produce or in terms of multiple of land revenue, which the tenants have to pay. Generally this price becomes so high that it enables only a small section of rich and upper middle peasants to purchase land. The vast majority of agricultural labourers and poor and middle peasants are unable to purchase any land.

(3) The tenancy laws provide for certain fixity of tenure for periods varying from five to ten years and of rent from three-fifths to one-sixth of the gross produce. In some cases rent is fixed as a multiple of the land revenue.

But even these laws are executed through the bureaucratic machinery which is not amenable to the influence of the peasant masses. As the peasant organisations are not strong enough to enforce the beneficial part of these laws, their full benefits do not accrue to them.

(4) The congress governments are also proposing steps for compulsory cooperative farming. They are proposing to take over all holdings below a certain limit compulsorily and merge them into cooperative farms. Under such compulsion, the interests of the poor peasants will suffer and the cooperatives will become the instruments of exploitation of the peasantry in the countryside.

(5) The congress governments have also enacting legislation prohibiting division of holdings below a certain limit and providing for compulsory consolidation of holdings, the plea being that only thus agriculture can be carried on economically. Such a measure leads in most provinces to depriving vast numbers of even their tiny plots and reducing them to the state of landless agricultural labourers. The process of consolidation is working in most provinces against the peasants and in favour of bigger landholders.

The real solution is the abolition of landlordism without

compensation and giving land free to the agricultural labourers and the peasants.

4. FIXATION OF CEILINGS AND FREE DISTRIBUTION OF LAND ABOVE CEILING—THE URGENT ISSUE

There are landlords who lease their fields to agricultural labourers and peasants for rent in kind or cash, or on sharecropping. There are other landlords who get their lands cultivated by farm servants and daily wage labour, without themselves doing any essential manual labour on their fields. And there are landlords who lease out some portion of their land for rent and get the rest of it cultivated by employing farm servants.

It is those landlords owning a large portion of the land, who deprive the peasant masses and agricultural labourers of their land. Taking advantage of the growing pauperisation of the peasants, and their total dependence on land even for earning a pittance for their life in the absence of industries or any other avocations, the landlords force them to pay exorbitant rents before they lease lands to them. Again the growing number of landless agricultural labourers and the growing unemployment in the rural areas enable the landlord to dictate to the agricultural labourers and the farm servants the most miserable wages.

Thus even the question of reduction of rents for the tenants and increase in the wages of agricultural labourers is closely linked up with the distribution of the surplus land of these landlords to the agricultural labourers and to the peasants. To draw these peasants and the labouring masses in the countryside into the movement, the question of fixing up the ceilings for land holdings and free distribution of the land over those ceilings, becomes an urgent issue.

Further, without breaking the monopoly of these landlords over the land, especially the hold of feudal landlords who lease out their lands, it is impossible to increase agricultural production to any appreciable extent to meet the

food and industrial raw material requirements of our people.

Certain arguments are advanced that large farms that are using modern machinery and advanced agricultural technique should not be broken up and the land distributed as it would retard the development of agricultural production. This question should not be looked at from the angle as to whether a few modern farms in the hands of certain landlords are more productive in comparison with small holdings. But it should be looked at only from the angle that in the interests of developing the whole agrarian movement, and of drawing in the masses of peasants by satisfying their land hunger, the break-up of even these farms by fixing a ceiling becomes necessary at this stage. Today the main fetter on production is the antiquated land system itself, which cannot be changed without united struggle of the peasant masses against the landlords. Therefore slogans and tactics must be determined in relation to the need of this struggle. It is only by drawing the peasant masses and rural labouring masses into the struggle, leading to giving them land, that ultimately an appreciable improvement even in agricultural production becomes possible and not by the growth here and there of big modern farms owned by the landlords.

(1) We must demand and extensively popularise that the ceiling for landholdings should be fixed and that the land in excess of that ceiling be taken over and distributed free to the agricultural labourers and the peasants.

The ceiling should be such as to allow enough income to maintain a person and his family at least at the same standard as that of a rich peasant, but it must not be so high as not to leave enough land for distribution among agricultural labourers and the peasant masses.

The party basing on the above principles, must work out what would be such a ceiling from area to area, in close cooperation with the kisan sabha, after a thorough study of all the facts and after inviting a serious and thorough discussion with the peasant masses in the area.

(2) We must demand that those landlords who lease out

their lands, even though they may own less than this ceiling, shall have no right of resumption, even under the plea of selfcultivation, as it would lead to the eviction of cultivators. They may be paid some rehabilitation grant, or land from surplus land if they want to take to actual tilling and cultivation and live in peace with the people. This is especially so in those cases of statutory landlords like inamdars, etc., who never have been cultivators for generations.

(3) There are small landholders, who own less than a family holding. (Family holding being in certain areas that amount of holding which would give employment for a single family of an adult male worker and his wife, with a pair of bullocks, employing seasonal wage labour, or in certain other areas it will be only that amount of landholding which gives a reasonable standard of living.) They might have leased out their lands because it was uneconomical to cultivate them themselves, or because they might have been forced to take up jobs or trades in towns or villages. They will generally be factory employees, petty traders, low-paid professionals, etc. Those are not to be confused with landlords; their cases are entirely different.

These small landholders should have the option either to come back and till their land, making it their main profession or lease it subject to fixity of tenure and reduction of rent as per the tenancy laws, or to sell it, or to take full compensation from the government at the market price, relinquishing the land to the tenant cultivator. If conflicts arise between these small holders and these tenants who are equally poor, the kisan movement must strive to bring some compromise to preserve the unity of these peasant masses. But in the case of those who have professions with incomes enough to maintain a reasonable standard of life, they shall be paid compensation or allowed to receive the reduced rents, but shall not have the right of resumption.

It is absolutely necessary to popularise the above proposals of land distribution, because the question of limitation of landholdings has already been brought on the agenda by the Congress, which has brought such legisla-

tions in certain states and has decided to hasten similar legislation in other states. Apart from the kisan masses, even their democratic allies in towns are led to believe by these spurious measures that the congress government's slogan of fixation of ceiling really abolishes landlordism and gives land to the tiller. Therefore it is essential to propose a concrete solution of the problem.

5 STRUGGLE AGAINST EVICTION AND FOR RENT REDUCTION

At the same time, the immediate and most pressing task of the party is to take up the struggle against eviction and for rent reduction. The party and the kisan movement have to fight all manipulations of the congress government and all provisions in their agrarian legislation that militate against the interests of the peasant masses and which are leading to the eviction of peasants from their holdings.

In carrying on the agitation and struggles against eviction and for the reduction of rent, the party and the kisan movement must utilise to the fullest extent all the concessions and facilities that are given by the existing agrarian legislation, however halting and restricted they may be.

It is necessary to come out with positive suggestions for improving the existing agrarian legislations in favour of the peasant masses. We must demand:

(1) Zamindaris, so far not taken over by the government, must immediately be taken over. Proprietary rights of tenants in the sir or khudkhas lands of these landlords be recognised.

(2) Compensation to the big zamindars be withheld.

(3) Legislation fixing up ceilings of landholdings and providing for surplus land being distributed free among agricultural labourers and poor peasants.

(4) Arrears of rent and revenue be abolished.

(5) Rents be scaled down to the level of the neighbouring ryotwari rates or by substantial amounts.

(6) Exorbitant water and other rates be reduced.

(7) All evictions be immediately stopped.

(8) Irrigation and forest and grazing facilities be provided.

(9) Proper survey settlements at government's cost—the work of survey to be finished quickly.

(10) All major items, in whatever forms and names they exist, be abolished conferring proprietary rights on the cultivators of inam lands.

(11) Proprietary rights to the land held by service inam holders be recognised, freeing them from the obligation of existing services. Separate remuneration should be paid for any services they render.

(12) Tenants-at-will:

(i) Tenants-at-will shall not be evicted and shall be guaranteed fixity of tenure.

(ii) Substantial reduction of rent.

(iii) Kind rents to be commuted into cash rents and meanwhile the peasant be given the option of payment in cash at the market price, even if the agreement is otherwise.

Rent Reduction

The amount of rent reduction which we would demand would vary from region to region, taking into consideration the actual rents that are being paid now, the consciousness of the tenant regarding the land he is cultivating, and the number and the relative strength of tenants. There are certain regions where the tenants have been cultivating lands of big landlords for considerably long periods continuously. Here it is possible to demand greater reduction in the existing rents.

But there are certain other regions where due to intensive pressure on land, due to a dense population and where also the landlords have started capitalist mode of farming, vast numbers of agricultural labourers in search of work accept tenancies changing from year to year and as such they have no particular attachment to any particular piece of land. In such cases, it becomes more difficult to demand an immediate heavy reduction in those temporary rents.

When we demand reduction of rent and fixity of tenure, we mean only the reduction of rents paid by the peasants to the landlords, and fixity of tenure to the peasants on landlords' fields. This does not apply in the case of those areas, especially where commercial crops are being grown extensively like sugar, tobacco, etc., and where the common feature is for the landlord to take land on lease from small holders and pay them low rentals. Here we must demand increase in the rates that are being paid to the peasants by the landlords.

6. DEMANDS OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS

Agricultural labourers are the most militant section of the agricultural population. The whole agrarian movement is to be based on those 70 per cent of the rural population of agricultural labourers and poor peasants, firmly uniting with middle peasants and winning over rich peasants against the landlords, forging a close alliance with the working class and the democratic movement in the towns.

The struggle of the poor and middle and rich peasants against the landlords for land, for fixity of tenure and even for reduction of rent, cannot be carried out successfully without the active support of and drawing in of agricultural labourers.

Yet, except in Andhra and to some extent in Tamilnad, Kerala and a few other places, we have not so far seriously taken their problems and fought for them nor brought them into an organised movement. This serious weakness of our movement has to be immediately rectified.

The party and the kisan movement must vigorously take up and champion the immediate demands of the agricultural labourers, as well as their basic demand for land. It is only by taking up these demands of the agricultural labourers that we can draw them into the movement against landlordism, against the ruling class and for land, freedom, democracy and peace. Failure to do this allows these sections to be drawn into communal, disruptive and

reactionary organisations. They may be even turned against other peasant masses in the villages, on the basis of caste divisions, disabilities and oppression.

Some of their immediate demands are:

(1) Cultivable waste lands to be assigned to them and the poor peasants without any charges at least for the first five years. Grants and longterm loans for purchasing cattle, implements, etc.

(2) Free housesites and equal right to the use of common lands and sites with others. No eviction from homesteads or from the present occupied houses.

(3) Cancellation of their debts to landlords and moneylenders and provision of cheap credit facilities.

(4) Removal of social disabilities based on caste and untouchability.

(5) Abolition of and penalisation of forced labour.

(6) Free medical and educational facilities by the government.

(7) Provision of employment opportunities by government starting various irrigation and development schemes.

(8) Fixation of minimum wage for day labour and minimum salary for the farm servants.

(9) The present excessive hours of work for farm servants to be reduced and a minimum number of holidays per year to be given.

The minimum daily wage of an agricultural labourer must be such as to enable him and his dependants to get at least the minimum necessities of life on the day of their working. The minimum wage is for normal work. But the daily wage for harder work or for busy seasons with longer hours will have to be higher than this minimum. The farm servants should get at least 365 times this minimum daily wage as his minimum yearly salary.

Overshadowing every other problem of the agricultural labourers the problem of unemployment faces them in an acute form. Millions of them have to wander in search of employment and agricultural work, even in busy seasons like the replanting and harvesting seasons, does not

last for more than a fortnight or at the most a month. There can be no improvement in their conditions until they are provided with work. The party must take up their demand for "work or unemployment relief".

7. SEPARATE ORGANISATION FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS

Agricultural labourers should be organised separately in independent class organisations apart from the peasant organisations, because, firstly, they have their own separate demands of wages, hours of work, holidays, etc. Secondly, most of these agricultural labourers are from socially backward or even so-called untouchable (harijan) castes and it will be more difficult to draw them and activate them in kisan sabhas directly along with the other caste peasants or even if we succeed in drawing them in, it may lead to the other peasants not joining the kisan sabha in large numbers. Thirdly, agricultural labourers will become the leading force if they are organised separately and at the same time brought into the kisan sabha.

We should try to draw into the agricultural labour organisations all other wage-earners in the rural areas, such as carpenters, blacksmiths, washermen, earth-diggers and other miscellaneous manual labourers.

But at the same time, it is necessary to understand that in certain areas where the immediate major struggle of both the agricultural labourers and the peasants is against a particular big feudal landlord or landlords, against forced labour, against evictions, from which both of them suffer in common, the need for separate agricultural labour organisations may not be so urgent. Wherever agricultural labourers are not or cannot be organised separately, there they would be organised into the kisan sabhas directly.

It must be borne in mind, however, that the moment this joint struggle achieves some concessions, it is common experience that the erstwhile ally, the rich peasant, tries

to take advantage of the concessions to the detriment of the labourers. Then it becomes absolutely necessary to organise the agricultural labourer in his separate organisation, and defend his special demands for better wages and for better conditions of work.

Also it is to be remembered that only when we start taking up and championing the special demands of agricultural labourers and fighting for them, the need for their separate organisation also becomes evident. So far we have been neglecting woefully the demands of agricultural labourers and thus failing to build even the unity of the agricultural labourers with the other sections of the peasantry.

Since their most important demand for land is also the common demand of the entire peasantry against the landlord and also because their economic tie-up is with that of the peasantry, immediate steps should be taken to evolve a coordinating mechanism at every level between agricultural labourers organisations and kisan sabhas drawing both the organisations into closer and closer functioning wherein the agricultural labourers and the poor peasants would be playing the leading role.

8. ECONOMIC PRICES FOR THE PEASANTS' PRODUCE

Due to the machinations of the foreign and Indian monopolists controlling the capitalist market, the produce of the peasants, when it comes to the market, fails to secure economic prices; millions have to part with their commodities at prices even far below the cost of production to the big trading houses and agents of British and American monopolists out to secure our raw material at low prices. Such is the case specially of producers of jute, sugarcane, tobacco, cotton, oilseeds, coir, rubber, copra, etc.

One of the important tasks of the kisan movement is to demand of the government to take measures to free the peasants from the machinations of the foreign and Indian

monopolists and give protection to the peasant producers by guaranteeing economic prices for their product.

While the government is always ready to put ceilings on prices of raw materials in boom periods in the interests of the Indian industrialists and foreign buyers, it is not ready to guarantee economic prices in the interests of the peasant producer. This neglect of peasants' interests must be fought.

We must demand of the government guaranteed minimum economic prices for the peasants' produce and if the market prices fall below the minimum, the government must step in and purchase the produce from the peasants at the minimum prices.

We must also demand that government conclude a long-term trade agreement with the Soviet Union, China and other people's democracies to ensure a stable market and fair prices for our products and thus break from the shackles of Anglo-American monopoly of our export-import trade.

In the case of foodgrains we continue to be deficit and prices are still high. The government in different states continue compulsory procurement to a limited extent to feed the industrial centres or to relieve extreme scarcity in deficit areas. But these procurement prices are half of what the peasant would get in the open market a few months after harvest.

We cannot demand that there be no procurement or no price fixation, because it is a question of food for the hundreds of millions of the poor in towns and villages. Nor can we demand that controls of the past be brought back, as they had become means of oppression of the people and of profiteering by the few.

The benefit in the rise in prices between the harvest and the later peak price period does not come into the hands of the poor or middle peasants. The lion's share of it goes to the landlord-hoarder or the merchant-hoarder.

So we must demand that procurement be done of all surplus grains of the landlords, especially from the big ones and big stockists. There should be reasonably fair

price fixed for the procurement of the grain and this fair price must be guaranteed even at harvest times to the poor and the middle peasants who are mostly forced to sell their grain immediately after harvest. These prices should be announced far in advance of the peasant actually starting his cultivation.

We must demand that cheap grain-shops be opened in all towns and villages by the government and rationed quantity of foodgrains be increased especially in scarcity areas at times.

9. RELIEF FROM FOOD SCARCITY AND FAMINE

Food scarcity and famine have assumed serious proportions. Tens of millions are starving. Yet the government proclaims that there is enough food in the country and that the cry of famine and scarcity is false. We have to debunk the government's arguments by showing how the fall in take-off of rations is due to people's inability to purchase the foodgrains at high prices because of extreme poverty, and how it is not because everyone has enough. We will also have to expose that the official claim about the so-called selfsufficiency is based on the acceptance of the subnutritional standard of consumption of food.

We demand that in the famine and scarcity areas, the government should arrange:

(1) Immediate establishment of cheap grain depots, relief works and free kitchens.

(2) Liberalisation of the famine code in respect of test works, tasks and wages.

(3) Productive works instead of stone-breaking and mere road-building and protective works irrespective of returns be taken up in famine areas as relief works.

(4) Moratorium on all debts and remission of arrears of rents and land revenue.

(5) Supply of fodder.

(6) Grants of taccavi loans to be liberalised.

At the same time, we must organise famine relief committees in cooperation with others and organise relief. Kisan sabha and units of agricultural labourers' organisations should work in the relief centres, test works, cheap grain shops, to prevent corruption and make them work properly.

10. ALLEVIATION OF INDEBTEDNESS

We have been slack in taking up this demand for cancellation of debts of the village poor to moneylenders and to landlords. Vigorous campaign for immediate moratorium and for legislation for scaling down and abolition of old debts should be carried on.

But legislation will not be of much use unless we see that the government takes steps to provide cheap credit for the peasants.

The present scale of taccavi loans through land mortgage banks or cooperative credit societies is too meagre to meet the need. We must demand enormous increase in these facilities. Loans to the peasants must be at lower rates of interests and the recovery must be on easy instalments spread over a long period.

11. BRING COOPERATIVES AND PANCHAYATS UNDER PEOPLE'S CONTROL

The cooperative societies are generally in the hands of landlords and rich peasants. Whether they be credit societies, or market societies, or purchase and sale societies, or even producers' cooperatives, they have been utilised by the landlords and the rich peasants to serve their own interests to the detriment of the needs and interests of the poor and the middle peasantry. This has been so especially where the kisan movement is weak.

This state of affairs, however, must not blind us to some of the facilities which the government gives to cooperatives. The government continues these facilities and wants to

develop the cooperatives more extensively, to create the illusion that a really cooperative commonwealth can be built in this fashion. But, without ourselves falling under these illusions, it is necessary that we actively participate in the cooperatives and try to utilise them, to cater to the needs of the agricultural labour, poor and middle peasants. We must fight corruption in the cooperatives and demand more democratic rights.

The congress government has enacted legislation in different provinces, for the formation of village panchayats elected on the basis of adult franchise and varying powers are given to them over village affairs: we must take keen interest in them and see that the landlords and village reactionaries do not get hold of them. We must endeavour to see that they are under the control of genuine representatives of peasant and rural labour masses. We must utilise these panchayats, take measures to improve the village assemblies, especially in the interests of the poorer sections. We must be constantly fighting against encroachments by the government officials on the powers of panchayats and against various obstacles that they would be creating. We should demand greater facilities and powers for them. For instance, we can demand that the administration of irrigation sources, grazing fields and forests, distribution of manures and agricultural implements, collection of land revenue, etc. be handed over to these panchayats.

We have to formulate demands for reduction of various tax burdens and demand institution of graded agricultural tax. The agitation against imposition of new tax burdens on the peasants is to be intensified and all such efforts resisted. The party and the kisan sabha should be in the forefront in this struggle.

12 TRIBAL DEMANDS

(1) Reserve line to be kept one mile distant from the villages.

Areas marked as reserves, but without forests, to be

given for cultivation. Liberalisation of rules relating to shifting cultivation. Forest panchayats to be formed. Forest produce to be utilised freely by the tribals for their use as well as for sale. Cooperatives for tribals wherein they can fell trees for sale.

(2) All types of landlordism in tribal areas to be abolished and old debts liquidated.

(3) All exploitation by the contractors to be checked and fair prices for the forest collections of the tribals and proper wages for their work.

(4) Medical aid through dispensaries, touring health officers, special measures for special maladies prevalent in tribal areas, disinfection of drinking water wells, ponds, and special measures to counteract malaria.

Veterinary dispensaries and touring veterinary officers to prevent cattle epidemics.

(5) Special educational facilities in tribal areas: education through their own language; free supply of school material; night schools for adults; free scholarships in secondary and university courses; training of teachers from the tribals.

13. IRRIGATION FACILITIES

The government boasts of its few big multipurpose projects but neglects many immediately necessary minor irrigation projects. Even these big projects, which taken by themselves are useful, are proving so costly to build thanks to the bureaucratic inefficiency and rampant corruption, thanks to the employment of a large number of costly foreign experts and refusal to utilise and encourage the talents of Indian engineers and technicians, that people will not get the full benefits from them.

While pointing out the inadequacy of taking only a few of these multipurpose projects, it is necessary to demand of the government to devote enough funds for the minor

irrigation projects. Without developing these, the big projects alone will not solve the irrigation needs of our peasantry.

It is necessary to systematically work out the most necessary and important minor irrigation projects in each district or region and build up agitation for them. We must even mobilise the peasants to build them, forcing the government to give maximum help.

In this connection, betterment levies on all the peasantry, in many cases even before the completion of the irrigation scheme, that the congress government contemplates to impose on the basis of acreage, must be opposed as this would make the poor and middle peasant more indebted and ruined. But we can put forward alternate suggestions of graded betterment levies on the landlords.

It is time that the party and the kisan movement come forward not only as a critic of the government policies and actions, but even as builder of projects, organiser of famine relief and flood relief; as a force capable of looking to every institution like cooperatives, rural banks, marketing boards, panchayats and schools; cultural activities, agricultural research centres, etc. It is true, without full power and a people's democratic government, these will not become all-inclusive but they will serve limited purposes and as examples of what we and the people are capable of building, if only the present rule of the Congress, of the landlords and monopolists is abolished.

The habit of looking down upon "constructive" programs, without carefully studying them from the point of view of the peasantry and the people, of sneering at working for 'reforms' must be given up. The fear that such work will lead us into 'reformism' and that we will be creating 'illusions' among the peasantry must be given up. It is by successfully leading the peasant masses to achieve these small reforms, and win successes, however small, in all fronts, against the landlords and their government, that we can inspire and lead the peasant masses into action for realisation of their full demands.

14. BUILD ALL-IN KISAN UNITY FOR DEVELOPING STRUGGLES

Vast millions of kisans who see their needs and aspirations embodied in these concrete demands and slogans are moving into action to achieve the same. Even large masses of peasants who still have great illusions that these land relations can be basically altered through the Congress and its government, are all the same desiring that these demands be fulfilled and aspirations realised. It is this that makes possible united struggles against the most reactionary elements in the country and develop a broad-based kisan movements and draw in all these elements to join even the kisan sabha.

Millions of kisans, who are disillusioned with the Congress, have been groping their way to solve their problems. Large sections of them are under the influence of the Praja Socialist and other parties.

In Punjab, a large number of sikh peasantry are still following the Akali Party.

Throughout the country, large masses of agricultural labourers belonging to the harijan community, are behind the scheduled castes federation.

(1) So it is necessary for the party and the kisan movement to make the utmost efforts to draw in these masses and congress and PSP workers into united-front actions and it is through these actions that they would shed their illusions. At the same time it must be realised that it is only if the party carries on a systematic ideological struggle against the fundamentals preached by the Congress as well as against the sarvodaya plan of solving the land problem through bhoodan and other movements that this process of disillusionment can be successful. We must make special efforts to work unitedly with the workers of the PSP and other democratic parties, while not hesitating to criticise the reactionary policies of the leadership of the PSP and other parties wherever it becomes necessary.

This ideological struggle and united-front actions will have to be strengthened through systematic organisational

work with a view to the drawing in of the millions of peasants and agricultural labourers into the movement for agrarian revolution.

It is the job of the party to see that the appeal of the All-India Kisan Sabha to all other champions of kisans and kisan organisations which are today outside the kisan sabha to come into the fold of the All-India Kisan Sabha is implemented. This can be done, as the All-India Kisan Sabha itself points out, by first forging unity in action to wage joint struggles against evictions, against imposition of new taxes, for rent and revenue reduction as well as forming joint committees of struggle. The kisan sabha's appeal to all its lower units to make a concerted drive to form joint committees of all the existing kisan organisations to fight kisan struggles on specific issues has to be carried out. It is then only that the whole mass of kisans can be rallied behind a united organisation.

(2) Building of the unity of the entire peasantry against the landlord-imperialist exploitation becomes the most important task in order to develop a broad united kisan movement.

The problem of unity of the peasantry is mainly a problem of uniting the agricultural labourers and the peasants, including the rich peasants, against the exploitation of the imperialists, feudal landlords and Indian monopolists. An attitude of drift and spontaneity in this respect or failure to study the problem in all its relations leads to either the neglect of agricultural labourers, their demands and struggles, or the emphasising of their conflict with the peasantry divorced from the common conflict of both against feudal exploitation. It is mainly from the former neglect that the kisan movement has suffered till now.

While coming forward more consciously and determinedly in defence of the wage and other demands of rural workers, however, kisan workers have to realise that the objective conditions for peasant-agricultural labour unity are daily growing and not declining.

Taking the agrarian policy of the government as a whole, particularly in respect of compensation to land-

lords, the prices of agricultural goods, taxation, famine relief, taccavi and so on, the peasantry as a whole is becoming more and more hostile to the government and the classes the government defends and wants allies in its struggle against them. At the other end, the labourers are also realising that, short of acquiring the lands of the landlord and state-owned cultivable wastes, no other measure can give them a suitable assurance of even a moderate standard of life. Considering these factors, kisan workers have to go all-out for uniting the forces of agricultural labourers and the entire peasantry for united onslaught against landlordism.

(3) To develop the broad united kisan movement, it is necessary that we popularise the victories the kisan movement has achieved, the various concessions which it has been able to wrench from the hands of the government in the form of various legislations as a result of the heroic and persistent struggles waged by the kisan masses. Too often the tendency is to narrate only the hardships that the people are suffering and to ignore the successes that their struggles have won in the mistaken belief that reference to such successes will breed reformist illusions, while the reality is that in order to inculcate confidence in the masses, confidence that unity and struggle can win demands, it is essential that such successes won by the people, no matter how small, are widely publicised and made the basis for further advance.

It is also necessary to rouse and organise the peasant masses by pointing out to them how in the past the peasants have heroically fought and won many a demand and blazed a path of heroic tradition in the struggle for national liberation.

(4) To develop the broad united kisan movement, it is necessary that we utilise every piece of legislation that has been enacted to the maximum that is possible to further the interest of the kisans. We must see that every concession or facility granted in the legislation is actually enjoyed in practice by the peasants and agitate for further rights and facilities.

We must utilise the forum of legislative assemblies to improve the existing legislation as well as to ventilate the grievance of the kisan masses and get relief for improving the lot of the peasant masses. There must be far greater linking up of our parliamentary work with the kisan work outside.

(5) To develop a strong kisan movement, it is necessary that kisan sabhas and agricultural labour organisations should take up all those tasks which will raise the social, economic and cultural level of peasants and agricultural labourers such as organisation of literacy classes, sports and cultural activities, relief and selfhelp movement, struggle against social disabilities, organisation of medical, public health and other forms of moral uplift.

Office of kisan sabhas and agricultural labourers' organisations must function, daily attending to the various difficulties the kisan masses face in their relations with the landlords, government officers and other public institutions; provide them with legal assistance, help them to improve their agriculture by bringing to their notice the latest methods of improving agriculture; help them to fight pests that affect their crops and cattle; help them to get good seeds, implements, manures, water to their fields in time; and similar other multifarious activities connected with the whole life of the peasant and his daily occupation.

In one word, the kisan sabhas and agricultural labourers' organisations must become an integral part of the peasant's life, from where he gets constant advice and help.

(6) To develop a strong kisan movement, it is necessary to draw the kisan masses into discussions for formulating their immediate demands. The party and kisan sabha organisation must be all-attentive to what actually they have got to say and be extremely flexible in giving shape to the formulations of their immediate demands on the basis of the actual reality and the concrete situation.

This cannot be too much emphasised, especially in view of the fact that most of the active workers in the existing kisan sabha committees, practically at all levels, are not

those who carry on agricultural occupation, but who are more of political workers.

(7) In developing kisan struggles, we must show extreme flexibility in adopting the forms of struggle suited to local conditions, to the mood and preparedness of the kisan masses and to their organisation. All forms—petitions, signatures, demonstrations, marches, strikes and hartals and even civil disobedience, etc.—are to be adopted according to the situation existing.

(8) In developing these struggles or even preparing for them, we have been failing miserably in our agitation to explain the grievances from which the peasant masses have been suffering and against which they are preparing to fight in as wide an area as possible, depending on the importance of the issue involved. It is only when we can effectively popularise our demands that we can draw in other sections in other areas who are suffering from similar difficulties to join with us and fight effectively. The struggles, when carried on an extensive scale would be far more likely to achieve successes than when confined to limited areas or localities. It is also only when we can effectively popularise our demands and the struggle far and wide, and especially in the neighbouring countryside and the towns, that we can win the sympathy and support of all democratic elements.

15. FORGE UNITY OF WORKING CLASS & PEASANTS

(1) To achieve success in our kisan struggles, the active support of the working class is to be achieved. But it is here that the party has been failing. We have not been able to popularise the demands of kisan masses among the working class. We have not been able to make them realise how intimately their life and problems are connected with the outcome of kisan struggles and hence the necessity of coming all-out in support of these struggles. We have not been able to bring the working class to hold

meetings, demonstrations, leave alone coming out in general strike in support of kisan demands.

The party also must popularise workingclass demands and struggles among the kisans and bring them in support of these. It is only thus that we can forge unity between the working class and the peasantry which is the gurantee of our ultimate victory.

The party must make determined efforts to send workingclass party cadre from industrial centres to neighbouring peasant areas to develop the kisan movement.

(2) The party and the kisan movement must rouse the kisan masses against manoeuvres of warmongers, led by the US imperialists and their junior partners, the British imperialists, to unleash a third world war.

It must rouse them to the realisation of what the outbreak of war would mean to their own democratic struggles for land, bread and a decent life; to their kith and kin and cherished desires of peaceful and prosperous livelihood; to their sons and husbands being dragged into bloody wars to safeguard the profits and loot of the millionaires and the landlords and the foreign imperialists.

It must rouse them to demand that our government follow a consistent policy of peace and against war; demand the withdrawal of all foreign armies from the Asian and African countries; free and equal trade and cultural relations with all countries, especially with the Soviet Union, China and East European democracies and closer trade and cultural ties and alliance with Pakistan.

It is also necessary to extensively popularise among the agricultural labourers and the peasant masses, the achievements of the Soviet Union, People's China and other people's democracies; this will create confidence in their own strength to strive to achieve similar objectives. It will consolidate the feelings of international solidarity, which would help to bring them against all the plots of American and British imperialists to unleash a world war against the Soviet Union and People's China and make them champions of peace.

(3) It is also necessary to popularise the program and policy of the Communist Party of India and its unflinching stand in the service of the people and especially the kisan masses. A systematic campaign of recruitment into the party of kisan and agricultural labour militants and their education on the one hand, and a systematic sending of party cadre coming from the middle class and intelligentsia to work among the peasant masses on the other, have to be undertaken. It is only thus that we can strengthen the ideological-political and organisational ties of the party with the millions of peasants and agricultural labourers, which is one of our immediate urgent tasks.

Failure to do this will disarm the masses of peasants and agricultural labourers against the onslaught launched by the imperialists, feudal landlords and monopolies, and against the various forms of petty-bourgeois ideology.

(4) The party and the kisan movement must make special efforts to rouse the kisan women to join the kisan sabha and participate in its multifarious activities. Special efforts are to be taken to formulate women's demands, especially those that affect the kisan women, and necessary steps to fight for them should be taken. Special efforts should be made to educate the kisan woman cadre.

Similarly the kisan youth are to be organised and drawn into kisan sabha activity. For this cultural, sport and other activities and social services should be organised. Peasant youth can be organised into strong disciplined youth leagues to carry out the kisan sabha activities and struggles.

(5) On many issues we are lagging behind the movement. One of the reasons is the lack of clarity and confusion on many issues and lack of theoretical understanding of basic concepts. The party must make an analysis of the classification of the peasantry, the colonial structure of Indian agrarian economy, the recent trends in the development of agriculture, the directions of the congress agrarian legislation, etc. The central committee, in consultation with the leading comrades of the AIKS, has to do the job.

(6) Functioning the kisan sabha and agricultural labour organisation at all levels should be taken by the party as one of its most important tasks.

The problems facing the provinces are varied and can be tackled only in the provinces. No day-to-day directions and guidance can be given from the centre. Hence every effort should be made to strengthen the provincial kisan sabhas and agricultural labour unions. They should be made the real guiding and leading bodies of the agrarian movement in the province. The function of the AIKS should be realistic and limited. It should pool the experiences of various provinces, exchange them, give assistance to weaker provinces in building organisation or studying problems and so on. It is again the job of the provincial kisan sabhas to organise special kisan schools for the training and education of the large number of kisan cadres that are newly coming up.

Collection of donation for the kisan sabha is one of the items of routine jobs of a kisan sabha worker. He can especially collect funds while running campaigns and conducting struggles and holding public meetings.

The village or union or thana kisan sabhas should be live and real functioning bodies which conduct day-to-day work and struggles. So far these units remain only nominal on paper. To build and activate them is one of the key tasks.

It is absolutely essential that we make a determined effort to get capable peasants and agricultural labourers, who are actively engaged in their occupation, to be on various committees at all levels, and to make them function in them so that the kisan sabha may develop as a real mass organisation and not allow the present position of their being only party or all-party political bodies. Only then it becomes possible to forge the live organisational links with the kisan masses.

18. States Reorganisation

1. The central committee of the Communist Party of India deplors the continued delay in forming the linguistic states which all sections of people have been demanding for the last three decades and more. Even though the government was forced by this mass pressure to appoint a states reorganisation commission to go into the whole question, the terms of reference, instead of laying down the well-accepted principle of reorganising the states by grouping together contiguous areas which are linguistically and culturally homogeneous, seek to bypass the same by raising false issues like financial viability and administrative convenience and by showing hypocritical concern for national unity and security. This has justifiably raised among the public suspicions that the commission is intended to find an excuse to deny the formation of linguistic states at least in certain cases.

The Communist Party urges upon the government and the commission to realise that any further delay or postponing of the issue will be very harmful to the democratic development of political life and administration and also even to the harmonious relations between various sections of the people. It urges upon the states reorganisation commission to submit an interim report as early as possible, but in any case not later than the end of September 1954, recommending the formation of the following states based primarily on language with such boundary adjustments as may be found necessary as explained in sections 5 and 6.

Resolution adopted by the CC, Delhi, 10-18 April 1954 and published in the pamphlet *On the Decisions of the Central Committee, etc. in July 1954.*

It impresses upon the states reorganisation commission that it is only by disintegrating the present Hyderabad state that any rational formation of linguistic states in the south can ever be achieved.

2. (1) **KERALA:** The present Travancore-Cochin state, minus the Tamil-speaking areas, and Malayalam-speaking areas of Madras state.

(2) **TAMILNADU:** The present Madras state minus the Kannada- and Malayalam-speaking areas plus the Tamil-speaking of Travancore-Cochin with necessary boundary adjustments with Andhra.

(3) **ANDHRA:** The present Andhra state with the Telugu-speaking areas of Hyderabad state—the Telangana area including Hyderabad city—and Telugu-speaking areas of Mysore, with necessary boundary adjustments with Tamilnadu, the present Madhya Pradesh and Orissa.

(4) **KARNATAK:** The present Mysore state minus its Telugu-speaking areas, with the Kannada-speaking areas of Madras, Hyderabad, Bombay and Andhra states and Coorg.

(5) **MAHARASHTRA:** The Marathi-speaking areas of Bombay, Hyderabad and Madhya Pradesh states, including Bombay city.

(6) **GUJARAT:** The Gujarati-speaking areas of Bombay state with Saurashtra and Cutch, with the necessary boundary adjustments with Rajasthan and Madhya Bharat.

(7) **THE PUNJAB:** The Punjabi-speaking areas of the Punjab and PEPSU states.

(8) **ORISSA:** The present Orissa state with necessary boundary adjustments with Bihar, Bengal, Andhra and Madhya Pradesh.

(9) **WEST BENGAL:** The present West Bengal state with the necessary boundary adjustments with Bihar and Orissa.

(10) **ASSAM:** The present Assam state.

(11) **RAJASTHAN:** Including Ajmer and with the necessary boundary adjustments with present UP, Delhi, Madhya Bharat, Gujarat and PEPSU.

(12) MADHYA BHARAT: Along with Bhopal and with the necessary boundary adjustments with Rajasthan, UP and Madhya Pradesh.

(13) MADHYA PRADESH: Hindi-speaking areas of the present Madhya Pradesh state along with the Vindhya Pradesh and with the necessary boundary adjustments with Madhya Bharat, UP, Orissa, and Andhra states.

(14) DELHI: To be formed by including Hindi-speaking areas of Punjab and PEPSU and such districts of western UP as have close economic links with Delhi.

(15) HIMACHAL PRADESH: With the necessary boundary adjustments with Punjab, PEPSU and UP.

(16) UTTAR PRADESH: The present UP state with necessary boundary adjustments with the present Madhya Bharat, Rajasthan, Vindhya Pradesh and Delhi.

(17) BIHAR: The present Bihar state with the necessary boundary adjustments with Bengal and Orissa.

(18) TRIPURA & (19) MANIPUR: Both these states are to be given an elected legislature and government of their own

(19) And lastly the KASHMIR AND JAMMU state whose special status has been recognised in the Indian constitution.

3 The central committee of the Communist Party of India demands that the institution of rajpramukh be abolished, the privy purses of all former rulers be stopped and all special privileges be abolished and their so-called personal property be taken over by the state. This would bring hundreds of crores to the finances of these new states. The present distinction of A, B, C states should be abolished.

4. It will be seen that the formation of these states will reduce the present number of states from 28 to 20 which itself rebuts the arguments of those who raise the bogey of balkanisation. This division of states is on a more rational basis, wherein the administration can be carried on in the language spoken by the overwhelming mass of people more conveniently and in consonance with the democratic wishes of the people.

These states are far more viable than the existing ones. To argue whether every state is absolutely viable financially is meaningless, as with the present allocation of finances between centre and the states, no such absolute financial viability can exist. Apart from this, these are not being carved out as independent states but as a part and parcel of a united India; as such any deficit in any single state has to be met by the centre.

Nor does the central committee of the Communist Party of India accept the theory that the formation of linguistic states will encourage provincialism or lead to fissiparous tendencies or lead to the disruption of the unity and security of India. On the other hand, it will lead to greater unity of India.

5. The central committee of the Communist Party of India wants it to be made clear that the boundaries of the linguistic states should be demarcated on the following principles:

(i) Village is to be taken as the unit. Demarcation line is to be drawn on the basis of majority of villagers speaking a particular language in that village and on the basis of contiguity of that village to that particular linguistic state.

(ii) It should be understood that, however carefully the demarcation line is drawn, both in these boundary areas, as well as in the interior of every one of these states, there will be linguistic minorities. These must be guaranteed that their education will be in their mother-tongue both in elementary and secondary stages. The question of whether college education is also to be given in their mother-tongue, and if so to what extent and under what practical conditions, is to be left to the states concerned. It is only then that these boundary areas, instead of being seats of discord and disunity, will become seats of mutual bonds between linguistic states.

6. When demarcating boundaries of these states there may be tribal areas within the boundaries. The tribal areas wherein a particular distinctive tribe lives should be

attached to one linguistic state or the other, as per their cultural and linguistic affinity with that of the neighbouring state, as well as on the basis on which state their economic development is more closely linked and likely to be more naturally developed. Where a tribe is interspersed by the migration of neighbouring linguistic populations, then the different compact areas wherein the tribe lives will have to be put in those states with which its economic life is linked or likely to be more naturally developed.

These tribal areas included in one linguistic state or the other must be so administratively divided into tehsils, districts or regional units as the case may be so that their local or regional autonomy can be exercised, as for instance, the Koya region in Andhra, the Gondwana region in Bastar district, Madhya Pradesh, the Warli area in Maharashtra, the Bhil tehsils or districts in Madhya Bharat and Rajasthan, various tribal areas in Orissa, the Jharkhand region in Bihar, the Nepali area in Darjeeling. The various tribal district councils in Assam enumerated in the constitution are to have far greater autonomy.

7. The central committee urges upon all democratic elements and parties not to fritter away their energies on minor details of boundary demarcation but concentrate their efforts to get the states reorganisation commission and the government accept the formation of the above states and the principles for demarcating the boundaries. Once this is achieved, the question of actual demarcation can be left to the commission on the basis of census figures available over a period of the last few decades.

The central committee of the Communist Party of India urges upon all democratic elements to intensify the campaign for the immediate formation of linguistic states, which will be a step towards further strengthening of the struggle for a full democratic life.

8. The central committee of the Communist Party of India directs its provincial committees to discuss among themselves and come to agreement on disputed areas on the basis of these principles and fight the chauvinistic demands that are being made by vested interests.

19. Memorandum to the States Reorganisation Commission

1 We are glad that the government of India has at long last appointed a commission to inquire into and report on the reorganisation of states. This, in our opinion, is a recognition by the government of India of the fact that it is no longer advisable to ignore the growing agitation in the country for the formation of linguistic states.

2. However the prime minister's statement in parliament announcing the appointment of the commission wherein he had stated that it will look not merely to linguistic and cultural homogeneity, but also to financial viability, administrative convenience and national unity and security, has justifiably raised among the public suspicions that the commission is intended to find an excuse to deny the demand for the formation of linguistic states, at least in certain cases.

3. It is a well-known fact that the present distribution of states in India has no rational basis. As has been stated by the prime minister himself, the present system is "largely the result of historical processes and the spread and consolidation of British power in India". It had nothing to do with the building up of a democratic life and administration. It had only helped to foster conflicts between sections of our people by the British and thereby help in the disruption of the democratic movement.

4. It was against this deliberate attempt to foster conflicts and disrupt our democratic movement that the national movement in our country raised the demand for the formation of linguistic provinces. That demand was raised not for purposes of disrupting the unity of India

but with a view to draw the masses of our people into participation in all aspects of the political, economic and cultural life of the country, and thereby strengthen the unity and security of India. Again, this recognition of the need for drawing the masses into the political life of the country led the Congress to amend its constitution in 1921 and provide for linguistic provincial units in the structure of the congress organisation.

5 The struggle of our people for linguistic states is thus a part of our struggle for freedom and democracy. The Communist Party holds that the formation of linguistic states is a prerequisite to ensure that the masses of the people take their full part in the democratic reconstruction of the country's economy and life, without which the country cannot take the wide road to progress and prosperity. Moreover this is essential for the fullest flowering of the democratic culture of all the peoples speaking different languages and the development of their languages and literature. This is also necessary for laying the firm and secure foundation for building the unity of India, on the basis of democracy for and equality of all the various peoples, who would voluntarily cooperate in the common endeavour of building a prosperous, progressive and democratic India.

6. We think it appropriate here to recall what the all parties committee appointed by the Indian National Congress in 1927, presided over by Pandit Motilal Nehru, and of which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was the general secretary, had stated on this question. In the chapter entitled "Redistribution of Provinces", the committee declared:

"What principles should govern this redistribution? Partly geographical and partly economic and financial, but the *main consideration must necessarily be the wishes of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned.* It is well recognised that rapid progress in education as well as in general culture and in most departments of life depends on language. If a foreign language is the medium of instruction, business affairs and the life of the country must necessarily be stunted. No demo-

cracy can exist where a foreign language is used for this purpose. A democracy must be well-informed and must be able to understand and follow public affairs in order to take an effective part in them. It is inconceivable that a democracy can do this if a foreign language is used. It becomes essential, therefore, to conduct the business and politics of a country in a language which is understood by the masses. So far as the provinces are concerned, this must be the provincial language" (emphasis added).

Again, the committee points out: "If a province has to educate itself and do its daily work through the medium of its own language, it must necessarily be a linguistic area. If it happens to be a polyglot area, difficulties will continuously arise and the media of instruction and work will be two or even more languages. Hence it becomes most desirable for provinces to be regrouped on a linguistic basis. Language, as a rule corresponds with a special variety of culture, of traditions and literature. In a linguistic area, all these factors will help in the general progress of the province" (emphasis added).

7. Nothing has happened in India since the Nehru committee submitted its report which can negate these weighty arguments of the committee which made them recommend that the language and the wishes of the people are the primary considerations for the reorganisation of states. In fact, with the removal of British rule from August 1947, it is natural that the people of India should feel the insistent urge that they must have the right and opportunity for full participation in all aspects of the political, economic and cultural life of the country. The growing demand for the formation of linguistic states is but a part of the democratic upsurge in the country.

8. The Communist Party, therefore, urges upon the states reorganisation commission to submit an interim report before the end of September, recommending the formation of the following states based primarily on the language of the area included in the proposed states:

(1) *Kerala*: The present Travancore-Cochin state minus the Tamil-speaking areas, and Malayalam-speaking areas of Madras state.

(2) *Tamilnadu*: The present Madras state minus the Kannada and Malayalam-speaking areas plus the Tamil-speaking areas of Travancore-Cochin with necessary boundary adjustments with Andhra.

(3) *Andhra*: The present Andhra state with the Telugu-speaking areas of Hyderabad state—the Telangana area including Hyderabad city—and Telugu-speaking areas of Mysore, with necessary boundary adjustments with Tamilnadu, the present Madhya Pradesh and Orissa.

(4) *Karnatak*: The present Mysore state minus its Telugu-speaking areas, with the Kannada-speaking areas of Madras, Hyderabad, Bombay and Andhra states and Coorg.

(5) *Maharashtra*: The Marathi-speaking areas of Bombay, Hyderabad and Madhya Pradesh states including Bombay city.

(6) *Gujarat*: The Gujarati-speaking areas of Bombay state with Saurashtra and Cutch, with necessary boundary adjustments with Rajasthan and Madhya Bharat.

(7) *The Punjab*: The Punjabi-speaking area of Punjab and PEPSU states.

(8) *Orissa*: The present Orissa state with necessary boundary adjustments with Bihar, Bengal, Andhra and Madhya Pradesh.

(9) *West Bengal*: The present West Bengal state with the necessary boundary adjustments with Bihar and Orissa.

(10) *Assam*. The present Assam state.

(11) *Rajasthan*: Including Ajmer and with the necessary boundary adjustments with the present UP, Delhi, Madhya Bharat, Gujarat and PEPSU.

(12) *Madhya Bharat*: Along with Bhopal and with the necessary boundary adjustments with Rajasthan, UP and Madhya Pradesh.

(13) *Madhya Pradesh*: Hindi-speaking areas of the present Madhya Pradesh state along with Vindhya Pradesh

and with the necessary boundary adjustments with Madhya Bharat, UP, Orissa and Andhra states.

(14) *Delhi*: To be formed by including Hindi-speaking areas of Punjab and PEPSU and such districts of western UP as have close economic links with Delhi.

(15) *Himachal Pradesh*: With the necessary boundary adjustments with Punjab, PEPSU and UP.

(16) *Uttar Pradesh*: The present UP state with necessary boundary adjustments with the present Madhya Bharat, Rajasthan, Vindhya Pradesh and Delhi.

(17) *Bihar*: The present Bihar state with the necessary boundary adjustments with Bengal and Orissa.

(18) *Tripura* & (19) *Manipur*: Both these states are to be given an elected legislature and government of their own.

(19) And lastly, the *Kashmir and Jammu* state whose special status has been recognised in the Indian constitution.

Although Tripura and Manipur are small in area and population, we have urged their constitution as two separate provinces for the following reasons:

(i) Although they are situated contiguous to Assam, they are mountainous areas with very sparse communications with Assam.

(ii) Their languages are different from those of Assam, and the main demand of the democratic movement has been for greater democratic rights.

(iii) The people of these states might have been willing to be within the state of Assam if the tribal areas within Assam had been conferred full local autonomy, with their own executive. But today the democratic urge of the people in these areas cannot be satisfied until their own demand for a legislature and executive is first satisfied.

It will be seen that in the proposals we have made, the present Hyderabad state will have to be disintegrated. The central committee desires to impress on you that no linguistic states can ever be formed in the south on a rational basis without the disintegration of the present Hyderabad state. The committee on linguistic states appointed by the

Jaipur congress in 1948 (popularly known as the JVP* committee) itself had recognised this in its report when it stated: "Thus the constitution of a province of Maharashtra inevitably raises the problem of Karnataka and makes a separate Karnataka province inescapable... The constitution of Andhra province raises...the problem of the Karnataka areas of the Madras province. *All three raise the problem of contiguous linguistic areas of Hyderabad state*" (emphasis added).

The central committee urges upon the commission to recommend that the present distinction between A, B and C states should be abolished altogether while reorganising the states. There cannot be any distinction in the degree of democratic rights enjoyed by the people of India. The committee further urges upon you to recommend that the institution of rajpramukh should be forthwith abolished as also their special privileges. Together with it their privy purses must be stopped and the so-called personal property of the former princes, earned out of misappropriation of state revenues, should be taken over by the state.

9. The Communist Party considers it necessary to rebut the arguments that are generally raised with a view to negate this demand for linguistic states. It will be seen that the formation of these states as above will reduce the present number of states from 28 to 20, which itself rebuts the arguments of those who raise the bogey of balkanisation whenever the demand for linguistic states is made. This reconstitution of states that we have suggested is on a more rational basis, wherein the administration can be carried on in the language spoken by the overwhelming majority of the people of the state.

10. Another argument that is sought to be raised against the formation of linguistic states is the allegation that such a distribution will jeopardise the unity and security of India. This argument is patently an absurd and false one. The linguistic states are not separate states with their own army and the defence services. Defence will continue

* Jawaharlal Nehru, Vallabhbhai Patel and Pattabhi Sitaramayya.

to be a central subject. As such, unity and security of India will in no way be jeopardised by the formation of states as proposed above.

11. How could one say that our western defences can only be maintained by the existence of two states, Punjab and PEPSU, on our western border. The PEPSU state is not even a contiguous area. One district, Kandaghat, is widely separated from the other parts of PEPSU and is surrounded by areas of Himachal Pradesh state. Similarly, Punjab has on its eastern side a large area with a majority of Hindustanti-speaking people. No sane man can argue that this setup on our western frontier is essential either for the defence of our country or for its unity. Neither can one argue that the creation of a Punjab, with the merger of the contiguous areas with a majority of the Punjabi-speaking people in the two states, and the joining of the eastern Hindustani area with the adjoining Hindustani-speaking areas will weaken the unity and security of the country. The same arguments will apply to every other part of India. On the other hand, experience has shown that the continuation of the present setup has only led to conflicts between our peoples which certainly are not conducive to the development of the unity of India. It is a remarkable thing that throughout our national struggle neither the congress leaders nor representatives of other political parties on the all-party committee, referred to above, had ever raised until 1947 this bogey of unity and security when discussing this question of linguistic states.

12. Another argument that is advanced is that of financial viability. It will be seen that the states proposed above are far more viable than many of the existing ones. Let us take certain examples. Travancore-Cochin already exists as a state. In the proposal that we have made, the Tamil-speaking areas of the state will join the existing Madras state. Similarly the Malayalam-speaking areas of the existing Madras state which comprise of the district of Malabar and certain adjoining areas of the South Kanara district will join the existing Travancore-Cochin state and form the Kerala state. The result would be that the Kerala state and

the Tamilnadu state will be more or less of the same size and revenue as the existing Madras and TC states. Examples like this can be multiplied.

13. Financial viability of the states is a question of the allocation of the revenues between the centre and the states. Today no state in India, with the present allocation of financial resources, has a surplus or is even a self-sufficient one. The budgets of all of them have become deficit.

14. It must be realised that the economy of all these states cannot be the same. There are provinces like Bengal and Travancore-Cochin which grow commercial crops like jute, rubber, tea, pepper and other exportable commodities. Certain financial results within the present setup may follow as a result of this. But that certainly cannot be a ground for denying the right of formation of linguistic states.

15. Moreover one cannot shut one's eyes to the fact that there has been an uneven economic development between different areas of India. Surely, this uneven economic development which results in certain areas being backward cannot become a ground for refusing the people of these areas their linguistic state through which they would be able to participate in the administration of the country. Such an argument would only mean that it is only the people of economically more prosperous areas that have the right to participate in the political, economic and administrative life of the country.

16. In this connection, it is worth recalling what the Nehru committee had stated in this regard. After stating that the linguistic principle and the wishes of the majority of the people are the two most important considerations in the rearrangement of the provinces, the committee proceeds: "The third consideration though not of the same importance is administrative convenience which would include geographical position, economic resources and the financial stability of the area concerned. *But administrative convenience is often a matter of arrangement, and*

must, as a rule, bow to the wishes of the people" (emphasis added).

Very correctly they point out that administrative convenience which includes financial stability is a matter of arrangement, because the allocation of the financial resources is a matter of arrangement between the centre and states.

17. Answering those people who opposed the formation of the province of Sind on the ground that it would be financially a deficit province, the committee stated: "The denial of right to selfdetermination on purely financial ground . . . is bound to lead to great dissatisfaction, and is bound to impede the progress of Sind and all the energy which should go to building up the life and work of the province would be spent in profitless agitation. If, however, this right is conceded, a strong impetus will be given to the new province to work hard and compete with more advanced provinces." The truth of these wise words has been proved by the last seven years since 1947, during which the demands for linguistic states had been negated by the government of India.

18. In this connection, the Communist Party of India wants to stress the fact that it is the duty of the centre to help the more backward states, so that they are enabled to rapidly do away with their backwardness and to help the even development of the whole country. That alone will cement the fraternal feelings of the people speaking the different languages and cement the unity of India. But to make this very backwardness a pretext for denying to the people of these areas opportunity to democratic development will only lead to the strengthening of disruptive forces.

19. The reduction of the total number of states from 28 to 20 as proposed by us will result in a reduction of the top administrative expenditure on governors, high courts, etc. This, together with the abolition of the institution of rajpramukhs with their heavy allowances and privy purses, would lead to the augmentation of a few crores of rupees to the revenues of India.

The argument of financial viability is, therefore, totally unsustainable.

20. Consistent with the formation of linguistic states, we urge upon you to recommend that the following procedure be adopted when demarcating the boundaries of the new linguistic states:

Village is to be taken as the unit. Demarcation line to be drawn on the basis of majority of villagers speaking a particular language in that village and on the basis of contiguity of that village to that particular linguistic state.

It should be understood that, however carefully the demarcation line is drawn, both in these boundary areas as well as in the interior of every one of these states, there will be linguistic minorities. These must be guaranteed that their education will be in their mother-tongue both in elementary and secondary stages. The question of whether college education is also to be given in their mother-tongue, and if so to what extent and under what practical conditions, is to be left to the states concerned. It is only then that these boundary areas, instead of being seats of discord and disunity, will become seats of mutual bonds between linguistic states.

When demarcating boundaries of these states, there may be tribal areas within the boundaries. The tribal areas, wherein a particular distinctive tribe lives, should be attached to one linguistic state or the other, as per their cultural and linguistic affinity with that of the neighbouring state, as well as on the basis as to which state their economic development is more closely linked and likely to be more naturally developed. Where a tribe is interspersed by the migration of neighbouring linguistic populations, then the different compact areas wherein the tribe lives will have to be put in those states with which its economic life is linked or likely to be more naturally developed.

These tribal areas included in one linguistic state or the other must be so administratively divided into tehsils, districts or regional units as the case may be, so that their local or regional autonomy can be exercised, as for instance, the Koya region in Andhra, the Gondwana region

in Bastar district, Madhya Pradesh, the Warli areas in Maharashtra, the Bhil tehsils or districts in Madhya Bharat and Rajasthan, various tribal areas in Orissa, the Jharkhand region in Bihar, the Nepali area in Darjeeling. The various tribal district councils in Assam enumerated in the constitution are to have far greater autonomy.

21. In conclusion, the central committee recalls what the linguistic provinces committee appointed by the Jaipur congress (December 1948) consisting of Vallabhbhai Patel, Pattabhi Sitaramayya and Jawaharlal Nehru, although itself opposed to the formation of linguistic states then, had to say: "Nevertheless, if there is a strong and widespread feeling in the areas for the linguistic provinces, a democratic government must ultimately submit to it, unless there is grave danger to the state."

No one can argue that there is grave danger to the state.

The committee itself accepted that there is widespread feeling. It stated: "We realise that there is not only strong feeling, but also much merit behind these proposals (for the formation of Andhra, Kerala, Karnataka and Maharashtra provinces) . . . We also realise that some of these linguistic areas, notably Kerala and Karnataka, have rather suffered in the past from their association with larger multilingual provinces."

Today this feeling has grown stronger than what it was in 1949. The appointment of the commission itself is a recognition of the growth of that feeling. Any delay or procrastination in conceding this demand is bound to lead to serious consequences.

The central committee of the Communist Party of India, therefore, urges upon the commission not to give any cause for an anxiety to the people, but to submit an interim report before September 1954 at the latest, recommending the formation of states, primarily based upon languages. as stated in para 8 above.

20. Government Must Intervene in Goa

The central committee of the Communist Party of India greets the people of Portuguese possessions in India for the heroic struggle waged by them for liberation from foreign rule and merging with the Indian Union.

The CC greets the Warli peasantry of Nagar Haveli for rising in their thousands to liberate their enclave from Portuguese rule, who, after liberation, had abolished forced labour according to the provision of the Indian constitution, reduced land rents to the level provided for in the Bombay rent reduction act and guaranteed minimum wage to agricultural labourers. They had also helped in establishing an elected panchayat for the administration of the enclave after the expulsion of the Portuguese authorities.

The CC strongly disapproves of the policy of the government of India of preventing, under pressure of the British government, Indian volunteers from entering Portuguese territory for giving fraternal support to the local population struggling for freedom. This step not only negates the basic position that the people of the Indian Union and Goans are fellow countrymen and Goa is part of the Indian territory. It actually strengthens the Portuguese in their efforts to suppress the popular movement in Goa and continue their rule over their possessions.

The CC gives full support to all political parties inside and outside the Portuguese possessions who are fighting for their liberation and calls upon the India government to do the same. It further demands that the government of India must intervene directly in Goa in aid of the local population and for liquidating Portuguese rule over its Indian pockets.

Resolution adopted by the central committee. Delhi. 5-11 September 1954, and published in *New Age*, 19 September 1954.

21. French India Struggle

The central committee of the Communist Party of India greets the people of Pondicherry and Karaikal in French India for the continuous and heroic struggle they are waging in spite of brutal repression, for throwing the French imperialists out of Indian soil.

The great demonstration of all sections of the people of Pondicherry on 9 August, when there was a total strike of all workers and students and complete hartal in the city, was ample evidence of the determination and patriotic unity of the fighting people on this issue.

It is this united struggle backed by Indian public opinion and the victory of the peace forces at the Geneva conference that have forced the French imperialists to reopen talks with the India government for a settlement of this question.

Despite the talks, repression on the patriotic forces of the people continues unabated in Pondicherry and Karaikal. The CC is confident that the fighting people will continue their struggle unabated until these territories are transferred to the Indian Union.

The CC demands that as these territories are transferred all the parties and groups that had carried on the struggle for over seven years must be represented in any interim administration that may be set up, pending their merger with the states adjoining these territories, and those elements who have all along been stooges of the French imperialists and in faithful service of their masters had been responsible for the reign of terror and loot for the past seven years should not be put back in power.

Resolution passed by the central committee, 5-11 September 1954 and published in *New Age*, 19 September 1954.

22. Welcome to Chou En-lai

For Favour of Publication

The Communist Party joins all our people in welcoming New China's prime minister Chou En-lai, when he arrives at Delhi.

During the next four days, Chou En-lai will remain in Delhi and hold consultations with our prime minister on how to end the war in Vietnam, how to restart the negotiations on Korea arbitrarily broken off by the US-dominated western powers, how to bring together the peoples and governments of Asia in order to end colonialism. These consultations between the two prime ministers are looked up to with hope and confidence by peaceloving people throughout the world.

The Communist Party appeals to all people and to all public organisations to organise meetings and demonstrations during this stay in India, in order to make it unmistakably clear that the Indian people are behind the efforts being made by the two prime ministers to bring peace to Asia which the warmongers, headed by the American ruling circles, are trying to draw into a world war. The meetings shall be a powerful demonstration of the feelings and deep friendship that the Indian people cherish for the great Chinese people.

23. Nehru-Chou-En-Lai Joint Statement

The Communist Party greets the joint statement issued by the Indian and Chinese prime ministers at the end of their consultations in Delhi.

Stressing as the statement does on five principles which should govern the relations between India and China, this statement stands in marked contrast to the policy of threats and blustering pursued by the American imperialists through the persons of John Foster Dulles and president Eisenhower. All those who love peace will agree with the prime ministers that these are principles which are applicable not only to the relations between India and China but to all problems of international relations.

The Communist Party appeals to the people of India and their organisations to build a powerful movement in support of the principles outlined by the two prime ministers in their joint statement, so that imperialist designs on Asia can be effectively combated.

Politbureau's press statement of 30 June 1954 at the end of Chou En-lai's visit.

24. Communist Answer to Pandit Nehru

Since his return from China, Pandit Nehru has made a number of speeches which have stressed the supreme need of Sino-Indian unity. In a forthright manner, he has declared his conviction that the Chinese people do not want war. He has been emphasising that the friendship between these two great neighbours, big and powerful, is a mighty bulwark for peace and freedom.

Pandit Nehru has also paid a handsome tribute to the leaders of New China for the way they are striving to bring about a quick transformation of their country.

CHOU-NEHRU DECLARATION: GREAT LANDMARK

We communists whole-heartedly welcome every one of these positions; they constitute an unanswerable reply to the imperialist warmongers who are deadset on branding China as having aggressive designs on the countries of Southeast Asia.

Not only that, we hold that the initiation of the five principles of peaceful coexistence, enunciated by the Chou-Nehru declaration, has been a significant landmark in the annals of Asia. The clear and unequivocal pledge of friendship between these two great Asian neighbours is a matter of tremendous importance not only for the countries of Asia but for the cause of peace and freedom in the whole world.

It has dealt a big blow to the imperialist system, creating consternation in the entire imperialist camp, and jubila-

Article by Ajoy Ghosh in *New Age*, 5 December 1954, and later revised, published as a pamphlet: the latter text is reproduced here.

23. Nehru-Chou-En-Lai Joint Statement

The Communist Party greets the joint statement issued by the Indian and Chinese prime ministers at the end of their consultations in Delhi.

Stressing as the statement does on five principles which should govern the relations between India and China, this statement stands in marked contrast to the policy of threats and blustering pursued by the American imperialists through the persons of John Foster Dulles and president Eisenhower. All those who love peace will agree with the prime ministers that these are principles which are applicable not only to the relations between India and China but to all problems of international relations.

The Communist Party appeals to the people of India and their organisations to build a powerful movement in support of the principles outlined by the two prime ministers in their joint statement, so that imperialist designs on Asia can be effectively combated.

Politbureau's press statement of 30 June 1954 at the end of Chou En-lai's visit.

24. Communist Answer to Pandit Nehru

Since his return from China, Pandit Nehru has made a number of speeches which have stressed the supreme need of Sino-Indian unity. In a forthright manner, he has declared his conviction that the Chinese people do not want war. He has been emphasising that the friendship between these two great neighbours, big and powerful, is a mighty bulwark for peace and freedom.

Pandit Nehru has also paid a handsome tribute to the leaders of New China for the way they are striving to bring about a quick transformation of their country.

CHOU-NEHRU DECLARATION: GREAT LANDMARK

We communists whole-heartedly welcome every one of these positions; they constitute an unanswerable reply to the imperialist warmongers who are deadset on branding China as having aggressive designs on the countries of Southeast Asia.

Not only that, we hold that the initiation of the five principles of peaceful coexistence, enunciated by the Chou-Nehru declaration, has been a significant landmark in the annals of Asia. The clear and unequivocal pledge of friendship between these two great Asian neighbours is a matter of tremendous importance not only for the countries of Asia but for the cause of peace and freedom in the whole world.

It has dealt a big blow to the imperialist system, creating consternation in the entire imperialist camp, and jubila-

Article by Ajoy Ghosh in *New Age*, 5 December 1954, and later revised, published as a pamphlet: the latter text is reproduced here.

tion in the camp of democratic states and among the people of every land.

It is, therefore, an imperative task of the democratic forces in India to mobilise our people behind these historic five principles of peaceful coexistence, and the Communist Party takes an active part in this national task.

ATTACK ON INDIAN COMMUNISTS

Coupled with these important steps furthering the cause of peace and democracy, Pandit Nehru has recently made quite a few attacks on the communists, the peak of which was reached in the broadsides he fired in a public meeting at Delhi last week.

Coming as they do from Pandit Nehru, who holds a position of special eminence in the country, it is necessary to examine these points of attack upon the communists.

Pandit Nehru has stated that the Indian communists in the past had condemned his foreign policy and are not puzzled when his foreign policy has earned the praise of countries like the Soviet Union and China.

There is no question of the communists being 'puzzled' by the present shift in Pandit Nehru's foreign policy. They welcome this shift. Let it be remembered that the Communist Party, almost alone among the political parties in the country, has all these years, since the advent of independence, fearlessly and consistently called for orientation of India's foreign policy in a progressive direction and has campaigned for closer ties with the countries like the Soviet Union and China—countries that have freed themselves from the grip of imperialism and are on guard against its onslaughts.

From a party that has almost singlehandedly warned our people against the menacing shadow of American imperialism over the countries of Asia the present stand of Pandit Nehru's government against the war-designs of American imperialism in Asia could not but evoke wholehearted support.

FOREIGN POLICY IN THE PAST

But Pandit Nehru is right when he says that in the past we Indian communists did attack his foreign policy as being influenced by Anglo-American imperialist powers. But this is an issue which demands selfexamination not by the communists but by Pandit Nehru himself. Can any serious student of Indian affairs deny that the foreign policy of Pandit Nehru's government has undergone a shift in the last five years? Is it not necessary for Pandit Nehru to ponder and ask why was it that we communists attacked his foreign policy in the past?

In those days the government of India had over and over again proclaimed its close association in the world scene with the imperialist powers of Britain and America.

Speaking in this very city of Delhi, five years ago, on 22 March 1949, Pandit Nehru declared:

"At the present moment you will see that as a matter of fact we have far closer relations with some countries of the western world than with others. It is partly due to historic and partly due to other factors, presentday factors of various kinds. *These close relations will no doubt develop and we will encourage them to develop*" (emphasis added).

There is no gainsaying the fact that the 'western powers' referred to above are in the main the British and American imperialisms.

We have also to note that India spectacularly sided with the Anglo-American bloc in the security council when on 27 June 1950 was passed the infamous resolution which branded North Korea as an aggressor and thereby gave the passport of the United Nations for the American invaders of Korea, who brought the world to the very verge of war. Who the real aggressor was has been revealed since then by the utterances of Syngman Rhee and his American masters

As late as March 1951 when India put her signature on the American offer under the mutual defence assistance pact, Dean Acheson, the US secretary of state, made it

quite clear that the aid given under the pact was "required by the government of India to maintain its internal security, its legitimate selfdefence or permit it to participate in the defence of the area of which it is a part" and it stipulated that our government, in case of transfer of the articles obtained under the aid, "will obtain the consent of the United States of America", while it permitted the USA to retain "the privileges of diverting items of equipment or of not completing services undertaken if such action is dictated by consideration of United States national interest..."

When later on the US imperialist circles clamoured against India taking the first steps marking herself apart from the imperialist bloc, Mrs Pandit, as a spokesman of Pandit Nehru's government, tendered India's bona fides, as it were, to the Anglo-American bloc when she beseechingly said:

"In the recent sessions of the general assembly, we voted as you did 38 times out of 51, abstaining 11 times and differing from you only twice."

WHO WAS IN THE WRONG?

It is thus clear that it is not the Indian communists who deserve to be criticised for attacking Pandit Nehru's foreign policy in those days, but it was Pandit Nehru's foreign policy in those days which deserves to be criticised, as in the main being influenced by Anglo-American imperialists.

The communists have nothing to regret for having warned all through against India being guided by British advice in the matter of Kashmir. It is not the communists but Pandit Nehru himself who on the advice of Lord Mountbatten took the Kashmir question to the security council, and agreed to abide by the protracted imperialist manoeuvres under the aegis of the United Nations.

Not till December 1952 did Pandit Nehru's government stand up to the offensive and dangerous moves of the Anglo-American bloc in the security council with regard

to Kashmir. And it was not till the beginning of this year that Pandit Nehru came forward against the American agents in Kashmir masquerading as UN observers—about whom the communists had warned right from the very beginning.

The communists have nothing to regret for protesting against Pandit Nehru's attack on the heroic fighters for Malayan freedom during his trip there in 1949, an attack which could only be of advantage to the British butchers who have been perpetrating horrors in Malaya.

The communists have nothing to regret for having unearthed the sinister arrangement by which Britain was allowed to recruit gurkha troops on Indian soil for despatch against Malayan patriots. Pandit Nehru after having denied it in parliament in 1952 had to admit it when the communists brought it to light with unanswerable evidence.

We can understand Pandit Nehru's embarrassment over the issue, but it does not behove him to attack the communists for having condemned this sordid episode of his foreign policy.

Equally sordid was the episode of the transit facility that the French imperialists were enjoying, on the sly, at Indian airports for despatching troops to defend their empire of Indochina. In this case too, right this year, Pandit Nehru's denial in parliament was followed within a few weeks by the exposure by the Communist Party which compelled the government to stop them.

Are we communists to be blamed for having criticised this part of Pandit Nehru's foreign policy? Rather we are proud to have done it as a national vindication of India's refusal to help imperialists to crush other countries striving, as we did, to be free.

WE WARN AGAIN!

Right today the Communist Party warns the government and the country against the danger of accepting US aid and points to the bitter fruits of abject subservience that came

to the lot of many a free country in Europe after accepting the tempting aids that American imperialism had been offering them for years.

We have no hesitation in saying that we communists are still opposed to the various US aids being accepted, coming as they do from an imperialist power which has proclaimed in no uncertain terms its objective of world conquest in the name of fighting communism.

We have warned and shall not cease warning against this danger to our sovereignty, drawing lessons not only from distant lands but from the fate of the neighbour at our doorstep, Pakistan, which starting from economic aid has sold its pass to US imperialism.

In his last speech in parliament before leaving for China, Pandit Nehru, while denouncing the SEATO war-combine, stated,

"I realise that the motives may be and are good. I repeat that countries in Asia, as well as those outside have certain fears and those fears may have justification... Most of these countries are afraid not of what governments do officially, but what they might do sub rosa through the activities of the communist party in these countries. This is one of the serious difficulties that have arisen in international affairs."

This was, in a way, giving almost a justification to the imperialists for hatching such a war plot, and it was hailed precisely for this very reason by the entire imperialist press. What was expected of Pandit Nehru, who has refused to be drawn into such a plot, was to show up that the talk of communist menace was just a cover by the imperialists for their designs on the countries of Asia.

Nor can we overlook the fact that although gorkha recruiting centres have been closed down after mass protests were voiced, transit facilities through India are still being afforded to the British government for despatching gorkhas to Malaya.

Pandit Nehru is irritated by the communist warning against staying within the British commonwealth. We make

it quite clear that our stay inside the British commonwealth goes against our independent defence. We need not go very far but quote from the *Economist* (London) which is the voice of British finance. Referring to the visit of the British chief-of-staff Harding, who is just now visiting our country, the paper says:

"His journey is unusual in that it is the first time since 1950 that a British chief-of-staff has set foot in India or Pakistan; the fact that he was invited by the commanders-in-chief of both the Pakistan and the Indian armies, who delivered their invitations when they attended commonwealth staff exercises in London in August, shows how close the professional relationship with the British army remains even now that nearly all the British officers who were left behind in 1947 to train their successors have returned home" (20 November 1954).

Today Winston Churchill has openly bragged about his fiendish designs even during the war of using the nazis against the very ally, the USSR, that saved Europe from hitlerite slavery. This has sent a wave of horror and revulsion among all the decent sections of world public.

And yet Pandit Nehru agrees to go to the commonwealth conference over which Winston Churchill presides. Not only that. The men with whom Pandit Nehru will confer there, the bosses of the British dominions, are the very people who are actively building the SEATO war-bloc, which Pandit Nehru has himself denounced.

For a statesman of Asia, whose advocacy of Sino-Indian amity has won the ready approbation of the entire peace-loving mankind, to sit at the same imperial table with men who parade their perfidy brings neither glory nor honour to India but provides a respectable alibi to those who are plotting to build up new armies for another world war.

It is this aspect of India's foreign policy—the aspect that follows directly from our links with the British commonwealth—that the communists have never hesitated to attack.

But despite these links with the British imperialists, which we want to be broken, whenever and wherever Pandit Nehru has taken a definite stand that has helped the cause of peace and curbed the imperialists, the Communist Party has come out in wholehearted support of each and every one of such moves.

OUR SUPPORT BASED ON PRINCIPLE

Even in the days when Pandit Nehru's government was trying to suppress the communists with armed violence, his demand for the seating of People's China in the UN, his warning against the crossing of the 38th parallel and the bombing of installations beyond the Yalu river by American troops, his move to stop the war in Korea and refusal to sign the San Francisco treaty—all these brought forth the support of the communists, though his government was doing its best to stifle their voice.

In the recent past every one of his moves in the direction of peace—against the H-bomb and the presence of US observers in Kashmir, the signing of the Sino-Indian treaty on Tibet, the Chou-Nehru declaration, the Geneva agreement, the denunciation of SEATO or his visit to China—received the wholehearted support of the Indian communists. Not only that. On many of the issues the communists strove to mobilise the people, as against the US observers in Kashmir, the US-Pak pact, or for the popularisation of the five principles of the Chou-Nehru declaration.

At the same time where we did not hesitate to criticise—and do not hesitate even today—is precisely where there is attachment to the Anglo-American bloc, particularly to the link with the British commonwealth, because it is clear that these attachments and links with imperialist powers undermine the very position of eminence that India has won today in the international field by siding with the forces of peace and refusing to be towed into the imperialist bloc for war. If India is to play its rightful role as a

consistent defender of peace and freedom, it is essential for it to break these links with imperialist powers.

It is thus the communists who can claim to follow a consistent line in foreign policy, for the touchstone of every one of their stand is whether particular move strengthens India's position or throws it into the bandwagon of imperialism.

Pandit Nehru has talked about halfhearted support of the communists for his foreign policy. But there is no halfhearted stand in the dictionary of communists. What they think is correct, they come out in unequivocal support for it. What they consider is wrong, they oppose equally unequivocally.

WHY SHIFT IN INDIA'S POLICY?

The shift that has come over in Pandit Nehru's foreign policy in the last two years is not the result of an accident. It is due to the growing strength of the democratic world and, in the first place, to the exposure of the myth of American military might on the battlefields of Korea.

Its fiasco not only upset the calculations of US imperialists themselves, but showed Pandit Nehru also how wrong his earlier assessments had been. On 7 December 1950, six months after the outbreak of the Korean war, he had remarked in parliament: "The democratic nations may win the war—mind you, I have little doubt that they will..."

The failure of the American arms naturally helped to break the illusions of many, including Pandit Nehru, about the strength of the imperialist powers.

Secondly, these years have shown to all, particularly the Asian countries, that the threat to their freedom comes not from the democratic countries like China and the USSR, but solely from the imperialist countries. As early as 1 January 1949, Pandit Nehru himself had to refer to the treacherous attack of the Dutch on Indonesia.

"We confess with sorrow that the attitude of some

western powers has been one of tacit approval or acceptance of this aggression. There is a western union of which Holland is a member. What does that union stand for? Money has flowed from the western union."

In the current year itself two documents signed by the two neighbouring countries reveal in a flash as to who is the enemy and who is the friend of free peoples of Asia. While Pakistan has signed the arms pact with the USA, selling off its sovereignty, India has signed the Chou-Nehru declaration proclaiming the five principles guaranteeing peaceful coexistence on the basis of respect for the very sovereignty which America threatens. And now with the Manila treaty, the game is open and unashamed.

Thirdly, the tremendous growth of anti-British and anti-American sentiments in our people and the welling up of the urge for peace and revulsion against war are factors of no mean significance. It is the democratic and peace movement in the country, in which the Communist Party also plays its part, which has helped to foster this urge, and it is Pandit Nehru's party and government which have from time to time frowned upon this movement.

Nevertheless it is this movement of our people against the warmongering imperialists which has contributed substantially in bringing about a shift in our foreign relations and making India a world power today.

The fact of India becoming a world power is something about which every Indian is proud, the more so the communists, for it has come along the path which they consistently and fearlessly advocated. We therefore support this change and have no hesitation in recognising it. We think that Pandit Nehru should also not hesitate to recognise this obvious change that has come over the very policy he directs.

BEHIND THIS ATTACK ON US

Pandit Nehru has combined his praise for China with his attacks on the Indian communists.

Why is it so? To some extent it is the first shot in the coming election battle in Andhra. It is there that the corrupt, crisis-ridden Congress is facing a powerful challenge from the Communist Party. And as it is nearly time for Pandit Nehru to give tongue to his own congressmen in Andhra, his latest vitriolics against the communists might be setting the line that he wants his followers to take up in Andhra.

But that is not all. There is something more basic which makes Pandit Nehru launch this vicious attack on the Communist Party precisely at this time.

The opening of the window into People's China and the closer liaison that is growing between India and the USSR have revealed to our countrymen in growing numbers the phenomenal developments that have taken place in those countries and is inevitably provoking in the minds of many of our people the question as to the path of development that we should follow in our own country, the social changes which alone constitute a firm basis for the upliftment of our country.

These new vistas have already startled the organs of big business, for they bring into relief the invidious contrast between the fast tempo of development in the once-backward China and the snail-speed progress in India accompanied by chronic suffering faced by millions. And it is through such appraisals that the people rapidly get a clear understanding of the correct path of development. The most conscious of them get increasingly drawn towards socialism—towards the all-conquering ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin—which alone points the way towards freedom, prosperity and happiness to the toiling masses.

It is this 'dangerous' development that Pandit Nehru wants to prevent. Already his speeches praising China have caused visible concern in big business circles, both Indian and foreign. Perhaps to allay that concern and to assure them that they can continue to count upon his government to protect their interests, that Pandit Nehru thought it necessary to make a pointed attack on the communists.

Hence it is that he combines his praise of China's achievements, which can no longer be denied, with denunciation of Marxism, which in his opinion is outmoded. That it is this very 'outmoded' Marxism which showed China how to overcome its age-old backwardness and grow into a mighty power with a rapidity which has amazed the whole world—this, he wants to make out, is a fact of no importance. As this argument becomes less and less convincing, louder and louder grows Pandit Nehru's denunciation of Marxism.

OLD AND DISCREDITED ARGUMENTS

Pandit Nehru has spoken in praise of the historic long march of the Chinese communists. But let it not be forgotten but it was precisely at the time of the same long march that Chiang Kai-shek repeatedly attacked the Chinese communists branding them as bandits.

And these are the age-old tactics of all those who have to fight communists and democrats. Ho Chi Minh, who could not but impress Pandit Nehru, was also dubbed a bandit by Bao Dai. And the Malayan communists and patriots who are relentlessly fighting against British domination were denounced by Pandit Nehru himself in 1949. The communists all over the world are used to this term of reproach, which their opponents hurl at them as they cannot crush or scare them into submission.

Even in our national movement, it is the British government and its stooges who used such terms of reproach against the congress leaders themselves.

So, when Pandit Nehru attacks us for indulging in violence, we do not think it necessary to go into any argument over it. The experience of these seven years since independence has proved to our countrymen as to who resorts to violence and who has to face it.

Propaganda in which Pandit Nehru has indulged this time also has tried to make out that the Indian communists

have no moorings among our people and they carry out the "dictates of Russia and China".

. It seems as if Pandit Nehru this time has been caught in the toils of his own propaganda. Elated by the mighty ovation he received all over China and the friendly gestures from the Soviet Union in appreciation of his stand for peace, he seems to have almost come to believe that Indian communists, as a result, would automatically come over to him, no matter what his policy is towards the masses of our own country. If Pandit Nehru has any such illusion, he is grievously mistaken. He should get rid of it once and for all.

The attitude of a Communist Party towards the government of the country or, for the matter of fact, towards any party, is determined by the attitude of the government towards the interests of the masses. And this is as much true of the Communist Party of India as of any other communist party in the world.

Loyalty to the ideology of Marxism and loyalty to proletarian internationalism teaches us, as it teaches communist parties in other countries (including the Communist Party of China that Pandit Nehru has praised), to be loyal to the masses of our own country, to serve them fearlessly, to oppose their oppressors and enemies.

It is this test that impels us to stand by the millions of evicted kisans and thousands of workers threatened by rationalisation and to show them how to struggle for their very basic needs. It is this which brings communists to champion the cause of the refugees. It is this again which brings them among the newly-astir ranks of the middle-class employees. Above all, it is this test that makes us supporters of the present shift in Pandit Nehru's foreign policy and, at the same time, determined opponents of his government, in the main, and the spearhead of the movement which strives to replace it by a democratic government.

Pandit Nehru has dubbed all these as "stirring up troubles". And he has quoted the case of the proposed strike of the bank employees as evidence of communist

machinations. But he forgets that the broad mass organisation of bank employees is no racket run by communists, for in its ranks are people from practically all political parties as well as many belonging to no political party.

Instead of glibly attacking it as "communist-inspired", Pandit Nehru would have done well to ponder why even the middleclass employees, traditionally loyal to the regime, are now coming out in thousands against the policies of the government. He might have profitably asked himself why his own labour minister Giri could not stay in the cabinet. Surely not because of communist provocation!

He would have done well to remember that the bank employees have taken the steps towards struggle after years of waiting and a number of tribunals had given awards, none of which the government could accept at the dictates of bank bosses. It is not by cursing the communists and protecting these bosses that Pandit Nehru can bring peace among the growing large number of discontented employees.

OUR LOYALTY TO OUR PEOPLE

These attacks on the living conditions of the different sections of the people, as also the renewed attacks on democratic liberties like the amending of the criminal procedure code in a reactionary direction and the prolongation of the preventive detention act, show the real character of the Nehru government. So long as these attacks on the people continue, the Communist Party shall continue to fight by their side, ranged against the government.

While Pandit Nehru gets our wholehearted support for every one of his moves for peace and against imperialism, he has to realise that the praise he has got from the democratic masses all over the world is not for the preventive detention act or the suppression of the peasantry—these might have won him bouquets in the USA and Britain—

and it is these very measures which the communists also fight.

Further, the Communist Party realises that the capacity of a country to pursue its foreign policy vigorously in a progressive direction depends on the strength of the economy, the condition of the masses and the extent of mass support a government enjoys. It is precisely there that Pandit Nehru's internal policy hampers, for it operates against the extension of democracy and does not improve the condition of the people.

These economic and political shackles imposed on our masses—on the working class and peasantry, on the middle classes and other progressive elements—hit at precisely those very forces inside the country that alone can guarantee the carrying out of the policy of peace and democracy, and bring new succour to those very reactionary elements in our midst who are anxious to take India back to the imperialist tutelage.

WHO IS INCONSISTENT?

Therefore what is paraded as a paradox in a stand of support to the peaceful aspects of Pandit Nehru's foreign policy and relentless struggle against the reactionary policies internally is nothing but a really consistent line of strengthening the forces of peace, freedom and democracy both at home and abroad.

Pandit Nehru has complained that China has unity while India lacks it. He should know why there is unity in China. Because the people there are united to sweep away the obstacles that stand in the path of China's advance towards the happiness of the masses; Chiang Kai-shek, despite his talks of unity, could not achieve it because he was anxious to preserve those very things which prevented the improvement of the lot of the people.

Today inside Pandit Nehru's own party there is disunity and he has to run hither and thither to solve internal congress crises. Let him ponder why it is so. The mass of

people cannot be united behind a policy which seeks to perpetuate the atrocious exploitation of the foreign and Indian vested interests.

There can be no unity in the land if you keep up landlordism and suppress peasants' struggles. There can be no unity so long as monopolists go scot-free and British capitalists continue their loot, while you threaten workers with rationalisation.

Pandit Nehru is never tired of deriding the communists for their alleged inconsistencies, for the contradictions in their position. If he thinks over the matter coolly he will see that it is he who is guilty of inconsistencies, it is his policy that is full of contradictions.

He condemns the designs of US imperialism but does not reject the aid whose avowed aim is furtherance of these very designs. He denounces the SEATO but refuses to break with British imperialism which is one of its main sponsors. He praises the achievements of the Chinese People's Republic but denounces the ideology which made these achievements possible. He takes a number of measures which help the cause of peace and freedom but pursues a national policy that weakens and shackles the very forces that are the true defenders of peace and freedom.

These contradictions and inconsistencies, as the Communist Party has many times pointed out, are not accidental. They follow from the class character and class policy of Pandit Nehru's government.

THE MASSESS SHALL DECIDE!

Pandit Nehru's denunciation of the Communist Party will not make us withdraw our support from those measures of his government which go to strengthen the cause of peace and of Indian freedom. We shall not merely continue to support them but strive to build the broadest unity behind them and for their implementation.

We know that these measures are the result of events and movements of world historic importance in bringing

about and developing which we too, together with other patriots and democrats, have played our role. They are the result of the collective efforts of us all—of those who cherish freedom, democracy and peace. Hence our duty and our task to further strengthen the unity of the people behind these measures, implement them and carry them forward.

Nor will Pandit Nehru's denunciation of the Communist Party scare us to line up behind his government whose policy in the main continues to be a policy against the interests of the people.

Loyal to the cause of the masses, loyal to the ideology of Marxism, undeterred by threats and provocations, we of the Communist Party of India shall unflinchingly strengthen the movement of our people for freedom and peace, democracy and a better life. Ultimately it is the masses that shall decide.

25. Andhra Election

1955 opens in India with a momentous political battle in full swing. The Andhra people will be in the forefront of this battle but it is not theirs alone. Democracy and a better life for our toiling people is the central issue—to the peasant his land, to the worker a decent wage, to the unemployed a job, and to the entire people a fuller and more worthwhile life building up their homeland. All of us must have a clear picture of the situation before us so that we may contribute to our utmost capacity in speeding the victory of democracy in Andhra.

The sordid tale of Congress betrayal, unscrupulousness, nepotism and determined service to the vested interests in Andhra is well known. This is not an isolated example of the degeneration of the Congress and its regime. The same tale can be told in state after state. Naturally enough this has resulted in the growing isolation of the Congress from the people.

That is why 1954 saw a tremendous sweep of mass struggle in one part of the country after another, reaching out to new areas and new sections. Calcutta witnessed the teachers' movement which won the support of the most diverse sections, and recently the hungerstrike and protest of the police force. In Uttar Pradesh a big peasant movement developed against the rise in water-rates as also in many parts of Bihar. Numerous peasant actions against evictions took place. The defence employees registered their energetic protest. Recently the unity of the bank employees among themselves and with the democratic public forced the government and the bankowners to beat a tactical retreat—not, however, before the government had clearly revealed its zeal for the plutocrats and financiers. These are only some striking examples of our people in action during the past year.

Ajoy Ghosh's introduction to P. Sundarayya's pamphlet *For Victory in Andhra* (1955) and dated 27 December 1954.

In Travancore-Cochin the people forced the congress government out of office and were prevented from garnering the fruits of their victory only by the betrayal of the PSP. In Malabar the district board elections unmistakably pointed not only to the decline in congress strength but to the emergence of a victorious challenge to it—the democratic movement headed by the Communist Party.

It is against this background of a growing struggle against the Congress and the perspective of a victorious challenge that the Andhra elections are taking place. The Communist Party had already become, as the general election result of 1952 indicated, the first party of the Andhra people. This is a position it has won through sustained service and sacrifice, by standing with the people particularly during the dark days of repression and terror in 1948-51. This position it has extended and consolidated during the thirteen months of existence of the Andhra state.

Pandit Nehru and other congressmen talk of national unity, of the so-called 'antinational' character of the Communist Party. It will be more than interesting to see how far the Congress has the temerity to take up such a position in Andhra itself. The Andhra people know full well who it is that has served their national interests, who it is that has fought for the creation of an Andhra state and fights today for Visalaandhra, who it is that has advocated the construction of projects which would bring vitality to Andhra life. The Communist Party in Andhra is the national party of its people. It is such a party and its allies which go to the people with their inspiring election program.

Sensing the gravity of the situation and the precariousness of their own position the ruling classes are resorting to desperate measures. The Congress which till now disdained to recognise the very existence of other parties, which never entered into agreement with other parties but demanded that they should dissolve themselves and join the Congress as individual members, the Congress which claimed to be the sole representative of the nation—that same Congress today has formed a united front with the Praja Party whose leaders changed colour half-a-dozen times in recent period and with the KLP which voted against the congress ministry and contributed to its overthrow. As for these

parties, while not daring to fight the elections under congress banner, they have agreed to join the congress legislature party after elections, in case the united front gains a majority, so that they may share office with the Congress. They have openly proclaimed that there is no difference between them and the Congress as regards 'program and method'. For this betrayal of their pledge, they have been given seats far in excess of what they dreamed of. This unprincipled ganging up shows to what level the Congress and its 'allies' have sunk.

In Andhra the process of polarisation has reached an advanced stage. The Communist Party by its organisational work and leadership of mass struggles has solidly entrenched itself among the toiling sections of the people. Through their opportunism the independents and small parties have lost enormously in prestige and influence. The two camps of democracy and reaction are clearly forming and ranging themselves against each other for the election campaign. The result of this contest will be of the very greatest significance for the progress of the popular movement throughout India. A rebuff in Andhra to the political offensive of the ruling class will have a galvanising effect on the masses everywhere, strengthening their confidence and will. It is the duty of the entire democratic movement in India to see such a rebuff is administered.

The political resolution of the third congress of the Communist Party of India had stated:

"In these conditions, the struggle for day-to-day demands, the struggle against taxation and high prices, against evictions, against mass unemployment, the struggle for the preservation and extension of civil liberties and democratic rights, the struggle for defence of freedom and sovereignty—all get more and more interlinked and can grow into the common struggle for the replacement of the present government by a government of democratic unity, a government formed by a coalition of different democratic parties and groups on the basis of a common minimum program to be decided according to the circumstances, which will give immediate relief to the people... Achievement of government of democratic unity is the objective towards which all struggles of the masses have to lead."

In Andhra the winning of such a government of democratic unity is now a concrete possibility. The Communist Party's aim in the elections is not merely to defeat the Congress at the polls, but to establish a strong alternative democratic government which can solve the problems of the people.

It is with this aim in view that the election manifesto has been drawn up, the main plank of which will be land reforms. It has laid down a minimum program of relief and advance for different sections of the people, for the development of projects essential for the Andhra state and for Visalaandhra with Hyderabad as its capital. Taking into account the lessons gained in the Travancore-Cochin elections, it has been decided to give the election symbol of the Communist Party to all those individuals who accept our election manifesto, show their readiness to join hands with the Communist Party to form a government and abide by the discipline of the legislature communist bloc. This bloc will make efforts to join with other progressive parties and individuals to form a united government.

This is the immediate perspective in Andhra—of the end of the governmental monopoly of the Congress and its allies. The congress camp is in consternation, and desperate attempts are being made to form all sorts of alliances no matter the price—the heavy concessions to the KLP and Praja Party bear this out. An indication of the lengths to which the Congress is prepared to go came from the Kurnool firing episode. The democratic movement has to be on guard lest during the elections widespread repression, curtailment of civil liberties and provocation are resorted to as a last desperate measure.

In the coming months all over India there must ring out the mobilising call—For Victory in Andhra!

26. Nehru's Socialism—A Hoax

Full employment within ten years through the creation of 24 million new jobs; annual investment of 1000 to 1200 crores of rupees; a "phased program of agrarian reform" which will be gone through "as quickly as possible"; steady march towards a "socialistic society"—such is the alluring prospect the government now holds out before the people through its recent pronouncements in parliament. A thrilling prospect indeed, one that should warm the heart of every one and dispel the existing atmosphere of discontent and frustration.

Curiously enough, all this has left the people cold. Even the guarded comments made in the bourgeois press go to show that few take these assurances seriously.

FACTS BELIE CLAIMS

Why? Because, facts, as has been said many a time before, are stubborn things. And facts, as revealed in the *Progress Report of the Five Year Plan*, on which all these calculations are based reveal a picture which, to put it very mildly, is none-too-promising.

Many a time, since the *Progress Report* was published, attention to these facts was drawn not only by the communists but also by well-known bourgeois economists. It is not necessary to narrate all of them here. Nevertheless, since the government persists in ignoring them, it is necessary to restate some of them.

Food production in the country has increased by 11.4

Article by Ajoy Ghosh published in *New Age*. 2 January 1955 and later reprinted as a pamphlet.

million tons and there has been an easing of the food situation—a welcome development.

But the *Report* itself ascribes at least half the increase to the "good weather of 1953-54" (p 58) which is a most uncertain factor. Further, it is admitted, part of the increase in figures is due to better "statistical coverage"—the produce of 89 million acres being left out of calculation in earlier estimates.

With all this, however, the availability of foodgrains is only 15 oz per adult per day as against 16.3 oz in the years 1934-38.

In the industrial sector "the index of production rose during the year to 136.3 as against 118.2 in 1951 and 128.9 in 1952". Nevertheless production declined in the "three major industries of jute, sugar, and [most serious from the point of national development] iron and steel".

Here again the fact must be remembered that 1946 which was taken as the base year was marked by low production. For example, the production of textiles which reached 4906 million yards in 1953-54 exceeded the target laid down in the plan and was much higher than the years immediately preceding the plan. But even in 1944, production had already reached 4852 million yards.

Further, if from the total cloth production—mill as well as handloom—the amount exported is deducted, the availability of cloth per head today is only 13-14 yards a year—less than what it was in the prewar years.

Paradoxically enough, increase in production has not been accompanied by increase in employment. With increase in workload and intensification of labour in various forms, more is being produced by industries with less workers.

Cottage and smallscale industries which form the source of livelihood of millions are declining everywhere throwing millions on the street. The number of registered unemployed has increased from 288,971 in 1950, a preplan year, to 589,000 in July 1954, the third year of the plan.

The total estimated investment in the country's entire

economy was to be between Rs 3500 crore and Rs 3500 crore in five years in the public and private sectors—the latter including "agriculture, largescale and smallscale industries, trade, banking, housing construction, etc."—according to C. D. Deshmukh.

This works out to Rs 700-720 crore a year. Admittedly this figure has not been reached. Investment in the state sector in three years has been Rs 885 crore, 40 per cent of the five-year estimate. Investment in the private industrial sector has been Rs 96 crore in three years—41 per cent of the total estimate of Rs 233 crore.

Figures of investment with regard to all the other items in the private sector are not available. Still, in view of the decline in cottage industries and the conditions of the peasantry, this investment as a whole must have been far, far less than in the public sector and the private industrial sector.

Even if, for the sake of argument, the fantastic assumption is made that this too was 40 per cent of the estimated outlay of Rs 1567 crore (Rs 1800 crore less Rs 233 crore) for five years—then the investment in the private sector as a whole comes to Rs 722 crore in three years.

Adding this to the investment in the public sector we get Rs 1605 crore—which works out to a little over Rs 535 crore a year. But as already stated, this would be on the basis of a totally unreal assessment of the investment in the private sector as a whole.

How all this is to be changed, how the grandiose promise of ensuring food sufficiency, creating 24 million additional jobs, of investing 1000 to 1200 crores of rupees per year is to be fulfilled—one reads in vain the speeches made in parliament by the spokesmen of the government to discover the answer.

The facts narrated above are well-known. They do not, however, tell the whole truth. They do not bring out the most significant features which the operation of the plan has revealed.

ROTTENNESS OF PLAN'S FOUNDATION

Even the best of plans may not attain its full target. Many unforeseen and unfavourable factors may hamper its implementation. Therefore if the plan had failed merely to achieve its targets in certain spheres, or even in all spheres, that by itself would not constitute a condemnation of the government.

Increase in production, both in industry and agriculture, has been meagre. But this increase itself has shown why the whole basis of the plan is defective, this increase itself has laid bare the utter rottenness of the very foundation on which all the schemes and plans of the government rest.

One can understand a situation in which industries are working to capacity but are unable to meet the full needs of the people.

One can understand a situation when enough capital is not available for industrial development and hence unemployment figures remain high.

One can understand a situation when due to natural calamities, food production has fallen, the peasantry is hard-hit and is, therefore, unable to buy the things produced.

In such a situation, the difficulties can be ascribed to purely natural and economic factors and the way out sought in such measures as forced saving and lowering of consumption, harder work, concentration on specific sectors, etc. A nation which displayed a glorious capacity for sacrifice and discipline in the days when it fought for freedom could certainly be counted upon to display similar qualities in the task of reconstruction of the national economy.

But can anyone claim that such is the situation today? Can anyone assert that the difficulties which our country is facing and the reason why the plan has not attained even some of its own targets are due to purely economic and natural factors?

If that were so, the people would certainly have forgiven

the government, or charged it at the most with miscalculations, and rallied round it to carry out the economic program with redoubled vigour.

Such, however, is not the truth.

THE TRUTH ABOUT OUR ECONOMY

Fourteen months ago, on 12 October 1953, in a speech delivered before the central advisory council of industries, the planning minister, Gulzarilal Nanda, made the following significant statement:

"On the one hand, there was the complaint that the country did not produce enough consumption goods. But when they increased production and took credit for it, they were suddenly faced with accumulation of stocks."

This one admission knocks the bottom out of the claim that the way out of our difficulties lies in "hard work"—which Pandit Nehru is never tired of repeating.

Has the situation changed during the last one year? Here is the testimony of the *Progress Report*:

"Despite the general rise, production in most industries was still much below capacity, due, in most cases, to lack of demand at current prices in the domestic and external markets. Falling off of demand in the latter was in some instances checked by appropriate revision of export duties" (p 151).

What was done to "overcome the lack of demand" in the internal market, why were "current prices" allowed to remain high? This the *Progress Report* modestly refrains from saying.

This is the situation. Increase in production in industries and in agriculture—which, commonsense tells, should improve the condition of workers and the peasants and enable them to buy more—has not led to expansion of the market. The added wealth has enriched somebody else. Hence industries are working far below even their existing capacity. Hence the disease of plenty in the midst of poverty, and

hence the palliative has to be sought in the "appropriate revision of export duties".

With land rent remaining at the old high level despite the much-boasted agrarian reforms, with millions of peasants being evicted from land by the landlords, with the colossal load of rural debt estimated at Rs 913 crore by the national income committee on which at a most conservative estimate an interest of Rs 86.5 crore has to be paid annually (which could have been used for improvement of agriculture), with irrigation rates increased from 50 per cent to 300 per cent in different states, with betterment levies and old and new taxes, including many imposed through district boards, local boards, panchayats, etc., with the peasant ground down by the catastrophic fall in the prices of agricultural goods while prices of what the peasant has to buy are kept high, with rural industries in decline—the entire agrarian economy is cracking up.

The situation is no better in the cities where lakhs of artisans are virtually starving, the working class has been subjected to new attacks and unemployment figures have steadily mounted.

All this has imposed restrictions on the market and created difficulties which no jugglery with words and figures, no sophistry can solve.

The question of capital formation is a vital question for all countries—especially for a backward country like ours. Investment in industries has been far less than what was expected. Was this due to lack of finance?

Let it be kept in mind that the index number of industrial profits which averaged 211 during the war years, 1940-45, rose to 259.9 in 1948 and to 310.5 in 1951.

Eastern Economist, the organ of big business, made the following comment on a study of profits made by the Reserve Bank of India for the years 1950 and 1951:

"In the first place, the gross profits of all private and limited concerns are now of the order of Rs 225 crore to Rs 250 crore. Their capacity to finance themselves might be reckoned as something like Rs 100 crore, inclusive of

depreciation. Assuming that depreciation makes an inroad of about Rs 40 crore per year, this would still imply that Indian industry is capable of new investment of something between Rs 50 to Rs 60 crore. These are figures so much beyond existing estimates that it seems difficult to explain the shortage of capital in the expansion of these industries. If the Reserve Bank estimate is correct, where is the private capital formation in Indian companies spending itself?"

The estimates of the Reserve Bank and of the *Eastern Economist*, both as regards profits and as regards availability of capital for new investment, are ridiculously low. Nevertheless neither Deshmukh nor his patron—big business—has answered the question: Where are the profits going? The answer, they know, would do no credit to big business to whose patriotism eloquent tribute has been paid, more than once by Pandit Nehru himself.

No purpose would be served by further examination of the reality behind the promises made by the government about what it proposes to do in the coming years. What has been said should suffice to show that the government is stubbornly refusing to face the facts because the facts irresistibly lead to conclusions none-too-palatable either to the government or to the classes it serves.

The independence day pledge itself began with the memorable words that stirred hundreds of millions:

"We believe that it is the inalienable right of the Indian people, as of any other people, to have freedom and to enjoy the fruits of their toil and have the necessities of life, so that they may have full opportunities of growth. We believe also that if any government deprives the people of these rights and oppresses them, the people have a further right to alter it or abolish it."

THE ESSENTIALS FOR ADVANCEMENT

Admittedly the problems of the country cannot be solved in a day. But the least that the people have a right to

expect when they have their own government is that they should "enjoy the fruits of their toil"—no matter how meagre the fruits are. That if more food is produced by the peasants' toil, the peasants' condition should improve. That if industrial production goes up by the workers' toil, they should have more employment and more of the necessities of life. That if more profits are made by the collective toil of the people, they should be so invested that the country's economy is strengthened.

If all that does not happen, if the argument of "market difficulties" is trotted out to justify the nonutilisation of even the existing industrial and labour capacities—then it should be evident to all that there is something seriously wrong somewhere.

What is that something? There was a time when Pandit Nehru knew the answer to this question. 21 years ago, he wrote:

"If an indigenous government took the place of the foreign government and kept all the vested interests intact, this would not be even the shadow of freedom" (*Whither India?*, 1933).

Why did Pandit Nehru feel it necessary to stress this? Was it just in the nature of a moral censure pronounced against the haves on behalf of the havenots?

Obviously not. Obviously he felt that the very existence of certain institutions linked with the vested interests stood in the way of people's progress, in the way of the content of freedom becoming real for the masses—food and cloth, housing and the necessities of life, cultural upliftment, industrialisation of the country.

The ending of British rule was essential; for that alone would make possible the sweeping away of the institutions connected with the vested interests which stood in the path of the country's advance.

It was this realisation that drew all patriotic parties and the masses into the struggle against British rule. Differences existed among them on many issues. But there was

agreement on the key issue—freedom from British domination. This was the basis of the unity.

NATIONAL UNITY—FOR WHAT?

Today Pandit Nehru moans the absence of unity in our country. He points to the example of China where the "people and the government are working as one" to rebuild their country. He forgets that once there was broad unity of the democratic parties and of the masses in our country too.

He forgets that on the historic day when the national flag went up the Red Fort, the whole nation hailed that event with tumultuous joy and stood behind his party—the Congress—solidly because they expected it to fulfil the pledge it had given, to realise the dream for which hundreds of thousands had faced imprisonment, baton-charges and bullets.

Why did that unity break down? Because Pandit Nehru's government proceeded to maintain those very institutions—British grip over our economy, landlordism and usury, power of monopoly capital—which had retarded the advance of the country.

The history of the last seven years is a history of the sordid way this was done, of the way in which disillusionment grew among the people, of the way in which the masses rose in struggle in defence of their rights.

National unity is not an abstraction. It is always unity for a definite objective and, therefore, can only be the unity of those who are interested in the realisation of that objective. In the new setup that came into existence after August 1947, unity of the democratic masses could be maintained and carried forward only through a resolute policy of removal of these obstacles which hampered the country's progress.

This is what the Nehru government refused to do. It claimed to improve the conditions of the people, to

strengthen the economy of the country, without the removal of these obstacles.

The historic program of the Communist Party of India pointed out the path along which alone the economic and political problems facing the people can be solved. Basing itself on this program, the Communist Party in its Madurai congress resolution stated:

"It is obvious today that *abolition of landlordism and removal of the burden of debts* by freeing the vast peasant masses of our country from the heavy exploitation of the landlord and usurious moneylender alone will smash the fetters on our agricultural production and release the creative energies of India's millions of peasants. That alone will assure for the national industries a vast expanding market and ensure capital formation on an ascending scale. Abolition of landlordism and handing over of land to peasants and agricultural workers are thus the prerequisites not only for the development of our agriculture but also for the industrialisation of the country.

"*The confiscation of British capital* will not only free our economy from the grip of the British imperialists and ensure the possibility of independent development unhampered by the fetters of imperialist monopolists, but will place in the hands of the state a powerful public sector with vast resources, which will ensure the possibility of effective control over the entire economy and thereby secure the possibility of successful planned development.

"*A democratic state* alone will be able to unleash the immense creative energies of the millions of our peasants, workers and the intelligentsia, and utilise the economic power and resources of the public sector obtained by the confiscation of British capital for a planned development in the interest of the entire people.

"*The experience of the last three years has fully demonstrated that the prerequisites of planned development of our economy in the interest of the people are the smashing up of feudal relations in our agriculture, confiscation of*

British capital and the establishment of a democratic state" (section 24).

All this Pandit Nehru's government refuses to do. It pays privy purses of Rs 5.5 crore to the princes while allowing them to retain their huge properties. It leaves vast areas of land in the hands of landlords, agrees to pay for land that is taken over compensation to the tune of 500 to 550 crores of rupees—about whose effect the following is stated in a publication of the All-India Congress Committee:

"While such becomes the liability of the state, the additional annual revenue which will accrue to the state government as the result of the abolition is pitifully low compared to the compensation that will have to be paid. . . In part A states whereas 414 crores of rupees will have to be paid as compensation, the additional revenue of the state government will be merely 19.52 crores of rupees, that is, a bare 4.71 per cent of the total compensation payable" (H. D. Malaviya: *Land Reforms in India*, 1954, p 435).

The author proceeds to say:

"The sum involved, anywhere in the neighbourhood of Rs 550 crore, nearly 25 per cent of the total visualised for the five-year plan, is indeed very huge and will remain a constant source of anxiety for the state exchequers for years to come. . ."

He further quotes the opinion of an American professor who, when asked by the government of India to study the land reforms in India, stated, "compensation at current values will load the present tenants with considerable debts".

The government does not even agree to the demand that British owners should not be allowed to ship out profits and that these, as well as profits earned by Indian big business, should be compulsorily directed towards channels of investment in accordance with national needs. That, in its opinion, is violation of the sacred rights of private property. It does not stop big business from even

entering into partnership with foreign capital on terms which are inimical to our national interests.

And what is the record of these men in terms of service to the people? This is what Khandubhai Desai, the present labour minister, has to say about the textile magnates and their loot:

"The industry (textiles) in equity, morality and even on economic grounds belongs to the nation which was made compulsorily to pay much more than the total value of these 420 mills which in fairness should now be transferred to the state without any compensation" (*Five Year Plan—A Criticism*, 1952, pp 70-71).

That despite all talks of 'control over industry' the government has no intention whatsoever to curb the power of big business and its loot is evident from the reaction of G. D. Birla to the threat of socialism.

In his statement issued on 23 December he said that the "misgiving in the mind of a section of the business community" was "due to lack of correct appreciation of the fundamentals behind the economic policy of the government".

And in order to remove this 'misgiving' he said the following—thereby unwittingly exposing all the pretensions of the government:

"Private enterprise can do the job more efficiently, with greater economy. But the private sector comes into the picture only when it can secure adequate capital and attract progressively larger investments. On the other hand, if the huge investment required for the task is beyond the reach of the private sector, then some sector must come into the picture to do the job, and that sector can only be the public sector. That is in reality the genesis of the mixed economy which we have accepted and yet have not fully appreciated" (PTI).

Such is Nehru's 'socialism', a socialism which hardheaded realists among the monopolists heartily welcome.

And what does this 'socialism' mean for the masses?

The rationalisation drive of big business fully supported and aided by the government threatens lakhs of workers with unemployment.

As for the peasants, at a meeting of the standing committee of the Congress Parliamentary Party, held on 21 December, "it was pointed out that the burden of various taxes, irrigation rates and municipal levies on the agriculturist has gone up by as much as 400 per cent in many areas while the price of paddy, for instance, has sharply gone down" (*Hindustan Times*, 22 December 1954).

As regards the conferring of real democracy on the people, the conferring of real power on the people's elected organs at all levels, through which alone the creative energy of the people can be mobilised—all the condemnation of the bureaucracy and police indulged in the pre-freedom days has ended, while their powers remain as unrestricted as ever and grow more.

Through various measures like the preventive detention act the liberties of the people are curtailed, the panchayats about which much was promised are stagnating and have become the vehicle for imposing new taxes on the people.

Such is the record of the government in the realm of economic and political policies.

NEHRU DISTORTS COMMUNIST STAND

While in the sphere of foreign relations the government, due to many factors, has shown a welcome shift from its previous position, a shift which has been supported by all democratic elements, its internal policies remain reactionary and antinational.

They sap the strength of the country and expose it to danger from abroad. They seek to chain and weaken the democratic forces, while strengthening those which are the pillars of reaction. They thus damage the cause of freedom and weaken the struggle for peace.

Thanks to its policy of refusal to attack big business in

any way, to mobilise its resources the government has to woo foreign capital, impose more and more burdens on the people and resort to deficit-financing—all of which threaten the sovereignty of the country, weaken its economy and intensify mass misery.

Hence it is the Nehru government that bears the responsibility for the present state of our economy, as well as for the existing strife and disunity. To cover up the fiasco of its policies, it has to make promises which it knows can never be fulfilled; talk about socialism while helping big business and landlords, launch repression against the masses when they rise in struggle, and resort to lies and slanders against the democratic forces and the Communist Party.

This campaign of lies and slanders against the Communist Party is led by Pandit Nehru himself who, realising the untenability of his position and unable to answer real criticism, has to adopt the age-old method of putting absurd arguments in the mouth of his opponents and then 'demolishing' them with great fanfare.

Consider, for example, the following which is supposed to be an answer to our criticism:

"You may say that we want India to be, let us say, like the Soviet Union. Therefore we must have the revolution of the type of the Soviet Union. Therefore we must have some kind of war preceding that revolution as it occurred in Russia. We are going to produce a war first and then civil war and all that in order to bring about a state of affairs which may enable us to go ahead. It is absurd" (*Speech before the Congress Parliamentary Party, 2 December 1954*).

And about learning from China, he had to say this:

"Take China. Forty years of civil war, Japanese invasion, destruction—it made the history of 40 years. Now something happened in China, a new centralised... government. That is the outcome, the result of 40 years of Chinese history. Now, how are we to produce forty years of Indian history of civil war before we get these?

But the communists do not reason it. They seem to think that things come out of nothing. If we try to go along the communist way, how are we to get it? By going through a process of destruction for a generation or two?" (ibid).

And with a zeal worthy of a better cause, he proceeded to draw a lurid picture of what would happen—the 'terrific problems' that would be created, the 'mutual hatred' that would be unleashed if the 'communist way' were to be adopted.

The whole line of argument is one which does not credit to the speaker and would have been completely ignored by us as irresponsible demagoguery and a tissue of lies if it had come from anyone other than Pandit Nehru. Since, however, he has indulged in it, one may ask him: When did he get these ideas from? Who told him that this is the 'communist way'?

WHAT THE COMMUNISTS SAY

What the communists have stated and continue to state is that certain *basic measures* have to be taken in order that the material and human resources of the country may be mobilised for the task of reconstruction.

What the communists have stated and continue to state is that certain institutions have to be swept away, certain property relations have to be ended, certain new institutions brought into being and new property relations created *before* planning becomes possible and *in order* that planning may be undertaken.

What the communists have stated and continue to state is that if these *fundamental steps* are not taken, then whatever progress is recorded will be meagre and halting, of an extremely uneven character, giving rise to new problems and new contradictions, paralysing advance or at least slowing it down.

What the communists have stated and continue to state is that our economic and cultural problems will not be sol-

ved, freedom itself will not be full and real as long as these measures are not taken and on their basis India built up as a modern industrial country of a prosperous and united people.

What the communists have stated and continue to state, when giving the example of the USSR and China, is that the USSR and China registered such rapid advance precisely because their governments dared to take those necessary measures which were needed in their respective countries.

Finally, what the communists have stated and continue to state is that the task of *economic reconstruction* should not be confused with the task of taking those *basic measures* which are needed for reconstruction, that while reconstruction is bound to take a long time in a backward country, the taking of the basic measures—like giving land to the peasants—does not take time but can be done immediately if the government has the necessary will and represents the real interests of the people.

Need all this necessarily lead to civil war and violence? Pandit Nehru, with his extensive knowledge of history, knows well that the Russian and Chinese people had to go through civil war precisely because the governments of those countries refused to take these measures, protected the vested interests and the institutions which blocked the advance of economy and of the nation.

He may also note the opinion on our agrarian setup expressed by two well-known economists whom no one would call irresponsible agitators:

"The choice lies between drastic and radical measures planned with a view to bring about reconstruction of our social and economic organisation or a continuance of the present drift, with sporadic attempts at halting reforms which may end in a grave agricultural crisis followed by a violent revolution" (Merchant and Wadia: *Our Economic Problem*, 1954, p 266).

By raising the bogy of civil war and violence, Pandit Nehru seeks to confuse the issue. He attempts to conceal

the fact that the reactionary classes, who are interested in preserving the present system, are discredited among the masses, are hated by them and are in no position to offer resistance to the urgently needed reforms, except with the backing of the army and police which his government commands.

To argue that if the privy purses of the princes were stopped and their properties taken over, if land were to be given gratis to the peasants, if British capital were to be confiscated and Indian monopoly capital brought under control—if all this were done, there would be an 'upheaval' in the country—to argue like this and think that it can carry conviction means not to rate very high the intelligence of the people.

PEOPLE'S DISCONTENT IS RISING

But unfortunately for Pandit Nehru, the days are gone when people could be deluded so easily. They are examining the policies of his government and seeing its real face. They know whom it represents and whom it serves. Neither talk of 'socialism' and the holding out of big promises, nor threats and repression can dampen the wave of mass discontent which is rising everywhere.

India urgently needs national unity—of all democratic and patriotic forces, both inside and outside the Congress. But it cannot be a unity on the basis which existed before 1947. Nor can it be unity behind the policies of the present government which maintains the institutions and interests that seek to perpetuate the present condition of the country and doom its people to starvation and nakedness, illiteracy and disease, backwardness and dependence on imperialist countries—thus imperilling the cause of freedom, democracy and peace.

The only unity that can be forged on that basis was the unity that was seen in Travancore-Cochin between the Congress and catholic reaction, in PEPSU and Rajasthan

between the Congress and the princes, and that which is being witnessed in Andhra today where an unprincipled ganging up has taken place between the Congress and the 'parties' that betray the people for a few seats in the assembly and for ministerial posts.

While the democratic forces would continue to fully support all those measures of the government which strengthen peace and defend national freedom, they know that the struggle for unity today has inevitably to proceed along the line of resistance to the attacks of the vested interests, defence of peace against the war-drive of the imperialists headed by the USA, and in opposition to the general policies of the government.

That unity is being forged in numerous struggles breaking out in all parts of the country—in fields and factories, in offices and educational institutions, on the streets. That unity is growing in the solidarity campaigns with the resurgent peoples of Asia. That unity is being fitted in Andhra where the democratic forces led by the Communist Party are striving to put an end to the corruption, nepotism and oppression that the congress rule signifies.

Out of the united mass struggles, and on the basis of the growing consciousness of the people, the force is emerging that will remove the present government from power, clear away the decadent load of the past and lay the foundations of a free, strong and prosperous India.

It is towards the fulfilment of this task that the Communist Party works and shall continue to work. It bases itself on the working class and the people who are the makers of history.

27. Communist Party in the Struggle for Peace, Democracy and National Advance

I. INDIA UPHOLDS THE CAUSE OF NATIONAL FREEDOM, ASIAN UNITY AND PEACE

1. The period we are passing through is rich with events of world-historic importance. The breach that was made in the system of world imperialism by the October revolution was further widened, after the victory over the forces of fascism, by the ending of capitalist rule in the countries of Eastern Europe, by the emergence of the Chinese People's Republic, by the formation of the democratic republics of Korea and Vietnam. Over nine hundred million people have broken away from the orbit of imperialism. The balance of forces has decisively shifted in favour of the camp of socialism and democracy. These developments and the growth and strengthening of the socialist world market have further deepened the general crisis of capitalism and sharpened all its contradictions. The great victories and the phenomenal advance of the national-liberation movement in the colonial and semicolonial world and the growing unity and might of resurgent Asia are dealing powerful blows to the whole imperialist order, cracking its very foundation. The imperialist powers, headed by the USA, are striving to build ramparts against the advancing tide of the people's movements and are engaged in preparation for a war for world conquest as their way out of the crisis.

Resolution adopted by the central committee, Delhi, 14-26 June 1955 to be made the basis for immediate work and for discussion at the conference of the party that were going to be held soon after. It was published as a pamphlet in July 1955.

2. The mighty camp of peace, democracy and socialism, led by the USSR and China, is conducting a great battle for peace, rallying in this battle progressive and peaceloving forces throughout the world.

The mass movement for peace, the movement which unites hundreds of millions of people in all countries and from all classes, has repeatedly frustrated the plans of the warmongers and has grown into one of the most powerful movements in all human history.

3. However the menace of war continues to threaten humanity. Though suffering defeat after defeat, the imperialists resort to new measures, sabotage agreements which they were forced to sign and intensify preparations for an atomic war. They seek to bring every country under their domination, build war-bases there. They threaten the sovereignty and freedom of every country and strive to suppress the forces of democracy everywhere. Under the circumstances, the struggle for peace has become the central issue of world politics today and a task of decisive importance for all countries. It has the most vital bearing on the struggle for defence of national independence and democracy.

4. Important changes have taken place in India's role and position in world affairs during the last few years. The immense and growing might of the socialism and democratic world, the staggering defeats suffered by the imperialists in their adventures in Korea and Vietnam, the sweeping advance of the national-liberation movements in Asia, the growth of the anti-imperialist, antiwar and mass democratic movement of the Indian people, the weakening of the imperialist camp and the sharpening of Anglo-American contradictions—all these developments on the one hand, and the increasing pressure from American imperialism which threatens India's sovereignty and tries to transform India into a satellite and a war-base on the other, have brought about a radical change in the India government's foreign policy.

5. Today India's foreign policy, in the main, opposes the war drive of imperialism and helps the cause of world

peace. It upholds the cause of Asian solidarity and generally opposes colonialism. It builds friendly relations with the Soviet Union, China and other peaceloving states.

Of historic importance was the Nehru-Chou declaration of 28 June 1954—the panch shila. It became a powerful factor in the Asian people's struggle for unity, peace and freedom.

This orientation in India's foreign policy has since been carried forward.

The Bandung conference, of which India was one of the chief sponsors, became a rally for Asian solidarity and against colonialism and dealt another blow to the war-plans of imperialism.

The friendship between India and Soviet peoples has been further strengthened by the visit of the India's prime minister to the USSR. The joint statement issued by Jawaharlal Nehru and N. A. Bulganin is a document of profound international significance, a powerful contribution to the cause of peace and friendship between nations. The evaluation of the international situation made in the statement, the principles it formulates, further isolate the instigators of war and have been welcomed by the whole of peaceloving mankind.

6. With this orientation in its foreign policy, India has been playing a great role in the worldwide battle for the preservation of peace—a role that has heightened India's international prestige and evoked in every patriotic Indian a sense of national pride.

The Communist Party which has been fighting for a consistent policy of peace welcomes and supports this orientation and will strive to further strengthen it.

7. In India and throughout Asia the struggle for peace is getting linked with the struggle for defence of Asian freedom and the building of Asian unity against the imperialist warmongers and the colonial powers who have banded themselves together in war-pacts like the SEATO. The struggle for peace is tremendously strengthening the struggle against the whole imperialist camp. Further, the com-

ing together of masses of different parties in the common struggle for defence of peace and freedom and for Asian unity has strengthened the mass democratic movement and extended its sweep. The growth of mass struggles in defence of the immediate demands of the people, growth of mass organisations and the strengthening of the general democratic movement have given added strength to the movement for peace. Life has shown how the struggles for peace, for defence and strengthening of national freedom, for democratic rights and vital interests of the masses are inseparably linked and strengthen each other.

8. Inasmuch as the Indian bourgeoisie does not want war and wants to preserve its independence, the present foreign policy is broadly in conformity with its class interests. At the same time it is necessary to recognise that in initiating the progressive shift in the government's foreign policy, in imparting to it a pronouncedly democratic, anti-imperialist and Asian unity content, the personal role of prime minister Nehru has been an important factor. Powerful forces in the ruling class, with their close economic links with the imperialists as well as influential men in the government, are getting apprehensive about the radical and democratic implications of such a policy and desire its reversal, or at least modification in a reactionary direction. The party has to expose these sections, isolate them and help to strengthen the broad mass movement of people of all parties and from all walks of life for the five principles and their consistent application for Asian unity. or still closer relationship with socialist and democratic states, for banning of atomic weapons. The extension and further strengthening of the mass movement for peace, the drawing into the movement of the masses of workers, peasants and other classes are imperative tasks. Governmental declarations alone are not enough to enable India play its rightful role in the struggle for peace.

The Communist Party will campaign for pacts of friendship and cooperation between India and all other peace-loving countries; it will campaign for the India government taking a firm stand against colonial wars waged by

imperialists, particularly British imperialists, in Asia and Africa; it will mobilise mass support for more trade and greater cultural and social exchanges between India and the socialist countries and for an all-round strengthening of Asian solidarity against imperialist powers. It will simultaneously demand the removal of pro-American and pro-British elements from the key positions in the India government and administration.

In these tasks the Communist Party will strive to secure the cooperation of all parties, organisations and individuals.

The party will systematically combat the false propaganda about 'two power blocs', about the 'menace of international communism', and explain to the masses the consistent peace policy pursued by the USSR ever since its formation.

9. The cause of freedom, of Asian unity and peace demands the strengthening of the struggle for break with the British commonwealth and severance of the political and military relations which commonwealth membership involves. Membership of the commonwealth headed by Britain, which is one of the chief enemies of world peace and of Asian peoples, is inconsistent with India's present role in world politics, with its policy of resistance to war and of building Asian solidarity. Also commonwealth membership subjects our foreign policy to British imperialist influence.

10. The existence of the powerful socialist and democratic camp and of the parallel socialist world market, the resurgence of the freedom movement in Asia, the growth of the democratic and peace movements inside the country, a relative improvement in certain aspects of Indian economy, the deepening contradictions in the imperialist camp resulting in its constant weakening and the growing conflict between the Indian bourgeoisie and imperialism—all these have made it possible for the government of India to assert increasingly India's sovereignty and independence. By defending its independence, by opposing the wardrive of imperialism, by taking steps to build Asian unity and to establish closer relations with socialist and democratic

states, India has strengthened its own sovereignty and freedom. The policies that the government of India pursues today in its relation with other countries are essentially independent and are not under the decisive influence of any foreign power. The emergence of India as a sovereign and independent republic upholding the cause of peace and freedom is a factor of profound significance in the present-day world.

II. RESULTS OF THE GOVERNMENT'S ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL POLICIES

1. However India's freedom rests on an insecure foundation. Due to the strong position of British capital in the country and the remnants of feudalism, India's economy remains weak, backward and, in many respects, dependent. The breaking of the power of British capital by its confiscation and nationalisation and the complete abolition of feudalism alone can place Indian freedom on a firm basis, remove the threat to its sovereignty and create conditions which will make freedom itself real in terms of economic advance and prosperity for the people. These anti-imperialist and antifeudal tasks have yet to be completed. And since the government of India, led by the big bourgeoisie, refuses to carry out these tasks and, on the contrary, protects, compromises with and makes concessions to foreign capital and landlordism, the mass movement for the completion of the antifeudal and anti-imperialist tasks has to develop in opposition to the government's general internal policies.

2. Conceived within the existing socioeconomic framework and making no attempt to change the pattern of Indian economy, the first five-year plan did not lay the basis for a strong and prosperous economy. At the same time the plan, aided considerably by favourable climatic and other factors, did achieve certain results. The increase in food production, the increase in production of jute and cotton, the improvement in India's balance-of-payment po-

sition, the reduction of the drain on India's sterling balance caused by heavy trade deficits and the arresting of inflation—have resulted in partial improvement of certain aspects of Indian economy, as compared to earlier years, and have strengthened the position of the Indian bourgeoisie. Nevertheless the actual achievements of the plan are extremely meagre, despite the huge sums that have been spent. Even many of the modest targets of the plan have not been attained.

3. The increase in the production of foodgrains (due largely to good monsoons) and of certain industrial goods has not meant an all-round strengthening of national economy and general improvement in the condition of the people. All the economic features of a backward country continue. The building of certain power and irrigation projects, though in themselves useful, has been accompanied by heavy enhancement of waterrates and other taxes while such measures as community projects and national extension service have conferred only limited benefits, mainly on the richer sections of the peasantry. The standard of life of the vast majority of people remains as low as before.

4. Our economy has not been freed from the grip of British capital. Industrialisation has hardly registered any progress, despite huge profits made by monopoly capital, Indian as well as foreign. Our agrarian economy faces a serious situation due to catastrophic fall in prices of agricultural goods, mounting burden of debts, heavy taxes, eviction offensive of the landlords, decline of rural industries, pauperisation of the mass of peasantry. In largescale industries, increase in production has not meant increase of employment or improvement in the condition of workers.

On the contrary mass unemployment has assumed menacing proportions all over the country—among workers, as well as middle classes and artisans, in cities as well as in villages. The working class has been subjected to increased workload and rationalisation, denial of bonus and retrenchment. No wonder under these conditions our

internal market remains narrow and many of our industries work below capacity which is symptomatic of the basic crisis from which our economy suffers.

5. These results are not accidental. The main direction of the government's economic policies has been towards the development of capitalism. But since this attempt is being made in the period of general crisis of capitalism, without basic agrarian reforms which alone could create an expanding internal market, and on the basis of collaboration of Indian monopoly capital with British capital, no important advance has taken place towards industrialisation. Monopoly capital has, of course, strengthened its position in national economy as a whole but it has utilised its power to amass wealth at the cost of the people.

In agriculture, government policies have resulted to a limited extent in curbing feudal landlordism, transformation of a number of feudal and semifeudal landlords into capitalist landlords and some concessions to the upper strata of peasants. But, despite these reforms, the conditions of the majority of the peasantry and agricultural workers have registered little improvement. On the contrary, their conditions are deteriorating due to the steep decline in agricultural prices, growth of debt burdens and tax exactions and increase in rural unemployment. Such have been the concrete results of the policies of the government, which sought to strengthen national economy without smashing the grip of foreign capital, without wiping out feudalism and by reliance on profit-motives of monopoly capital.

6. Such policies could not be carried out without giving rise to mass opposition—struggles of workers against retrenchment and intensification of workload; struggles of peasants against evictions, new taxes, low prices for their goods; struggles of agricultural workers for living wage; struggles of middleclass employees for human conditions of life; struggles of students against rising educational fees and for academic rights; struggles of citizens of all classes for civil liberties. These struggles have, in many cases brought together masses following different parties.

helped the growth of common mass organisations, evoked wide popular sympathy and have been supported by solidarity actions. They have heightened the consciousness of the people, ranged them against the attack of vested interests and the antipopular policies of the government, halted in many places the offensive of monopolists and landlords and won important concessions.

7. The general attitude of the government towards the demands and struggles of the people has been one of unconcealed hostility and of full support to the vested interests. Wherever the masses have fought against worsening conditions of life, the attempt of the government has been to suppress them with a heavy hand. The policies of the government have thus meant attack on the standard of life of the people and their democratic rights, interruption in production, increase in police expenditure, intensification of strife and conflict all over the country.

8. It is evident, therefore, that the limited gains made by the first five-year plan rest on a precarious economic and political basis. Conditions have not been created yet for steady and continuous advance, for full utilisation of the productive forces of our country and its vast manpower, for popular participation in an effective manner in the work of national reconstruction. These conditions have yet to be created.

III. PLAN-FRAME OF THE SECOND FIVE-YEAR PLAN

1. The experience of the first five-year plan in India, as contrasted with rapid all-round development in People's China in the same period, proves that a backward and undeveloped country like ours can rapidly advance to happiness and prosperity only if it puts an end to exploitation of foreign capital, abolishes feudalism in all forms distributes land to agricultural workers and poor peasants and takes to the path of people's democracy which creates conditions for the transition to socialism. This is the objective which the Communist Party placed before the country

in its program and this is the objective for which it continues to fight.

2. At the same time the party is conscious of the fact that with the existence of a powerful world socialist market and the existing correlation of class forces in our country, where there is an intense urge for national reconstruction on the part of the people, it is possible even today for the democratic movement to secure a limited advance in the direction of economic development of the country. Such development will be realised mainly in the measure that the positions occupied by imperialist, feudal and monopolistic interests in the economy of the country are weakened and undermined, the standard of life of the masses is raised, creating an expanding internal market and the democratic rights and liberties of the people are extended.

It is from this point of view that the Communist Party views the proposals regarding the second five-year plan.

3. While the leaders of the government are never tired of emphasising the great achievements of their plans and projects they are quite conscious that these 'achievements' have not satisfied the people, have not overcome the basic weakness of India's economy, have not fulfilled even their own modest expectations. No wonder the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industries in its memorandum on the second five-year plan has only touched the fringe of the problem. The leaders of the India government can no longer ignore the lessons of the first five-year plan. They have had their bitter disappointment in the expectations that imperialists would pour in capital to help them build up industries and thus make speedy capitalist expansion possible. Not only have these hopes been belied, but Indian capitalists are now faced with fierce competition from imperialist quarters, both here in India and in the export market outside. Feudal remnants in agriculture prevent the expansion of the internal market.

In fact the contradictions between imperialism and feudalism on the one hand, and the needs of Indian economy on the other, are sharpening every day.

4. Faced with such realities and guided by their urge

for capitalist development, the Indian ruling class and its planners have begun reformulating their approach and have already given some indication of a new orientation. The government's agreement with the Soviet Union for the building of a steel plant in the state sector, for example, represents a significant departure from the earlier object dependence on the British and American imperialists for capital goods and technical knowhow.

The plan frame that has been recently published proposes rapid industrialisation of the country with particular emphasis on the development of basic industries which will be mainly in the public sector. For meeting consumer goods demands, it proposes fuller utilisation of existing capacity and encouragement and development of smallscale and cottage industries.

The proposals to build basic industries, if implemented, would reduce the dependence of India on foreign countries in respect of capital goods, strengthen the relative position of industry inside India and strengthen our economic position and national independence. The party, therefore, supports these proposals and also the proposal that these industries should be mainly developed in the public sector. It supports the proposal that the demand for consumer goods should be met, as far as possible, by better utilisation of the existing capacity and by development of smallscale and cottage industries so that jobs are provided for an increasing number of people and maximum possible resources are available for the development of basic industries. The party not only supports these proposals but will expose and combat those who want them to be modified in a reactionary direction.

6. The attempted industrial development and expansion, if pursued, will bring the Indian bourgeoisie into growing conflict with the powerful positions of British capital in India and with the feudal and semifeudal relations in agriculture. It will sharpen the conflict between various sections of the bourgeoisie themselves facilitating the weakening and isolation of the most reactionary elements. In the context of growing mass democratic

movements in India, this growing conflict can result in the adoption of limited measures by the government against imperialist, feudal and reactionary monopolist interests.

7. We are not only interested in all such developments but it shall also be our endeavour to carry them forward by mass mobilisation. Every step that is taken against the interests of foreign capital, against feudal and semi-feudal agrarian relations, for curbing monopoly capital will receive our most energetic and unstinted support.

8. The proposals made in the plan-frame will not, however, automatically bring about all this. Those proposals, despite their relative bolder targets and professed objectives, do not constitute the basis for a democratic plan, a real national plan. They are totally inadequate. Some of them are even reactionary.

The plan-frame does not propose any check or control on the operation of British capital in India, even in relation to remittance of profits abroad—let alone the taking over of British concerns. There are no indications that the government intends to restrict the profits of monopoly capital and gives decisive importance to the question of radical agrarian reforms. No effective proposals have been made for liberating the peasant masses from the grip of landlords and moneylenders. On questions of labour-management relations, living wage, popular rights, the planners have nothing new to propose.

The plan is mainly linked with the world capitalist market which is crisis ridden. This will adversely affect the stability of prices in India and result in continuation of unequal exchange in our foreign trade.

The policy of the government in the past has been to make the common people bear the burden of its plans, while giving free reign to the rich to amass profits. The plan-frame makes it clear that in this respect no basic change is contemplated. Finances are proposed to be raised by increasing the burden on the common people—increased taxation in various forms, forced saving, deficit-financing. All this will be accompanied by a powerful

propaganda drive calculated to create the illusion that if people cheerfully bear the burden now, they will be laying the foundation for a happy and prosperous future.

IV. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR A NATIONAL PLAN

1. These reactionary features and the significant omissions are not fortuitous or due to oversight. They follow from the class character of the government and its basic policies. They are the product of the outlook which refuse to recognise that for all-round strengthening of national economy it is necessary to take bold action against British capital and landlordism, curb monopoly capital, improve the condition of the people, carry out democratic measures.

These reactionary features are essentially due to the fact that although the contradiction between the needs of India's industrial development and the interests of imperialism, feudalism and reactionary monopoly capital has grown in the last few years, yet the government is not prepared to attack them. Even when seeking to curb them, under the growing pressure of the masses and due to its own needs, the government proceeds by way of compromise, by way of heavy concessions and compensation which seriously jeopardise the very objective of economic advance.

2. The Communist Party opposes the main trend of the taxation inquiry commission's recommendations, which envisages not reduction but increase of tax burdens on the common people and which the authors of the plan-frame have accepted. We are determinedly opposed to such policies. No additional tax burdens on the masses on any account until and unless, on the one hand, the classes that are in a position to pay and other resources have been fully tapped; and on the other, the living conditions of our people have been improved.

3. In these circumstances the Communist Party, while giving support to every step that the government may take

to strengthen national economy, will put forward concrete proposals which it wants to be adopted as an integral part of the second five-year plan.

A full-fledged people's plan can only be based on confiscation of British capital and transfer of land to the tiller without compensation.

Even in the existing circumstances, a patriotic plan must make decisive inroads into the position of foreign capital in India and also of landlordism. It must weaken the position of monopoly capital in our national economy. It must raise the standard of life of the people, constantly and continuously, and create an expanding internal market. It must be based on an equitable system of taxation, raising the necessary resources primarily from those who can bear the burden—the foreign capitalists, the landlords and princes, the big bourgeoisie. It must strive to create a stable price structure. It must make possible all-round advance—in the sphere of health, housing, culture, etc. It must mean the adoption of progressive labour laws, the ensuring of popular cooperation and the unleashing of popular initiative through extension of democratic rights and civil liberties.

Unless these things are done, the problems facing our country will not be solved.

V. FOR OVERCOMING THE DIVISION AMONG DEMOCRATIC FORCES

1. The proposals of the Communist Party in relation to the second five-year plan will be guided by the above principles. The Communist Party holds that these principles are not merely correct, not merely do they conform to the interests of the masses, they are also principles whose implementation would strengthen national economy as a whole. They should therefore be supported by every patriotic Indian, no matter to which party he owes allegiance.

The Communist Party will strive to bring about the broadest unity on the basis of these proposals and create

mass sanction behind them. The party will immediately launch a mass campaign to popularise these proposals on a nationwide scale.

2. An essential part of such a campaign is the struggle against the reactionary policies of the government and the defence of the vital interests of the masses.

The task of organising mass resistance against the attacks on the standard of life of the people, solidarity actions, struggles for civil liberties acquires exceptional significance. By conducting such struggles we defend the immediate interests of the masses, consolidate their organisations and forge their unity and also help the strengthening of those forces inside the Congress that desire to develop our economy by attacking the position of British capital, landlordism and monopoly capital.

3. These mass struggles will also bring to the forefront the question of governmental policies—agrarian, labour, civil liberties, taxation, etc. They will strengthen the movement against the reactionary policies of the government and forge mass unity for the adoption and implementation of progressive policies. They will thus be a powerful weapon to build the united front of the people.

4. These partial struggles have to be combined with (i) broadening of the mass movement for peace and Asian unity; (ii) sustained and continuous mass campaign for the concrete alternative policies proposed by the party; (iii) correct united front tactics to overcome the division in the mass movement; (iv) correct tactics to forge unity of different classes and organisations that constitute the democratic front; (v) sustained mass activity in all spheres which includes participation in, and securing for the people maximum benefit from government projects and schemes; (vi) extension and strengthening of the mass organisations; and (vii) building a mass Communist Party. Only if all these tasks are carried out simultaneously and mass struggles waged in the context and as an integral part of such activity will it be possible to extend and strengthen the democratic front continuously, to coordinate partial struggles and

transform them into a mass political movement on a national scale—powerful enough to defeat the anti-people policies of the government and force the adoption of progressive policies. Failure to carry out these tasks will mean the partial struggles remaining on a local and sectional plane, evoking sympathy and even admiration when fought heroically, winning some demands, but unable to create a strong impact on the democratic movement as a whole, strengthen and broaden it.

5. For overcoming the disunity of the democratic forces and for adopting correct methods to develop the mass movement, a correct appraisal of certain important features of the present political situation is essential.

The Congress is trying to consolidate its position by utilising the democratic, anti-imperialist sentiments of the people, as well as their urge for national reconstruction and also by forging unity with such landlord and other reactionary elements as well opposing it in the past. It has attained a measure of success in this. The limited economic gains under the first five-year plan, the easing of the food situation, the proposal for industrialisation under the next plan, and the talk of a socialist pattern of society have given rise to hopes and illusions. These, together with the prestige that India has acquired as a result of its foreign policy, are utilised by the congress leaders for the consolidation of the position of the Congress.

Voting figures of the Andhra and Travancore-Cochin elections, of byelections to parliament and the state assemblies, as well as of district boards, municipalities and panchayats reveal that, broadly speaking the gain of the Congress has been at the cost of independents and of parties of feudal and communal reaction, many of whose leaders have joined and are joining the Congress. As regards the parties that oppose the Congress from the left, of whom the Praja Socialist Party and the Communist Party are the most important, they have secured a higher percentage of votes than in the general elections. The votes polled by the Communist Party in byelections to state assemblies up to the end of December 1954 rose to 12.2 per

cent from 6.8 per cent in the general elections. In several areas the Communist Party has strengthened its position to a considerable extent.

However it must be admitted that the gain of the Congress has been greater than the gain of the left parties. In relation to the democratic opposition as a whole, the Congress is stronger today than it was some years ago. This is not due to objective factors alone. The prevailing disunity among the opposition parties and, above all, the failure of the Communist Party to mobilise the masses on a big scale for intervention on national-political issues have also contributed to this strengthening of the Congress.

6. The building of the democratic front demands the establishment of mass unity in action. In carrying out this task, the fact must be taken into account that a vast number of democratic elements are inside and under the influence of the Congress. The division between the masses following the Congress and the masses following the parties of the democratic opposition is the main division among the democratic forces—a division that manifests itself in every class in Indian society. Nevertheless the possibility of achieving greater and greater degree of unity for progressive measures and policies exists and is growing.

7. It is an important fact of our presentday political life that the masses under the influence of the Congress, as also sections of congressmen, are becoming increasingly critical of the antipeople policies of the government. In a number of places many of them come forward to oppose the repressive measures of the government and to support the workingclass and peasant struggles. Both in the state legislatures and parliament, as well as outside, many congressmen are voicing opposition to the undemocratic features of government policies and demanding that government should speedily carry out reforms to give relief to the people. Our party naturally welcomes this development. It will strive to organise common activity with congressmen and masses under congress influence. Such common activity will go a long way in overcoming the division that exists between congress and noncongress masses.

8. Of great importance also is the task of establishment of unity of action with units, members and supporters of the Praja Socialist Party which, apart from the Communist Party, is the most important all-India party in the country with a mass left following.

The crisis that has developed in the PSP is the result of the policies which the dominant leadership of the party pursued—policies against the movement for world peace, Asian solidarity, friendly relations with the USSR and China, policies of disruption of democratic unity (as in Travancore-Cochin), policies of refusal to build mass unity in action.

The errors of these policies are becoming evident to increasing number of PSP members. The realisation is growing that continued dissensions among opposition forces help only the government and the Congress Party and weaken the democratic movement. On the other hand, unity among opposition parties, helping the extension and strengthening of the democratic movement, strengthens each of these parties. The urge for unity has found concrete expression in a number of united workers' struggles and in the movement for the liberation of Goa. Our party will make every endeavour to consolidate and carry forward this process.

9. Our party will strive to build a united front with other democratic and left parties that have a mass following and with progressive individuals and organise common activity with them on every issue.

10. In relation to parties of communal reaction, parties that divide the masses on religious basis (Jana Sangh, Hindu Mahasabha, Rama Rajya Parishad, Muslim League and Akali Party) the attitude of the Communist Party is one of uncompromising opposition, ruthless exposure and combating of their disruptive slogans and tactics, determined struggle against their ideology. The party will not have united front with them in any elections. At the same time, the party will strive to draw the masses and individuals following these parties into common struggle and common activity.

11. The tasks of the democratic movement in relation to the present government have to be determined on the basis of the actual practice of the government, on the basis of a concrete assessment of its policies and measures as they affect the life of the masses of the people. Although the foreign policy of the government of India has undergone a radical change in recent years in a progressive direction and must therefore be supported and although some of the declarations and proposals made in the plan-frame of the second five-year plan are to be welcomed, the internal policies of the government, taken as a whole, continued to be reactionary and undemocratic in practice—despite talks about a socialist pattern of society.

They are policies of serious compromise with and protection of foreign capital, heavy concessions to landlordism, support to the monopolists in their attacks on the working people, imposition of fresh burdens on the masses, suppression of democratic rights and civil liberties. They are policies that seek to weaken and shackle the very classes that are the most resolute defenders of peace and national freedom while making concessions to reactionary antinational classes in our economy and political life.

Hence the mass movement has to develop in opposition to these policies, with a view to defeat and reverse them, and to secure relief for the people, improve their condition and position. The immediate task is to establish the broadest unity in action, of masses following all parties including the Congress, to win the demands of the people and to create mass sanction for the adoption and implementation of progressive policies.

VI. THE BASIC OBJECTIVE—PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY

1. While laying utmost emphasis on the task of building the broadest mass unity for immediate demands and for progressive policies, the Communist Party will also

strive to make the masses realise, through their own experience, the necessity of bringing about basic transformations in our economy, in our social and state structure, and the necessity of establishing a new government which can carry out these transformations.

2. In the course of its general propaganda and ideological-political activity among the masses, the party will systematically, concretely and constantly popularise the fundamental slogans of the program and emphasise the necessity of establishment of a government of people's democracy.

3. The attainment of political freedom by India and the leading position of the big bourgeoisie in the Indian state do not alter the basic objective and basic strategy of the Indian revolution. Allied with landlords and compromising with imperialism, the Indian bourgeoisie cannot complete the bourgeois-democratic tasks that our country has to fulfil in its present stage. Only the establishment of a government of people's democracy—which includes all the democratic classes including the national bourgeoisie, but is led by the working class—can fulfil these tasks speedily and effectively. The people's democratic revolution will not only carry out these tasks but also put the country on the path to socialism—the only correct path, in the present epoch, for the advance of every country.

4. The possibilities of advance along the capitalist path in the present epoch of the general crisis of capitalism, in the existing conditions in India where British capital holds a powerful position and outmoded feudal and landlord agrarian relations continue, are limited and even these possibilities cannot be realised without infliction of misery on the people, leading in its turn to market difficulties which would repeatedly slow down advance and would, at times, paralyse it, giving rise to crisis and anarchy. Therefore, while resolutely fighting for every progress that can be made under the present conditions, the Communist Party will carry mass propaganda in favour of people's democracy and socialism.

VII. FOR STRENGTHENING AND EXTENSION OF THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

1. The struggle for the immediate demands of the masses continues to be the most important task before the party and the most important means for forging popular unity. It is through these struggles that the masses of different parties come together, become conscious of the need for unity and win concessions. It is through these struggles that their morale is heightened, popular support evoked and the attack of the vested interests and government repulsed. It is through these struggles that conditions are created for the building of united organisations which are of vital importance for the extension of the democratic movement and the strengthening of the democratic front.

It is necessary that wherever possible such mass struggles are conducted through broad united committees representing the unity of the fighting masses.

2. A serious weakness of the democratic front is the disunity among industrial workers who are split in rival and parallel trade unions. The growth of workingclass struggles against rationalisation and retrenchment and for adequate wage and bonus has helped to forge workingclass unity and has also led to the formation of united unions in a number of places and industries. This process has to be carried forward.

An equally serious weakness, a weakness which keeps the whole democratic movement at a low level, is the inability of the party to inculcate political consciousness even among workers who are under its influence and move them into action on a big scale on such broad democratic issues as peace, civil liberties, support to the demands of the peasants and other classes. The overcoming of this weakness is one of the most important tasks before the party.

3. The development of peasant struggles against evictions, heavy taxes and for adequate prices as well as struggles of agricultural workers for minimum wage have made significant headway in recent period and registered several victories. With the rapid deterioration in the condition of

the mass of peasantry, due to factors already enumerated, these struggles assume great importance throughout the country. Special stress has to be given to the task of further extension and strengthening of the kisan sabhas and agricultural workers' unions.

Middleclass employees (teachers, clerks and others) face many problems similar to the working class—inadequate wages, retrenchment, menace of unemployment and starvation. We have to defend their interests and help to strengthen their organisations.

4. The building of the democratic front, in the present situation in the country, is a complex task. The policies of the government have, on the one hand, intensified the misery of the people, on the other hand, some of the measures of the government, backed by a powerful propaganda drive, have given rise to hopes and illusions. They have, on the one hand, imposed heavy burdens on the people, on the other, conferred some limited benefits on certain sections. All these factors have to be taken into consideration when working out concrete tactics.

5. At the same time, it has to be remembered that all these do not prevent the masses, even now, from coming together in defence of their demands and rights. The discontent is deep, the urge for unity strong, all the objective conditions for building mass unity in action continue and are growing. With a sober and realistic appraisal of the situation, with correct slogans and forms of struggles and activity, with sustained mass work, in all spheres, it is possible not merely to develop united mass actions in defence of the immediate demands of the people, but also build a powerful mass movement. This has been adequately proved by the events of recent months.

6. The party has to defend resolutely the interests of the most oppressed masses—the working class, the agricultural labourers, the poor and middle peasants, the artisans and urban middle classes, who are the worst sufferers under congress rule, who form the majority of our people and who must constitute the firm basis and the main force of the democratic movement at all stages of its develop-

ment. The party must simultaneously champion the demands of the rich peasants, of the national bourgeoisie, of the small manufacturers and businessmen and initiate such campaigns and struggles as can unite all sections on the poor, for civil liberties, for protection to national industries against foreign competition, for concrete proposals regarding plans and projects, for implementation of schemes in the interest of the people. The party has to fight for equal rights of women and against the evils of untouchability in all its forms. It has to pay serious attention to the problems facing the students. It has to unfold activity on the widest scale, in cooperation with all sections and elements, to fight the menace of flood and famine, to combat unemployment and poverty, disease and illiteracy, making use of all measures of the government and existing laws. It has to constantly strengthen the mass movement for peace and draw into it all patriotic and peaceloving Indians belonging to all parties.

The tendency to keep away from schemes and projects sponsored or run by the government must be given up. We have to participate in them, actively and effectively, combat corruption, inefficiency and bureaucratic practices, help to implement and run them in such a way that maximum benefit is secured for the people. This must become an important part of the activity of the party and of mass organisations where we work.

It is only through such sustained and all-sided activity combined with ideological-political work that the mass organisations can be strengthened and the most militant and selfsacrificing elements drawn into the party making possible its growth into a mass party—essential for the development of the democratic front.

7. Ideological-political work among the broad masses is an essential weapon for the forging of mass unity. Importance of ideological struggle has increased because of the growth of democratic and socialist sentiment among the masses on the one hand and the intensified propaganda carried on by the government and by communal reactionaries on the other.

The government and the ruling party, the Congress, no longer able to deny the necessity for radical reforms, preach that these reforms can be brought about without mass struggles and the strengthening of the mass movement. They denounce class struggle as something alien to Indian traditions while supporting the vested interests in their offensive against the people. They foster belief in changes being brought about, from top, through governmental action alone, slowly, with the 'consent of all'. They denounce all militant action, all popular resistance, as anarchy.

The communal reactionaries raise false issues, fan hatred and disrupt the unity of the people with such slogans as *bān* on cow-slaughter.

Patient, sustained ideological work, carried on not merely through the press and platform but by each party member, each militant in day-to-day contact with nonparty masses has to be undertaken in all parts of the country and by every party unit. This task is an integral part of the task of building the democratic front.

8. The carrying out of all these tasks, the growth of the mass movement and of the consciousness and fighting unity of the masses can help to bring about in states, where the democratic forces are strong, such conditions as make it possible to raise as a practical slogans, the replacement of the present state government by a government of democratic unity. Where the democratic movement and the party attain sufficient strength, it will be particularly necessary to bring forward this as the major slogan in the general elections.

Representing a coalition of democratic parties and elements, such a government, wherever formed, will defend the interests and rights of the people, carry out maximum possible reforms under the given conditions, inspire and help to carry forward the democratic movement and strengthen the fight for peace. In states where it is not possible to conduct election battles on the slogan of the government of democratic unity, the party will strive for strengthening the democratic opposition inside the legisla-

tures through such elections as an essential task for carrying forward the democratic movement. The strengthening of the democratic opposition inside parliament and the state legislatures requires that our party secures a strong position as a constituent of the democratic opposition.

9. The objectives that the Communist Party puts forward and the policies and measures it advocates correspond to the interest of our country and our people. The party, therefore, will do its utmost to unite the masses of all political parties and all sections of our people for support to these policies and measures and for the realisation of this objective. The party is confident that in this truly national task it will secure the cooperation of all patriotic and revolutionary forces inside the country.

28. Communist Party and Problems of National Reconstruction

3. OUR PROPOSALS

It is universally accepted that the most important task before India today for the rebuilding of its economy lies in laying the foundation for its rapid industrialisation and in carrying out real agrarian reforms without which there cannot be any national reconstruction.

On Industrialisation and Public Sector

Reconstruction of our national economy demands that all out efforts must be made to rapidly develop heavy industries such as steel, coal, heavy chemical and machine-building. The development of such heavy industries must constitute the pivotal task for the industrialisation of our economy.

The Communist Party demands that all new units of heavy industries must be started in the public sector. We are opposed to huge funds of the state being handed over monopolists such as the Tatas and the Indian Iron and Steel Co, in the name of aid for expansion irrespective of their own internal resources and without stipulating conditions in conformity with public interests. Not only have crores of rupees been advanced to them, sometimes even without interest, but concerns like the Tatas have been enabled to earn enormous profits by rising steel prices. All this is nothing but forcing the people to pay for

Pamphlet, published in July 1955, consists of three parts. The first part deals with the first five-year plan, the second with the plan-frame of the second plan and the third with our proposals. Here is reproduced only the third section.

expansion, the benefits of which are reaped by the monopolists in terms of fabulous profits.

However, where it is advantageous and economical to expand such existing plants rather than start new ones, the government may provide such assistance. In such cases the Communist Party demands that the state must enter into partnership with the concerns so assisted in proportion to the funds it makes available for such expansion and must also get a measure of control over them. This will ensure the proper utilisation of the public funds so advanced and at the same time make profits resulting from all such expansion available for the development of national economy.

In the present condition of our economy, it is necessary to start many new industries and enterprises in the public sector. But the public sector must not be restricted to merely developing new industries under it. Then needs of development of our economy demand the nationalisation of British concerns which occupy a dominant and strategic position in our industry. Unless these British concerns are nationalised, the public sector cannot occupy the position it must secure in our economy if it is to direct the course of industrialisation.

The taking over of British concerns will place a big source of capital formation in the hands of the state for development purposes. In this connection it must also be taken into account that some of the British-owned industries and undertakings are vital to national development. But the British ownership of these industries and enterprises results in their being run on antinational lines. This stands in the way of our economic development.

In the world production of manganese, India occupies a position only second to that of the Soviet Union and in the capitalist world market our country occupies a near-monopoly position in this respect. Manganese is a key material for the production of steel. And yet there is not a single ferromanganese industrial unit in our country. The possession of these manganese mines by British mono-

polists has led to very nearly the whole of our output being exported to feed the steel industries of the imperialist countries. Nationalisation of the British-owned manganese mines would mean that our state would be able not only to develop a big ferromanganese industry, but would also be able to use its virtual monopoly of the vital commodity in the capitalist world market for the purpose of getting urgently needed materials on advantageous terms from foreign countries for our industrial expansion.

India's known resources of coal are not high. Our metallurgical coal resources are particularly poor. And yet the British coal companies which have a virtual monopoly of metallurgical coal are simply wasting it by selling it for purpose which can be met by low-grade coal. As a result our metallurgical coal reserves are getting fast exhausted. Further, conservation of coal and the safety of our miners have been criminally neglected by the coal bosses, whose only concern has been their profits.

This fact has been admitted publicly by no other a person than R. K. Ramadhyani, coal commissioner and chairman of the coal board. He wrote: "Full recovery of coal has not been the main objective of many collieries. The tendency has been to work the most profitable sections and to leave the less paying sections... In spite of legislation and rules, which seek to enforce certain standard of safety in mines, the tendency is to adopt the less meticulous and scrupulous methods."

India's reserve of copper is extremely poor. And yet the only copper mine we have is exploited by a British concern and the entire output is being exported.

The exploitation of our gold mine by British interests means a tremendous drain of our country's resources.

The British bosses of our jute industry have proved themselves to be totally callous in the matter of developing the industry by undertaking increased production of such goods as would satisfy the growing needs of our own people. They have been averse to developing trade with

China and the countries of socialism. Such diversification of export trade is necessary not only for reducing our dependence on the US market, but also for expansion of the entire external market. The failure to create a domestic market and expand the external market has resulted in the nonfulfilment of even the production targets under the first five-year plan, which merely required the utilisation of the existing capacities. In fact there has been a planned curtailment of production.

Plantations are a source of enormous profits and inhuman exploitation of Indian labour. The British tea-planters, for example, in the first eleven months of 1954, remitted Rs 4.34 crore abroad as profits.

For these reasons the Communist Party proposes that, to start with, manganese mines, gold mines, copper mines, coalmining as a whole, and the British-owned or British-controlled jute mills and plantations as well as foreign banks and foreign insurance concerns be immediately nationalised. Foreign monopoly in our overseas shipping must be eliminated by rapid expansion of our shipping industry and by substantial increase in our shipping tonnage.

Until the basic and machine-building industries are developed, introduction of new machines for rationalisation in our existing industries should be stopped. The demand for increased consumer goods should be met, as far as possible, by fuller utilisation of the installed capacity in the existing organised industries and by encouraging and helping smallscale and cottage industries. In order that smallscale and cottage industries may play their full part, it is not only necessary to afford them protection against monopoly competition, by means of subsidies, tariffs, and so on, it is also necessary to guarantee a market for them. This should be done by large purchases of 'stores' for government and semigovernment institutions from these industries. Along with marketing opportunities, it is essential to provide them with credit facilities and raw materials at cheap prices.

Foreign Trade

Foreign trade is one of the most important aspects of our national economy. As a result of the control of our foreign trade by British monopolists, it is confined mainly within the imperialist world market, particularly British and American. The result has been the imposition of unequal trade terms on India and the plunder of our wealth. The prices of our raw materials have been lowered, whereas the prices of the goods we import have not shown any appreciable decline. All this has led to the pauperisation of our peasants and the weakening of our economy.

This harmful dependence on the imperialists cannot be overcome unless India develops largescale trade with the socialist market. It is not difficult to realise that with British capital controlling our foreign trade and shipping, with Indian monopolists traditionally linked with the City of London and the capitalist world market, there would be tremendous resistance to the development of our trade with the socialist market.

A situation like the above can be overcome and our trade with different countries expanded on the basis of mutual advantage only by the state taking over the monopoly of foreign trade, at least in the major commodities. Having regard to the close economic and other ties with Pakistan, trade with Pakistan however should not be taken over by the state.

State monopoly of foreign trade would, in particular, enable our state to enter into long-term trade agreements with the countries of the socialist market, which have a planned economy. These agreements can guarantee the sale of specified quantities of our commodities in return for equivalent supplies of machinery and other commodities required for the development of our economy. Such agreements will progressively ensure stability and independence to our foreign trade. India's foreign trade must be saved from the clutches of the crisis-ridden capitalist world market and diversified and developed on independ-

ent lines in conformity with its needs of economic development in general and industrialisation in particular.

Moreover state monopoly of foreign trade will place the profits earned from such trade in the hands of the state for utilisation for the country's economic development. Today the bulk of the profits that the foreign bosses earn out of our foreign trade do not even appear in their accounts and are directly appropriated by the offices in their own countries.

In this connection it is well to remember that much of what we export to Britain such as tea, hides and skins, are reexported to other countries. State monopoly of foreign trade can ensure the export of such goods directly to the countries to which they are now reexported by Britain, and at the same time, can ensure that the profits made by the British intermediaries accrue to India.

For the above reasons the Communist Party demands state monopoly of our foreign trade in the principal commodities, bona fide trade with Pakistan being, however, exempted. The party maintains that this should be an important aspect of planning.

Tariff and Protection

It is hardly necessary to stress the need for protecting our national industries from foreign competition which still constitutes a great menace. The import-export policy of the government is only to a little extent correlated to planning. Import licences are now liberally issued to benefit monopolists, and the quantitative restrictions are being gradually done away with. From the statements of the commerce and industries ministry it appears that the government will give up the policy of using tariff as protection to our national industries. According to them, tariff is necessary only as a source of revenue for the state.

It must be remembered that all this is taking place

against the background of the export drive by the UK and the USA. It is significant that large sections of small traders, businessmen and industrialists are openly criticising the government's liberal attitude towards such foreign imports resulting in unequal foreign competition against indigenous products.

The Communist Party demands that the government's tariff policy be guided by the needs of 'protection' as well as of the exchequer. We also demand that quantitative restrictions be imposed on certain categories of imports thus checking the improper use of our foreign exchange resources. The import of luxury goods and other articles, which are not needed for the development of our economy or for the consumption needs of the masses, as distinguished from the richer classes, should be drastically cut down, if not completely banned. If at all these are to be imported, it must be done not only in very restricted quantities, but also under heavy import duties. Protection to indigenous industries also requires that the foreign competition that is carried on from within our country by foreign concerns and interests like the Lever Brothers be curbed and eliminated.

On Land Problem

The Communist Party attaches the greatest significance to agriculture and peasant problems which are of primary importance to the life of the country. The grinding poverty of the peasants not only obstructs the development of agriculture but also very severely limits the internal market even for the absorption of a minimum quantity of manufactured goods. The impoverishment and ruination of the peasantry results in hundreds of thousands of peasants flocking to the cities and towns in search of employment. This swells the army of unemployed, brings down the wages to a very low level and thus makes improvement in the living standards of the people difficult. The cultural advance of the nation becomes impossible as long as our multimillioned peasantry lives under condi

tions of semistarvation and is deprived of material means even for the education of the children.

The advance of our economy in general and the industrialisation of the country in particular are not possible without raising the standards of life of our peasant masses, without a big upsurge in our agriculture. All this call for democratic land reforms and, above all, the distribution of land among the agricultural labourers and poor peasants.

The party, therefore, demands the immediate fixing of ceilings on landholdings. Ceilings would, of course, vary from area to area, and even from holding to holding within the same area, depending on the nature of the soil and the crops grown. The guiding line in fixing ceilings should be to ensure that the maximum possible quantity of land becomes available to the state for distribution. At the same time care should be taken to see that peasants who cultivate the land with their own labour and that of their families, as well as those who cultivate with hired labour together with their own labour and that of their family members—as opposed to landlords and capitalist farmers who do not contribute their own or their family members' labour—are not deprived of their land.

In enforcing a ceiling, it is necessary to defeat the manoeuvres of the landlords who have in the recent period resorted to the fraudulent division of their large holdings among their relatives and friends. It is therefore necessary to make provisions to invalidate such division of property that has been resorted to in the last few years for the purpose of defeating the ceiling.

Not only is it necessary to confer permanency of tenure to peasants who are cultivating landlords' lands and ban evictions as a punishable criminal offence, it is also necessary to restore their holdings to the peasants who have been already evicted by landlords on a large scale.

Simultaneously with the fixing of ceilings on landholdings the cultivable waste lands in the hands of the government and the landlords should be distributed immediately.

It is necessary also to take away the waste lands that have been given to landlords and distribute them to agricultural labourers and poor peasants.

The mere distribution of land may not enable the poor peasants and agricultural labourers to bring it under cultivation for want of capital. It is necessary, therefore, that a phased program of reclaiming such lands be undertaken at state expense, with the cooperation of the agricultural labourers and poor peasants.

There must be substantial reduction of rents.

Credit Facilities

Our agriculture cannot be put on a strong foundation and our peasants cannot be assured of any stable and progressive increase in their living standards unless they are freed from the clutches of usurious moneylenders. Although it has been decided that the newly-created State Bank should undertake the expansion of rural credit as part of its activities, the funds sanctioned for this purpose are too meagre and do not touch even the fringe of the problem. We demand that a minimum of Rs 250 crore be set apart by the government for rural credit. We also demand that the State Bank of India should undertake the distribution of rural credit directly through its own branches. Such credit should be extended to all peasants, whether they are owners of land or tenant-cultivators, according to the needs of cultivation and the grant of credit should not be made conditional upon their furnishing fixed assets as securities.

Expansion of credit facilities alone is not enough. The peasantry has to be relieved from the crushing load of the already existing indebtedness which is estimated even by the Reserve Bank of India at Rs 900 crore. So long as this heavy debt burden remains, the peasants cannot be saved from the clutches of the moneylenders.

Steps should therefore be taken for a drastic reduction of these debt burdens. Whatever remains due after such reduction should be made payable by easy instalments

spread over a number of years. The Communist Party demands the setting up of popular debt conciliation boards with this end in view.

Pending such measures, the Communist Party demands a moratorium on all debts owed by the peasants to money-lenders and landlords.

Cooperatives

Cooperative organisations have a vital role to play in regenerating our rural economy. Cooperatives are essential for ensuring peasants and artisans a fair price for their products, for supplying them with their necessities at reasonable prices, for providing cheap credit to them. For this purpose cooperative societies should be organised and developed on a big scale throughout the country.

In the absence of real land reforms, the existing cooperative societies have become the happy hunting ground for landlords, moneylenders and traders. The cooperative credit societies do not lend money to the poor peasants who cannot furnish security. The result is that the landlords who dominate and control them use their power for getting loans for themselves and in the name of their relatives. All these loans go not for the improvement of agriculture, but for augmenting the landlords' and traders' resources for increasing their usurious moneylending operations.

The consumers' cooperatives and marketing cooperatives that exist are also similarly utilised by the landlord and trading elements for their own ends. The funds of these societies are additional resources in the hands of these elements for indulging in speculative activities and mulcting the peasants of the proper price of their products.

The Communist Party demands that the landlord element be excluded from the management of cooperative societies and that their management be vested with the peasants themselves. Cooperatives at all levels must be democratised and the existing cooperative laws must be amended for this purpose.

Agricultural Labour

Minimum wages for the agricultural labourers must be fixed throughout the country. Their debts to the landlords and usurers must be cancelled and they should be provided with cheap credit facilities and free housesites. Waste lands should be distributed among them.

Irrigation

Extension of irrigation, not only through major projects, but through numerous minor projects have to be speedily carried out. In area where there are no facilities for such projects, subsoil water has to be harnessed for irrigation purposes by means of electric pumps, tube-wells, etc. Today the majority of peasants cannot avail of these facilities because the government demands deposits of large sums of money to meet the cost of installation. We demand that the state should bear these installation charges, and should charge the peasants only for the supply of electricity. Similarly, water-rates should be brought down to a level that is within the reach of peasants.

Community Projects

To the extent that community projects and national extension service blocks meet certain elementary needs of the villages such as roads, drinking water wells, digging of manure pits, common recreational facilities and supply on credit of fertilisers, seeds and agricultural implements, they perform a useful service.

However the Communist Party rejects the idea sedulously propagated by the Congress and Pandit Nehru that these are a key to rural development in the present conditions. Such propaganda is a deliberate attempt to divert the attention of the people from the extreme urgency of democratic land reforms.

These community projects and national extension ser-

vice blocks are no substitute for land reforms. In the absence of land reforms, these projects and schemes can produce only very limited results. As the **Hindu** pointed out in an editorial of 8 April 1955. "A per-capita additional expenditure of four rupees a year (in the second five-year plan) on amenities in the villages does not seem to promise a spectacular advance in rural life... Nothing is said about the means of fully utilising the available human and material resources in the villages with a view to eliminating rural unemployment and underemployment."

As for loans distributed through these schemes, they cover only a fraction of the rural population, mainly the landlord and rich peasant elements. Even official reports agree that "only thirty per cent of the people are 'credit-worthy' who alone can hope to obtain loans under these schemes".

Above all, bureaucratic methods in the projects and schemes involve a costly and top-heavy administration which eats up a very big chunk of the expenditure out of all proportion to the services rendered. The Communist Party demands a drastic cut in administrative expenditure and the maximum utilisation of the funds for the common people in the rural areas.

Workers' Wages and Amenities

Planning has no meaning if increased production does not simultaneously lead to improvement in the material and cultural conditions of our people. The Communist Party therefore demands that the government reverse its present policy of wagefreeze and of encouragement to attacks on the wages and emoluments of the workers and employees. Rationalisation and retrenchment must be stopped. A national minimum wage must be fixed.

Social insurance schemes must be rapidly extended to cover industries and all types of risks and must not merely confine itself to health. Provision must also be made for unemployment insurance and old-age pensions.

The Communist Party demands the setting apart of a sum of fifty crores of rupees per annum for providing benefits to the unemployed.

The problem of housing for industrial workers must be vigorously tackled through specialised agencies, in which the workers themselves play the most important and active role. It should not be left to the pleasure of the employers and of the state governments as at present. This dependence on state governments and employers has led to the scandalous state of affairs where the major part of the funds set apart for housing the industrial workers has remained unspent.

Prices

The question of prices has assumed vital importance today. Indeed, with it are interwoven many other vital questions of our economy and of planning. The right type of relation between the different sectors of our economy, especially between agriculture and industry, the increase in the consumption level of the masses and the expansion of the domestic market, earnings and living standards of our people and the distribution of the national income—all this depends on how the question of prices is tackled. The steep fall in the prices of agricultural produce in the last two years clearly demonstrates not only the absolute insecurity of the peasants, but also its bearing on the entire economy. Planning and increased production lose all meaning if they are accompanied by such terrible insecurity for the vast masses of our country.

Therefore it is vitally necessary to ensure the peasant a fair and economic price for his produce. This cannot be done so long as speculators and monopolists are allowed to manipulate trade and dictate prices to the peasants, so long as our agrarian economy remains subject to the pressure and influences of the imperialist market. Neither can the peasantry be protected against falling prices by mere announcement by government of price support or

by token government purchases of wheat and rice. Even government prices are fixed arbitrarily and the purchases made by it at such prices remain more or less symbolic without influencing prices in the interests of the peasants.

The Communist Party is firmly of the opinion that in order to protect the peasantry against falling prices, the government must not only fix prices at a level which would allow the peasant a fair margin over his cost of production, but the government must also buy at such prices on a sufficiently large scale without which the market prices cannot be influenced. In fixing the prices of agricultural produce and also in selling it, the government should, of course, keep in view the interests of the consumers.

We demand that an end be put to the activities of speculative elements in our rural economy.

Similarly state intervention is necessary to prevent the monopolists from denying the common people the benefits of increased production. The people cannot benefit from increased production unless simultaneously the prices of manufactured articles are brought down in conformity with the purchasing power of the people. The party deems it absolutely necessary for the state to intervene in regulating and controlling the prices of essential articles of mass consumption like cloth, sugar, soap as well as agricultural and other implements needed by the peasants and artisans.

Resources

The financing of the plan at the cost of our poverty-stricken and tax-burdened masses, in our view, is most harmful to the interests of our economy and progress. Tax burdens on the people depress their living standards, reduce their purchasing power and thus lead to the contraction of the domestic market, whose rapid expansion is the need of the hour for industrial advance. We therefore demand that all proposals for increasing the tax burdens on the people including those of the taxation inquiry

commission, be rejected. Further, we demand immediate measures for lightening the existing tax burdens on the masses. Resources for the development of our economy can and must be found elsewhere.

If the British concerns are nationalised, they would offer a big source of funds and capital formation for nation-building purposes.

So long as the British and other foreign interests are not nationalised, there must definitely be a drastic cut in the remittance of their profits abroad. A ceiling on remittance of profits must be fixed which should ensure that no foreign investor is allowed to remit as profits more than what would have been earned on the investment by way of interest at the prevailing bank rate. In other words, for purposes of remittance of profits, private foreign capital shall be put on the same footing as loan capital. Bona fide remittances by Pakistan nationals should, however, be exempted from this restriction.

All profits in excess of this ceiling on remittance should be procured by the government as compulsory loans in order to utilise them for the industrialisation of the country along desired lines.

The policy of allowing unrestricted profits to the monopolists, both foreign and Indian, must be given up. A ceiling should be imposed on dividends and all other forms of distributed profits. In no case should such ceilings be more than two to three per cent above the bank rate. The imposing and enforcement of such a ceiling on profits would enable the state to mop up the surplus earnings of the monopoly concerns for meeting the needs of our economic development. Such surplus may be mobilised as compulsory loans to the government. Moreover the government should tap the funds that are set apart in various 'reserves' in excess of actual needs or otherwise utilised in issuing bonus shares.

With the funds so mobilised an investment pool directly under the government may be created. The tapping of these resources is also necessary for curbing speculative activities.

For these reasons and for the planned direction of our economy as a whole, it is imperative to undermine the position of the monopolists and drastically curb their powers by legislative and executive measures. Of particular urgency today is the total abolition of the 'managing agency' system. Finally, the state sector must be rid of the control and influence of the monopolists. The monopolists and their representatives must not be placed in the management and direction of the industries and enterprises in the public sector.

Industries in the public sector represent a source of capital formation. That they have not so far yielded any appreciable revenues, barring the railways, is no reason why they should not be developed on business lines yielding revenue for the state. As a matter of fact, the public sector should be developed as an everexpanding source of revenues. Therefore it must also be expanded on lines which yield immediate profits.

State monopoly of foreign trade in the main commodities of export and import is yet another important source of capital formation. Money is to be found by reducing expenditure on police, and economy measures in other branches of the present expensive, top-heavy bureaucracy. For this it is necessary to encourage initiative among government employees and drastically cut salaries and allowances of the highly-paid officials. The carrying out of democratic reforms will enable the states to relieve their budget of a substantial portion of the expenditure on police and other coercive sections, maintained at an impermissible heavy cost for suppressing the people. Thus a sum of at least fifty crores of rupees or so per annum may be made available in the budget for development purposes. Cancellation of the privy purse of the princes and the requisitioning of their hoarded wealth as compulsory loans will go to augment considerably capital resources. Estate duties on the princes, monopolists and big landlords must be increased and effectively enforced.

Land reforms, as well as measures for solving the problem of rural indebtedness, will substantially contribute

to capital formation. Land reforms would save hundreds of crores of rupees from falling into the hands of the landlords and usurers who use much of these funds for unproductive purposes. The above measures will help create capital resources in the hands of the peasantry for investment in agriculture resulting in its improvement and increased production. Land reforms and distribution of lands particularly among the agricultural labourers and poor peasants have thus become essential for stepping up capital formation in our economy.

With the state providing for agricultural credit, the funds in the hands of moneylenders will find no avenues of investment. Ways and means can be found for channeling all these vast funds into productive investments.

There is no justification for paying any compensation to the big landlords. However, since the government would still adhere to the policy of compensating them, we propose that payment be at least postponed for a period of fifteen years.

With the resources thus available it is impermissible to impose additional burdens on the people by way of taxation or otherwise. The financing of the second five-year plan by means of additional taxation must on no account be resorted to until and unless, on the one hand, the classes that are in a position to pay and the resources enumerated above have been fully tapped and, on the other, the living conditions of our people have been improved. Heavy tax burdens on the masses in a country like ours not only bring privation and suffering to them, but damp their enthusiasm even for good projects. Worse still, these strike at the very roots of an expanding economy by lowering their purchasing power.

This orientation in our public finance has become a crucial issue upon which the future of our country's economic advance largely depends.

The financing of the plan along the above lines would also enable our country to depend on these internal resources for the development of our economy. The present dependence on assistance from imperialist countries,

chiefly the USA, must go. Reliance on our own internal resources has become all the more necessary today in view of the fact that the imperialists, particularly the US warmongers, use their 'assistance' as a means of furthering their designs against the countries to which they extend such economic 'assistance'. In this connection we must make it clear that we are opposed to foreign private capital investment in India in the name of development or for any other reasons. Such investments result in not only ruthless exploitation of our resources and in the draining away of our wealth out of our country, but also enable the imperialists to maintain their grip over our economy. So we demand that all foreign private capital investment in India be at once banned.

However foreign capital or assistance, if necessary, may be secured at governmental level and in the form of loans and technical knowhow. Foreign loans may also be allowed in the private sector, but the private sector must not be permitted to negotiate these loans except for investments in such enterprises or for such purposes as may be approved of by the state for promoting the cause of our economic advancement.

Reconstruction of our economy and the success of any genuine plan call for the unleashing of the creative energies of our people, inspiring and mobilising our vast masses into truly nation-building tasks. It is only by the acceptance of such proposals as we have set forth above that popular enthusiasm can be roused and the masses moved into action for the rebuilding of our country. No plan can succeed in rejuvenating our nation unless it generates the creative energies and the labour enthusiasm of our masses.

In this connection it must also be emphasised that special attention needs to be paid to the cultural and material advancement of the backward elements of our society like the harijans, scheduled castes, adivasis and so on. Substantial financial provision should be made for promoting their general welfare, particularly for providing for them adequate educational and medical facilities, proper housing sites, clean water supply, financial aid for developing

handicrafts in which they are largely engaged as well as credit for economic rehabilitation.

In the interests of national reconstruction it is also necessary to draw the vast masses of the refugee population in India into productive activity. For this the refugees must be speedily rehabilitated in life and provided with gainful employment.

Civil Liberties and Democratic Rights

Further, the initiative and creative energies of the people cannot be unleashed on a sufficiently large scale without taking long strides towards democracy. The implementation of any plan for real national reconstruction is an impossibility within the present bureaucratic administrative setup. It has already been seen that even the budgeted amounts in respect of various schemes could not be fully utilised. This has become a common phenomenon.

The bureaucratic corruption and wastefulness in our projects is common knowledge. Because of this bureaucratic setup, the state enterprises are proving unprofitable and have become objects of ridicule by the monopolists. Bureaucratic inefficiency and bungling have no doubt given a handle to the monopolists, who want to sabotage the incipient public sector.

Similarly, entrusting government officials alone with the task of implementing land reforms will lead to sabotage in a substantial measure by the landlords.

Revoke All Repressive Measures

The initiative of the masses cannot be encouraged with the growing attack on civil liberties and democratic rights. Working people should be given full civil liberty and unfettered rights to organise in defence of their vital interests.

The Communist Party, therefore, demands the revocation of all repressive measures, both legislative and executive, including the so-called national safeguarding and

security rules, which undermine the democratic rights of the workers and employees and corrupt public life. We further demand the cancellation of all existing prohibitive orders on meetings, processions and the like.

Recognise the Role of Mass Organisations

It must be recognised that the trade unions, kisan sabhas and other popular mass organisations have a vital role to play in the democratisation of the life of the country.

Our public enterprises cannot be run on business lines and the corruption and nepotism so much rampant in them fought without the active cooperation of the workers. In order to enlist this, it is essential to recognise the role of the trade unions and associate the workers and employees with the management and direction of industrial and other business undertakings.

For this purpose it is necessary to set up joint committees of real representatives of workers and management in which workers and employees will have positions of authority and responsibility.

Tradeunion organisations should be entrusted with the management and administration of state insurance and other social services.

The present policy of active disruption in the tradeunion movement by encouragement and patronage to trade unions whose leadership toes the line of the government has to be abandoned once and for all.

Recognition of all trade unions formed by workers and recognition of their right of collective bargaining are the crucial issues of democracy in the sphere of worker-management relations in industry.

In the rural areas, kisan sabhas and representatives of the toiling peasants must be associated in the actual implementation of land reforms. Their cooperation must be sought in the formulation of local development schemes, minor irrigation projects and in the execution of these and other schemes.

Such cooperation cannot be forthcoming so long as the government continues its discredited system of recruiting labour and dealing with them through contractors. This system, as is well known, leads to huge funds being swallowed by the contractors and it also means the lowest level of wages to the workers.

The state must deal directly with the workers through teams of workers themselves. Similarly the execution of minor schemes should be entrusted to the villagers.

Democratic Panchayats & Local Bodies

All these require that local elected organs of the people like panchayats and local boards should be invested with large powers in local matters. Sufficient funds should also be made available to them for enabling them to discharge their responsibilities. The panchayats must on no account be forced by the government to levy taxes. The question of levying local taxes should be left to the decision of the panchayats themselves. Above all, the panchayats must be democratised.

Encourage and Cultivate Indian Talent

Not only is it necessary to mobilise the workers and peasants, but it is equally necessary to inspire the initiative and creative efforts of our scientists, engineers and technicians. Today most of them are vegetating because of the policies of the government of importing 'experts' for every conceivable thing, while not encouraging Indian nationals.

This policy has cost the country heavily. Many of these so-called 'experts' have proved themselves incompetent and unnecessary. The only service they have rendered the country is, apart from causing a terrific drain on our finances, to suppress the talents of our patriotic engineers, scientists and technicians.

The Communist Party demands an end to this state of affairs. Our party demands that no foreign experts should

be brought in unless it is indispensable to do so. It further demands that our own scientists, engineers and technicians be encouraged and helped in every possible way. They should be placed in positions of responsibility. Public discussion among them on the problems of engineering, science and technique, through specialised journals and their own organisation on a wide scale should be promoted. This will draw all talents into the service of the country and will at the same time raise the general level and calibre of our scientific and technical personnel.

The employment of British nationals in the British industrial and commercial undertakings in the country must be severely restricted. Ordinarily no British national should be allowed to come to India to take employment in business and industrial enterprises unless it is indispensable for reasons of technical knowhow. Even then the state should see that they are employed only for a minimum period necessary for training Indian nationals. It is necessary for the government to take energetic steps to replace the large number of existing British personnel in industrial and business concerns by Indian nationals.

* * *

This is the line of democratic advance, creating conditions for the industrialisation of the country and upsurge in our agriculture, while at the same time making possible steady improvement in the living conditions of the people. This would also strengthen our national economy and foundations of our sovereignty and independence.

The real path forward lies in the struggle for the realisation of the demands we have set forth in our proposals. These proposals transcend narrow party barriers and correspond to the interests of all democratic classes, of the whole people. We are therefore confident that they will receive the growing support of the democratic masses, of all those interested in the steady, uninterrupted development of our economy and in the well-being of our people, irrespective of their party affiliations.

The Communist Party would, therefore, strive its utmost to mobilise our people in the struggle for the realisation of every one of these demands and for national advance. It would seek the cooperation of all our people for conducting vigorously the day-to-day struggle of the masses and for vigorous intervention of the popular forces in all matters that relate to the life of our people and the cause of our great country.

29. Goa—What Next ?

I. INDIA'S RIGHT TO LIBERATE GOA

All political parties and individuals in India today are discussing the question—Goa: What next? And the millions who were swept into action on 16 August by the massacres of the 15th are thinking and waiting for the answer.

The issue of liberation of Goa has been on the agenda of every party for a long time. The settlement in Pondicherry and the withdrawal of the French brought the question of Goa into the limelight. If the French could be thrown out, why not the Portuguese?

As the ruling party and a leading party in the country, the people expected the Congress to give the lead in taking effective steps to liberate Goa. But the Congress maintained that it was for Goans to fight for their liberation though, no doubt, such an approach falsified the understanding that Goans are Indians and Goa is a part of India. When Kashmir was attacked it was not left to the Kashmiris to defend themselves.

Held fast under a military rule, the Goans obviously could not do much.

Then a movement was set afoot that Indians should start a satyagraha to enter Goa with the flag of the Indian republic and thus nonviolently and peacefully struggle for liberation of Goa.

Batches of satyagrahis began to trickle into Goa but the movement did not catch on. Officially the Congress kept aloof and when large batches were proposed to enter on 15 August last year, the government of India and specially the government of

New Age, 28 August 1955, printed this article by S. A. Dange, which was later published as a pamphlet.

Bombay frowned upon them. The satyagraha of Indians was banned.

Again months of a tame satyagraha proceeded on, done by people who were technically Goans. Well-known PSP leaders then offered to lead batches. Gore and others of the PSP were thrown into Portuguese prisons and ill-treated. But beyond newspaper protests and a few meetings the movement did not advance. Why?

The main failure was that the movement was kept within the narrow limits of one or two parties and groups who were not ready to widen it into a movement of the masses led by a united front of all parties and opinions and the official congress leadership in Maharashtra befriended this line, without saying so.

The failure to make Goa an issue of wide mass action had emboldened the Portuguese also. Their arrogance increased. But the inhumanity of their dealings with the satyagrahis began slowly to rouse the people.

II. BIRTH OF A NEW MOVEMENT

At this juncture the formation of the all-parties Goa vimochan sahayyak samiti was a timely and decisive step. All political forces, including congressmen, joined the samiti. The Congress as an organisation did not come in but the president of the samiti is Jedhe who is the president of the Maharashtra congress committee also.

The most significant force in this new all-party organisation was the Communist Party. When communists, socialists, jansanghites, congressmen and others decided to build this new united front, the pace of the movement changed. Volunteers by the thousands came for the satyagraha. Women in Poona, Belgaum and other areas brought money and food for thousands. When V. D. Chitale and Sardesai of the communists, Peter Alvarcs and S. M. Joshi of the socialists, Godbole and Apte of the Jan Sangh, R. K. Khadilkar and others with J. Tilak of the Hindu Sabha as secretary and K. M. Jedhe of the Congress as president joined hands in the samiti to build the movement, setting

aside all their 'equidistances, alliances and lines', the movement was bound to become a mass movement and cease to be a narrow party affair. With Tilak as secretary, the samiti got the big Kesari office organisation to help it in its day-to-day work.

This new united front called the samiti had a peculiar character of its own, which we never had in the national movement in India or even in the movement against the French in Pondicherry.

This front contained all the political trends in the country. It had no conflict with the ruling and dominant party, at least to begin with. It had no particular class-base; it was all-class. No detailed program of objectives on which there could be immediately any vital differences. No fetish on forms of struggle, though satyagraha was accepted by all as the form on Indian soil.

The immediate result of this was that thousands of young men and women came to join the volunteer bands. Each band, though composed of adherents of all parties, was sent into action under one leader of one party. All parties were given their turn in this and in the send-off rallies, which were held in Poona, the rallying centre for the satyagrahis from the whole country, speeches were made without importing party slogans of the speaker. If anyone departed from this practice, Jadhve, the president, mercilessly pulled him up.

Due to the formation of the samiti another vital change took place in the composition of the satyagrahis. Workingclass and peasant fighters, middleclass youths, students and women of a new type began to dominate the scene. Perhaps in the opinion of some they did not look 'dilapidated' and emotionless enough to deserve the epithet of 'classical satyagrahis'. But they were that real type which had made Indian independence and freedom a reality in Sholapur and Peshawar in 1930, Satara and Midnapore in 1942, Bombay and Calcutta of the RIN in 1946, and in many a battle for people's rights even in free India after 1947. They knew how to fight with discipline, in the given manner, whatever it be. They knew how to die and they knew what imperialists and killers are. They were real satyagrahis of the battlefield and not false and foggy theoreticians of 'force and the soul'.

The Portuguese too understood the nature of the change. They began preparations to retaliate and frighten the satyagrahis by sheer cold-blooded torture and massacre. And in their tone towards the government and Pandit Nehru, the Portuguese became insolent and arrogant.

The congress leadership and the government at first underestimated the new turn, the appeal of the united samiti and the determination of this unity of the fighters from below. They thought it would be just a little less pale edition of the former satyagraha. In fact the fading off of satyagraha in the previous period had caused worry even to Pandit Nehru and the Congress, because it had increased the arrogance of the Portuguese backed by the British pronouncements and American advices.

In a way the formation of the samiti was liked by them as a way out and the government and the Congress took the welcome step of lifting the ban on Indian satyagrahis entering Goa. When asked why Indian satyagrahis were being allowed to enter Goa, unlike last year, the chief minister Morarji Desai of Bombay, in his usual perverted way replied that he was doing it because these new satyagrahis were not amenable to his advice and 'refused to be saved' by him, which was an indirect slander on the previous satyagrahis—as if they did not break his ban because they wanted 'to be saved' from Portuguese bullets by the paternal kindness of the Bombay government.

III. FIASCO OF CONGRESS POLICIES

Events were taking place with rapidity under the auspices of the samiti. When four satyagrahis from the batch of Rajaram Patil, a communist leader from Satara and a 1942 fighter, by their determined and swift manoeuvres surprised the Portuguese guard at Panjim, lowered the Portuguese flag and hoisted the tricolour on the fort, the Portuguese knew that a new type of satyagrahi had come on the scene. Soon, when the old Maratha leader, Senapati Bapat jumped into the fray, when Amirchand was killed by torture, and news of socialist Madhu Limaye and communist Nandekar being flayed alive reached the people, indignation be-

gan to mount. When the outright shooting of two communist satyagrahis, Thorat and Saha took place, lakhs of people mourned throughout India. Thousands of men and women wept at the funeral in Poona.

The government of India expressed anxiety; Pandit Nehru inquired about the torture of Nandedkar; party prejudices fell away for a time. All India was asking the question—how to stop this butchery?

The strength of the samiti and the initiative taken by this united organisation, however, worried the congress leadership. The samiti moved quickly from one stage to another. It is decided to offer mass satyagraha on 15 August. A call-up for thousands of satyagrahis was set in motion. Transport of satyagrahis by rail and road required money. That limited the call to 3000 volunteers.

The decision of mass satyagraha brought in the first major difference of the samiti with the congress leadership. The working committee which met just then passed a resolution disapproving the mass satyagraha under the plea that "this is likely to change the nature of peaceful satyagraha and might actually come in the way of realisation of the objective aimed at". But the samiti rejected this advice and adhered to the policy of mass satyagraha. And to crown it all, the trade unions of Bombay which had their representatives on the samiti, gave a call for a general political strike on 12 August in preparation for the 15th. The INTUC and the Congress in Bombay opposed the call. But Bombay's working class ignored them and struck in full force, which once again angered and scared the government and congress leadership.

What was the fear of the congress working committee? One was that the traditional leadership of the Congress was losing its grip on the political developments. The failure of the INTUC to prevent the strike of 12 August was a shock to them. Another fear was that the ordinary people may conclude that broad unity and united fronts are more efficacious in action than the mere seal of the official Congress. The third was that the presence of many groups that had used arms in 1942 struggle might do so again in Goa. And the fourth was that the Portuguese butchery may turn out to be so violent that the people in India would

demand of the government to use their military forces to throw out the Portuguese.

National attention was shifting from Dhebarbhai and Delhi to the united samiti and the satyagrahis and their political parties. The thing that galled them most was that the mightiest funeral so far was for the two communist martyrs and that in the 15th August action, the leader on the main front of one thousand satyagrahis, chosen unanimously by the samiti, was a communist leader, V. D. Chitale of the Maharashtra party.

It is to the credit of the parties in the samiti that they all disapproved of the working committee resolution and refused to call off the mass form of satyagraha action. On 15 August three thousand satyagrahis were on the march to Goa. For the first time in eight years, after independence, the eyes and ears of the Indian people were not turned only to the trumpet-blasts from Delhi Fort on 15 August.

At 9 a.m. at Banda on Goa border, the republican tricolour was hoisted and garlanded. Speeches were made in tense emotion, because everyone knew that the 592 listed on the roll headed by V. D. Chitale, were marching to death. At 10.15 a.m. they crossed the border in rows of four deep. Within two minutes, sten-guns and rifles spat deadly fire on them. Sardar Karnail Singh, communist worker of Ludhiana, fell dead while seizing the flag from wounded Chitale; several including Vasantao Oak, fell wounded, but the flag stood erect in their hands. They were asked again to move forward; the brave Subhadrabai, a congress worker, dashed forward. Again a volley of fire. Madhukar Chaudhari, communist worker of Madhya Pradesh, was killed and Subhadrabai and Mahankal,* Jansangh worker of Ujjain, were wounded. There was silence for a few minute and orders were given to withdraw.

There were firings and killings on other points of the border—at Castle Rock, Aronda, Terekhol, etc. It is estimated that in all 21 died that day.

* He died in hospital on 15th night.

IV. NEHRU'S ASSURANCE EMBOLDENS THE PORTUGUESE

It is needless to narrate the events that followed. On 16th, when the news of the massacre reached the people, every man and woman struck work. All towns and cities stopped work and millions came on the streets. The mighty city of Calcutta shut as one man; all harbours and docks, all work everywhere ceased, except where some hardened bureaucrats tried to overreach themselves. The masses in Bombay marched to the government secretariat to ask that the tricolour be flown half-mast in honour of the martyrs of freedom and liberation. But the gentlemen in power refused to pay homage to the victims of imperialist butchery. Their manual of rules was more sacred than the blood of the martyrs. The masses lost their temper and smashed the secretariat windows. Never in the history of India had such a nationwide strike and hartal taken place.

There had been torture and killings of the satyagrahis in 1930 and 1942; there had been massacres in Bombay and Calcutta in 1946 in the RIN strikes. But such a spontaneous united action on strike and hartal as on 16 August had not taken place. On this 16th, every man and woman and young boy and girl had felt acutely and not only felt but acted. Two hundred million of the Indian people to act instantaneously and with one mind was quite a new phenomenon.

The events of 15th and 16th shook the congress leadership. They forgot their position and partly in panic and partly in chagrin, they made statements, which they should not have made.

Just when the 3000 satyagrahis were marching to death for liberation of Goa with the flag of the republic in hand, what need was there for premier Nehru to shout from the Delhi Fort, at that very hour, that he will never use force against the Portuguese; and further insult the satyagrahis by saying that if they were acting under the delusion that he would send military forces they were mistaken.

What was the necessity to give this assurance to the imperialist powers, that whatever they do, they do not have to fear that the might of the Indian forces, whatever it be, will be used against them. What kind of mentality was it to assume that the satya-

grahis were really not ready to die facing the Portuguese bullets but were really marching under the delusion that the Indian army will protest them? To consider that the sense of sacrifice and daring rests only with certain 'professional satyagrahis' and gentlemen bearing the shield of power, is to show what selfdelusion can be created even in a man like premier Nehru. It is needless to mention the utterances of the smaller fry round the throne, who only see hooligans in the masses in anger and action. They said so in 1920 when Bombay threw itself against the royal welcome after the Jallianwala Bagh. They say so now.

Why this loss of balance and dignity in the national leadership? Why this desire to see only the reactions of the imperialist world and the smashed windows of the secretariat, rather than the strength of the people and their inimitable and heroic facing of Portuguese bullets? By what was the wide visioned premier's national telescope narrowed? By subjective petty considerations of his class and his party and his desire to come forth in history as the liberator and conqueror by the sheer tactic of playing between the allies of Portuguese imperialists.

The great action of 15th and 16th was not led by the Congress; in fact it was opposed by the working committee resolution. But the people acted over the head of the Congress, though the press was told to report that the working committee resolution was drafted by Nehru personally. Such a mighty nationwide action, in which the traditional leadership was absent, and its vast success, was bound to irritate the established gods!

Secondly, which was this upstart of a Goa vimochan sahayyak samiti to direct such great events?

Thirdly, what a disturbing thing for the power of the ruling class and the official leadership of the Congress that this samiti contained communists and socialists; communists who were 'up-rooted' and socialists who had no 'roots'!

Fourthly, what phenomenon was it that on the very Ramlila ground where half a million Delhi citizens welcomed great Nehru, from Bandung and Moscow, the same half a million struck work and raised slogans not approved by their great idol!

Fifthly, what a peculiar thing that these great events were without violence, that the fearless 3000 had behaved better than

the professional satyagrahis, that the communist leader and the 592 behind him satisfied all the conditions of real satyagraha!

Sixthly, what a disturbing thing that the Communist Party's martyrs were honoured as much as those of others, that among the fallen, the communists carried the honours, a fact grasped by all, despite petty and mean tricks of some news correspondents to hide the identity of communist martyrs as communists!

Seventhly, what a disturbing thing that the thin wall of prejudices that still lingered between the Communist Party and some sections of the nationalist masses had collapsed in the great sacrifice of 15 August!

Such thoughts were bound to dim the vision of even great men, when they saw things from narrow party ends and were preoccupied with pleasing diplomatic tactics.

They are now out to counteract the trend of these developments. The Congress Party, it is said, will now send its true satyagrahis to Goa. Why are they true and why are we false?

They will send teams of elevens and not batches of hundreds. They will tell the Portuguese their time and place of entry and they will proclaim the message in printed Portuguese, lest the guns may not understand Hindi slogans! And they will go with official blessings.

Had we done anything false to the satyagraha code on the Banda point? The Portuguese knew days in advance that the satyagrahis will come to that point. Those who came were absolutely peaceful even in the face of point-blank fire. These 592 had entered the territory in full daylight and not by stealth. When they entered they had only the flag in hand and slogans on their lips. When fired at, they did not run away or stampede. They went forth until asked to stop. In open daylight, with full notice they had challenged the sovereign might of the Portuguese, which was being enforced by martial-law. Yet the samiti's satyagraha is not true! The truth will dawn on the borders only now when blessed by the holy waters of Dhebarbhai. Well, respected gentlemen, despite your inner desire to displace us, which hardly squares with purity of satyagrahi motives, we wish you all success. If Salazar bows to you, we shall not forget our martyrs, but we shall garland you all the same.

V. GOA : WHAT NEXT?

The peak of 16th has ebbed away. The masses are now slowly thinking over events. All political parties are faced with the difficult question—What next? Every trend of thought is somewhat at a deadlock.

The samiti has sprung up as a national body with a prestige and standing hardly attained by anybody in such a short time and so swiftly. But just in that lies its weakness also. It has no stable organisation. It is composed of parties, which even with the slightest difference, are likely to pull apart. It has some elements who only do party or factional manoeuvres, even when people are marching to death.

The samiti and its moves in this great satyagraha could be effectively checkmated by the government, who refused transport at the last minute. But it must be stated that after the satyagraha, the government gave help to the satyagrahis to return. This shows how the state machine and the Congress Party can spike the movement, when it wants to. The withdrawal of government opposition to Indians doing satyagraha, no doubt, helped the samiti to mobilise support from good congressmen and a few of the rich also cooperated. Such is the organisational position of the samiti.

The samiti is bound to be affected by the varying opinions of the parties that compose it. The Congress Party will either try to capture it and force the others out of the united front or encourage some of the groups into defection or use the state machine to paralyse it. The samiti has now to revalue the situation both from the political and organisational angle.

VI. SAMITI'S IMMEDIATE TASKS

The political situation is the most difficult and crucial. The main question before it is: What are its main slogans in the following period? Talks in the samiti circles bring out the following points:

The first is: Should the committee continue satyagraha and if so in what form?

When on 16 August the news appeared that satyagraha had been suspended, there was chagrin in large sections of the masses and jubilation in congress circles. Actually the message was perverted by some people. The original decision read that "mass satyagraha of 15 August has terminated for the day". This was done in order to tell the satyagrahis who wanted to offer again in the evening and next day that the mass action of 15th for them was over. But in transmission, it is still a mystery, who changed this to abandonment of satyagraha as such. To counteract this the samiti decided to send 300 of the satyagrahis who had come from Bombay under the leadership of Madhu Dandavate on 19 August. There were no casualties on that day.

There are some friends who think that this massacre is fruitless and that it be stopped and some other form of struggle be undertaken. To these friends one can say that until some other form comes on the stage and pushes forward, it is unwise tactics to stop satyagraha. It must be remembered that it is the satyagraha and its consequences that have moved the vast millions into action. To give it up now would be playing into the hands of people who do not want the samiti to exist, its unity and prestige to grow and the political parties in it to develop fraternal relations in direct action.

Of course the satyagraha to be done now need not be of the Banda form. It can take such forms as can avoid massacre of valuable cadres as far as possible.

The second question that is posed by some is—why not mobilise the masses to persuade the government of India for police action? There are very serious differences on this among all the parties of the samiti.

Some seem to think that the anger exhibited by the masses against the government, even including Nehru, on 16 August shows deep disillusionment of the masses and their readiness to act in furtherance of this slogan even in face of the opposition of the Congress. I think this is an overestimation of the mood of the people and their criticism. On 16 August they were angry at the massacres and they did not like Nehru's statement that he would not use military force against the Portuguese. The statement was resented by some, not because they wanted police

action, but because the time, manner and the formulation of the statement were badly chosen. It looked as if the Portuguese were being given a blank cheque just when the satyagrahis were being shot in cold blood. And many thought that it was sheer hypocrisy to talk of nonviolence and peace against fascist butchers, when the government itself maintained an army and police force and did not hesitate to shoot unarmed workers and students in the country when they chose to struggle.

If Pandit Nehru had not sworn to theories of nonviolence and had only limited himself to stating that India today was not in a position to take military action, that it was tactically unwise to do so today, but that he wished the peaceful satyagrahis all success, there would not have been that criticism of his action as it was on 16 August. Nehru had miscalculated the force of the movement of 15 August and he evidently bungled in his speeches. Once having done it, he is sticking to it and becoming more offensive as in his Sitapur speech. But such speeches show that he has felt the weakness of his position and is trying to use his prestige to attack the other parties and cover up his own mistakes.

At the same time the congress leadership will take active steps to concentrate people's attention on the international position of India and its difficulties as well as prestige, and the new satyagraha which is to be conducted by the official congress leaders.

When this gathers momentum, it will not be so easy to mobilise the people against the government for the slogan of police action.

Moreover it is wrong to equate action against Portuguese with police action against the nizam. This one involves not a princely state but a foreign power and its allies in England and America.

Many sections of people do believe the argument that if Portugal does fight with British and American aid of arms where can India go, when our armaments for all their essentials depend on Anglo-American supplies.

Of course this can be countered by saying that in the present context of India's friendship with all countries, including the USSR and China, the Anglo-Americans dare not go against India in the military sense.

To which they reply, that even then it means increasing international tension which contradicts our policy of peace.

This obviously is a wrong argument. Every country is entitled to fight against a colonial occupier to liberate its territory and that peace policy and anticolonial struggles are not contradictory. The panchshila principles are being theoretically twisted merely to suit the tactics of the period.

There are reports that certain roving diplomats of the premier and talkative leaders of the Congress are asking why the communists do not ask China to take Macao from Portugal and Hong Kong from the British, and why they are not attacking Taiwan? We have to expose the hypocrisy of this comparison. China has to face a combination of several imperialists and hence it has chosen to fight one at a time. It has taught the Americans a lesson in Korea and taken Tachens by fight. And if Taiwan and other parts do not come to it, it will fight with all its arms. China never said it has given up its arms and will liberate Taiwan by satyagraha, nonviolence and all that.

Then they point to the fact that the French left Pondicherry without military action on our part. Is not this a triumph of nonviolence and the policy of peace? Were not the French bigger imperialists than the Portuguese?

They forget to tell the people that France did not agree to surrender in India until it was defeated by the armed might of the people's forces in Vietnam; that it did not negotiate until the British and Americans, for their own interests, decided not to back France.

France was a rival to Britain. But Portugal is a colony of Britain and America. It is not nonviolence that shook the French but the people's revolution in Vietnam and rivalries among imperialists.

All these arguments have to be put forward to educate the people; but with all that, the people for a time will accept the argument of 'tactics' if not of nonviolence and will not decisively stand up for the slogan of military action.

Hence on this the samiti can as well leave the matter to future developments and demand of the government all possible effective steps in the given situation, not excluding 'police action'.

The third question before the samiti is of developing aid to militant resistance of the Goans from within. Partisan action

from within seems to be the key to the situation in its further development. In this there is already too much bravado and loose talk of guerilla actions. All sorts of stories are put into the press by certain groups to gather political advantage for the future. The samiti should argue with all these groups and exercise caution and restraint in the interests of the success of the movement and safety of the people. It has to concentrate, apart from satyagraha, on aid to militant resistance from within.

The samiti should work in full cooperation with all parties, including the Congress and even governmental agencies on certain matters. It must introduce some sort of organisational discipline within itself, without infringing on the views and autonomy of the parties composing it.

To sum up: the satyagraha should continue in some form, the aid to militant resistance from within be stepped up; correct education of the masses in relation to the policies and issues involved be carried out with common and agreed understanding on the samiti's platform and the organisational setup should be strengthened and clarified without manoeuvring for party positions to the detriment of the common cause. This should be the task of all forces of freedom, democracy and peace.

The sacrifices of the heroes of 15th August and the mighty will of the millions that spoke through the actions of 16th August will not go in vain. Politics, parties and the people have advanced to a higher stage. Anticolonialism and Asian solidarity will act and win. On 15th and 16th August the people of India put the principles of Bandung into real action. That is the real road to peace and defence of national freedom.

30. Goa

The central committee of the Communist Party of India places on record its sense of profound pride in the Indian people for the glorious part played by them in the struggle for the liberation of Goa, Daman and Diu. The valiant struggle by the satyagrahis, the growing resistance movement inside Goa itself and the countrywide demonstrations, hartals and strikes after 15 August have been unprecedented in the history of our national movement since the transfer of power. They are indicative of the deep and abiding love for freedom of our people and their determination to end the grip of colonialism once and for all from its last strongholds on our soil.

The Goan liberation movement has rightly called forth the admiration and support of the democratic and freedomloving people all over the world.

In this context, the AICC resolution denouncing satyagraha, and the coercive measures adopted by the Bombay government for preventing satyagrahis from reaching the Goan border are an attack on the Goan liberation movement as also on the countrywide unity built by the Goa Vimochan Sahayyak Samiti for the liberation of Goa.

These actions of the government clearly demonstrate that the ruling circles in India have been alarmed by the militant mass from the Goan liberation movement has been developing; that they have succumbed to Anglo-American pressure which insolently demanded the ending of satyagraha after 15 August. In effect this policy amounts to giving free rein to the continuance of Portuguese rule in India, and emboldens them to intensify their savage terror.

Resolution passed by the CC, 10-19 September 1955 and published in *New Age*, 25 September 1955.

While attacking the Goan freedom movement in this manner, the government of India has failed to place any alternative course before the people for liberating the Goan people from Portuguese rule. The sealing of the border and other measures taken by the government are utterly inadequate to achieve the end in view.

The prime minister has attempted to defend the change in government's policy on the grounds that satyagraha led to countrywide hartals and demonstrations after 15 August, that it has created international complications, and that he did not want the liberation movement to grow in a manner that would necessitate resort to police action which, he claimed, was against India's policy of peaceful settlement. The central committee cannot accept these arguments which are a cover for the capitulatory policy of the government of India. Obviously such a policy can never be claimed as a national policy and cannot secure the support of our people.

The Communist Party repudiates the argument that panchshila debars a people and their government from liberating any part of their country occupied by a foreign power. For such liberation can under no circumstance be equated with aggression by one country against another.

In Goa it is the Portuguese who are the aggressors, it is they who are violating the territorial integrity of India. Hence the liberation of Goa by the people of India and their government is in full conformity with the principles of panchshila.

Recognising that colonialism is the biggest threat to world peace and that Goa is being used as a war base, the Communist Party is convinced that the liberation of Goa is an urgent necessity for the cause of peace.

The central committee is of opinion that having regard to all the efforts which the government of India has made for a negotiated settlement of the Goan question and which have been most insolently rejected by the Portuguese fascists, having regard to the immense sacrifices made by the Indian people for the liberation of Goa, and finally, having regard to the barbarities perpetrated by the Portuguese rulers in Goa, resort to police action is not only justified, but called for.

The central committee is further of the opinion that the government of India must abandon its policy of hampering the popular movement for Goan liberation and render it the fullest active assistance.

While, therefore, calling upon the government of India to lift the ban on the satyagrahis and to actively aid the Goan liberation movement, the central committee demands that the government of India should make it clear to the Portuguese rulers that unless they are prepared to open negotiations immediately, the government of India would be free to take any action in respect of Goa, including people action.

The central committee assures the Goan people that the Communist Party will continue to give all assistance for their liberation as it has done in the past. The intensification of the resistance movement inside Goa itself is a vital task in the coming period to which all patriotic elements in India must give the fullest help.

The popular movement in India for Goan liberation, which reached a high pitch on 15 August and the subsequent days, has also to continue until its goal is reached. The central committee trusts that the Goa Vimochan Sahayyak Samiti, which has guided the movement till now on the basis of the widest national unity, will carry the struggle forward despite the new obstacles placed in its way by the recent decisions of the AICC and the India government.

31. A Visit of Great Historic Significance

“The few days that you have spent here will find an important place in our history and there will be a great deal of talk about this. In the journey of our life, we have gone another step forward, nearer to our goal—progress of our country, welfare of our countrymen, uplift of the common man, friendship and peace in the world. . .

“Your visit will be long remembered in India. Whatever you like to take from this country, you may take. But do take a very valuable thing—the message of love from the people of this country to the people of the Soviet Union. Do svidania !”

These moving words of prime minister Nehru bidding farewell to the leaders of the Soviet Union at Palam airport on 14 December, truly sum up the sentiment of hundreds of millions of our people—not only those millions who had the opportunity to see them during the three weeks of their historic tour but also those others belonging to places which they could not visit.

The visit of the leaders of one country to another is nothing new in the history of diplomatic relations. Normally it creates no stir except in the country visited: there too it is confined to the official circles and follows a routine round of official meetings, formal speeches and glittering banquets. Often these are soon forgotten, leaving behind no abiding impress on the mind of the people

NOTHING LIKE THIS BEFORE

But the tour undertaken by the Soviet leaders in our country was something totally different. Weeks before their arrival there

Article by Ajoy Ghosh on the visit to India of Khrushchov and Bulganin was published in *New Age*, 25 December 1955.

was a stir at the places they were to visit and millions were on the move getting ready to receive them in a manner that they had never done before for anybody. It is idle to repeat all that we have ourselves witnessed with amazement—the trek of thousands for miles and miles just to have a glimpse of the Soviet leaders, to join in the thousand-throated cheers greeting them, the cavalcade of bullock carts, camels and even elephants bringing thousands of others from distant villages, the officials vying with the people in making it a magnificent turnout—all these were repeated, over and over again, wherever they could go. Nothing like this has happened before—neither in the magnitude nor in the warmth of the reception.

And this visit all the time held the attention of the whole world focused on it. It was looked upon by friends and foes alike, allies and adversaries, as the biggest event of the day.

Some of the most important political statements of recent times have come during this visit. Unequivocal judgements were pronounced during the tour against colonialism, against war facts, against weapons of mass destruction. Powerful voice was raised vindicating People's China's rights as a world power and warning against the dangerous situation in Korea and Indochina. On Goa, on nuclear weapons, on Geneva conference on Kashmir and the Baghdad treaty, the Soviet leaders declared categorically their views during this tour, and equally powerfully did they come out in support of the struggle for national liberation, offering a helping hand and declaring their readiness to share their invaluable experience.

The scathing denunciation by the Soviet leaders of the rapacious methods of oppression and exploitation practised by colonisers came to our people in sharp contrast to the superior attitude maintained by the imperialist rulers towards the peoples whose independence they had robbed and whose wealth they had plundered.

The imperialist press has raised a howl that the Soviet leaders had mooted "controversial" issues during a goodwill tour, that they abused the hospitality of India in attacking the western powers. But the "controversial" issues over which the hired press of the western monopolists lost their balance are precisely those

issues that demarcate the forces of progress from those of reaction, the forces of peace from those of war. Naturally the forthright pronouncements of the Soviet leaders, be it on the issue of Goa or the fattening of Hitler as the battering ram against the Soviet Union, create embarrassment for the western rulers with their black record of perfidy and bloodshed.

In these momentous weeks, indeed, have been packed the events of a whole lifetime. Like frost before the powerful sun, there melted in these few days the vile propaganda of the imperialists against the Soviet Union carried on ceaselessly for nearly four decades.

How ineffective has been their vicious lie and how triumphant today has been the word of truth that the democratic forces in India, above all the Communist Party, has never flagged in spreading about the Soviet Union. The joy at this success in the democratic circles today can be matched only by the bitter frustration that has spread in camp of reaction.

MAGNIFICENT RECORD

Let us, however, not forget that this has not been a question of propaganda alone. Much more effective than all the propaganda in the world has been the mighty achievements of the Soviet Union. Nothing—not even the best of professions—can stand comparison with the great record of Soviet practice. The land where the toiling man has been enthroned in power, where exploiting classes have been eliminated, where labour produces without the hunting spectre of unemployment such a land has got truth on its side and nothing can challenge its effectiveness. The lies and false promises on the opposing side could not stand before the majesty of the magnificent record of the Soviet Union.

All this has been opened before the very eyes of our people, first by the trip of our prime minister to the Soviet Union last summer and more so by the return visit of the Soviet leaders to our country this winter. For the Soviet leaders wherever they went told how they did the job in their own country, and popular interest transcended personalities and projected on the land from where they came.

Above all, this tour enabled the vast millions of our countrymen to see with their own eyes what kind of men the leaders of the USSR are. For years the imperialists have tried to show them as inscrutable ogres spreading totalitarian terror, hatching dark plots against mankind. But all that slander is completely and irrevocably exposed today.

Whether at Bhakra-Nangal or in the Nilgiris, whether at Bombay's milk colony or at the Chittaranjan Loco Works, whether at Sonapat or at Perambur, the Soviet leaders, in the most informal and intimate manner, discussed various problems of work with the very men who did the job, compared them frankly and unreservedly with their own experience, treated the very humblest of the men with respect and consideration, donning the Gandni cap as—what an arrogant British journalist has written—“no British prime minister would do”, chewing pan or saying namaste, sharing jokes with people as if they are part of a family.

CAPTURED HEARTS OF MILLIONS

All this not only captured the hearts of millions but showed to them what a living affinity the leaders of USSR have with the people. They have proved to the very hilt that these are men that require no ostentatiousness to keep up their so-called prestige. Through these leaders our people have seen the achievements of the Soviet Union, for here are leaders of a new kind, leaders who themselves are the eloquent testimony for the system that prevails in the Soviet Union. Our countrymen and women could get a glimpse of the intimate relations that exist between the Soviet people and their leaders. There is something in that relationship which draws people irresistibly towards them.

What is the net upshot of this memorable visit? The bond of friendship between India and the Soviet Union—the bond that remained throughout our struggle for freedom, the bond that was strengthened by prime minister Nehru's visit to the USSR—has now been further strengthened by this visit.

Prime minister Bulganin in his parting words had described the growing India-Soviet friendship as “a glorious triumph of history”. It is as well that we remember today the tremendous significance of this heightened friendship across the Himalayas.

The visit brings together in closer friendship three of the greatest countries of the world—India, USSR and China—whose populations put together constitute more than half the population of the world. And not merely in manpower, but by their command of immense resources, by their wielding of great political and moral power, they together constitute the most powerful factor for peace in the world of today.

As N. A. Bulganin said: "friendship between the Indian and Soviet peoples is a great historic achievement. It was born in the struggle of the peaceloving peoples against war, in the struggle for peace and security. Friendship between our peoples has an enormous significance for the further consolidation of the forces of peace" (Speech at the civic reception in Jaipur, 8 December 1955).

The social and political system that prevails in India is different from the system that prevails in the Soviet Union and People's China. Yet this difference in systems has stood as no bar to friendly relations and friendly, peaceful cooperation. The imperialists have always been trying to make out that there can be no peaceful coexistence with these countries because they uphold a different political and social system.

N.S. Khrushchov unhesitatingly declared:

"I think that if one wants a close example of coexistence, then such an example is given by our relations with India. We do not merely coexist, we are also friends despite the difference of political viewpoints on a number of questions. The basis of this friendship is our joint struggle for peace. Therefore we must not relax our efforts in this direction. Let us also in the future break everything that interferes with peaceful coexistence. Let us strengthen everything that promotes the development of peaceful coexistence of States" (Speech at the banquet given by the Indo-Soviet Cultural Society, Bombay, 24 November 1955).

Jawaharlal Nehru emphasised the same point:

"There is a special significance in the friendship between India and the Soviet Union. That special significance is, we respect each other's views and ideas, though we differ in some respects.

"So we have placed an example before the world—that though we hold different views and do things according to our own ideas,

still this friendship will benefit us. We want to benefit by their experience. This is the meaning of panchshila, which is being so much talked of today" (Speech at Palam airport, 14 December 1955).

MODEL FOR WHOLE WORLD

Not only is this relationship a model of peaceful coexistence, a model for the whole world, but India and the Soviet Union have jointly appealed to all other states to abide by the five principles of the panchshila. In the words of the joint statement issued under the signature of the three leaders, Jawaharlal Nehru, N. A. Bulganin and N. S. Khrushchov on 13 December 1955:

"These discussions have resulted in a reiteration of their firm conviction that international relations should be governed by the five principles and that every effort should be made to lessen international tensions and promote the cause of peace and cooperation between nations."

The Soviet leaders appealed for their acceptance by all the world:

"The acceptance of these principles by all other countries, including the United States, Britain and France, would be an important step towards further easing international tension and establishing the necessary confidence between nations" (Statement to the Press Conference, New Delhi, 14 December 1955).

Jawaharlal Nehru in his farewell message at Palam airport on the same day echoed the same sentiments:

"Our main object is to increase the circle of our friends so that there may be cooperation among nations and peace established on firmer ground."

Thus it is that this visit and the joint statement following it enjoin before the peoples of the world a new round of efforts for the enforcement of the panchshila between all nations. What was born as a declaration between the Republic of India and the People's Republic of China one-and-a-half years ago is today being placed before the entire world for universal acceptance as a step towards world peace. No wonder that the Soviet leaders' visit to India should create consternation in certain circles of the USA and the UK.

Far-reaching effects are to flow from the visit of the Soviet leaders on the cause of freedom for the peoples of the entire colonial world. Here are the representatives of a leading world power stretching their hands to establish relations in terms of complete equality with the peoples of Asia. There is no infringement of sovereignty as Marshall aid or a Seato would enjoin. There is no tinge of patronising backslapping as would an Attlee or a Mountbatten indulge in.

On the contrary, not only is India's political freedom honoured but its great role in international affairs gets its rightful recognition. No politician of any western power has up to this day upheld this just claim of India as was done by N. S. Khrushchov:

"We hold that India is a great power and it should take one of the first places in the rank of the great states of the world" (Speech to the members of Parliamentary Association for the Advancement of Hindi, Delhi, 13 December 1955).

The perspective of economic cooperation with the USSR that is opened up before our country is something that could never be envisaged before. The offer of a steel plant with unheard-of credit facilities has been a major asset in the building of our economy.

The joint communique on economic relations is an entirely new kind of economic agreement which has never before been offered by any great power. In the face of the vast requirements of our second five-year plan, India gets an economic agreement at terms which benefit it both ways.

For the first time through a single agreement we are offered the goods that we require and not what others want to dispose of; and we are given the opportunity to sell what we desire—including our manufactured goods—and thereby secure a new and more advantageous market for our goods.

Nobody can evade facing the inescapable contrast between this type of economic cooperation with 'aids' that infringe on our sovereignty or impose goods that we do not need or inflict 'experts' who hardly know anything. Over and over again the Soviet leaders have offered to share their experience with us in

the field of technical advance or in the matter of training technical personnel—an offer which no imperialist power has offered so readily.

Recognition of our political freedom coupled with the recognition of our rightful role in the councils of the world—who cannot but contrast this with the imposition of subservience in the name of military alliance and in the infringement of sovereignty in the name of ‘aids’—military or economic?

Farreaching will be the effect of this visit on the democratic movement in India. It isolates the allies and friends of imperialists in our country. It reveals before the masses whose interest these people serve who speak about the ‘Russian menace’.

Reliance on the strength generated by our own people, striving to strengthen their independence, by building their own economy—such are the watchwords of our own democratic movement too. Today that is reinforced by the words of the Soviet leaders, words born out of the eventful experience of the first socialist state in the world.

Equally important for the democratic movement is the fact that the Soviet leaders, in the most fraternal manner, explained their own system based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and thereby helped to dispel the wrong notions about communism spread by reactionary circles. Whether in the matter of Soviet democracy or about the existence of the Cominform, the Soviet leaders, patiently and lucidly, tried to clear away the mistaken apprehensions about the world communist movement that very often hamper the growth of a united democratic front.

NEW POSSIBILITIES

The effort of reaction to divide and weaken the democratic movement by means of the poison of anticommunism will thus suffer a setback. The powerful upsurge of a united people that the visit of the Soviet leaders has engendered, creates new confidence and ushers in new possibilities for the entire democratic movement.

The nationwide eagerness to greet the Soviet leaders has brought together people of all parties, of all political beliefs, and

along with them the mass movement they represent. Not only did they together greet the Soviet leaders but through their utterances and intimate contact they—the millions of our countrymen and women—could get a better idea of what a socialist country is. This itself is a powerful factor in defeating the disruptors of the democratic movement and helps to bring together the fraternal ranks of all forces, that desire to consolidate and strengthen national freedom.

This way the visit of the Soviet leaders to our country symbolises a new landmark in the march of democracy in free India.

32. Defeat Merger Proposals of Existing States

The central committee views with grave concern the determined efforts of the congress working committee and the government of India to create multilingual states such as West Bengal-Bihar, Dakshina Pradesh and Paschima Pradesh through undemocratic and unprincipled merger and integration of states.

Far from strengthening the unity of India and the solidarity of our peoples, these efforts, if allowed to succeed, will create conditions in which conflict between various nationalities will be a permanent feature, thereby constantly undermining the unity of India.

Experience has already shown how such multilingual states prevent the full participation by the mass of the people in the administration and political, economic and social life of the country, stifle the growth of the language, literature and culture of different nationalities and finally hamper the growth of democracy in our land.

Experience has equally proved how these multilingual states, by giving rise to conflicts and discord, disrupt the democratic movement and thereby retard the advance of the people.

Ever since it came to power, the congress leadership has sought to throw to the winds its earlier promises and commitments to reorganise the provinces on the linguistic basis—promises which had been repeated time and again by the congress leaders before they came to power.

It will be recalled that in the election manifesto of 1945-46 the Congress had reiterated unequivocally this pledge

Resolution passed by the central committee, 28 January to 4 February 1956 and published in *New Age*, 12 February 1956.

and commitment to the country. But after coming to power, instead of proceeding to redeem the pledge, it sought to put it in cold storage by the appointment of a number of committees.

However the unity and strength of the people achieved a great victory in the formation of the Andhra state in October 1953. It was again the upsurge of the people that led to the appointment of the states reorganisation commission.

The congress leaders and committees, all these years, raised chauvinistic claims and roused passions of hatred and animosity. The congress working committee looked on as their provincial leaders and committees vied with each other in rousing such passions.

Despite its rejection of the linguistic principle, the SRC could not but recommend the formation of Kerala, Karnataka and Madras mainly on the basis of language.

At the same time it denied the demand for linguistic states to the peoples speaking Marathi, Gujarati and Punjabi. Although it adduced cogent arguments for the demand of Vishalaandhra, the SRC refused to recommend its immediate formation. In the matter of boundary adjustments the SRC discarded all democratic principles and based itself on sheer opportunism.

In making its recommendations, the SRC patently permitted itself to be guided by all sorts of extraneous and opportunist considerations and, above all, by its most unwholesome concern for the interests of big business.

Any government true to its pledge and responsive to the just and democratic aspirations of the people, would have at once proceeded to modify the reactionary features of these recommendations in a democratic direction. But not so the government of India.

Although, due to the pressure of the people, the recommendation for a bilingual state of Bombay was modified, yet the government decided to bring the city of Bombay under central administration, instead of making it a part of Samyukta Maharashtra.

It also came out with the proposal to create zonal councils as a first step towards the denial of linguistic states. On the question of boundary adjustments, it modified the SRC recommendations in a reactionary direction in certain cases, such as in the case of West Bengal and Bihar.

Conscious of the fact that such arbitrary and undemocratic decisions would never be acceptable to the people, the government launched a campaign of provocation and terror. Even before announcing these decisions, it arrested the leaders of the samyukta Maharashtra movement and banned meetings in many places.

Naturally these provocative actions on the part of the government have given rise to spontaneous demonstrations by the people in Bombay and in other places.

The government sought to suppress these demonstrations with police terror. In Bombay, particularly, the orgies of police violence and terror reminded one of the darkest days of British rule. Over a hundred people have been killed and hundreds of people wounded as a result of police firings. In Bombay city alone over 5000 were jailed. Shootings and arrests have also taken place in Orissa. Among those arrested and detained without trial are six members of the central committee of our party.

The central committee pays its homage to the memory of those patriots who have fallen in the cause of the linguistic reorganisation of the country and sends its deepest condolences to bereaved families. The committee greets the people who have so valiantly fought for a noble cause in the face of unmitigated police terror.

The central committee demands the immediate release of all those arrested and the revocation of all repressive measures.

The central committee takes note of the most unfortunate fact that this situation has been utilised by certain antisocial elements, inspired and financed by the vested interests, in engineering attacks against the minorities and in destruction of public properties.

The responsibility for creating this situation and these

ugly incidents rests on the government and the congress leadership.

The central committee appeals to our people to steer clear of such provocations, prevent such disruptive and harmful activities, and, in particular, protect at all costs the minorities. It is only thus that the foul game of the provocateurs can be foiled, the unity of the people preserved and the movement for linguistic reorganisation of our country carried forward to its victory.

The congress leadership and the government of India have seized upon these incidents and are utilising them for depriving the people of the success they have achieved in their fifty years of struggle for linguistic states, and wiping out from the map of India even the existing linguistic states. The merger proposals are nothing but an attempt to completely reverse the course of history.

The central committee strongly opposes these merger proposals and demands their immediate withdrawal. It demands the modification of the SRC recommendations in strict conformity with linguistic principles.

Consistent with these principles, Bombay city must form part of Samyukta Maharashtra, the demand for Vishala-andhra must be immediately conceded. The democratic setup must be maintained in Delhi, similarly Tripura and Manipur must be granted democratic setup.

The institutions set up under the sixth schedule of the constitution in the tribal areas must have enlarged powers so as to make autonomy real and effective.

As far as the boundary issues are concerned, they should be settled on the basis of language and geographical contiguity taking village as the unit. Border questions can be solved not by rousing the people on the question of this border area or that, but by all the people and parties fighting together for the acceptance of the democratic principle enunciated above. Once this principle is accepted, the drawing of boundaries is an easy matter by means of mutual discussion or by some other machinery such as the boundary commission.

The central committee appeals to our people to be fully aware of the dangers of the merger proposals. Defeating this sinister move of the congress working committee and the government has now become a supremely urgent task for our entire people.

The central committee, therefore, calls upon all patriotic parties and organisations, upon all right-thinking men and women, to immediately launch a vigorous campaign, not only in the states proposed to be merged but throughout the entire country to defeat the merger proposals.

In this situation a heavy responsibility rests on the shoulders of our party units and members. The central committee is proud of the part they have already played in the struggle for linguistic states. Today they have to carry forward the struggle in a difficult and complicated situation.

The success in this great struggle for the linguistic re-organisation of our country lies in fighting back all provocations and manifestations of chauvinism and, above all, in building the broadest possible unity of our people throughout the country.

33. On the 20th Congress of the CPSU

RESOLUTION

The party congress, having heard the report of the general secretary, resolves that in view of the fact that the twentieth congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was an event of the greatest importance and took decisions which every communist party in the world needs to study seriously, calls upon all party committees and members to study the documents and organise discussions with the help of the general secretary's report.

The central committee will make available the recent article in the *People's Daily* on the subject to help the discussions. The central committee will review such discussions and endeavour to enrich our understanding in the light of these documents and discussions.

REPORT BY AJOY GHOSH

The 20th congress of the CPSU met in the background of very big successes and on the basis of these successes, the congress showed the path of further advance. The fifth five-year plan had been completed much ahead of schedule and the bold targets of the sixth five-year plan are there before us. The perspective is that not in the distant but in the near future the Soviet Union will catch up with and outstrip the most advanced capitalist countries. On the basis of these achievements, now the decision has

This was printed as a pamphlet in June 1956. Here are given only the resolution of the fourth party congress at Paighat, 19-29 April 1956, and the report made by the general secretary Ajoy Ghosh. An article from *People's China*, No 8, 16 April 1956 printed there has been omitted.

been taken to reduce the working-day, to raise wages, to raise the standard of life of the people. Secondly, very big successes were secured in the struggle for peace. At no time since the end of war was the international situation so free from tension as now. Both in the realm of internal and international affairs, the congress was meeting in the background of mighty victories and, on the basis of those victories, working out a path for still greater victories. The discussions and decisions of the congress have to be understood in this background.

The first big factor to which the congress draws our attention is the emergence of socialism as a world system. The significance of this development is becoming more and more clear as days pass. The socialist world has not merely come into existence. It exerts ever more powerful influence on the whole course of history. It has got massive achievements in every sphere and these achievements prove the incontestable superiority of socialism over capitalism.

It was precisely the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe that suffered the most serious damage during the war. The bourgeoisie had thought that as a result of these damages, these countries would not be able to recoup for a very long period. Yet actually what has happened is that the prewar level of production has been left far behind. And the very rapidity of this recovery, the rapidity of the advance after the serious damage caused by war, shows the contrast between the two systems. This incontestable superiority of the socialist system is having a very powerful impact on the minds of men. As was said at the congress, in the minds of men socialism is already stronger than capitalism.

All of you comrades know that section in the *Communist Manifesto* where it is stated that of all classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie, the proletariat alone is revolutionary, while the other classes are conservative and even reactionary. The *Manifesto* states that these other

classes become revolutionary to the extent that they adopt the standpoint of the proletariat. This in those days was not a common phenomenon. Big changes have taken place since then.

Formerly also many other people talked of socialism. Noncommunists talked of socialism in the past as they do at present. But in those days, the talk of socialism by social-democrats, by bourgeois intellectuals, served only one purpose and that was to hold the masses away from the real socialist movement, hold them back from the task of real socialist transformation. Today also to some extent it serves that purpose. But today such declarations act in a different way. Social-democracy has proved its bankruptcy. It has not been able to solve any problem while Marxism has achieved mighty victories. Therefore the ideas of socialism today flow more and more into the channels of Marxism-Leninism.

Another thing is that hundreds of honest elements are coming to accept socialism, though they dislike certain aspects like civil war, violence, etc. But they are not at all opportunists or enemies of socialism. Many of these elements are moved by genuine socialist ideals.

In a world situation, when capitalism was the only system, when the superiority of socialism was not definitely proved, it was easy to utilise the slogan of socialism for antisocialist purposes. But in a world situation when socialism has proved its superiority, when capitalism is in a state of crisis, in such a world the ideas of socialism can be most easily directed to Marxism-Leninism than at any time before.

Secondly, the growing strength of socialism helps the disintegration of the colonial system which in the past was the main reserve force of world imperialism. This disintegration of the colonial system is a very big factor in world politics. Marxism-Leninism had predicted the inevitable collapse of the colonial system. But the collapse is not proceeding everywhere in the same way as was pre-

dicted. This has got to be clearly seen. We thought that it would proceed in only one way, namely, the conquest of power by the masses led by the working class, the revolutionary overthrow of imperialist rule, and the establishment of a democratic dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry. This has happened in a number of countries—China, Vietnam, etc.—though there also have been modifications in the state forms. Nevertheless the struggle in these countries has proceeded in a particular way, a revolutionary overthrow of imperialism by an alliance led by the working class. It is possible that it will happen in the same way in some other countries also. But this is not all. When we speak of the disintegration of the colonial system, we include in this process the events that have developed in countries like India, Burma, Indonesia and Ceylon—the attainment of freedom by them. What is happening today in the Middle East? It is not merely the working class, the peasantry and the national bourgeoisie but even some elements from amongst the feudal classes are found taking a stand against the imperialists. This is an entirely new phenomenon. For example, there is the dismissal of Glubb by the king of Jordan.

The struggle for defence of peace and against military blocs that is developing in the countries of the east is an essential and vital part of these freedom struggles itself. By the waging of this struggle, these countries strengthen their national freedom.

All this is possible today because of the emergence of socialism as a world force and the growth of the anti-imperialist movement in the countries of the east. It enables these countries to wage a far more determined and firm struggle against the drive of the imperialists towards a world war than at any time before. It strengthens their independence. The former colonial countries asserting freedom find powerful support in the USSR and China.

They have established diplomatic relations and economic relations with the socialist world because it is a factor

which strengthens their own freedom. It makes them less dependent on the imperialists and leads to the deepening of the crisis of the imperialist system itself.

But we should not think that it is only the socialist world that is helping the colonial world to win its freedom. This disintegration of the colonial world is itself a factor which benefits the socialist movement and socialist world. We are helping the socialist world by what we are doing. We are playing a great and increasingly more important role in humanity's march towards socialism.

Firstly, this disintegration of the colonial system weakens imperialism and thus weakens its capacity to undertake military adventures against the socialist world; it denies its manpower and resources with which it could undertake such adventures.

Secondly, it is not merely that we gain from the economic relations with the socialist world because it helps us to rebuild our economy on the basis of development of heavy industries, but such economic relations help to strengthen their economy also.

Thirdly, and above all, the fact that a vast number of countries which were formerly a part of the imperialist world are today defending their freedom and taking a stand in opposition to the imperialists—is a factor which directly helps the consolidation of the socialist world.

What the socialist world needs, above all, is peace. But for the second world war, the economy of the Soviet Union would have been far more advanced than today. And the fact that countries like India, Burma, Egypt and even Saudi Arabia are taking a stand against war and the preservation of peace is a factor of strength to the socialist world.

What is the effect of the disintegration of the colonial system on imperialism? That also has got to be seen. The urge for national reconstruction that has grown in these countries and which results in their establishing relations

of friendship with the USSR further narrows down the area of unrestricted exploitation of the imperialists. It makes it difficult for them to solve the crisis of market at the cost of the colonial countries as they used to do in the past. Inevitably this deepens their crisis.

Secondly, this narrowing down of the area of exploitation sharpens the conflict between the imperialist powers themselves.

Thirdly, it helps the working class in the imperialist countries to expose and isolate the worst reactionaries from among them. For example, the defeat suffered by the French imperialists in Vietnam resulted in the sweeping decline of the prestige of their political leadership and it helped the working class to isolate the worst reactionaries in France.

Fourthly, it helps the moral isolation of the imperialists. In Britain, they point out: "India which was a colony takes today an independent stand on every issue, while Britain allows the US imperialists to establish bases on its own soil."

And finally, it underlines the whole basis of social-democracy and reformism in the imperialist countries. It was superprofits from the colonial countries that formed the foundation of the growth of reformism in many of the advanced imperialist countries. Sections of the working class were bought over by them. Today it is becoming more and more difficult to do that and thereby the economic basis of reformism is getting more and more weak. It results in the sharpening of the conflict between the bourgeoisie and the working class in the capitalist world.

What we have to see is that the breakup of colonialism and winning of freedom by colonial countries is of tremendous importance which strengthens the socialist world, weakens imperialism, intensifies conflict between imperialist powers, intensifies political and moral isolation of imperialists and their agents, undermines the basis of reformism.

The emergence of socialism as a world system and the disintegration of colonial system—both proceeded side by side and each process strengthened the other. Both, in their totality, delivered heavy blows against the system of exploitation built up by imperialists.

New prospects in the struggle for peace have developed. The desire for peace has given rise to a vast movement embracing hundreds of millions of people. A vast zone of peace has come into existence—the zone comprising socialist as well as nonsocialist countries.

In this connection it is necessary to reassess a phenomenon of the postwar years and that is the growth of the sentiment of neutrality. The sentiment of neutrality is a sentiment which opposes alignment with all military alliances. A doctrinaire and dogmatic concept would be like this. Between forces of war and peace there can be no neutrality and so any country which takes a neutral stand objectively helps warmongers. Many leaders of the communist movement suffered from this concept in the past. But, in reality, what does that sentiment of neutrality express? It is a sentiment for peace, which wants to keep out of the imperialist drive for war. It may be that leaders who express these sentiments look upon both as power blocs. It may be that subjectively the desire of some of them is to condemn the Soviet Union. But which is the country today that wants to establish war bases and is going ahead towards war? It is not the Soviet Union; it is the UK and the USA. Neutrality expresses the sentiment of the masses for maintenance of their national freedom.

Today a vast zone of peace has come into existence comprising of the socialist world as well as a number of countries which declare nonparticipation in military blocs as the basis of their foreign policy. India, Burma, some Arab countries and even some European countries are more and more taking to this path.

A decisive factor in the battle for peace is the growing military strength of the Soviet Union. Not merely the

mass of people but powerful states headed by the USSR and China stand for peace and actively fight for peace. Their strength grows every day, making resort to war an extremely dangerous adventure for the imperialists.

All these factors, together with the growth of communist and workingclass parties, the strength of the movement for peace, brought about a situation which made the CPSU consider it necessary to modify the Marxist formulations with regard to the inevitability of war.

It was said at the same time that the economic causes of war remain, and as such the possibility of world war also remains. With the colonies going out of imperialist orbit, with the area of exploitation getting shrunk, the desire of imperialists to launch a war against the socialist world certainly does not decrease, but increases. The law of uneven development of the capitalist system gives rise to rivalries. So both the causes of world war and inter-imperialist war operate.

At the same time, as has been pointed out, while the danger of war remains—it remains so long as these conditions remain—the counteracting forces are very strong and are continuously growing. In this situation it is possible to prevent war.

"Today there are mighty social and political forces possessing formidable means to prevent the imperialists from unleashing war, and if they actually try to start it, to give a smashing rebuff to the aggressors and frustrate their adventurist plans" (*Report of the 20th Congress*).

After pointing out the problem of markets, the report says, "all this means, the struggle for market is becoming sharp in the imperialist camp". Therefore the conflicts inside the imperialist camp continue to sharpen. But that does not mean that war between them is an immediate possibility. A situation may arise in future when such a danger grows real and imminent. But by the time such a danger arises it is quite likely that those forces which are

operating against war will become so strong that even if they are not able to bring about an end of the capitalist system, would be powerful enough to prevent a war from breaking out.

It must be understood that this thesis about war not being inevitable is not just an abstract formulation based on a mathematical study of factors for and against. The thesis is borne out of practical experience in the struggle against war.

As you know, after the end of the war, within a year or two once again the international situation deteriorated and tension was created. The practical steps taken by the Soviet Union, together with other factors, have brought about a radical change in the situation despite all the attempts of the imperialists to aggravate international tension. The Geneva conference, if you look at it from the point of view of 'practical' results, may not appear to have many achievements, but it succeeded in creating a certain atmosphere and reducing international tension. A new spirit was born out of this conference on the basis of which further successes could be achieved. This itself was a big practical achievement. The forces working for peace today could confidently say that war is not inevitable though the danger always remains, and this thesis has a tremendous practical importance. It arms the forces of peace with confidence in victory. It helps to broaden the sweep of the peace movement.

Then the 20th congress also made a concrete analysis of the capitalist system. That analysis is there. I do not think that it is necessary to elaborate that. But one thing that is very pointedly brought out at the 20th congress is the contradictory processes that are at work. This had become necessary because of the oversimplified understanding of the economic crisis of the capitalist system that had grown in the past in many communist parties throughout the world. This had two evil effects.

In the Soviet Union many technicians and economists

arguing on the basis that capitalism has declined, came to the wrong conclusion that no technological advance was possible in capitalist countries. But even in this period technological advance was being registered in some capitalist countries in certain spheres. The capitalists, faced with a shrinking market, were trying to meet the new situation by improving the technique of production. This was not seen by many and they did not study sufficiently the advance of technology that was being made in America. This to some extent harmed the progress of Soviet industry. Also, in capitalist countries predictions were made about the time and nature of the impending crisis which proved incorrect. Our understanding at Madurai was also based on this absolute decline of capitalist production and an oversimplified estimation of the economic crisis. In the 20th congress it was necessary to reexamine this understanding. It is not only necessary for the communist party to study crisis in general, but also a particular crisis in concrete in each country and not to minimise the contradictory processes.

At the same time, while keeping all this in mind, the communists must also see the general direction in which capitalist economy is moving—the direction of new social and economic upheavals. Either an oversimplified understanding of the crisis or belief in capitalist prosperity is wrong. We have to study the day-to-day developments that are taking place without at the same time losing sight of the direction in which the capitalist economy is moving—new upheavals. Only then will we be not taken by surprise.

The CPSU congress also proclaimed the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism. It held that because of the new international situation when the balance has shifted in favour of the forces of socialism, because of the massive achievements of socialism in the USSR and other countries in every sphere which are having a powerful influence on the masses of the people, because of the growth

of the ideas of socialism all over the world and because strong communist parties have come into existence in many countries—such a peaceful transition is a possibility in several countries.

The concrete examples that were given at the congress in which peaceful transition has taken place were the East European countries and China. It was stated that in these countries, the transition to socialism was effected in a peaceful way. We all know what happened in the East European countries. The old state apparatus broke down during the second world war itself under the blows of the Red Army as well as of the patriotic forces. And after the defeat of Hitler, new coalition governments came into power. They were in the nature of people's democratic governments of the first stage which carried out the bourgeois-democratic tasks and which included the bourgeoisie also. In the second stage, the transition to people's democracy of the second stage took place and it is now in essence the dictatorship of the proletariat effected without violence and bloodshed. Same things are happening in China also—prolonged civil war in the first stage, peaceful transition to socialism in the second stage.

These were the only examples before us. The question that would naturally be asked is: Is this all that is meant by what the congress stated? If so, what is new in this?

If you take Khrushchov's report this is what he states:

"The winning of a stable parliamentary majority backed by a mass revolutionary movement of the proletariat and of all the working people could create for the working class of a number of capitalist and former colonial countries the conditions needed to secure fundamental social changes.

"In the countries where capitalism is still strong and has a huge military and police apparatus at its disposal, the reactionary forces will of course inevitably offer serious resistance. There the transition to socialism will be attended by a sharp class, revolutionary struggle

"Whatever the form of transition to socialism, the decisive and indispensable factor is the political leadership of the working class headed by its vanguard. Without this there can be no transition to socialism."

The question may be raised: In which countries is peaceful transition possible? In countries where capitalism is still strong and has huge military and police apparatus at its disposal, the reactionary forces will, of course, offer serious resistance. Which are these capitalist countries? Countries like France, England, Italy—in all these countries capitalism is still strong and has got a military force far more powerful than what existed before the last war. England has the biggest standing army in the world compared to the size of its population.

Here capitalism is strong and a powerful military apparatus is at its disposal. Same in France and Italy. Is it that these countries are excluded from this category? If so, which capitalist countries are meant? If you try to understand this thing literally, then the discussion that will start will be of an abstract nature. What has got to be seen is the significance of this proposition. For that I would like to take you back a little.

You remember the proposition made by Engels in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, where he refers to universal suffrage and says that "universal suffrage is the gauge of the maturity of the working class . . . On the day the thermometer of universal suffrage registers boiling point among the workers, both they and the capitalists will know what to do." That is, if a stage comes when this universal suffrage threatens the capitalist order itself, then capitalists and the working class will know what to do. Then prolonged struggle for power begins which inevitably takes the form of civil war or violence.

Why was this issue posed in this way? Because it was realised that the ruling classes, with the state apparatus, military and police at their disposal, are not going to depart from the scene merely because they have not the

backing of the majority of the people. On the contrary, they are going to use this force against majority of the people who have declared themselves against the ruling class. That is why universal suffrage could not enable the working class to bring about fundamental transformations.

As you know while being in complete agreement with this proposition, Marx visualised the possibility of peaceful transformation to socialism in *some* countries, for example, in a country like Britain. Lenin pointed out that this was possible in those days because in Britain there did not exist a huge military and bureaucratic apparatus. So, when we talked of impossibility of socialism being achieved except by violence means, we did not mean thereby that it is theoretically impossible for the party of the working class to get the support of the majority of the working people. What we stressed was that even if it happens that despite the existence of bourgeoisie, bourgeois control over press, etc., working class and its party manages to get a majority of the people on its side, then the ruling classes will force civil war on the people. Stalin reemphasised this thesis. At the same time he stated that if in the remote future it so happens that capitalist encirclement is replaced by socialist encirclement, then it is possible that in some countries transformation will take place in a peaceful way. This is how Marxists looked at the matter.

Now the question is being posed anew. Here, on the question whether peaceful transformation to socialism is possible or not, there are two distinct questions involved.

The first question is: Is it possible for the working class and its party to secure a stable parliamentary majority? To this question the 20th party congress replies in the affirmative. It says it is possible, for the factors already pointed out, i.e. the growth of ideas of socialism, disintegration of colonial system, the political and moral bankruptcy of the capitalist class, the deepening crisis of capitalism and the strength of the communist parties. It is possible through a mass revolutionary movement to achieve parliamentary

majority backed by a broad movement, to bring about such a situation when working class and its allies can come to government. Will this alone make peaceful transformation possible? If capitalism is still strong—not merely economically, but politically and morally also, if capitalist system has got the support of big sections of people, if it retains such control over the state apparatus as to be able to use it against the parliament, then violent revolution is inevitable.

We all know what happened in Spain. A democratic government came to power through elections but the reactionary classes not only remained powerful but also retained effective control over the armed forces. And when the government tried to introduce certain reforms they used the armed forces against it. A bloody civil war followed which ultimately led to a fascist dictatorship.

Must such civil wars necessarily take place today? No. If the working class heading the people is able to develop a powerful mass movement and secures a parliamentary majority, if the position of the reactionaries in the state apparatus is weakened through a series of measures and through extension of democratic rights for the people, if reaction is unable to secure a sufficiently broad mass base for its counterrevolutionary activity—if all this happens which is quite a possibility in the new situation—then it is quite possible that fundamental changes will be effected in a more or less peaceful way.

And this is a possibility not merely for France and England but which is there even in a country like India or Indonesia. In these countries, in certain circumstances, the transition to the first stage of people's democracy may also be effected in a peaceful way—without civil war. Obviously, as has been pointed out here, "Whatever the form of transition to socialism, the decisive and indispensable factor is the political leadership of the working class headed by its vanguard. Without this there can be no transition to socialism."

In a country like Indonesia, for example, where there is a powerful communist party which has won nearly one-fourth of the electorate, allied with progressive elements, it is possible for them to create conditions for going forward still further. There will be a series of mass struggles which will lead to a series of crises, but these crises need not burst out in a civil war.

One may say that this is a theoretical possibility. But where is the necessity of stating this? It is necessary because from this certain practical tasks follow. If such transition is a possibility, then the communist party in every country strives to turn this into a reality. Today when the mass of people desire socialist transformation but do not desire civil war, this is an imperative duty of the communist party.

But from this certain tasks follow. And one of the most important of these tasks is the struggle for the strengthening of democracy in every sphere. We have to fight against the arbitrary powers which the police and bureaucracy enjoy and strive to curb them. We have to fight for the democratisation of the state apparatus and the removal from it of the most reactionary elements. We have to fight for the extension of the rights and powers of the people's elected organs—panchayats, district boards, etc.

Here you will see how the French Communist Party in its resolution has posed the problem. It has stated that "the transition to socialism by the parliamentary path cannot, on the other hand, be envisaged except through immediate and constant struggle for the defence and enlargement of democratic liberties".

Fight for the extension of democracy, the fight for the curbing of the power of the police and bureaucracy and to increase the power and rights of the elected organs is essential for the peaceful transition to socialism. The greater the democratisation, the greater the possibility. This is a major practical task which follows from this.

The question therefore is not: *Which countries can have socialism peacefully?* The question is: *What conditions must be created in order to effect such a transition?* The former question would lead to endless discussions of an academic nature—discussion about the difference between one country and another. The latter question would lead to practical activity which can create the necessary conditions.

How is this different from reformism? It is different from reformism in various ways. I will tell you three main things. One is: it has been stated that a parliamentary majority *backed by mass revolutionary movement led by the working class*—without this, it is not possible. Secondly, the leadership of the working class is essential. Thirdly, the reformists state that formal democracy—existence of the parliamentary system, universal suffrage, by which people can choose their representatives once in a few years—is alone enough to enable us to go over to socialism. Marxism states that this formal democracy is not enough. Unless there is real existence of democracy, that is, if the police and bureaucracy retain their arbitrary power, if the armed forces are not democratised, if the local elected organs have no power, then with all this, universal suffrage does not enable you to go forward to socialism. Reformists in the capitalist countries say that merely by the parliamentary method we shall change over to socialism.

Marxists, on the contrary, even today say that formal democracy is not enough and that real democracy is needed. A sustained struggle for extension of democracy will have to be carried on. On our success in this struggle will depend the possibility of peaceful transition.

This thesis of peaceful transition to socialism is a big weapon in our hands. It enables us to heal the split in the socialist movement. It enables us to forge links with socialists who sincerely desire socialism but abhor civil war. It enables us to fight the propaganda of the bour-

geoisie. It enables us to bring to the forefront the enormous significance of the struggle for democracy.

The 20th congress has stated that in peaceful coexistence, socialism will win. We are confident because socialism is superior. The statement that war is not fatalistically inevitable, that peaceful transition to socialism is possible—what does all this indicate? It shows that world socialism had advanced to a new stage. It is born out of the tremendous confidence in the victories that we have already won. The future belongs to us.

When the 20th congress met, the world movement for peace for national freedom and democracy, and for socialism had advanced to a new stage. Here certain old concepts were acting as obstacles in the path of further development of the movement. The 20th congress replaces these old concepts by new concepts that correspond to the new historic situation and enable the movement to acquire greater speed than ever before.

* * *

Now I will take up the next question—the most difficult question—the question of Stalin and the cult of the individual. This phrase, 'cult of the individual', what does it exactly mean? Let us take that first.

For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy! of 30 March gave the definition of the cult of the individual as "inordinately exalting individual persons, investing them with supernatural traits and qualities, imputing all but miraculous powers to them and kowtowing to them". It is an incorrect conception, alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. The mistake lies not in recognising the talents of a leader but in ascribing to him supernatural powers and infallibility.

After the 20th congress a number of questions have come to the mind of every one of you. What about the contribution of Stalin to the development of Marxism-Leninism?

What about his role in building socialism and fighting against right and left deviations? Why is it that there was no reference to it in the 20th congress? These questions came to my mind also.

Secondly, what were the other leaders doing all these days? What role did they play in fostering or combating the cult of the individual?

Thirdly, what made it possible for such things to continue for such a long time?

I cannot answer all these questions. There can be no dispute about the tremendous positive role of Stalin in enriching Marxism, in building socialism in the USSR, in fighting against right and left deviations, in guiding the international communist movement. I think that if the 20th congress report itself had made a statement about the positive achievements of Stalin, then much of the confusion that has arisen would have been avoided. This was subsequently done in the *Pravda* editorial.

But as regards the second and third question, I have no satisfactory replies to give. What replies have been given have not satisfied me.

Instead of debating these issues, let us see the whole thing dispassionately.

Did the cult of personality develop in the USSR or not? I have no doubt it did develop. We also know that it was primarily in relation to Stalin.

Did Stalin himself play a role in the development of this? About this a number of instances have been given, e.g. the biography of Stalin. It is very evident that the book is permeated through and through with the cult of the individual, ascribing to Stalin miraculous powers.

While Stalin, in a general way, very often criticised exaltation of individuals as being alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, the concrete form which it was taking in the Soviet Union in relation to him, in the latter period of his life, he did not combat: but, on the other hand, encour-

aged it. I know on an issue like this, it is very difficult to be very objective. At the same time, it is necessary to do so because, what has happened is a major event not only in the life of the CPSU, but in the life of all communist parties.

I hope you have got the statement that has appeared in *New Age*, made by the Chinese party. That document deals with the question in a more satisfactory and in a more elaborate way than I have seen so far anywhere. All comrades should read that articles.

We should understand that what is today being criticised is not merely Stalin. What is being criticised is the whole method of leadership that had evolved in the CPSU over a certain period. If Stalin is specifically mentioned, it is so because he was the leader of the CC of the CPSU. If we look at it as a mud-slinging business, then we would not be able to see any further. Let us look at the thing in a different way. We must see the criticism in its proper perspective; it is necessary to do so because today many of the bourgeois leaders say: "What did we tell you? Is this not what we told you all along?" Some of our comrades also say that the whole moral basis on which they stood is shaken and there is nothing on which to stand. But let us see whether this is really so.

In the years since it was born there have been mighty achievements of the Soviet Union in every sphere. From a backward country it has been transformed in this period into one of the most advanced countries in the world, and also a country with advanced agriculture. In this very period there has been an enormous increase in the material and cultural standards of the Soviet people. The USSR played an immense role in transformation of socialism into a world system, in bringing about the present situation when one-third of humanity has taken to the path of socialism. But for the USSR, the disintegration of colonial system could not have taken place. But for the USSR, victory in the antifascist war could not

have been won. But for the USSR, there would be no people's democracies. What we have to see is, first of all, the mighty achievements of the USSR which are of profound historic significance, not only for the Soviet Union but for the whole humanity. The mistakes have to be judged in the background of these achievements. It would be no exaggeration to say that never in the history of humanity has so much been achieved in 40 years as in the USSR. This is the first fact that has to be recognised.

When we recognise that all this could not have come of itself, then we will see that the basic line which has been pursued all these years is a correct line. It is not only Stalin, but the present leaders of the CPSU and the central committee too that have made this possible. The CPSU has been the party which has acted as a model for international communist movement and Stalin was the international leader of the communist movement. Where was the international communist movement thirty years ago and where it is today, we know. That also is a tribute to Stalin and to the leaders of the international movement. So the whole thing has to be viewed in the background of victories which have no parallel in history.

Contrast this with the achievements of other parties which throw mud at us. For example, the Labour Party in England. It came to power several times and every time it paved the way for the victory of the Tories. Here in India, we have the Congress in power which received the support of overwhelming majority of the people before 1947. Within three or four years, people began cursing the Congress. Did the Labour Party or the Congress ever think it necessary to come before the people and say to them that these were the mistakes they committed? Parties which have not got achievements of even one-millionth part of those of the CPSU, come and say today that the CPSU has been committing mistake after mistake. And many of our comrades also are unfortunately taken in by that. What we have to say is: See where the world stood

40 years ago, in 1917 and today. And this is because, first and foremost, of the October revolution and the Soviet Union.

What we have to see is that the Soviet Union was faced with an exceptionally difficult job. In all other states, all other parties that came to power had before them only one task—perpetuate their own rule. Here it was a question of bringing about a transformation of a type that has never been attempted in history and together with that create the conditions for transition to a still higher form of society. There was no previous precedent by which it could be guided. A country launched on a new path, an uncharted path, beset with enemies outside and inside—it was in this situation that the Soviet Union found itself. It was inevitable that in such a situation mistakes would be committed, even mistakes of a serious character. It is inevitable because something new is being attempted: Not replacement of one class rule by another only, but simultaneously creating conditions for the total abolition of class rule itself.

It is also inevitable that wrong theories would be propounded again and again. And we have got to go forward by correcting them from time to time. But it is not enough to see this, it is necessary to realise also that these mistakes should be as few as possible and they should be rectified as quickly as possible. If we do not see this, then we would not be doing justice to the masses of our country, the proletariat of our country, to the cause of world socialism itself.

It is precisely this recognition and speedy correction of mistakes that was prevented by the cult of personality. Herein we have to see the harm done by the development of cult of personality. That is, if powers to do miracle are ascribed to certain persons, if they are looked upon as infallible, then inevitably the tendency would be to okay everything these persons say or do and, therefore, mistakes would accentuate and get perpetuated. That is, a speedy

correction becomes difficult if the cult of personality exists.

Mistakes often get committed because of the nature of the situation, because of the complexity of the tasks, but those mistakes fail to get corrected, they pile up and lead to new mistakes if the cult of personality grows. It is in this context that the criticism has to be understood.

The sharp criticism is not with a view to discredit Stalin. I did not meet any person in the USSR who in any way minimised the immensity of the achievements of this period and also the fact that Stalin's was the outstanding role in this. But they say that mistakes were committed and they were not speedily corrected because of the cult of personality, the belief that a particular individual is infallible, a belief which Stalin himself gradually came to foster. Collective leadership cannot come into existence only by regular meetings. No one should consider himself to be infallible—this is the precondition for collective functioning. Because collective leadership presupposes readiness to understand each other and correct one's own mistakes.

If the cult of personality grows, gradually innerparty democracy comes to an end, collective functioning ceases, even regular meetings do not take place, the party fails to assess its work objectively and learn from its mistakes.

Therefore let us first recognise the immensity of the achievements and the tasks, see that mistakes were committed in the execution of these tasks, and that these mistakes did not get corrected because of the cult of personality, which resulted in the continuation of old and commission of new mistakes. All this did serious damage to the party and the movement.

Comrades would like to know what kind of damage has been done due to this.

I shall not be able to deal with it in detail, but I would like to mention certain facts. For example, regarding

agriculture, it has been stated that a serious situation developed in agriculture because of certain policies, which were later rectified after Khrushchov's report made in September. You will see the rectification that was made. Then it was pointed out that mistakes were committed with regard to Yugoslavia. Further, there was lack of vigilance about the attack of Hitler's Germany.

But I want to deal with another and a more vital question. That question is the position of the security services and the question of Beria. It has been stated that the security services abused their power, that they grew into 'a state within the state' and that certain excesses were done.

Class struggle as we all know leads to the overthrow of capitalism. It does not cease after the bourgeoisie has been overthrown. Dictatorship of the proletariat is a determined war waged by the proletariat against an enemy who has been overthrown but not yet destroyed, who is not in power but still very powerful. The question arises—what happens after the abolition of classes? As you know, by about 1934 in the Soviet Union hostile classes came to be eliminated. The big capitalists had been eliminated long ago and by 1934 the kulaks also had ceased to exist as a class. The question was whether there would be class struggle even after this. It was correctly pointed out by Stalin that there was the capitalist encirclement and there were elements from among hostile classes and degenerates who act as agents of imperialism outside. Therefore we cannot say that class struggle had ended. Vigilance had to be exercised so that the enemies of the working class do not take advantage of the situation. Capitalism continues to survive in the minds of men for a long period and sustained struggle had to be waged to eliminate it. But the concept that class struggle becomes more and more intensified as the socialist society grows stronger and stronger—this was a wrong and dangerous concept. It led to the tendency to brand as 'enemies of the people'

even those who were only politically wrong or who politically differed. It led to excessive reliance on security services and underestimation of the fact that the socialist society, as it grows, develops the moral power to isolate and combat harmful trends and tendencies, and educate elements from all sections.

The result was that the security forces came to occupy extraordinary powers and when a person like Beria took charge of these services, excesses were committed. Not merely enemies were made the target, but action was taken against some others and they were persecuted.

Such a theory, and the practical measures that followed, created an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust in many spheres and prevented frank criticism and self-criticism. Men like Beria took full advantage of the situation to creep into responsible posts and use them against the interest of the socialist society.

Beria had a shady past. In the years of the civil war he was on the side of the bourgeois-nationalists in Transcaucasia who wanted to overthrow the Soviet government. The organisation was directly in touch with the imperialists, financed and helped by them. Subsequently certain persons who knew Beria in those days tried to expose him and Beria used his power in the state apparatus to liquidate them. One of the things which contributed to the growth of his power and one of the reasons for the excesses—was this understanding about the intensification of class struggle under socialism.

From this it should not be taken to mean that all the trials that took place in the Soviet Union were fabricated. Many of those who were punished were guilty. But in several cases the punishment was excessive and also a number of innocent people suffered. This particular theory about class struggle and the manner in which it was applied and understood did damage to Soviet law and authority and there were violations of the rules laid down by Soviet law.

Doctrinairism grew inside the party and the concept grew that certain persons are to develop theory and others are merely to apply it. Initiative got stifled. This prevented the party from working out a flexible policy on several issues.

Doctrinairism affected other parties too. In 1924 Stalin made a well-known speech where he stated that the Indian—bourgeoisie is split in two sections—one of which had already managed in the main to come to agreement with imperialism. For a long time a discussion started inside our party on this—which section? The fact is that it is an incorrect statement. It is believed by events. Yet none of us even dared to say it is wrong. It was assumed that it cannot be wrong because Stalin has stated it. This doctrinairism grew not in one party, but in many parties. It was thought that it is the job of particular parties and of particular leaders to develop Marxism and others were merely to apply the theories. A tendency developed to fit facts into particular theories and when they did not fit in, to deny the facts themselves.

In organisation also, with the growth of the cult of personality, methods of personal leadership came into existence and started getting reproduced at the lower levels also. This happened in many cases.

Again, this method of personal leadership is a factor which prevents correct assessment of the situation and pooling together of experience and results in serious mistakes.

So it has been correctly pointed out that both in the realm of theory and practice, the growth of cult of personality did serious damage. One question may be asked: Why Stalin did this? Was it that he was seeking some personal ends?

Every one with whom I have talked is of the opinion that there was no trace of any personal interest as far as Stalin was concerned. Everything he did, he did very sincerely believing that that was in the best interests of

socialism, of the working class and of the revolution. But he came to believe in his infallibility and so he began to think that he alone was right. He developed the habit of distrusting others. The practice of constant consultation, of seeing his own mistakes declined. The aim he set before himself was the strengthening of socialism and the revolution; but there itself, with the growth of cult of personality and with the belief in his own infallibility, he committed mistakes and these mistakes did damage politically and theoretically.

All this, let me repeat again, should not be allowed to blur in any way the gigantic achievement of the USSR in every sphere, the immense advance registered by the world communist movement and the outstanding role played by Stalin in all this. To do that would mean to deny facts, to distort history.

At the same time, we must also recognise that serious mistakes were committed and but for these mistakes the achievements and the advance could have been still greater. Today, with old methods of leadership abandoned and collective functioning restored, we can confidently look forward to such advance.

The leadership of the CPSU, by boldly declaring ideological war against the cult of personality and by laying bare the damage it has done, has rendered great service to the Soviet people, to the people's democracies and to the entire international communist movement. Whatever criticism we may make of the specific manner in which this was done, the fact remains that the job had to be undertaken. Whatever temporary confusion it may have created, in the long run it will be of great help to all communist parties.

Many of us may be critical of the way in which certain things were done. But we must not permit a spirit of cynicism to develop in relation to the USSR and the CPSU. That would be fatal for our movement. Let us remember what the bourgeoisie had hoped for when Stalin died. They had thought that the CPSU would go to pieces. Not only

that has not happened, but the present leadership has fully demonstrated its capacity in deeds. The success which its peace policy has attained is there. The security services have been deprived of their extraordinary power. Collective leadership has been restored. Big advance has been made in raising the standard of life of the people. Marxism-Leninism has been creatively developed. The CPSU remains the leading party of the international communist movement and its record shows it is worthy of the trust reposed in it by the Soviet people.

Then in the organisational sphere, certain other principles have been laid down in the report which are of value not only to the CPSU but to all parties.

It points out: "The main thing in the party's work of organisation is work among the masses—to influence the masses and rally them for the accomplishment of the economic and political tasks set by the party. We must no longer tolerate a situation when workers of the party apparatus, instead of being daily amidst the masses, confine themselves to their offices, produce reams of resolutions, while life passes them by."

This is equally true of many other parties, particularly of our party. Here another thing I will read out: "Unfortunately, in many party organisations we still find the absurd juxtaposition of party political work and economic activity. We come across party 'leaders' who hold that party work is one thing and economic and government work quite another. These 'leaders' even complain that they are being diverted from so-called 'pure party' work and are made to study economics, technology and agronomy, to study production."

What is the significance of this for us? Every party is faced with the same problem—not only parties in power. a kind of divergence between party work and mass work has grown in many parties. As we know, it is there in our party to a considerable extent.

Then, "Many party organisations are oblivious of the party principle that, together with proper utilisation of old cadres, young people who have proved their mettle in practical work should be boldly promoted to leading posts." This is another vice which is found not only in the CPSU—is this not there in our party?

Again, "Despite this progress in disseminating knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, the position in respect to ideological work is still unsatisfactory. The main shortcoming at present is that it is largely divorced from the practice of communist construction." Divorce between ideological work and practical problems is a common failing of all communist parties but is especially found in our party.

The 20th congress of the CPSU is a landmark in the history of the international communist movement. On the basis of mighty victories it showed the way to still greater victories. Eschewing all dogmatism and doctrinairism, it tackled the current problems in a bold way, creatively developing Marxism-Leninism. It has shown what possibilities have opened out and how these can be realised for uniting all patriotic, democratic and socialist elements in every country for advance in every sphere, for new successes, for the cause of the people and the working class.

34. Political Resolution

1. INDIA UPHOLDS THE CAUSE OF NATIONAL FREEDOM, PEACE AND ASIAN UNITY

The period we are passing through is rich with events of world-historic importance. The breach that was made in the system of world imperialism by the October revolution was further widened, after the victory over the forces of fascism, by the ending of capitalist rule in the countries of Eastern Europe, by the emergence of the Chinese People's Republic, by the formation of the Democratic Republic of Korea and Vietnam. The emergence of socialism from within the bounds of a single country and its transformation into a world system, the growing consolidation and unity of the socialist world, exercise powerful influence on the entire course of world developments. The balance of forces has decisively shifted in favour of the camp of socialism and democracy. Due to the massive achievements of the socialist world and its growing contrast with the world of capitalism, the ideas of socialism are gaining support in every country among ever broader sections of the people.

The great victories and the phenomenal advance of the national-liberation movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries have delivered shattering blows against the imperialist colonial system, which is rapidly disintegrating. Countries of the former colonial world, which have shaken off imperialist rule and taken to the path of independent development, find in the socialist world a firm ally in the struggle for defence of freedom and peace. They

Adopted at the fourth congress of the Communist Party of India, Palghat, 19-29 April 1956.

find in the socialist world market a powerful means to strengthen their national economy and rid themselves of dependence on imperialist powers. This leads to the establishment of increasingly closer relations between the socialist countries and the former colonial countries—a factor that further weakens the imperialist system.

These developments have considerably reduced the sphere of domination of the imperialist powers and deepened the crisis of the capitalist system. They have accentuated all its contradictions. In order to solve these contradictions and overcome the crisis of their system, the most aggressive elements among the imperialists strive to suppress the working class, democratic and national-liberation movements, to reimpose their colonial rule on the peoples of Asia under the garb of military alliances and to win world supremacy by means of war. They reject proposals for the banning of atomic weapons. They press forward with the rearming of Western Germany and prevent the peaceful unification of the German people. They are sabotaging the agreement for the unification of Vietnam. They are trying to whip up tension in several areas. But the efforts of the imperialists are suffering defeat after defeat. A number of countries, declaring nonparticipation in military blocs as the principle of their foreign policy, are opposing the war-plans. A vast zone of peace has come into existence. The bold and resolute measures taken by the socialist and peaceloving states in defence of peace, their growing unity and might, their positive steps in the direction of relaxing tension, the peaceful role played by a number of nonsocialist countries headed by India, the powerful growth of the democratic, workingclass and peace movements, have not only repeatedly frustrated the plans of the warmongers but have led to the creation of a new atmosphere in international relations. The idea of peaceful coexistence, the principle of settlement of disputes between states by peaceful means, have won historic victories.

The danger of war remains and will require constant struggle on the part of the forces of peace. But these forces of peace have already attained immense strength and

are rapidly growing stronger. In this situation, the possibility has opened out of defeating the attempt to drag the world into war and of ensuring lasting peace. It is this possibility and the confidence born out of it that moves the partisans of peace in all countries to strive to build the broadest unity of all forces, parties and organisations opposed to war, for more resolute struggle for further relaxation of tension and for establishment of relations of friendship between states.

The Communist Party of India had warned that India's newly-won independence and sovereignty would be threatened by the imperialist powers who were bent on subjugating independent nations in pursuit of their drive for war and colonial conquests.

The party had warned that the NATO and other military pacts of American imperialism with European powers were not only directed against the USSR, but constituted a menace to the independence and freedom of all nations, including the nations of Asia. It had declared that notwithstanding Britain's pretended friendship with India and India's connection with the British commonwealth, Britain, which is one of the chief colonial powers, would do everything to undermine Indian independence. From the beginning, therefore, it had demanded a foreign policy free from British influence, a policy based on friendship among all nations, a policy of peace and opposition to colonial conquests and war. The party had repeatedly stated that only by pursuing a consistent policy of opposition to imperialism and war, could India's interests be protected and her independence strengthened.

The years that have passed and the shifts that have taken place in the government's foreign policy have vindicated the line of the party. Under the stress of the war-danger, of imperialist pressure against Indian independence, and in the background of the increasing strength of the forces of peace and democracy in the country and the world, the government of India has moved more and more against imperialist powers and openly championed the cause of world

peace, Asian independence and solidarity, and Indian freedom.

In this worldwide battle against the menace of war, against military pacts, for the establishment of relations of peace, for the banning of weapons of mass destruction, the republic of India in recent years has played an increasingly important role, a role that has heightened India's international prestige and evoked in every patriotic Indian a sense of national pride. This role has won India the friendship and respect of peaceloving states and forces. It has heightened the isolation of the imperialists, strengthened the resistance of the countries of Asia to imperialist pressure. The emergence of India as a sovereign and independent republic upholding the cause of peace and freedom is a factor of profound significance in the presentday world.

Of historic importance was the Nehru-Chou declaration of 28 June 1954, which enunciated the panchshila. The five principles that should guide all countries in their mutual relations have since then been accepted by the USSR and by a number of countries and have exercised great influence on the whole world.

The Bandung conference, of which India was one of the chief sponsors, became a rally for Asian-African solidarity and against colonialism and dealt a powerful blow in defence of peace.

The friendship between the Indian and Soviet peoples which was strengthened by the warm welcome accorded to prime minister Nehru when he visited the USSR, the friendship which found unforgettable manifestations during the visit of N. A. Bulganin and N. S. Khrushchov to India is a most important factor for world peace. This friendship, and the agreements that have followed from them, set a model before the whole world of the relationship that can be established between states with different political systems.

The new relationship between India on the one hand and the socialist world headed by the USSR and China on the other, is not merely a factor that strengthens world peace. It is also an important means to strengthen India's

own position in world affairs, to strengthen India's freedom and economy—as can be seen from the declarations made by the leaders of the USSR on Kashmir and Goa and from the economic agreements that India has concluded with the USSR and other socialist countries.

The Communist Party which has been fighting for a consistent policy of peace and for friendly relations with peaceloving states, welcomes and supports these achievements and will continuously strive to rouse and unite the people to carry them forward.

The policy of peace is a genuine national policy, an anti-imperialist policy which continues and carries forward the traditions of our democratic movement. Hence it is that the struggle for such a policy provides the basis for broad unity embracing every class and every sections of our people that desires to heighten India's world prestige and consolidate her freedom. In India and in many countries of Asia, the struggle for peace is getting linked with the struggle for defence of freedom, for Asian unity, against the pressure of imperialist warmongers who have banded themselves together in war pacts. The struggle for peace is tremendously strengthening the struggle against the whole imperialist camp. Further, the coming together of masses of different parties in the common struggle for defence of peace and freedom, for Asian unity, for friendship with the USSR and China, has strengthened the mass democratic movement and extended its sweep. The growth of mass struggles in defence of the immediate interests of the people, the growth of mass organisations and the strengthening of the general democratic movement, have given added strength to the movement for peace. Life itself has shown how the struggles for peace and defence of national freedom, for democratic rights and vital interests of the masses, are inseparably linked and strengthen each other.

Finding that India is not ready to toe their line, the imperialist powers, including Britain, have in recent years done everything to threaten India with encirclement and blackmail it into submission. The Baghdad pact, which was organised under the leadership of Britain, creates a serious

danger to India's security. The commonwealth countries—Australia, New Zealand and Britain which are members of the SEATO—encouraged Pakistan's claims on Kashmir at one of the sessions of the SEATO powers. Britain intervenes on behalf of Portugal on the question of Goa and backs Portuguese occupation of Indian territory. Britain and the commonwealth countries thus work against Indian interests, notwithstanding the government of India's claims about the benefits of the commonwealth connection.

The American imperialists follow a still more blatant line of intervention against India and do everything to undermine India's independence. The US-Pakistan military pact is an open attempt to change the balance of arms in this area, set Pakistan against India and create tension between the two countries. It is an attempt to make Asians fight Asians, and the provocative border incidents of recent days constitute a grave warning to the Indian people that imperialist conspiracies are afoot against the freedom of India.

The formation of the SEATO of which Pakistan is a member, the provocative support to Portugal on the question of Goa and Pakistan, on the question of Kashmir, constitute other menacing steps taken by American imperialists against India.

The NATO, the SEATO and other military pacts are designed to create armed camps around India and to put pressure on India to join the war-bloc.

The Indian people cannot ignore these grave happenings. The Communist Party of India draws the attention of the entire people to these and calls on them to unite and fight together this growing menace.

The Communist Party of India welcomes the fact that the government of India has seen this danger and is resisting imperialist pressure and blackmail against India.

The imperialist warmongers are suffering fiasco after fiasco in their game of blackmailing the Asian countries by their war-blocs. The growing strength of the peace camp and solidarity of Asian countries for freedom and against war is inflicting blows on the warmongers. The recent election results in Ceylon and the peace policy of its new gov-

ernment, the resistance of various West Asian countries to war conspiracies, are significant developments which show that it is possible to defeat the imperialist conspiracies and preserve and strengthen peace and freedom in Asia.

The policy of peace pursued by the government of India helps the people of the world to avoid the menace of another war and simultaneously curbs the enemies of Indian independence.

The Communist Party of India calls upon the people to exercise vigilance on the question of Kashmir and defeat the imperialist game of embroiling India and Pakistan in conflicts. It is, therefore, urgent that the Kashmir problem be settled peacefully through negotiations and the Communist Party of India considers that both India and Pakistan should settle the issue of Kashmir by taking the present ceasefire line as the basis for demarcation of the boundaries, and should restore the traditional economic and trade relations of Kashmir as part of peaceful relations between India and Pakistan.

Although the present foreign policy of the government of India conforms to the interests of the entire Indian people (including the national bourgeoisie), important elements, including some in leading positions in the ruling party, are getting apprehensive about the implications of such a policy. While among the mass of congressmen the progressive orientation of the government's foreign policy has evoked great response, it is not without significance that some of the top leaders of the Congress seldom speak against the military pacts that menace Indian freedom, against the moves of the aggressive imperialists. Some of them are striving for modification of the policy. These elements are strengthened in their attitude by the refusal of the congress leadership to join hands with other parties and organisations for a common movement for peace.

This makes it even more imperative that resolute efforts be made for the initiation and building of a united national movement of all forces, parties and organisations, including the Congress, to support and strengthen the peace

policy of the government of India and for the defence of India's freedom and security.

The situation also enhances the importance of vigilance and of a more active role than before in the building of such a movement, of the working class, peasantry and democratic masses in general and their organisations.

The cause of freedom, of Asian unity and peace demands the strengthening of the struggle for break with British commonwealth and severance of the political and military relations which commonwealth membership involves. Membership of the commonwealth headed by Britain, which is one of the chief enemies of world peace and of Asian and African peoples, which is striving to drown in blood the freedom struggle of the people of Cyprus, is inconsistent with India's present role in world politics, with its policy of resistance to war, of building Asian solidarity, of support to nations fighting for freedom. Also commonwealth membership subjects our foreign policy to British imperialist influence as seen in the continued 'transit facilities given to gorkha soldiers to Malaya, as also in the dependence on the imperialists for arms and equipment for our defence forces.

The task of the Communist Party in relation to the struggle for peace and the defence of national freedom, is to unite and mobilise the masses on the broadest possible scale in nationwide campaigns:

- (1) Against the danger of war, for the prohibition of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction and for disarmament.
- (2) Against military pacts, especially the SEATO and the Baghdad pact.
- (3) For strengthening Asian solidarity and for a pact of collective peace for Asia and the Pacific region.
- (4) For restoring to the People's Republic of China its legitimate rights in the United Nations; for strengthening the bonds of friendship and cooperation with the USSR and China in all fields—economic and cultural and on international issues on the basis of the panchshila.

- (5) For full support to the colonial peoples' struggles against imperialism.
- (6) For effective measures for the liberation of Goa.
- (7) For improvement of relations with Pakistan, for settlement of outstanding issues through methods of peaceful and friendly negotiations; for a no-war pact; for reestablishing economic relations between India and Pakistan dislocated by partition; for removing all barriers that stand in the way of mutually beneficial relations between our two peoples and for promotion of cultural and other activities which strengthen the bonds of brotherly relations between them.
- (8) For break with British commonwealth.

2. RESULTS OF THE GOVERNMENT'S ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL POLICIES

In this world context of the emergence of socialism as a world system, which has broken the monopoly of imperialists in capital goods and technical knowhow and is prepared to share its experiences with the underdeveloped countries and to trade with them on terms of equality and mutual benefit, in the context of the weakening of the camp of imperialism with its colonial system disintegrating, bright possibilities of overcoming economic backwardness as well as the dependence on imperialists and of rapidly advancing along the path of an independent economy ensuring industrialisation of the country and prosperity to the people have opened up before the Indian people. But in order to fully realise these possibilities, it is essential to strengthen and unite the democratic forces inside our country in popular movements and mass struggles against the legacies of the past colonial regime and for correct policies in the interests of the people and the country. For this it is necessary to understand and analyse the internal policies of the government and appraise

their actual effect on our country and on the life of our people.

The irrigation projects that have been completed in the first five-year plan and the Sindri fertiliser factory have helped agricultural production. Aided considerably by good monsoons, production of foodgrains and industrial raw materials such as cotton and jute has registered an advance. All these have been substantial gains to the nation. Import of foodgrains, cotton and jute has been considerably brought down, thus saving a substantial amount of our foreign exchange.

Similarly the development of hydroelectric power has been an important gain. It not only lays a power-base for industrialisation, but also would help the proper utilisation of subsoil water for agricultural production in vast areas where no other irrigational facilities are available.

The community projects and national extension service (NES) by laying village roads, by digging wells and taking up such schemes, have catered to certain elementary needs of the villages which have been long neglected. The distribution of fertiliser loans and other loans for improvement of land in the areas under community projects has however benefited mainly the richer sections of the peasantry.

The increase in the production of cotton, jute and other industrial raw materials and the building of a number of projects and other constructional activities by the government, together with the policies pursued by the government, have also resulted in increase of industrial production, whose index rose to 125.7 in 1955 with 1951 as the base year.

All these gains for the nation, however, have not resulted in an all-round strengthening of the national economy. The standard of life for the vast majority of people continues to be low. All the economic features of a backward country continue.

The first plan did not result in the building of basic and heavy industries, the basis of the industrialisation of the country. Secondly, the increase in industrial produc-

tion has been brought about mainly by increased utilisation of installed capacities and not by any appreciable expansion and development of capacities. Even so, many of the industries continue to work below their installed capacity. Thirdly, the increase has taken place in the big industrial units at the cost of medium and small industrial units which continue to languish. Fourthly, the plan has not resulted in improving the relative position of industry in our economy.

In the field of land relations, the abolition of statutory landlordism such as the zamindari and jagirdari systems has been carried out in most of the states. Although huge compensation has been paid to the zamindars and large tracts of fertile land have been left in their hands, this measure has no doubt curbed the powers of these statutory landlords and restricted the old time feudal exploitation. The first plan laid down certain broad lines of agrarian reforms. These included fixity of tenure for the tenants for a period of five years and reduction of rents payable by them to the landlords to between 20 and 25 per cent of the gross produce and fixation of a ceiling on landholdings. The measures for the reduction of rents and for conferring rights of tenure are yet to be passed in a number of states. And even where they have been passed, they contain serious loopholes and their implementation has been left to bureaucratic officials, strongly linked with the landlords through innumerable ties, with the result that these measures have not been implemented in vast areas.

The ceilings on landholdings have not been fixed in the majority of the states and even where they have been fixed, the laws have been framed in such a way that very little land has been available for distribution.

But even the talk of these reforms has led to mass eviction of peasants in every state which has been connived at and, at least in some cases, encouraged by the state governments in which landlord interests predominate.

The irrigation schemes have been accompanied by prohibitive betterment levies and water taxes. All this to-

gether with the fact that large sums of money have to be spent for converting dry lands into wet lands, has led to the sale of lands by the peasants who cannot afford such prohibitive costs.

No steps have been taken to scale down the unconscionable debts of the peasants, which have gone on mounting. Their misery has been further increased by sharp fluctuations of prices of their produce.

Experience has shown that the peasants cannot effectively avail of the laws relating to rent reduction so long as complete security of tenure is not ensured. Experience has also shown that the implementation of the existing agrarian laws depends essentially on the strength of the peasant movement and the unity of the peasantry.

As for the working class, it too fared badly under the plan. The increase of production of industries has been brought about by intensifying the rate of exploitation of the working class. Through schemes of rationalisation and intensification of labour, productivity increased by 44 per cent. This led to a decline in the number of workers employed in factories, and thousands of workers faced retrenchment and unemployment. Although productivity of the employed workers increased by 4½ per cent, their real wages have just touched the prewar level.

Moreover, in a number of factories, particularly in medium and smallscale industries, wagecuts have also been resorted to. In the major industries bonus has been cut down. The fall in price of foodgrains was immediately accompanied by a cut in the dearness allowance of workers.

The problem of mass unemployment has become acute all over the country—among workers as well as the middle class and artisans, in the cities as well as in villages.

While the condition of the masses has thus not registered any appreciable improvement and has actually worsened for vast sections of peasants, agricultural labourers, workers and middle class, monopoly capitalists have

reaped rich harvest out of the implementation of plan. The profits of the monopolists—both Indian and British—have gone on increasing. This can be seen in the fact that the profits of our industries increased from Rs. 318 crore in 1950, the preplan year, to Rs 511 crore in 1954, whereas in the same period the wage bill increased from Rs 193 to 207 crore only and the salaries bill from Rs 39 to 42 crore only. This meant that the share of the monopolists in the net income from industrial production went up from 57 to 67 per cent, while that of the workers and employees declined from 43 to 33 per cent in the same period.

This process of increasing profit has continued in the year 1955.

The price that the Indian people had to pay for this development has been a heavy one. In addition to the sufferings of the peasantry due to violent fluctuations in price, increased agricultural debts and usurious interests, the increased workload on the workers and attack on their working conditions and increased unemployment, tax burdens on the people have gone on mounting year after year. On the other hand, direct taxes on the monopolists (income and corporate taxes) have declined in absolute terms in this very period when their profits have increased enormously.

These results are not fortuitous. They are the inevitable results of the policies that underlay the first five-year plan. A government of the bourgeoisie and landlords, in which the former is the leading force, sought to develop capitalism in India. But it sought to do so not by such radical agrarian reforms as would substantially reduce the burdens on peasants, thereby ensuring a stable and expanding internal market, but by compromising with feudalism and by protecting landlords. Hence it guaranteed huge compensation to zamindars and allowed them to keep large areas as selfcultivated land. It generally intervened and helped the landlords through its repressive machinery and police to evict the tenants in the name

of law and order. Through all these and other measures, like the distribution of chemical manure and irrigation facilities, it sought to modify feudal relations and develop capitalism in agriculture.

Allocation of capital issue, raw material, transport, import and export licences, etc., was carried out by this government in such a way as to benefit mainly the monopolists.

It sought to develop industries not by attacking the positions of British capital but by placing reliance on the imperialists for the supply of capital goods and technical knowhow, and by wooing foreign capital for investment in private industries. For this purpose, it did not shirk from giving concessions to foreign monopolists, not given to any Indian national. It allowed them the right of unrestricted export of profits and repatriation of capital while denying us capital goods and technical knowhow. Inevitably, as a result of this policy, it relied on the imperialist market for our export and import trade and refused to change the pattern of our foreign trade, by developing trade with the Soviet Union and the socialist market.

This policy did not produce the expected results. The imperialists did not pour in capital for industrial development nor did they give India the needed capital goods. Not only have these hopes been belied but with the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, Indian capitalists have been facing more and more fierce competition from imperialist quarters both here in India and in the export markets outside. Moreover, the imperialists utilised their hold over India's foreign trade to inflict on it unequal terms of trade, thereby inflicting more misery on the masses. The government's policies enabled the imperialists to ship more profits out of the sweat and toil of the Indian people.

Being counter to the interests of the masses and of the country, such policies could not be carried out without giving rise to mass opposition—struggle of workers against retrenchment and intensification of workload; struggles

of peasants against evictions, new taxes, low prices for their goods; struggles of agricultural workers for living wage, for land; struggles of middleclass employees for human conditions of life; struggles of students against rising educational fees and for academic rights; struggles of citizens of all classes for civil liberties. These struggles have, in many cases, brought together masses following different parties, helped the growth of common mass organisations, evoked wide popular sympathy and have been supported by solidarity actions. They have heightened the consciousness of the people, ranged them against the attack of vested interests and the antipeople policies of the government, halted in many places the offensive of monopolists and landlords and won important concessions.

While the government has taken a hostile attitude towards the struggles of the people, it has lent powerful support to the vested interests. Wherever the masses have fought against worsening conditions of life, the attempt of the government has been to suppress them with a heavy hand. The policies of the government have thus meant attack on the standard of life of the people and their democratic rights.

It is evident, therefore, that the gains from the first five-year plan, which sought to develop national economy without wiping out feudalism, without attacking the positions and profits of British capital, by dependence on the imperialists and by reliance on profit motive of monopoly capital, rest on a weak economic and political basis. Conditions have not been created yet for steady and continuous advance, for effective utilisation of the productive forces of our country and its vast manpower, for popular participation in an effective manner in the tasks of national reconstruction. These conditions have yet to be created.

3. DRAFT PROPOSALS FOR THE SECOND FIVE-YEAR PLAN

The basic conflict in Indian society is the conflict between imperialism and feudalism on the one hand and the

entire Indian people, including the national bourgeoisie, on the other. The mass opposition to the policies of the government that grew rapidly in the period after the attainment of independence and expressed itself powerfully in the last general elections was, to a great extent, a product and reflection of this conflict. For the government of India, though desiring to strengthen national economy and national freedom, pursued policies that were in practice policies of protection of and concession to foreign capital and of alliance with the concession to landlordism, while striving to curb and modify it to some extent. The government gave free rein to monopoly capital to amass profits at the cost of the working class and the mass of the people. It sought to suppress the democratic movement.

The implementation of the first five-year plan, based on these policies, did not lessen this basic conflict in Indian society. The conflict has further intensified. Moreover the advance of the ideas of socialism and in particular the achievements of the Soviet Union and People's Republic of China are exercising a profound influence on the minds of the masses of our people. They are stirred by the deepest anti-imperialist feelings and are moved by a strong urge for national reconstruction.

As a result of these national and international developments, and on account of the growth of the mass movement for the strengthening of freedom, for radical reforms and for improvement in the conditions of the people, as well as the aspirations of the Indian bourgeoisie to develop India as an independent capitalist country, and also due to the experience of the first five-year plan, conflicts and contradictions have grown between imperialism and feudalism on the one hand and the needs of India's economic development on the other. This is reflected also in the growth of conflicts and contradictions between the government of India and imperialism.

All these, together with the relative strengthening of the national economy as also the position of the Indian bourgeoisie as a result of the increase in agricultural and

industrial production leading to an improvement in India's balance of payments position, have led to important modifications in many of the policies of the government.

This is seen in a number of measures taken by the government, such as the conversion of the Imperial Bank of India into the State Bank of India, the fourth amendment to the constitution, and the nationalisation of life insurance. The agreement with the Soviet Union for a steel plant, the Nehru-Bulganin declaration of December 1955, on economic cooperation, the growing trade relations with the countries of the socialist camp, all these clearly indicate that the government has abandoned its earlier abject dependence on the British and American imperialists for capital goods and technical knowhow and is prepared to take the help of the socialist world for developing our industries.

The experiences of the first five-year plan have not been without their lessons. It has become ever so clear that India cannot overcome its present economic backwardness and dependence, cannot reconstruct its economy without rapid industrialisation, without in particular building heavy machine-building industries, without carrying out radical agrarian reforms in which the distribution of land to the mass of agricultural labourers and poor peasants must occupy a most decisive place. In the period of the first plan, it has also been once again proved that in order to rebuild India's economy, it is essential to come to grips with the vested interests of British capital and feudalism in our economy and thus fight for the elimination of the legacy of the hated colonial regime. Equally has it been emphasised that the cause of industrialisation of our country and the balanced growth of our economy cannot be advanced by relying on imperialism and the capitalist world market.

Experience has once again proved that a democratic plan must make decisive inroads into the position of British capital in India and also of landlordism. It must weaken the position of monopoly capital in our national

economy and political life. It must substantially reduce the burden on the peasant masses. It must raise the standard of life of the people constantly and continuously and create an expanding internal market. It must be based on an equitable system of taxation, raising the necessary resources primarily from those who can bear the burden—the foreign capitalists, the landlords and princes and the big bourgeoisie. It must strive to create a stable price structure. It must make possible all-round advance in such spheres as health, housing, culture. It must mean the adoption of progressive labour laws, the ensuring of popular cooperation and the unleashing of popular initiative through the extension of democratic rights and civil liberties.

The path of independent capitalist development which the Indian bourgeoisie and the government have taken is underlined by the fact that “the rapid industrialisation with particular emphasis on the development of basic and heavy industries” has been declared as the “principal objective” of the second plan. Although the original proposals in regard to industrialisation, set forth in the plan-frame, have been modified in a reactionary direction due to the pressure of big business, a sum of Rs 691 crore has been allocated for largescale industries and minerals in the public sector. These include three steel plants with an estimated total production of 2.2 million tons of finished steel. In addition, provision has been made for fertiliser factories, a lignite project, and a heavy electrical plant, which will however commence its production at a much later date.

The fulfilment of the targets in the industrial sector would contribute to the reduction of India's dependence on foreign countries in respect of capital goods, particularly for light industries, and strengthen the relative position of industry in our economy.

The proposed higher allocations to protect and encourage village and smallscale industries are also a welcome feature.

The proposals for land reforms such as the enforcement of ceiling throughout the country, restriction of holdings for personal cultivation, as well as on the resumption of holdings for the same purpose, undoubtedly constitute a step in the right direction. Further, the necessity for reduction of rents to a maximum of 20 per cent of the produce has been greatly stressed and this is also a welcome feature.

These proposals, if they are speedily and fully implemented, will lighten to a certain extent the burdens on the peasantry and contribute to the expansion of the internal market.

These proposals, therefore, provide the basis for forging the broadest unity of the peasantry in order to get them implemented.

The Communist Party will seek to mobilise all the democratic and progressive forces in all the parties, including Congress, for the immediate acceptance by the government of India, and for the rapid implementation by the various state governments, of the proposals made by the land reforms panel of the planning commission. It will strive to forge united peasant movement on the basis of these proposals.

The proposed large investments in and expenditure on irrigation and power, community projects, and national extension services, and on social services such as health, education and housing are welcome, although they are admittedly still inadequate relatively to the needs.

Despite its emphasis on industries, its bolder physical targets and its other positive features, the second plan suffers from a number of serious limitations and weaknesses. The extremely inadequate provisions for heavy machine-building industries which have been made, substantially reducing even the original proposals of the plan-frame, will slow down the tempo of development and hamper the realisation of the objective of rapid industrialisation.

Contrary to the proposals of the plan-frame, the restrictions on the growth of the public sector on the one hand, and the most unduly increased allocations for the large-scale industries in the private sector, would lead to the *strengthening* of the monopolists and retard planned reconstruction of our economy. The heavy allocation for modernisation of largescale consumer goods industries will aggravate unemployment and seriously endanger smallscale and village industries.

These concessions to the monopolists will lead to *frittering away of our resources including foreign exchanges* and will seriously jeopardise the fulfilment of the targets of the draft plan. Moreover this will, as a whole, even *further strengthen the monopoly-dominated private industrial sector* instead of the public sector getting the desired ascendancy over the former.

The proposals for the agrarian sector suffer from serious weaknesses. These consist in exemptions of several types of land from the ceiling, thus further reducing the area of land available for distribution, provision for heavy compensation to the landlords (in lieu of the grant of ownership rights to the tenants), payment of a price for the surplus land that is to be distributed to the agricultural workers and poor peasants, absence of a proper provision for the restoration of lands to ejected tenants, and, above all, the absence of any measures of implementation of reforms by democratically elected committees of the peasants vested with adequate powers. Thus they do not ensure the distribution of the land to the agricultural labourers and poor peasants on a big scale, without which it is not possible to bring about an upsurge in our agriculture, general capital formation in the countryside, secure stability in our agricultural production and expansion of internal market.

It is no accident, therefore, that with its concessions to the monopolists, with its restrictions on the public sector, and finally with its refusal to undertake distribution of land to the land-hungry peasants on a big scale, the se-

cond plan fails to provide for any improvement in the employment situation. On the contrary, the unemployment situation is liable to be aggravated. It will also be noted that the plan does not propose practical measures for promoting labour enthusiasm and for ensuring mass participation. The question of guaranteeing living wage finds no place in it.

The attitude of the plan towards British and other foreign concerns operating in India cannot but cause serious concern. The proposal for nationalisation of British concerns in the branches in which they are powerfully entrenched is not accepted. The plan does not propose any effective measures against the operations of foreign capital in our country. Beyond what is available through usual taxations, the skyrocketing profits of the British concerns are not touched, the heavy remittances of funds by them from our country are still not proposed to be checked.

On the contrary, Rs 100 crore worth of new foreign private investment is provided for the plan period. Instead of taking over India's foreign trade at least in respect of principal commodities, assurances have been given that the existing volume of trade with Britain and America will continue to be maintained, thus making it possible for the imperialists not only to exploit our resources, but also obstruct planned developments, and the growth of India's trade relations with the USSR and other socialist countries. Similarly the plan permits the payment of compensation to the zamindars and refuses even to cancel the privy purses to the princes. Practically no restriction is placed on the profits of the monopolists, and they are allowed to deprive the country of the resources so essential for its reconstruction.

The second five-year plan proposes to raise the resources through foreign assistance, increased taxation, forced savings and heavy deficit financing. While the excessive reliance on foreign assistance makes the plan precariously dependent on extremely uncertain factors beyond our control, the increased taxation and forced savings spell fresh

economic burdens for the masses. The deficit financing on such a big scale as proposed in the plan (Rs 1200 crore), without measures to counteract the activities of monopolist-speculators, gives rise to the dangers of inflation and of further accumulation of wealth in the hands of the rich. In fact with the first dose of large deficit financing revealed in the budget for 1956-57 inflationary trends have started and prices of essential commodities have registered a sharp increase in the last two months. All these endanger the realisation of even the existing targets and make the future of the plan uncertain.

This method of financing the plan by throwing its burdens on the common people is bound to evoke their resistance. Hence it is that the draft does not propose any cut in the police expenditure which has progressively increased year by year. Hence also no extension of democracy for the people and tradeunion rights are proposed. On the other hand the draft proposes the imposition by law of a regimented trade union, which would loyally carry out the policies of the government in the interest of monopolists.

In government undertakings and services, government's rules, such as the government servants' conduct rules, the national safeguarding and security rules, and other measures are used to crush the independent tradeunion movement. Many a time workers face victimisation for holding political opinions other than those of the ruling party.

All these create serious dangers for the relatively progressive proposals that have been made in the draft. Experience has already shown that the landlord interests that are strongly entrenched in most of the state governments and the bureaucratic officials succeed in substantially sabotaging the implementation of the land reforms proposals, unless a strong kisan movement is built for implementation of these proposals.

It would be sheer defeatism, however, to think that the draft is the final word. It should be recalled that these

same reactionary modifications of the original proposals of the plan-frame in respect of industries came in for severe criticism by most of the members of the consultative committee, including congressmen, when the January memorandum of the planning commission, otherwise known as the blue book, was discussed.

What is essential is to fight for the restoration of the original proposals in the plan-frame, fight for their full implementation as also for the implementation of the progressive land reform proposals in a democratic way, and, finally, to fight for further improvements in the second plan with a view to ensuring rapid industrialisation of the country. It is of utmost importance that the reactionary features of the plan in respect of resources are resolutely combated and overcome. Equally is it necessary to develop the initiative of the masses and carry on sustained struggles for securing maximum benefits to the common people out of the allocations for social services, and for preventing bureaucratism, corruption, nepotism and waste in the execution of social service schemes. Popular intervention should be organised in a big way on every one of the issues connected with the formulation and implementation of the plan. In view of the conflicts over policies which have grown and are growing inside the Congress and, above all, in view of the growing strength of the democratic forces inside the country, immense possibilities have opened out for carrying out these tasks.

4. POLICIES OF THE GOVERNMENT AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THEM

The progressive features and possibilities of the plan as well as its limitations and weaknesses stem from the very character of the government of India and the aims it pursues. It is a bourgeois-landlord government in which the bourgeoisie is the leading force. Its policies are motivated by the desire to develop India along independent capitalist lines.

With this aim in view, the government strives to weaken the position of British capital in our economy. It strives to curb feudal forms of exploitation, transforming feudal landlords into capitalist landlords and create a stratum of rich peasantry that can act as the social base of bourgeois rule in the countryside. It strives to extend and develop the state sector which in the existing situation is essential for the development of capitalism itself. These aims and the measures resulting therefrom inevitably bring the government into conflict with imperialism, with feudalism and sometimes with the narrow interests of sections of the bourgeoisie, as was seen in the case of the nationalisation of life insurance. They also lead to conflict of policies, as seen in the entire controversies over the problems of industrialisation.

These conflicts have a progressive significance in relation to the democratic movement. They increase the possibilities to move the government, by mass pressure and by strengthening popular unity, in the direction of democratic reforms and against concessions to reactionary forces.

With the increased efforts for industrialisation in the conditions of today when the urge for national reconstruction among the people as well as the mass movement are both growing, these conflicts cannot but further sharpen making it possible for the democratic movement to secure the adoption of a number of measures that weaken the position of foreign capital in our economy as also that of the position of Indian reactionary forces in our political and economic life.

The Communist Party is vitally interested in such developments and strives to strengthen them, for they help in strengthening the democratic movement and in consolidating and extending the democratic front. Every step that is taken by the government for strengthening national freedom and national economy, against imperialist, feudal and monopoly interests, will receive our most energetic and unstinted support.

But it would be a profound mistake to consider that the sharpening of the conflict between imperialism and the government of India, of the conflict between feudalism and the needs of bourgeois development and the attempt of the bourgeoisie to strengthen its position in this conflict, have already led to or can by themselves lead to the internal policies of the government becoming popular, democratic. The bourgeoisie seeks to strengthen its position not merely in relation to imperialism and feudalism, but also in relation to the popular masses. It seeks to resolve its conflict with imperialism and feudalism at the cost of the people.

Therefore, while opposing imperialism and attempting to weaken its grip over national economy, the bourgeoisie simultaneously maintains its links with British capital and gives facilities for further inflow of foreign capital. While striving to curb and weaken feudalism, it simultaneously maintains its alliance with landlords, against the democratic forces and makes concessions to the landlords. While striving to industrialise the country, it seeks to place the burdens of economic development mainly on the common people. While extending the public sector, it simultaneously pursues policies of support to monopolists in their attacks on the working people and adopts many measures which enrich the monopolists and thus help them to strengthen their position in important spheres of our life. While calling upon the people to cooperate in the task of national reconstruction, it simultaneously strengthens the bureaucratic apparatus, places main reliance on it, refuses to extend democracy and to adopt measures that would improve the conditions of the people. These are policies that weaken and shackle the very classes that are the most resolute defenders of peace and national freedom—the classes without whose initiative and creative activity the nation cannot be rebuilt.

Due to all this and the divergence between the aims of industrialisation and the methods adopted by the government to achieve these aims, the process of development of

the country acquires a slow and halting character marked by twists and turns, giving rise to sharp conflicts and profound contradictions. They retard the sweeping away of the obstacles that stand in the way of India's development. They impose colossal burdens on the people, impoverish them, thus preventing stable and continuous expansion of the internal market.

In executing these policies, the government not only attempts to placate the people by making concessions and granting some relief, but often resorts to repressive measures also. In the day-to-day struggles of the masses as well as the struggles waged by the people on democratic issues, the congress government often resorts to wholesale arrests, lathicharges and even terror by shooting. The brutal suppression of the struggles in connection with the SRC report, the killings of Patna students, the firings on tea-garden workers of Darjeeling, the mass arrests in several places in connection with day-to-day struggles, all these reveal the callous character of the government in relation to the masses when they dare to resort to action in defence of their rights and interests. The struggle against this suppression, the struggle for protecting and extending the democratic rights, forms an integral part of the struggle for uniting the people.

In these circumstances the task of building national unity for peace, for defence and strengthening of freedom, for national reconstruction, for defence of the vital interests of the masses and for extension of democracy is an extremely complex task. It demands support to the government's stand in relation to the struggle for peace and efforts to strengthen it further. It demands support to all those measures of the government which weaken the position of imperialism and feudalism, curb monopoly and strengthen national economy. It demands the bringing of pressure on the government in order to accelerate the pace of industrialisation and the adoption of measures related to this task. It demands vigorous combating of the policies of compromise with and concessions to foreign

capital, landlordism and monopoly interests. It demands determined struggles against the government for improvement in the condition of the life of the people. It calls for vigorously combating and defeating the repressive measures of the government and securing the protection and extension of democratic rights. In order that the Communist Party may pursue such a revolutionary and flexible policy and play its rightful role as the builder and spearhead of the democratic movement, it must come forward as an independent national force. It must act as a party of opposition in relation to the present government.

Guided by the interests of the country and the people, the Communist Party will extend wholehearted support to the government in its policy of defence of peace and in every measure that the government takes to reduce the dependence of Indian economy on imperialism. But it will oppose the serious concessions the government makes to foreign capital and will mobilise the masses with a view to curtailing these concessions.

The Communist Party will support every measure the government takes against feudal landlords and for the land reform measures it has proposed. It will mobilise peasantry and our people against their sabotage by landlord interests in the state governments and the bureaucrats linked with them, and for a consistent implementation of these proposals through the democratic cooperation of the peasant masses and their organisations.

The Communist Party will resolutely fight against the government's policies of support to the monopolists attack on the working people, which result in fresh burdens on the masses. It will fight its antidemocratic policies that suppress democratic rights and civil liberties, disrupt the tradeunion movement and deny tradeunion rights. It will organise the mass movement of workers, peasants and other democratic sections with a view to defeat and reverse these policies as well as to secure relief for the people and to improve their conditions.

5. THE BASIC OBJECTIVE—PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY

While laying utmost emphasis on the task of building the broadest mass unity for immediate demands and for progressive policies, the Communist Party will also strive to make the masses realise, through their own experience, the necessity of bringing about basic transformations in our economy, in our social and state structure and the necessity of establishing a new government which can carry out these transformations.

In the course of its general propaganda and ideological-political activity among the masses, the party will systematically, concretely and constantly popularise the fundamental slogans of people's democracy—basic agrarian reforms with distribution of land to the peasants gratis, the confiscation of British capital and establishment of a democratic state—and emphasise the necessity of a government of people's democracy.

The attainment of political freedom by India and the leading position of the bourgeoisie in the Indian state do not alter the basic objective and basic strategy of the Indian revolution. It is the establishment of a government of people's democracy—which includes all the democratic classes, including the national bourgeoisie, and is led by the working class—that will bring the democratic revolution, but also put country on the path to socialism—the only correct path, in the present epoch, for the advance of every country. Therefore, while resolutely fighting for every progress that can be made under the present conditions, the Communist Party will carry on mass propaganda in favour of people's democracy and socialism.

6. FOR OVERCOMING THE DIVISIONS AMONG THE DEMOCRATIC MASSES

The immediate program which the Communist Party places before the country is a program whose implementation would lead to the strengthening of national freedom, rebuilding of national economy, improvement in the condi-

tion of the people and strengthening of the forces of democracy in our economic, political and social life.

It would consolidate national unity and enable India to play an ever more important role in world affairs. The Communist Party will, therefore, strive to build the broadest united front of all patriotic and democratic forces for the adoption and implementation of this program and for concrete policies and measures and struggles related to it.

Not merely is such unity an urgent necessity but the political situation in the country is favourable for its realisation.

The emergence of India as a world power and its role in world affairs have strengthened the urge among patriotic forces for bold and far-reaching measures in the internal sphere—measures that would liquidate the legacy of the colonial order and ensure national advance in every sphere. It has become evident to all that the menace to Indian freedom will remain as long as the country's economy remains weak. Developments in the world arena, growing contact with the socialist world, the massive achievements of socialism in the USSR and vivid demonstration of the advance made by China are having a powerful impact on the minds of our people. They are giving an impetus to radical, democratic and socialistic ideas. They are underlining the need for unity of democratic forces, for policies of national advance.

Democratic forces in India stand divided. The most important division is that between the democratic forces that follow the Congress on the one hand and the masses that follow the democratic opposition parties on the other. Further, the democratic opposition itself is divided—mainly among the masses that follow the Communist Party, Praja-Socialist Party and the Socialist Party. Besides there is a vast mass of unorganised people which is not lined up behind any of the political parties. These divisions manifest themselves in every class in Indian society. But in the recent period, significant advance has been made in the direction of overcoming these divisions. In the campaign

against the US-Pak pact and the aggressive plans of the imperialists, in the mighty welcome accorded to the Soviet leaders, masses of all parties have come together. Among masses of all parties, the desire and urge are growing for unity, for resistance to and struggle against the offensive of the vested interests and the government, for national reconstruction, for reforms and democracy. United struggles are growing in scope and intensity.

The Congress is trying to consolidate its position by utilising the radical, democratic and anti-imperialist sentiments of the people, as well as their urge for national reconstruction, and also by forging unity with such landlords and other reactionary elements as were opposed to it in the past. It has attained a measure of success in this. The limited gains under the first five-year plan, the easing of the food situation, the proposal for industrialisation under the second plan and the talks of socialist pattern of society, have given rise to hopes and illusions. These, together with the prestige that India has acquired as the result of its foreign policy, are being utilised by the Congress for its strengthening.

Nevertheless, as events have shown, this consolidation of the Congress is of an extremely uneven and partial character, and rests on unstable foundations. The actual practices of the government, belying claims in many spheres, give rise to sharp criticism. The measures of the government, often running counter to the very sentiments that the government strives to utilise, its deeds frustrating the very expectations that its promises raise, give rise to mass opposition and intensifies the conflict inside the Congress—sometimes forcing the government to retreat from its earlier position.

Among the members and masses of the Congress sentiments of peace and anti-imperialism, of friendship with the USSR and China, of democracy and socialism, for radical reforms in order to carry out the task of national reconstruction have made significant headway.

The adoption of socialism as its declared goal by the

Congress has to be viewed in this context. On the one hand, it is an attempt by the bourgeoisie to camouflage the real character of its policies, misled the masses and use their radical sentiments for consolidation of its own class rule. But it is also an indication of the growing power and attraction of the ideas of socialism—a development which the ruling class cannot ignore. Further, it has radical implications. The very declaration of socialism as a goal acts as a radicalising force. It strengthens the leftward swing among congressmen, congress masses and people in general, gives impetus to the demand for democratic reforms. While the mass of congressmen enthusiastically supports those policies of the government that help to strengthen national freedom, national economy and benefit the people, it is growing critical of anti-people, undemocratic policies and of the divergence between the declared aim of socialism and the actual practice. Many members of the Congress and the masses following them have not only opposed the antidemocratic measures and policies of the government in words, but joined hands with parties and masses outside the Congress in common struggles. On the issue of Goa, on the issue of linguistic states and opposition to merger proposals, on the issue of opposition to tax burdens as well as in relation to struggles for civil liberties, the country has seen powerful united campaigns in which members and masses of the Congress have played a significant role. Inside the parliament and state legislatures on several issues connected with the task of national reconstruction, many congressmen today voice the same sentiments as the parties of the democratic opposition, although party discipline prevents them from exercising their votes in the manner they would desire.

Among parties of the democratic opposition of which Communist Party, the Praja-Socialist Party and the Socialist Party are the most important, consciousness of the necessity of unity has grown and has led to united action on many issues related to the defence of the interests of the people, civil liberties, liberation of Goa, linguistic provinces as well as elections.

The barriers that divided the democratic masses and elements of different parties are slowly being overcome. Contacts have grown between the Communist Party on the one hand and the Praja-Socialist Party and the Socialist Party on the other, between the democratic elements inside the Congress on the other.

Struggles of the masses have been growing in all parts of the country and bringing about popular unity on an increasingly broader scale. They are having powerful impact on the consciousness of the people, giving concrete expression to the growing spirit of protest and resistance against reactionary policies and measures, strengthening unity, facilitating radicalisation.

The recent period has witnessed united struggles of the working class on a big scale in many parts of the country, struggles during which workers belonging to different trade unions and vast number of unorganised workers, united in defence of their common interests, heroically fought for their demands against the capitalists and against the repressive measures of the government. A significant feature of these struggles was the participation of workers following the INTUC as well as several INTUC unions. These struggles evoked general sympathy and support from broad democratic masses. In many cases important concessions were won demonstrating the power of unity. The struggles of the working class have not been confined to the economic plane alone. In the campaign for the liberation of Goa, in the fight for linguistic states, in the struggle of civil liberties, the working class in many centres played a leading role, exercising great influence on all classes and sections and powerfully strengthening the popular movement.

The determined struggles waged by the kisans against evictions, against mounting tax burdens, for land, the struggle of agricultural workers for adequate wages and for land, aided by the growth of radical and democratic sentiments in the country, have not only won many victories but are having an impact inside the Congress itself. This is reflected in the agrarian proposals of the second five-year plan and in the proposals of the land reforms panel.

All these are developments of immense importance for the democratic movement and open out vast possibilities. They are creating conditions for forging the broadest unity of the Indian people. This unity, in the existing situation, has to be a unity of the democratic and patriotic forces in all parties, of all those who are desirous of progress. It has to be directed towards the strengthening and acceleration of the progressive policies of the government, while combating the antipeople and undemocratic policies and measures which still predominate in the internal sphere, with a view to modify and reverse them. It has to be unity for the adoption and implementation of measures and policies which are in the interests of our country and our people. It has to be unity for a move to the left.

For the building of such unity, it is essential to adopt a correct attitude towards the political parties in the country, especially parties which have a considerable mass following.

Although the Congress is the political party of the bourgeoisie which has taken many landlords in its fold, it has among its members a vast number of democratic elements. It has an anti-imperialist and democratic tradition. Recent measures of the government and its promises have helped the Congress to rehabilitate its position even among some sections that were moving away from it. Simultaneously there has been a growth of radical and democratic sentiments inside the Congress and among masses following the Congress.

Our approach towards the Congress and the method of criticism of its political policies have to be such as take into account all these factors. They have to be such as do not repel honest congressmen but draw them towards unity. They have to be such as strengthen the fight for democratic policies inside the Congress itself, strengthen the forces that, however haltingly, are taking a relatively progressive stand.

The Indian National Congress is the ruling party. In the struggle against compromise with imperialist and feudal

interests, in the struggle against the powers of bureaucracy and police and for extension of democracy, it is against the policies of the government and the Congress that people have to fight. In these circumstances, no question therefore arises of a general united front with the Congress.

From this, however, it should not be concluded that the democratic front will be an anticongress front. This is so not merely because of the anti-imperialist and antifeudal tasks which we are faced with, but also because of the composition of the **Congress**.

The composition and character of the Socialist Party and the Praja-Socialist Party vary from state to state. Nevertheless, broadly speaking, they can be described as parties of the democratic opposition. The mass support they have secured is mainly on the basis of democratic opposition to the policies of the government and in the name of socialism. The cadres of these parties are socialist-minded.

Till recently the dominant leadership of the PSP (which included the Socialist Party also) pursued policies of violent denunciation of the USSR and China, of opposition to the movement for peace, of refusal to build democratic unity in the name of anticommunism, of attempt to secure agreement with the Congress. The errors of these policies are becoming evident to the members of the PSP and the Socialist Party and has resulted, during the last one year, in modification of such policies to some extent in several states. On a number of issues and in several campaigns and struggles, these parties have joined hands with the Communist Party and other democratic forces. Our Party will make every endeavour to consolidate and carry forward this process. The coming together of left parties helps to unite the advanced sections of the masses and is a factor of great importance for mass struggles as well as electoral contests.

The unity that the Communist Party strives to build is democratic unity. Such being the case, the attitude to be adopted towards communal parties, parties that divide the masses on religious basis must be an attitude of uncompro-

mising opposition to their disruptive communal ideologies and reactionary policies. The Communist Party will have no united front with them in any elections. At the same time, it will strive to draw the masses and individuals following these parties into common struggle and common activity. The party will at the same time defend and campaign for the legitimate demands of the minority communities.

The Communist Party will initiate a nationwide campaign for concrete policies and measures which help to strengthen the freedom and independence of India, to rebuild national economy and improve the condition of our people. An essential part of such campaign is the establishment of unity of action of masses in defence of their immediate interests and for the extension of their democratic rights.

The task of organising mass resistance against attacks on the people and for immediate improvement in their living conditions, solidarity actions, struggle for civil liberties and democratic rights is of exceptional significance. By conducting such struggles, we defend the interests of the people, consolidate their organisation and unity and also help the strengthening of those forces in the Congress that desire to develop our economy by attacking the position of British capital, landlordism and monopoly interests.

It is through these struggles, as well as activity and campaigns for democratic demands that masses of different parties come together, become conscious of the need for unity, of the power of unity and win concessions. It is through these struggles that their morale is heightened, popular support evoked and the attack of the government and the vested interests repulsed. It is through these struggles that conditions are created for the building of united organisations which are of vital importance for the consolidation of the democratic forces and for its strengthening.

It is necessary that whenever possible such mass strug-

gles are conducted through broad united committees representing the unity of the fighting masses.

These mass struggles also bring to the forefront the question of governmental policies—agrarian, labour, civil liberties, taxation, etc. They strengthen the movement against reactionary policies and forge mass unity for the adoption and implementation of progressive policies.

Essential though such struggles are for forging ahead of the democratic movement, they by themselves are not enough. They have to be combined with:

(1) Struggle for broadening of the mass movement for peace, for friendship with the USSR, China and other socialist countries, for Asian unity and against military pacts and for strengthening of relations with the socialist world market.

(2) Sustained and continuous mass campaign for popular policies for national reconstruction.

(3) Correct united-front tactics to overcome the division in the democratic movement and to end division in the working class.

(4) Sustained mass activity in all spheres, of which participation in and securing of maximum benefits from government schemes and projects are essential parts.

(5) Vigorous efforts to secure equal rights for women and effective intervention in the realm of culture, health, etc.

(6) Extension and strengthening of the mass organisations.

(7) Building a mass communist party.

Only if all these tasks are carried out simultaneously and mass struggles waged as an integral part of such activity, will it be possible to extend and strengthen the democratic front continuously, to coordinate partial struggles and transform into a mass political movement—powerful enough to defeat the antipeople policies of the government and make possible the adoption of progressive policies. Failure to carry out these tasks weakens the immediate struggles themselves, these struggles remaining on a local

sectional plane, evoking sympathy and admiration when fought heroically, winning some demands but unable to create a powerful impact on the democratic movement as a whole, unable to strengthen and broaden it.

A serious weakness of the democratic movement is the continuing disunity in the working class, which is split in rival and parallel trade unions with affiliations to different all-India tradeunion centres. It must be noted that the struggle for tradeunion and workingclass unity has registered significant progress. The growth of workingclass struggles against the offensive of the employers has helped to strengthen workingclass unity in action.

The formation of several all-India trade federations, embracing all sections of workers irrespective of their political affiliations, the merger of rival unions in important centres, the formation of joint committees for defending the interests of the workers in several centres, are all concrete manifestations of this growing urge for unity.

The growing friendly relations between our country and China and the Soviet Union, the increasing exchange of tradeunion delegations between India and the Soviet Union and between India and China, have all helped to combat anticommunist prejudices. They also help in intensifying the urge for unity. Conditions have matured for taking the struggle for tradeunion unity to a new and higher level.

In the face of these developments, the ruling class is making more determined efforts to weaken and wipe out the independent tradeunion movement. But today it seeks to camouflage its offensive under the slogan of tradeunion unity. Actually it seeks to impose by law regimented trade unions on the working class, which would carry out the policies to the ruling class and check the growth of resistance of the workers to the antiworkingclass policies of the government and the offensive of the employers.

However the recent agreement between the two wings of the railway workers' federation, the emergence of single federations of post and telegraph employees, defence workers and employees are all serious blows against this policy.

The unity of the railwaymen's federation and other federations has created a favourable situation for carrying the struggle for unity of the existing trade unions in various centres on the basis of the principle of one union for one industry and on the basis of democratic elections of office-bearers and committees of unions and also for the creation of a single all-India trade union centre. The most urgent need of the hour is to carry on a sustained campaign for such unity.

The spread of democratic and progressive ideas in all classes of the people has its repercussions on the working class in a very pronounced manner. The more the working class moves in the democratic movement, the more it allies itself with all progressive and democratic forces in the country.

The struggle for working class unity cannot be successfully waged without a determined struggle to prevent the imposition of black laws on the working class.

The struggle against the offensive of the capitalists and the government, the fight for better conditions of life, must get intertwined with the general tasks of the democratic movement enumerated before. This not only unifies the working class but also gets broad popular support for its demands and fights which are part and parcel of the struggle of the Indian people for a better livelihood, for democratic liberties, for national reconstruction, etc. The relation between unity, struggle and general democratic movement must be viewed in this light.

In particular it must constantly be explained how the fulfilment of the demands of the working class is essential for carrying out the reconstruction of our economy. This becomes all the more urgent today in view of the offensive of the employers and the government against the working class in the name of national reconstruction through such measures as rationalisation and increased workload.

Thus the attempt of the government to disrupt and split the working class, to regiment or bluff it in the name of national reconstruction, and to pit the public against the class, will be foiled. This will also enable the class to in-

tervene in and utilise measures and legislation brought forward by the government.

The working class has in some sectors wrested concessions from the government and the employers. A unified working class can further wrest important concessions not only for itself but also act as the spearhead of democratic movement more and more in the coming period.

In this situation the task of forging tradeunion unity in the form of creating united central tradeunion organisations on the basis of tradeunion democracy and industry-wise federations on an all-India basis, and the formation of one union in one industry, becomes more urgent than ever before. The democratic functioning of trade unions at all levels is of utmost importance.

An equally serious weakness, a weakness which keeps the whole democratic movement at a low level, is the inadequate political consciousness even among workers who are under the influence of the party. This comes in the way of moving them into action on a big scale on such broad democratic issues as peace, civil liberties, support to the demands of the peasants and other classes. The overcoming of this weakness is one of the most important tasks before the party.

An important factor in the democratic movement is the growing urge amongst middleclass employees, (teachers, clerks and others) to organise themselves into trade unions and to take to new and more militant forms of struggle hitherto confined to the working class. They are faced today with problems similar to those faced by the working class—inadequate wages, retrenchment, victimisation, growing unemployment and starvation. A further feature to be noted is the growing radicalisation of these sections due to the antipeople, antidemocratic policies of the government. We have to resolutely defend their interests and help to strengthen their organisations thereby drawing them into the democratic movement in unity with the working class.

The development of peasant struggles against evictions, heavy taxes and for adequate prices and agricultural loans, as well as struggles of agricultural workers for minimum

wage and for land, have made significant headway in the recent period and registered several victories. With growing deterioration in the condition of the mass of the peasantry, these struggles assume great importance throughout the country. Special stress has to be laid on the task of further extending and strengthening of the kisan sabhas and agricultural workers' unions.

A serious weakness still persisting in building of the democratic front is inability to lead solidarity movements in a proper and consistent manner between the working class and the peasantry. Therefore the Communist Party is to give serious attention to the building of such solidarity movements and unity of the working class and the peasantry, which would be the main basis of the united democratic front.

The party has to defend resolutely the interests of the oppressed masses—the working class, the agricultural labourers, the poor and middle peasants, the artisans and urban middle classes, who are the worst sufferers under congress rule. It is they who form the majority of our people and therefore must constitute the firm basis and the main force of the democratic movement at all stages of its development. The party must simultaneously champion the just demands of the rich peasants and of the small manufacturers and businessmen. In order to strengthen and advance the struggle of our people to achieve economic independence, the party will support the national bourgeoisie against foreign competition and in whatever effort it may take to overcome economic dependence.

The party shall initiate such campaigns and struggles as would unite the people on such issues as opposition to unjust taxation, defence of civil liberties and democratic rights, protection to national industries against foreign competition. The party shall initiate campaigns on concrete proposals regarding the plan and targets as well as for the implementation of the government projects and schemes in a manner most advantageous to the masses.

Women who constitute half of the population of the country and who can be potential force for the democratic move-

ment and for the fulfilment of the national tasks facing the country, still suffer under heavy social and economic disabilities. The Communist Party must effectively fight against these and for equal rights of women not only through parliamentary enactments but also through ideological struggle for changing the consciousness of the people. The party should also strive that women come into an organised women's movement, united on the basis of the tasks that face it.

The party has to pay serious attention to the problems facing the youth and students. It has to unfold activity on the widest scale, in cooperation with all sections and elements, to fight the menace of flood and famine, to combat unemployment and poverty, disease and illiteracy, making use of all measures of the government and existing laws. It has to constantly strengthen the mass movement for peace and draw into it all patriotic and peace-loving Indians belonging to all parties.

The tendency to keep away from schemes and projects sponsored or run by the government, though far less than before, still persists in several areas. This must be completely eliminated. We have to participate in them, actively and effectively combat corruption, inefficiency and bureaucratic practices, help to implement and run them in such a way that maximum benefit is secured for the people. At the same time we must take initiative in formulating popular schemes and plans. These schemes and projects are also important means to forge unity of all progressive elements, irrespective of the parties to which they belong, for serving the people. This must become an important part of the activity of the party and of the mass organisations where we work.

The struggle for democratisation of local bodies assumes great importance today. The government at the centre and in the states entrusts the administration more and more to officials in preference to the local elected bodies. Even the existing powers of such bodies are being curtailed. The Communist Party will fight against all forms of bureaucratic control and interference in local administra-

tion and it shall strive for ensuring such administration democratically through elected popular bodies. Administration through local elected bodies offers great opportunities to attend to the needs of the people and defend their interests.

It is only through such sustained and allsided activity, combined with ideological-political work, that the mass organisations can be strengthened and the most militant and selfsacrificing elements drawn into the party, making possible its growth into a mass party—essential for the development of the democratic front.

Ideological-political work among the broad masses is an essential weapon for the forging of mass unity. Such ideological-political work has assumed great importance today for consolidating the popular forces which are moved by the democratic and socialist sentiments, for combating the intensified propaganda drive by the government and the Congress, for eliminating the vicious influence of communal reaction. Development of popular cultural activity must play an important role in strengthening ideological-political work.

The government and the ruling party, the Congress, no longer able to deny the necessity for radical reforms, preach that these reforms can be brought about without mass struggles and the strengthening of the mass movement. They denounce class struggle as something alien to Indian traditions, while supporting the vested interests in their offensive against the people. They foster belief in changes being brought about from top, through governmental action alone, slowly, with the 'consent of all'. They denounce all militant action, all popular resistance as anarchy.

The communal reactionaries raise false issues, fan hatred and disrupt the unity of the people.

Patient, sustained ideological work, carried on not merely through the press and platform, but by each party member, each militant in day-to-day contact with nonparty masses has to be undertaken in all parts of the country

and by every party unit. This task is an integral part of the task of building the democratic front.

The carrying out of all these tasks, the growth of the mass movement and of the consciousness and fighting unity of the masses can help to bring about in states, where the democratic forces are strong, such conditions as make it possible to raise as a practical slogan, the establishment of an alternative government capable of carrying out a minimum program. Where the democratic movement and party attain sufficient strength, it will be particularly necessary to bring forward this as the central slogan in the general elections.

Such a government, wherever formed, will defend the interests and rights of the people, carrying out maximum possible reforms under the given conditions, inspire and help to carry forward the democratic movement and strengthen the fight for peace. In states where it is not possible to conduct election battles on the slogan of such a government, the party will strive for strengthening the democratic opposition inside the legislatures as an essential task for carrying forward the democratic movement. The strengthening of the democratic opposition inside the parliament and the state legislatures requires that our party secures a strong position as a constituent of the democratic opposition.

The objectives that the Communist Party puts forward and the policies and measures it advocates correspond to the interest of our country and our people. The party, therefore, will do its utmost to unite the masses of all political parties and all sections of our people for support to these policies and measures and for the realisation of this objective. The party is confident that in this truly national task it will secure the cooperation of all patriotic and revolutionary forces inside the country.

*Appendix***THE IMMEDIATE PROGRAM**

The Communist Party places before the people the following immediate program whose realisation would strengthen our national independence and help all-round development of our national economy:

(1) Against the danger of war, for the prohibition of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction and for disarmament.

(2) Against military pacts, especially the SEATO and Baghdad pact.

(3) For strengthening Asian solidarity and for a pact of collective peace for Asia and the Pacific region.

(4) For restoring to the People's Republic of China its legitimate rights in the United Nations; for strengthening the bonds of friendship and cooperation with the USSR and China in all fields - economic and cultural, and international issues on the basis of the panchshila.

(5) For full support to the colonial peoples' struggle against imperialism.

(6) For effective measures for the liberation of Goa.

(7) For improvement of relations with Pakistan, for settlement of outstanding issues through methods of peaceful and friendly negotiations; for a no-war pact; for reestablishing economic relations between India and Pakistan dislocated by partition, for removing all barriers that stand in the way of mutually beneficial relations between our two people and for promotion of cultural and other activities which strengthen the bonds of brotherly relations between them.

(8) For break with the British commonwealth.

**NATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION AND
STRENGTHENING OF OUR INDEPENDENCE**

(a) Industry

(1) Priority to development of heavy and basic industries, which includes iron and steel, machine-making, including fabrication of steel plants, heavy chemicals, oil, coal, minerals and power, which should be in the state sector.

(2) Protection to national industries against foreign competition.

(3) Location of industries should be so arranged that while taking into account natural advantages, balanced development of various regions is provided for. In backward states where private capital

cannot be mobilised even for largescale light industries, these should be undertaken by the state.

(4) Development of armaments, aircraft and shipbuilding industries by the state with a view to strengthen our national independence.

(5) Pending the development of heavy and basic industries, increased consumer demands should be met, as far as possible, by maximum utilisation of existing capacities in organised industries and by encouragement of smallscale and village industries.

(b) Resources

(1) In order to augment the resources for national reconstruction, certain industries and undertakings should be nationalised. To begin with, banking, general insurance, coal-mining as a whole, aluminium industry, manganese, copper, iron and gold-mining, as well as British controlled jute mills and plantations, should be immediately nationalised.

(2) Impose a ceiling on export of profits and take over profits in excess of the ceiling as compulsory loan.

(3) Impose a ceiling on profits of all big industries and commercial undertakings and take over profits in excess as compulsory loan.

(4) These, together with the reserves of large companies to form a national development pool, to be invested in the state and private sector in accordance with national needs.

(5) State monopoly of foreign trade in the principal commodities. This would give the State the profits from such trade. It also enables it to diversify our foreign trade and develop it on the basis of mutual advantage. Further promotion of State trading in the internal market.

(6) Heavier taxation on corporation profits, tax on personal wealth and tax on capital gains. Steeply graded income-tax and fixation of ceilings on personal and family incomes.

(7) Postponement of payment of compensation to big landlords.

(8) Cancellation of privy purse to princes.

(9) Requisition of the hoarded wealth of the princes as compulsory loans.

(10) Reduction of the salaries and allowances of highly-paid officials.

(11) Energetic drive against evasion of income-tax and corporate-tax and full realisation of these.

(12) Drive against wastage in projects and government undertakings.

(c) Peasants

(1) Immediate carrying out of urgent agrarian reforms and substantial reduction of the burden of the rents and usurious interests.

(2) Immediate fixation of ceiling on landholdings and distribution, without any payment, of the land in excess to the agricultural labour and peasants.

(3) Setting up agricultural labour and peasant committees to implement land reforms.

(4) Planned free distribution of all government cultivable wasteland to poor peasants and agricultural labourers within a period of three years and state aid for bringing these under cultivation.

(5) Substantial scaling down of debts owed by peasants to landlords and moneylenders by cancellation of unconscionable debts. Arrangements for the liquidation of remaining debts in easy instalments spread over a number of years. Setting up of debt conciliation boards for this purpose.

(6) Wide extension of cooperatives for rural credit, marketing of produce as well as for supply of agricultural machinery and implements, fertilisers, etc. The existing cooperative law to be drastically amended in a democratic direction, by drastically curtailing the powers of the bureaucratic officials of the cooperative department.

(7) Cancellation of debts owed by agricultural labourers to landlords and moneylenders. Fixation of minimum wage for agricultural labour and its enforcement, by encouraging the organisations of agricultural labourers and securing their cooperation.

(8) Guaranteeing of a fair price to the peasants for their produce.

(d) Irrigation

In addition to the major projects, numerous minor projects should be undertaken. The outlook that irrigation projects can be undertaken only if it yields a return on investments above the bank rate should be given up. The benefits that they confer on the peasants should be the only criterion.

Where the government supplies electricity or instals tube-wells, the cost of installation should be borne entirely by the government. Water-rates should be brought down to a level that is within the reach of the peasants.

(e) Working Class

(1) The present rationalisation drive in the major industries like jute and cotton textiles, in the name of stepping up exports, should be stopped.

(2) The present policy of wage-freeze should be given up. A national minimum wage should be fixed and workers should be assisted in securing fair wages which should be above the national minimum wage in the various industries and regions.

(3) Pending such fixation, an immediate increase by 25 per cent to all workers' wages in view of the increased productivity of labour. The dearness allowance should be amalgamated with basic wages.

(4) Social insurance schemes to be rapidly extended to cover all industries and types of benefits and not merely confined to health. The benefit of the present health insurance scheme should be extended to the workers' family members.

(5) Provision for unemployment benefits.

(6) Housing problem to be energetically tackled through specialised agencies at all levels in which the workers themselves may play the decisive role.

(7) Right to bonus.

(f) Education

(1) Free and compulsory elementary education up to the age of 14 years.

(2) Our entire system of education must be reorganised. Since rapid industrialisation of our country is the objective, the pattern of education should conform to this aim. Adequate provision for technical and scientific education on a large scale should be made.

(3) Education at all levels including the university standards should be in the regional language or languages. The study of Hindi should be encouraged as the language of the union government and for communication between governments and people of different states. Provision should be made to teach minorities where they are in considerable number in their mother-tongue up to the end of secondary state. Adequate safeguards for Urdu language and script and provision for imparting education in Urdu for Urdu-speaking population.

(4) Ensuring academic and democratic rights for students and teachers.

(5) Adequate salaries for all teachers.

(g) Health Services

(1) Adequate medical service and maternity homes both in the cities and the countryside.

(2) Arrangement for supply of drinking water to all localities.

(h) Extension of Democracy

The initiative and creative energies of our people cannot be unleashed on a big scale without taking long strides in extending democracy. Experience has shown that bureaucratic administration of our projects leads to inefficiency, corruption and wastefulness. En-

trusting the bureaucrats with land reform and such measures beneficial to the people often leads to their sabotage. The initiative of the masses cannot be unleashed with growing attacks on their civil liberties and democratic rights.

Hence it is necessary to:

(1) Democratise the state structure; abolish upper houses in the legislatures; introduce proportional representation in all elections, right of recall, secret ballot even for panchayat elections; and officials at various levels to be under the control of elected local bodies.

Union territories, as long as they continue, must have a democratic setup and not be administered by commissioners with nominated advisory councils.

(2) Ensure the right to organise, hold meetings and demonstrations and for this purpose repeal all repressive laws and measures, including preventive detention act, ban of meetings, processions and demonstrations.

(3) Drastically revise the police code, curtailing the powers of the police to arrest, shoot, lathicharge and ban meetings and processions.

(4) Repeal the dramatic performances act of 1876, end police censorship of plays, restrictions and renting of halls, etc.

(5) Prevent imposition of regimented trade unions on the workers. Repeal of legislation which encourages regimentation; active encouragement to trade unions to unite and form one trade union in each industry or undertaking on the basis of internal tradeunion democracy.

(6) Recognise trade unions and the right of collective bargaining through trade unions.

(7) Assure tradeunion rights to workers. The national security and safeguarding rules, under which workers in government undertakings and departments are arbitrarily and summarily dismissed, must be repealed. Declaration of areas like Chittaranjan and Hirakud as prohibited areas must be rescinded.

(8) Give workers and employees an effective voice in the management and direction of industrial enterprises. Committees of elected representatives of workers and employees should be recognised on an equal footing with the administration and should have positions of authority and responsibility.

(9) Entrust trade unions with the management and administration of employees' state insurance and other social amenity schemes.

(10) Make substantial financial provisions for the material and cultural uplift of backward elements of our society like harijans, scheduled castes, adivasis.

(11) Ensure equal rights to women—inheritance including the right to own land, for equal pay for equal work, maternity leave and maternity benefits, creches for children, no discrimination on account of sex or marriage in the matter of employment; and substantial provision in the social welfare schemes of the government for welfare of children and social educational, cultural and economic advancement of women.

(12) Provide refugees with gainful employments and rehabilitate them in life.

(13) Associate, with an effective voice, in rural areas the kisan sabhas and organisations of agricultural labour in the implementation of agrarian reforms, in the education of local development schemes.

(14) Vest the local organs of the people like village panchayats, local boards and municipalities with powers to discharge their responsibilities. The power of government officials should be curtailed so that they function as the servants of the elected representatives of the people in the local boards.

(15) Entrust all local development work, such as community project scheme, NES, etc., to the panchayats and reduce the present high administrative cost.

(16) Launch an energetic drive against corruption.

(17) Separate the judiciary from the executive.

35. Struggle For Linguistic Provinces

The fourth congress of the Communist Party of India greets the people of various linguistic nationalities of our country for their heroic struggle and their success in securing the establishment of linguistic states in the country. These struggles and successes have not only vitalised the forces of democracy, but have gone a long way towards strengthening the unity of the people of our great country.

The SRC report which recommended the formation of such states and the legislative measures taken by the government to implement the new proposals constitute a great triumph of all patriotic and democratic forces which stand for the democratic reorganisation of our states, ensuring conditions for selfexpression of various nationalities which inhabit our land and, above all, for building the unity of India on invincible foundations.

On the occasion the congress recalls with pride the great mass struggle of the people of Andhra which not only secured for them a separate Andhra state, but inspired the movement for linguistic reorganisation of states all over the land. It is to this mighty upsurge of the democratic and patriotic forces that the government has had to ultimately yield.

The formation of separate states of Gujarat, Kerala, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tamilnadu and Visalaandhra mark the victory of the democratic forces and of all linguistic nationalities.

It is a matter of profound significance that, when the

Resolution passed by the fourth party congress, Palghat, 19-29 April 1956 and published in *New Age*, 13 May 1956.

congress rulers at the top sought, in violation of their past pledges, to deny the reorganisation on states on linguistic basis, the people themselves came forward and took the initiative in defeating the government policies and ensuring such linguistic reorganisation of states.

The strength of the people in this great struggle lies in their unity, the unity which brings together in common action democratic and patriotic forces within all parties, in all walks of our public life.

While congratulating the people on their success, the fourth congress of the Communist Party of India warns them that narrow provincial feelings are being roused in the border areas and provincial chauvinism and separatism are being instigated by the forces of reaction.

The struggle for the linguistic states is an integral part of the struggle for better life and democracy. Under no circumstances, therefore, can the masses be allowed to be divided by such disruptive activities. Such disruptive activities not only weaken the cause of the linguistic reorganisation of states, but disrupt the unity of our people so essential of democratic and economic advance.

Whatever may be the provocation, the working class and other democratic forces have to conduct their struggle for the cause of linguistic reorganisation of states in a manner which strengthens their unity by defeating the game of separatist and chauvinist elements.

The fourth congress of the Communist Party also warns that the vested interests are circulating mendacious propaganda to all minorities against the linguistic states and creating an atmosphere of panic and suspicion. It is all the more necessary, therefore, to conduct the movement in a manner which consolidates the fraternal ties among the people to fight back these slanders.

The congress of the Communist Party of India condemns the repressive measures taken by the government against those struggling for linguistic states. The state governments have jailed thousands of people for fighting for their just

rights. They have lathicharged vast crowds in many places, suppressed civil liberties and resorted to brutal shootings in Orissa and, on a mass scale, in Bombay.

The congress of the Communist Party of India pays its homage to the innumerable martyrs who have laid down their lives for this democratic cause and sends its greetings to all those who have suffered for it. It congratulates the thousands of men and women in Bengal, Bombay and other states who have courted arrest and braved jail, in defence of their democratic right.

The congress of the Communist Party of India condemns the proposed merger of Bengal and Bihar as against the interests of the peoples of the two states and against the cause of unity of India itself and congratulates the people of Bengal for resisting it. It demands the immediate withdrawal of the proposals.

The congress of the Communist Party of India strongly protests against the proposed separation of Bombay from Maharashtra and considers it to be a grave injustice inflicted on the people of Maharashtra under the pressure of vested interests. The proposal to keep Bombay under central administration deprives Bombay's citizens of their democratic right to have their own Legislature, tears it away from Maharashtra and disrupts the economic life of Maharashtra.

The congress of the Communist Party of India condemns the attempt to implement it despite public opposition and the onslaught of police terror.

It congratulates the people of Bombay and Maharashtra and of West Bengal on their peaceful satyagraha and struggles and assures them that the party will do everything in its power to strengthen their struggles so that the city of Bombay is included in Maharashtra and the West Bengal-Bihar merger proposal is withdrawn once and for all.

36. Statement on Communal Situation in Punjab

The politbureau views with grave concern the serious attempt being made to inflame communal hatred and passions in the Punjab by the Maha Punjab Samiti and Jana Sangh. Their agitation for a Maha Punjab is based on the most rabid communal ideology, which seeks to pit the hindus and sikhs speaking the same Punjabi language against each other and thus constitutes a grave danger to the growth and unity of the democratic movement in general and to the workingclass and peasant movements in particular. The hindu communalists are strengthened by powerful forces within the Punjab Congress, who back them in this agitation.

The Communist Party has stood for the linguistic reorganisation of states as an essential step for the development of the democratic movement and for strengthening the unity of the country. The entire course of developments in the country over this issue has vindicated the stand of the party. Where the people have united behind this demand they have won great victories despite the opposition of the congress high command to the demand.

In the Punjab, however, the hindu communalists and the akalis had succeeded in creating divisions among the Punjabi-speaking people on a communal basis. With the aim of the hindu community dominating over the sikhs, the hindu communalists raised the slogan of Maha Punjab. In their communal frenzy, they went to the extent of asking the Punjabi hindus to repudiate their own mother-tongue, Punjabi, and when defeated in this attempt, they now

This politbureau statement of 4 June was published in *New Age*, 10 June 1956.

raise the slogan that the gurmukhi script is the religious script of the sikhs and not the script of the Punjabi language—the language of the Punjabi people.

The akalis, on the other hand, raised the slogan of a Punjabi state. This slogan, while it ostensibly seemed to be based on the democratic principle of linguistic states, excluded certain Punjabi-speaking areas so as to carve a state in which the sikhs would be able to dominate over the hindus. Their propaganda and agitation had further tended to create fear among the hindus in the Punjabi-speaking areas, instead of uniting them for a democratic demand.

The situation was further worsened as a result of the Punjab government under the chief ministership of Sachar and the state Congress supporting the demand of the hindu communalists for a Maha Punjab state.

The opposition of the congress high command to the principle of linguistic reorganisation on the one hand, and the activities of these communal forces on the other, have deprived the Hindustani-speaking people of the Hariyana area of the Punjab, as well as the Punjabi-speaking people of their just right of separate linguistic states.

The central government and the congress high command, however, could not altogether ignore the democratic urges of the people. In these circumstances they have come forward with a regional formula according to which the future state of Punjab, in which the present state of PEPSU will be merged, will be divided into two regions. In one, Punjabi will be the language of administration up to the district level and in the other, Hindi. Each region will have a regional council consisting of all members of the Punjab assembly elected from the constituencies in the respective regions, whose advice in respect of a number of developmental subjects, including education and public health, should be ordinarily accepted by the cabinet.

The Communist Party of India is of the opinion that all these, together with the merger of PEPSU with the Pun-

jab, constitute a partial recognition of the democratic principle on which the demand of the linguistic state is based.

However, with a view to placate the akalis, the congress high command, while demarcating the Punjabi—and Hindi-speaking areas into two regions, proposes to include the Kangra district into the Hindi region. Neither is the language of this area Hindi nor is it contiguous to the Hindi-speaking areas. The district is separated from the Hindi-speaking area by over 150 miles of Punjabi-speaking area to which it is contiguous. Its inclusion cannot be justified on the ground of the needs of economic development either. The only consideration behind its inclusion in the Hindi region is purely communal one, viz that the majority of the people of the district are hindus.

It is this bowing down to communal considerations that brings grist to the agitation of the hindu communalists. It would appear that the congress high command now seeks to placate the hindu communalists by unprincipled concessions on the question of language.

Far from creating conditions where communal harmony and the unity of the people could be strengthened, such opportunistic appeasement of communal forces only encourages them more and would further worsen the situation.

Under such conditions there is a grave danger of communal forces seeking to utilise the regional councils to further embitter communal passions.

In these circumstances all democratic elements that stand for the unity of the people have a grave responsibility. They should unite in a powerful movement against the communal agitation of the Maha Punjabi Samiti and Jana Sangh—against every one of the slogans based on communalism, as regards state, language and script.

They should also unite immediately for the reversal of the decision to include Kangra district in the Hindi region and demand its inclusion in the Punjabi region.

Confident of the ultimate triumph of the cause of the

linguistic states for the Punjabi—and Hindi-speaking people and of their own strength and brotherly unity, the Communist Party appeals to all sections of the democratic and patriotic people in the Punjab to rise as one man and defeat the communal forces. It is by resolutely combating these disruptive communal forces, by completely isolating them from the public life that the great Punjabi—and Hindi-speaking peoples can carry forward their glorious fighting traditions and advance along the path of democratic reorganisation of their national life.

37. Struggle Against Cult of the Individual in CPSU

The central committee of the Communist Party of India has considered the situation arising out of the publication by the state department of the United States of America of a document which purports to be the text of the report delivered by Khrushchov at a special session of the twentieth congress of the CPSU.

The central committee has also studied the resolution passed by the central committee of the CPSU on 30 June.

The facts mentioned in the report have come as a great shock to communists and to millions of progressive people all over the world. They reveal that together with great successes in the building of socialism in the USSR there also occurred during the latter part of the life of J. V. Stalin instances of distortion of Soviet democracy, infringement of socialist legality by excesses and arbitrary acts and violation of norms of inner party life.

The central committee of the Communist Party of India considers that in view of the seriousness of the mistakes committed and in view of the damage done by them it was necessary to take resolute measures to rectify the mistakes and undo the damage done. It was necessary to wage a determined struggle against the cult of personality, a cult alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, whose growth played a big part in creating the conditions in which these mistakes occurred. The cult of the individual belittled the role of the masses and the party, came in the way of the growth of their initiative. By undertaking these tasks, the CPSU leadership has rendered a great service to the cause of socialism.

Resolution adopted by the central committee, 1-11 July 1956, and published in *New Age*, 15 July 1956.

The resolution of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has analysed the historical and social conditions that contributed to the development of the cult of Stalin. Historical circumstances of hostile capitalist encirclement, rise of fascism, and the threat of attack on the Soviet Union necessitated iron discipline, centralisation of leadership and also some justifiable limitations on democracy. It was under these conditions that certain negative traits of Stalin began to develop, which gradually led to the cult of the individual and lack of collective leadership with harmful consequences.

It is evident that Stalin was mainly responsible for the distortions of Soviet democracy and for the violation of innerparty norms. It is also incontestable that in the later period of his life, the cult of the individual assumed enormous proportions. While fully recognising the negative features and grave defects that developed in Stalin's methods of leadership, the central committee of the Communist Party of India considers that a onesided appraisal of his role during the last twenty years of his life, years of mighty developments in the USSR and the world communist movement, causes bewilderment among the masses and can be utilised by enemies of communism to confuse them. The central committee, therefore, is of the opinion that an objective assessment of Stalin's life and work in their entirety, Stalin's great achievements and serious shortcomings, is essential for successfully fighting the cult of the individual and for effectively combating the prevailing confusion.

The central committee considers that the excessive glorification of Stalin's person and role which became a marked phenomenon during his lifetime requires adequate explanation. It is also necessary to undertake a fuller analysis of the causes which led to the arbitrary acts and excesses. It is only then that a correct appraisal of the growth of the cult of the individual can be made. To ascribe all shortcomings and arbitrariness to the defects of

an individual falls short of Marxist-Leninist standards of historic objectivity.

The revelations made in the report of Khrushchov have been seized by the imperialists and other enemies of the working people to denounce the Soviet Union and undermine the confidence of the people in the socialist system. The resolution of the central committee of the CPSU passed on 30 June has correctly exposed the machinations of these enemies and stressed the need for loyalty to the scientific ideology of Marxism-Leninism and to the cause of proletarian internationalism.

The enemies of the working class are at pains to make out that the violations of Soviet democracy and the excesses committed are inherent in the Soviet system. There is serious danger of many honest and progressive elements being influenced by this propaganda, which the Communist Party of India considers it imperative to expose and combat.

Less than forty years have passed since the triumph of the proletarian revolution in Russia. During this period the Soviet Union has transformed itself from a backward country into one of the most advanced countries in the world, from a country of tsarist autocracy to a country of victorious socialism. During this period, one-third of humanity has been freed from the yoke of capitalism, and socialism has emerged as a world system. While the capitalist world is in the midst of ever-deepening crisis which dooms hundreds of millions of people to conditions of misery, unemployment and cultural backwardness, the socialist world has registered gigantic progress in every sphere. The example set by the socialist world and the positive measures taken by it have profoundly influenced the entire course of human history. If today the possibility has arisen for prevention of war, for peaceful transition to socialism in a number of states, if new opportunities have opened out before the countries of the former colonial world for independent economic development, the decisive factor in all these is the growing economic, political and moral might of the Soviet Union and other socialist

states and the policies adopted by them. It would be no exaggeration to say that never in human history has so much been achieved over such vast areas in such a short period.

It is evident that a system in which such violations and distortions were inherent could not have unleashed the creative energies of hundreds of millions on a scale never known before and brought about such unprecedented social transformations.

The central committee of the Communist Party of India is confident that the detractors of socialism and slanderers of the Soviet Union, though they may sow some temporary confusion cannot prevent the growing popularity of the ideas of socialism in our country nor can they weaken the bond of Indo-Soviet friendship.

The twentieth congress of the CPSU, on the basis of the gigantic achievements of the past and guided by the all-conquering ideas of Marxism-Leninism, has charted out the path for further advance. The decisions of the congress and the measures following from them have already had powerful impact on the whole world and have considerably strengthened the movement for peace, democracy and socialism.

The mistakes and excesses that occurred in the USSR were not due to the principles of Marxism-Leninism or the soviet system but to deviations from them in practice in several respects. These deviations occurred in the background of great victories of socialist reconstruction carried out in an extremely difficult period. There can be no doubt that with the measures that are being adopted to combat and eliminate the defects that crept in during this period and with further measures based on a thorough analysis of the developments of the past, the Soviet society will advance further in every sphere and ensure continuous expansion of socialist democracy.

It is the enemies of socialism that have propagated that socialism is founded on regimentation in thought and constitutes a denial of that freedom of spirit which is the source

of individual initiative. The socialist society is in a position to guarantee full freedom of conscience and liberty to individuals because it abolishes exploitation of man by man and creates conditions in which such individual freedom can constantly flourish. The successes of socialist transformations in the economic life should make it all the more possible to enlarge the field of individual liberty and create effective guarantees against its violation.

The central committee of the Communist Party of India considers it necessary to state emphatically that for the advance of socialism it is indispensable to adhere firmly to the tenets of socialist democracy, and to expand it continuously. The central committee of the Communist Party of India attaches fundamental importance to the safeguarding and development of individual freedom and liberty under socialism. The central committee is confident that the world communist movement will profit by the experiences of the USSR and take effective measures for the defence and extension of democracy in every sphere.

While socialism has become the common goal of all progressive mankind in our present epoch, each country will, however, proceed to this goal in its own way. Firmly adhering to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the Communist Party of India seeks to achieve its goal of socialism by basing itself on the national traditions and specific features of our own country.

Loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the common goal of socialism and the struggle for peace, democracy and the defence of national freedom, constitute today the basis of proletarian internationalism and fraternal cooperation among communist and workers' parties. This cooperation which is based on exchange and pooling of common experience, freedom of criticism and selfcriticism and independence of national parties is indispensable for the socialist movement. The Communist Party of India will do everything to promote and strengthen this common bond of proletarian internationalism.

38. Basis for Settlement of Naga Problem

Developments in the Naga region are causing deep concern to every thinking Indian. Our defence forces are shedding the blood of our own countrymen. It constitutes a tragic commentary on the present administration. The seemingly remote Naga problem calls for deep thought and prompt action from every Indian.

The Communist Party shares the feelings of a large section of the Indian press and public opinion that a peaceful solution of the Naga problem must be immediately sought by the government.

Our party notes with deep regret that instead of pursuing this course of sanity and humanity, the government of India has adopted the policy of intensifying military measures. This policy of the government is bound to create further bitterness not only among the Nagas but also in the minds of other tribes and push the Nagas to further desperatism on the one hand and create on the other antagonism between the plains people and the Nagas which was so far absent in the situation.

We are firmly on the opinion that the responsibility for creating this situation primarily lies with the government's unsympathetic and bureaucratic attitude towards the Nagas and their rigid policy of sticking to the sixth schedule of the constitution, which is not only far from satisfying the aspiration of the Nagas but has also been so far unable to satisfy any tribe in Assam. The government drifted to this position although the demand for independence of the Nagas was raised long before, in 1946 itself.

Resolution passed by the central committee, 1-11 July 1956, and published in *New Age*, 22 July 1956.

The party never supported the Naga demand for separation from India and repeatedly advised them to give up their demand for independence and fight in cooperation with the people of India for a democratic setup in the Naga Hills.

Our party was also the first to expose the conspiracies of the imperialists through the foreign missionaries which were based on stirring and disseminating anti-India prejudices and led the Nagas to advocate the wrong and separatist demand of an independent Nagaland.

The imperialist agencies did their worst to mislead the Nagas by keeping them separate from all possible cultural-political and friendly association with the people of the plains. But the government of India, even after ten years of independence, has failed to carry out policies which would have allayed the suspicions of the Nagas and won their confidence that they have an assured place to live and fight for an honourable and happy life inside the Indian Union. On the other hand, following the footsteps of the former alien rulers, the congress government carried on the same policies of separation and strengthening bureaucracy to administer the area and giving free rein to non-Naga tradesmen and usurers to exploit the Nagas, at the same time doing everything to prevent free intercourse between the people of the plains and the Nagas.

The Communist Party is firmly of the opinion that a new bold policy based on the following lines is needed to solve this problem:

—Open appeal to the Naga leaders for peaceful negotiations; immediate cessation of military operations, general amnesty and guarantee of civil liberty.

—Enlargement of autonomous rights to the Nagas in the field of internal administration and bring the entire Naga region including Tuensung and Tirup frontier areas now under NEFA into a single administration.

—Adequate economic grants for development projects

for the welfare of the Naga people. Ensure the democratic cooperation of the people there.

—The recognition of their full rights on languages, culture, customs and tribal institutions of the Nagas, including judicial institution and help them to develop further in their own way.

The Communist Party of India calls upon the people and parties in India to take up the issue and urge upon the government to change its present policy and take the path of peaceful negotiation and settlement in the Naga Hills.

39. Statement on Bilingual Bombay State

The decision of the government of India to impose a bilingual state of Bombay on the people of Maharashtra and Gujarat is a severe blow against their cherished democratic desire for Samyukta Maharashtra and Maha Gujarat.

The government of India and the congress high command are fully backing the determination of big business that the city should not go to a Samyukta Maharashtra state, of which it should, by all democratic standards, form a part. But unable to face the people of Maharashtra, they seek an opportunist solution this way.

Attempts will be made, as was done when the Bengal-Bihar merger proposal was mooted, to persuade the Maharashtrais that by the strength of their numbers they can dominate in the bilingual state, while on the other hand, the Gujaratis will be told that numbers do not count, but only economic power.

Far from helping to build the fraternal relations between the Gujaratis and Maharashtrais, the imposition of the bilingual state will only result in embittering feelings and undermine the unity of the country.

Emboldened by the temporary and inglorious success they have achieved in the case of Bombay, certain elements with the support and blessings of the congress high command are making frantic efforts to upset the decisions already reached in regard to Bengal, Bihar and the southern states, and to foist bilingual states on the people.

The politbureau of the central committee of the Communist Party of India is confident that these designs to be foiled by the united will of the people.

This statement was issued by the politbureau on 8 August 1956 and published in *New Age*, 12 August 1956.

40. On India's Path of Development

The articles by Modeste Rubinstein entitled "A Non-capitalist Path for Underdeveloped Countries" (see Appendix) has attracted some attention because of the attempt that they make to analyse the forms of economic development that are taking place in India.

Some of the formulations made in the article are perfectly correct. For example, it shows the differences between India on the one hand and the United States and countries of western Europe on the other and rightly points out that state capitalist enterprises in India under present conditions play a progressive role. It may be mentioned here that this has been the thesis of the Communist Party of India also, as can be seen from the following:

"We must clearly realise that while the extension of the state sector and the nationalisation of certain concerns in today's America may have no progressive significance whatsoever, in India the extension of the public sector in order to develop heavy industries has got a progressive significance" (*Some Questions of Party Policy*, p 57).

Hence it is that our party has consistently supported all steps taken by the government for extension of the state sector.

Nevertheless, despite these and a number of other correct observations that the articles make, the general trend of the articles is wholly misleading and the main thesis that they put forth is without foundation.

The articles, after stating that objective possibilities exist in India for taking to the path of socialism by peaceful methods, a statement with which there would be gene-

ral agreement, make the astounding assertion: "That path has been advocated for many years by Jawaharlal Nehru".

Approvingly quoting the Avadi resolution of the National Congress, the author attempts to prove the thesis that the resolution "is expressive of the attitude of the congress leadership and of the government on a number of key economic reforms". The case that is made in favour of the thesis cannot however carry conviction to one who has studied the political and economic realities in India.

The "commanding position of foreign capital" (mainly British) in several vital sectors of Indian economy such as coal, jute, oil and tea, is admitted in the article as also the position of Indian monopoly capital in some other sectors. But their political and even economic implications are ignored. No importance is attached to the fact that the main profit-making concerns remain in the hands of private capital.

PROFESSION AND PRACTICE

The author quotes from the Avadi resolution that there should be equitable distribution of national wealth but does not care to mention to what extent this pious declaration has been given effect to.

As is well known and has been mentioned in several articles, the net income from factory industries in India increased from Rs 550 crore to Rs 760 crore between 1950 and 1954. The total increase in wages and salaries, however, was only from Rs 232 crore to Rs 249 crore while the profits distributed as dividends rents, interest, etc., increased from Rs 318 crore to Rs 510 crore. The share of wages and salaries in the net income declined from 42 to 33 per cent, while the share of profits increased from 58 to 67 per cent.

And while these profits were being made by intensification of the exploitation of workers and also at the cost of

the consumers, the proportion of direct taxes whose burden mainly falls on the richer classes declined, while the proportion of indirect taxes grew. According to the taxation inquiry committee's report, if all taxes levied by the central, state and local bodies are taken into account, direct taxation declined from 45 per cent in 1944-45 to 24 per cent in 1953-54. The revenue collected from sales tax whose burden falls on common people increased from Rs 8 crore in 1939-40 to Rs 52 crore in 1952-53 and is expected to reach Rs 70 crore in 1956-57.

The index of industrial production between 1946 and 1954 increased by 46.5 per cent. But the index of average number of workers rose in the same period by only 6 per cent.

Despite the stupendous increase in profits and in the productivity of workers as revealed in the above figures, the government did not think it necessary to compel the capitalists to grant adequate wage increase. All trade-union leaders, including the leaders of the government-backed Indian National Trade Union Congress, have exposed the hollowness of the plea that the industries cannot afford such wage increase. Facts and figures quoted by the tradeunion leaders on the basis of the publications of the government and of the Reserve Bank of India have not been challenged by anyone. Yet all that the second five-year plan has to say is that "studies should be undertaken to see whether there is any scope for wage increases even at the present level of productivity" (*Second Five Year Plan*, p 579).

Which class has profited most from the economic policies of the government—this is a question which any Marxist, any serious student of economics, has to examine in order to determine whether the path taken by a government is the path of socialism or even of democratic planning. Unfortunately Modeste Rubinstein does not even pose the question.

SECOND PLAN

The second five-year plan has declared certain objectives and laid down certain principles. These objectives and these principles have been welcomed by patriotic-minded Indians—not because they bring about socialism but because, if carried out, they will help to strengthen India's national economy and bring about some improvement in the condition of the masses. Nevertheless the actual methods which the government has proposed not only intensify distress of the people but jeopardise the very declared objectives of the plan.

This is seen most clearly in the methods by which finances needed for the plan are proposed to be raised. Deficit-financing on a vast scale (1200 crores of rupees) and crushing burdens on the people—such are the proposed methods, in the main.

Already the effects of these methods are evident. In an editorial published on 7 May 1956 the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, a paper which generally supports the National Congress and the government, expressed concern at the "joint operation of the excessive pricerise and the imposition of heavy indirect taxes" and warned, "Unless the prices come down to a reasonable level and the current method of levying taxation is replaced by a more just and equitable system the increase in national income, instead of adding to the common man's prosperity, will result in making the rich richer and poor poorer."

The process has gone unchecked since then. The imposition of new excise duty on cloth in August 1956 which has already sent cloth prices soaring is the latest blow against the people. Prices of everyday necessities, above all foodgrains, are mounting rapidly threatening millions of people with semistarvation.

On 31 August 1956 the same day when the new excise duty on cloth was imposed, a question was put in the parliament by a member asking why the central government wanted to pay to the foreign owners of the Kolar

Gold Fields in Mysore, a higher rate of compensation than that proposed by the Mysore government. The government's reply was that "it would not be in public interest to reveal details of the negotiation".

Such is the concern for the people and such is the concern for the monopolists on the part of a government which claims to stand for socialism.

All these facts find no mention in the articles by Modeste Rubinstein. Nor does the author think it necessary to pose the question as to whether and to what extent trade-union rights, democratic rights and civil liberties are being safeguarded and extended. The attempt to brutally suppress workingclass struggles as in Darjeeling, Kanpur Amritsar, Orissa, the launching of thousands of cases against workingclass and peasant cadres, the mass shooting as was indulged in Bombay and Ahmedabad—all these are ignored. It seems to be assumed that these have no relevance to the question of "path of development".

AGRARIAN QUESTION

But by far the most astounding thing in the articles which claim to examine "forms of economic development" in India is that they practically make no reference to the agrarian question—the key question in India. This is not accidental. It follows directly from the whole basic approach.

This is not the place to examine in detail the agrarian policy of the government. As the political resolution of the Communist Party of India adopted at its fourth congress points out the government of India "strives to curb feudal forms of exploitation, transforming feudal landlords into capitalist landlords, and create a stratum of rich peasantry that can act as the social base of bourgeois rule in the countryside". At the same time this policy is carried out in such a way as to preserve and consolidate the alliance between the bourgeoisie and the landlords.

This is seen in the heavy compensation that is being paid to the landlords whose land is acquired and also the way the land problem is treated. As regards compensation, "the sum involved", writes H. D. Malaviya, secretary of the political and economic research department of the All-India congress committee, "anywhere in the neighbourhood of Rs 550 crore will remain a constant source of anxiety for the state exchequers for years to come". Malaviya fully agrees with an American expert whose opinion was sought by the government of India that "compensation at current rates will load the peasant with considerable debts".

Landlordism under various names and in various forms has long been the worst feature of our economic life. An article published in August 1955 by Krishna Ballabh Sahai, the revenue minister of Bihar, estimated that 2.54 per cent of the holdings in the state cover 7 million acres or 25 per cent of the total agricultural land. In Madhya Pradesh, 3.44 per cent of the holdings cover 30.5 per cent of the land. A. P. Jain, minister in the central government, has recently stated that 60 per cent of our peasants own only 15.5 per cent of the total cultivable area, while 5 per cent of landholders own 34 per cent of the land.

The high rent which peasants have to pay together with heavy taxes and other dues drive them to contract debts at usurious rates. Dr. Raj of the Delhi School of Economics has calculated that "perhaps as high as 800 to 1000 crore rupees of the income generated in the agricultural sector every year is appropriated in the form of rent and interest". This evidently is an underestimation.

What has been done in the course of nine years when the Congress has held absolute power? The *second five-year plan* itself, while waxing eloquent over what has been done, has nevertheless to admit certain facts: "Progress in the regulation of rents has been slow and in several states lags behind" (p 189). "During the past few years there have been instances in some states of largescale ejection of tenants and of 'voluntary surrender of tenancies'... Most

'voluntary surrender of tenancies' are open to doubt as bona fide transfers" (p 185).

As regards ceiling on holdings, it is admitted that very little progress has been made in respect of the so-called private lands. Taking advantage of the deliberate procrastination on the part of the government, the landlords have resorted to fictitious transfer and other means on such a vast scale that very little land will be left by the time ceilings are imposed—even if they are imposed at all. The open sabotage of the proposal for ceiling by the Bihar government, which has evoked the wrath of all honest congressmen in the province, the blunt rejection of the very idea of ceiling by the UP government tell their own story. The *Times of India*, owned by the multimillionaire Dalmia, in an editorial of 10 August 1956 criticising the dilatory tactics of the government on this issue, asks the question: "Must the question of ceilings await the accession to power of some other party which will do what the Congress has promised for the past 25 years?"

No useful purpose would be served by giving more facts. What has been stated should suffice to show the utterly untenable nature of the main thesis presented by Modeste Rubinstein in his articles.

It is one thing to state that capitalism is not popular in underdeveloped countries and its possibilities are limited. It is a totally different thing to assert that countries like India which are striving to develop an independent economy and, with that objective in view strengthening the state sector, have already thereby taken to or are moving towards a noncapitalist path. Unfortunately Modeste Rubinstein fails to make a clear distinction between the two.

GOVERNMENT POLICIES—COMMUNIST ANALYSIS

We do recognise that the economic policy of the government of India is different from the policy that was pursued by the British government. We have pointed out in

our political resolution that "the government of India is a bourgeois-landlord government in which the bourgeoisie is the leading force" and that "its policies are motivated by the desire to develop India along *independent capitalist lines*" (*emphasis added*).

We have further stated:

With this aim in view, the government strives to weaken the position of British capital in our economy. It strives to curb feudal forms of exploitation, transforming feudal landlords into capitalist landlords and create a stratum of rich peasantry that can act as the social base of bourgeois rule in the countryside. It strives to extend and develop the state sector, which in the existing situation is essential for the development of capitalism itself. These aims and the measures resulting therefrom inevitably bring the government into conflict with imperialism, with feudalism and sometimes with the narrow interests of sections of the bourgeoisie, as was seen in the case of nationalisation of life insurance. They also lead to conflict of policies, as seen in the entire controversies over the problems of industrialisation.

"These conflicts have a progressive significance in relation to the democratic movement. They increase the possibilities to move the government, by mass pressure and by strengthening popular unity, in the direction of democratic reforms and against concession to reactionary forces.

"With the increased efforts for industrialisation in the conditions of today when the urge for national reconstruction among the people as well as the mass movement are both growing, these conflicts cannot but further sharpen making it possible for the democratic movement to secure the adoption of a number of measures that weaken the position of foreign capital in our economy as also that of the position of Indian reactionary forces in our political and economic life.

"The Communist Party is vitally interested in such

developments and strives to strengthen them, for they help in strengthening the democratic movement and in consolidating and extending the democratic front. Every step that is taken by the government for strengthening national freedom and national economy, against imperialist, feudal and monopoly interests, will receive our most energetic and unstinted support" (*Political Resolution*, pp 21-22).

The government of India, abandoning its earlier policy of total dependence on imperialists, has entered into economic relations with the USSR and other socialist countries. It is defending the cause of peace and taking a resolute stand against imperialist warmongers. All this strengthens our national economy, our national independence and heightens our national prestige. These measures are fully in accord with our national interest, with the interest of progressive forces all over the world and hence the Communist Party wholeheartedly supports them.

At the same time, conscious of the limitations of independent capitalist development in India in the present context, we have stressed that:

"... It would be a profound mistake to consider that the sharpening of the conflict between imperialism and the government of India, of the conflict between feudalism and the needs of bourgeois development and the attempt of the bourgeoisie to strengthen its position in this conflict, have already led to or can by themselves lead to the internal policies of the government becoming popular, democratic. The bourgeoisie seeks to strengthen its position not merely in relation to imperialism and feudalism, but also in relation to the popular masses. It seeks to resolve its conflict with imperialism and feudalism at the cost of the people.

"Therefore, while opposing and attempting to weaken its grip over national economy, the bourgeoisie simultaneously maintains its links with British capital and gives facilities for further inflow of foreign capital. While striving to curb and weaken feudalism, it simultaneously

maintains its alliance with landlords, against the democratic forces and makes concessions to the landlords. While striving to industrialise the country, it seeks to place the burdens of economic development mainly on the common people. While extending the public sector, it simultaneously pursues policies of support to monopolists in their attacks on the working people and adopts many measures which enrich the monopolists and thus help them to strengthen their position in important spheres of our life. While calling upon the people to cooperate in the task of national reconstruction, it simultaneously strengthens the bureaucratic apparatus, places main reliance on it, refuses to extend democracy and to adopt measures that would improve the conditions of the people. These are policies that weaken and shackle the very classes that are the most resolute defenders of peace and national freedom—the classes without whose initiative and creative activity the nation cannot be rebuilt.

“Due to all this and the divergence between the aims of industrialisation and the methods adopted by the government to achieve these aims, the process of development of the country acquires a slow and halting character, marked by twists and turns, giving rise to sharp conflicts and profound contradictions. They retard the sweeping away of the obstacles that stand in the way of India's development. They impose colossal burdens on the people, impoverish them, thus preventing stable and continuous expansion of the internal market.

“In executing these policies, the government not only attempts to placate the people by making concessions and granting some relief, but often resorts to repressive measures also. In the day-to-day struggles of the masses as well as the struggles waged by the people on democratic issues, the congress government often resorts to wholesale arrests, lathicharges and even terror by shooting. The brutal suppression of the struggles in connection with the SRC report, the killings of Patna students, the firings on tea-garden workers of Darjeeling, the mass arrests in

several places in connection with day-to-day struggles, all these reveal the callous character of the government in relation to the masses when they dare to resort to action in defence of their rights and interests. The struggle against this suppression, the struggle for protecting and extending the democratic rights, forms an integral part of the struggle for uniting the people.

"In these circumstances, the task of building national unity for peace, for defence and strengthening of freedom, for national reconstruction, for defence of the vital interests of the masses and for extension of democracy is an extremely complex task. It demands support to the government's stand in relation to the struggle for peace and efforts to strengthen it further. It demands support to all those measures of the government which weaken the position of imperialism and feudalism, curb monopoly and strengthen national economy. It demands the bringing of pressure on the government in order to accelerate the pace of industrialisation and the adoption of measures related to this task. It demands vigorous combating of the policies of compromise with and concessions to foreign capital, landlordism and monopoly interests. It demands determined struggles against the government for improvement in the condition of the life of the people. It calls for vigorously combating and defeating the repressive measures of the government and securing the protection and extension of democratic rights. In order that the Communist Party may pursue such a revolutionary and flexible policy and play its rightful role as the builder and spearhead of the democratic movement, it must come forward as an independent national force. It must act as a party of opposition in relation to the present government.

"Guided by the interests of the country and the people, the Communist Party will extend wholehearted support to the government in its policy of defence of peace and in every measure that the government takes to reduce the dependence of Indian economy on imperialism. But it will oppose the serious concessions the government makes to

foreign capital and will mobilise the masses with a view to curtailing these concessions.

"The Communist Party will support every measure the government takes against feudal landlords and for the land reform measures it has proposed. It will mobilise the peasantry and our people against their sabotage by landlords' interests in the states' governments and the bureaucrats linked with them, and for consistent implementation of these proposals through the democratic cooperation of the peasant masses and their organisations.

"The Communist Party will resolutely fight against the government's policies of support to the monopolists' attack on the working people, which result in fresh burdens on the masses. It will fight its antidemocratic policies that suppress democratic rights and civil liberties, disrupt the tradeunion movement and deny tradeunion rights. It will organise the mass movement of workers, peasants and other democratic sections with a view to defeat and reverse these policies as well as to secure relief for the people and to improve their conditions" (*Political Resolution*, pp 22-24).

Such is our analysis of the policies of the government, based on objective study of facts. Such is the policy which the Communist Party of India follows in order to unite the masses of our people in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM

Modeste Rubinstein's articles not only give an incorrect picture of the economic situation in India, they also suffer from other defects. Whatever the intention of the author may be, the articles strengthen some erroneous concepts about socialism that have recently gained currency in certain circles.

It is undoubtedly true that the massive achievements of socialism in the USSR and the epochmaking advance registered in China have had a powerful impact all over the world and especially in underdeveloped countries and have

enormously strengthened the ideas of socialism not merely among the working class but among the peasantry, and other progressive classes and sections. It is equally true, as already stressed, that the extension of the state sector plays a progressive role in these countries. All this however does not justify the thesis that by declaring socialism as their aim and by developing the state sector, these countries can launch themselves on a 'noncapitalist' path of development.

Rubinstein admits that "steps to develop state industry are not, in themselves, of a socialist character". Unfortunately, however, this perfectly correct thesis gets practically negated by other formulations in the same article.

In support of his analysis about the developments in India, Modeste Rubinstein asserts that "socialist development is bound to differ in accordance with the conditions prevailing in different countries". No one will dispute this formulation. But what is virtually ignored in the article is the profound truth that "Whatever the form of transition to socialism, the decisive and indispensable factor is the political leadership of the working class headed by its vanguard. Without this, there can be no transition to socialism" (*Report of the central committee of the CPSU to the twentieth congress*).

The historic formulation of the 20th congress of the CPSU about the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism arm the workingclass movement all over the world with a weapon of exceptional power. This formulation of the 20th congress is fully in accordance with Lenin's teaching that "Marx did not commit himself—or the future leaders of socialist revolution—to matters of form, to methods and ways of bringing about revolution". At the same time, there is a serious danger of these formulations being understood in an incorrect way which is contrary to the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism—principles which are equally valid for all countries.

"Socialism is inconceivable", wrote Lenin, "unless the

proletariat is the ruler of the state" (ibid, p 365). The essence of this thesis, as we have seen, has not been negated but on the contrary has been reasserted by the 20th congress of the CPSU.

In what sense then, one may ask, did Lenin consider state capitalism, even under bourgeois rule and even in advanced capitalist countries, to be an advance? The answer is given in Lenin's well-known article, written a year before the October revolution, "The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It": "State monopoly capitalism is a complete material preparation for socialism, the prelude to socialism, a rung in the ladder of history between which and the rung called socialism, there are no intermediate steps" (Lenin's emphasis, *Selected works*, Vol 2, p 114).

Earlier in the same article: "...given a really revolutionary democratic state, state monopoly capitalism inevitably and unavoidably implies a step or several steps towards socialism!" (ibid, p 113).

After the revolution, Lenin combating the 'lefts' showed how state capitalism with the working people in power can help to create conditions for transition to socialism. The example of China fully corroborates this thesis of Lenin.

The bourgeoisie, no matter how radical and progressive, cannot build socialism which is based on new property relations. Power in the hands of the democratic masses led by the proletariat—this is the essential condition for the building of socialism. The replacement of bourgeois-landlord rule by the rule of the people headed by the working class—without this socialism is inconceivable. The actual methods of conquest of power will not be the same in all cases. New historic possibilities have opened out of effecting the transition to socialism in a peaceful way: and it is the duty of all communist parties, all forces standing for socialism, to strive their utmost to realise this possibility. But it would be utterly incorrect to hold that this is the same as the theory of 'gradualism', the theory of

socialist 'elements' gradually growing within the capitalist state and ushering in socialism.

Further, the Leninist thesis that the bureaucratic state machine of the bourgeoisie cannot be the instrument for the exercise of power by the toiling masses and for the building of socialism—this thesis also retains its full validity. The precise method of eliminating the old state apparatus may be different and spread over a much longer period than was the case in Russia after revolution. But in order to build socialism the old state apparatus has to be replaced by a new system—one in which real power is vested in popular elected organs. It is worth noting that under the Nehru government, which claims to stand for socialism, the bureaucratic-police apparatus has not merely been kept intact but its power and scope have steadily grown.

To conclude: There undoubtedly exists a noncapitalist path of development for the underdeveloped countries like India. But it would be an illusion to think that the present government, headed by the bourgeoisie, can advance on that path. The Communist Party of India does not suffer from such illusions. Therefore, while fully recognising certain possibilities of advance in the existing situation and while fully supporting all measures of the government which help to realise these possibilities and strengthen the cause of peace, national freedom and national economy, the Communist Party simultaneously strives to strengthen the forces of democratic hands of the democratic masses led by the working class. That alone can complete the tasks of the democratic revolution with the utmost rapidity and advance the country towards socialism.

Appendix

A NONCAPITALIST PATH FOR UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

I

What will be the path of economic and social development of the economically backward, and now independent, countries of Asia and Africa? The question is being debated by economists, sociologists, politicians and journalists. An abundant literature on the subject has appeared in the west.

There are two points of view among the ruling elements of the United States. Some monopoly spokesmen maintain that political independence should not essentially change the economic and social pattern of these countries. That opinion is perhaps most saliently put in the study *The Political Economy of American Foreign Policy*, which follows the state department line. The underdeveloped countries, the study intimates, should remain underdeveloped for all time, or at any rate should not advance beyond the status of purveyors of cheap raw material and food for the industrial nations and markets for their manufactures. This is an attempt to perpetuate colonialism in a slightly refurbished form and prevent Asia and Africa from breaking out of economic backwardness and dependence.

The other point of view is that the Asian and African countries will develop rapidly along capitalist lines and will thus help to rejuvenate the senile capitalist system.

The fallacy of both predictions lies in the fact that they take no account of the aspirations of the people of the underdeveloped countries, who are determined to solve this all-important question independently. Another thing these predictions leave out of account is the conversion of socialism into a world system embracing European and Asian countries with over a third of the world's population. This is a fact of epochal importance: the ideas of socialism, first given practical embodiment in the Soviet Union and now being applied in several other countries, have a powerful appeal for all nations, particularly for those of Asia and Africa which, having broken out of colonial dependence stand at the historical crossroads.

The socialist achievements of People's China are exerting an especially powerful influence in the two continents. It was established at the third session of the national people's assembly last month that

the original plan of socialist economic reconstruction had been completed ahead of schedule. The socialist sector is now the dominant force in the Chinese economy, and this is a sure guarantee of successful transition to socialism. It has been demonstrated in practice that the people's democratic system in China makes it possible to carry out socialist reconstruction by peaceful methods.

This is how the international implications of China's socialist achievements are assessed by an American expert, Hans J. Morgenthau, director of the centre for the study of American foreign policy at the University of Chicago, in an article in the *New Republic* of 16 April:

"Nobody who has recently travelled through Asia with his eyes open can fail to be impressed by the impact which the emancipation of China from western dependence and the restoration of its power as a nation and as a civilisation is making upon all of Asia from Japan to Pakistan. What Asians admire and respect in China is what seems to them the fulfilment of the aspirations of all of Asia: to be masters in their own house and to prove themselves to be equal, if not the superior, of the west."

Those who believe that the alternative before the Asian and African countries is either to remain virtual colonies or choose the path of capitalist development, are taking a very narrow view to say the least. For in both continents there is a clear understanding that economic backwardness is due to the long years of colonial domination. That is why India, Burma, Indonesia, Egypt, Ceylon and many other nations are so vigorous in their opposition to colonialism and to all other forms of imperialist oppression or foreign monopoly dictation.

Freed of colonial tutelage, the Asian and African countries are confronted with many complex economic, social and political problems. These involve governmental structure, economic (particularly industrial) development, cultural advancement, liquidation of feudal survivals, the nationalities question, and many more. Properly speaking, these are the same problems that had to be faced in one or another degree by the countries now classed as highly developed. Some found capitalist solutions, others followed socialist patterns. Which of these two will Asia and Africa choose?

This article will deal principally with the economic aspect of the problem, and more specifically with the forms of economic development in one of the major Asian countries, India.

India's Development

Foreign capital is still strongly entrenched in the Indian economy, holding commanding positions in such branches as coal, jute, oil and tea, and controlling a substantial portion of the engineering and elec-

trical engineering industries. Native monopoly capital controls the relatively highly-developed cotton industry, also iron and steel, cement and several branches of engineering. Many Indian monopolies are closely linked with foreign financial interests.

It would, of course, be naive to expect monopoly capital to strive for socialist reconstruction. Nevertheless, in India, which is advancing along the road of independent political and economic development, the objective possibilities exist for obviating the continued growth of monopoly capital and, by peaceful methods, in conformity with the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, taking the socialist path.

That path has been advocated for many years by Jawaharlal Nehru. In his *Discovery of India*, Nehru describes the activities of the national planning committee initiated by the Indian National Congress in 1938. Under his chairmanship, the committee laid the groundwork for planning economic development after independence and the formation of an independent national government. The first target was industrialisation, without which India would stand no chance of wiping out poverty and unemployment, building up a proper national defence and tackling the job of economic reconstruction. Members of the committee could not agree on the principles of India's future social system, but, as Nehru remarks, "it became clear to me that our plan, as it developed, was inevitably leading us towards establishing some of the fundamentals of the socialist structure".

Further consideration of social problems led Nehru to the following very significant conclusion, which he made in the thirties: "Inevitably we are led to the only possible solution—the establishment of a socialist order, first within national boundaries, and eventually in the world as a whole, with a controlled production and distribution of wealth for the public good."

After independence and proclamation of the republic, all these questions reappeared in much more acute form. India's millions were giving thought to what course their country should follow, and the realisation was steadily gaining ground that continued development of capitalism would not solve any of the economic and social problems. From this followed that socialism offered the only way of overcoming economic backwardness, unemployment and poverty. There were, naturally, various interpretations of socialism.

The growing appeal of socialism found expression in the resolution which the house of the people adopted in December 1954. It reads in part: "The objective of our economic policy should be a socialistic pattern of society and towards this end the tempo of economic activity in general, and industrial development in particular, should be stepped up to the maximum possible extent."

The Indian National Congress, when it met at Avadi in January 1955, adopted a resolution declaring its basic aim to be the "estab-

lishment of a socialistic pattern of society" where: (a) the principal means of production are under social ownership or control, (b) production is progressively speeded up, (c) there is equitable distribution of the national wealth, (d) there is progressively fuller employment so as to lead to full employment within a period of ten years.

The fact that the Avadi resolution called for a "socialistic pattern of society" and not for "socialism" gave rise to a heated discussion of what the economic basis of that society would be.

The predominating view was that such a society could be based only on social ownership of the principal means of production. But the opinion was also expressed that it should be based on the handloom. Others affirmed that Indian socialism must be based on the 'big Indian family' and complete decentralisation of production. Still another opinion was put forward by G. D. Birla, prominent spokesman of Indian monopoly capital. Addressing the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry in 1955, he said that a socialistic pattern of society had nothing in common with socialism as such, and that the supreme embodiment of this pattern should be sought in British and the United States. These statements are not fortuitous; they are evidence of differing viewpoints, determined by definite class interests, on the future development of India.

But however differently interpreted, the Avadi resolution is expressive of the attitude of the congress leadership and of the government on a number of key economic reforms. The government's policy is primarily to accelerate industrialisation and build up a state-owned heavy industry producing means of production. It is set forth (with certain essential reservations) in the second five-year plan and in the resolution on government industrial policy submitted to the house of the people on 30 April.

The resolution stresses the need to expand the state sector and establish a growing cooperative sector. The state sector, it says, should embrace all basic branches of industry, including those of strategic importance, and public utilities, and other major industries requiring capital investment, which under present conditions can be supplied only by the state.

The state sector does not yet play a decisive part in the economy. The minister for planning, Nanda, states in his report to the congress committee that output by state industry is less than three per cent of the national total. If agriculture and certain other branches are excluded, it accounts for about 11 per cent in manufacturing, mining and transport. "It is obvious", Nanda says in the report, "that the public sector will have to be enlarged greatly in order that it may occupy a significant place in the economy of the nation."

The state sector now extends to the following: (1) railway transport; (2) air transport, nationalised in 1953; (3) integrated hydro-engineering projects, of which the biggest are the Bhakra-Nangal in

the Punjab, the Damodar valley development in West Bengal and Bihar, and the Hirakud project in Orissa; (4) more than ten big and medium-size industrial enterprises built in recent years. Of these the most important are: the Chittaranjan locomotive plant, the Sindri nitrate fertiliser plant, the Visakhapatnam shipyards; the Perambur carriage works near Madras, the Bangalore engineering works, the Rupnarayanpur cable factory, the Delhi DDT plant, the penicillin plant at Pimpri near Poona, and the thorium and uranium processing plant on Trombay island, near Bombay.

All these enterprises, equipped with the latest machinery, are already in operation and are successfully nearing their rated capacities. State-owned factories are still few but, as N. S. Khrushchov remarked, in them one sees "the contours of India's future powerful industry, bulwark of its independence, of its national might".

The state sector in heavy industry is being considerably enlarged under the second five-year plan, chiefly by the erection of three iron and steel mills to produce one million tons of steel a year each. The biggest, the Bhilai mill in Madhya Pradesh, is being built in cooperation with the Soviet Union. The plan calls also for the construction of three-state-owned nitrate fertiliser mills, a large plant producing heavy electrical machinery and a number of units in the industries manufacturing means of production. The underlying purpose is rapid industrialisation, with emphasis on the development of heavy industry mainly—but not entirely—in the state sector.

These steps to develop state industry are not, in themselves, of a socialist character. State-owned enterprises—railways, for example exist in several capitalist countries. They are state-capitalist enterprises. However in India as in other economically backward countries that have recently embarked on the path of independent development, state-capitalist enterprises assume a special character. It would be a mistake to equate them with state-monopoly capitalism in the United States or western Europe. American state-monopoly capitalism is an outgrowth of the private monopolies, which are eager to exploit not only their own people, but the people of other countries as well. It is therefore a servant of the expansionist policy of the colonialists, and its role is entirely reactionary.

On the other hand, the purpose of state-capitalist enterprises in India is to facilitate industrialisation and general economic development. They help to strengthen India's independence, and to weaken the positions of imperialism. Consequently state-capitalist enterprises in India, under present conditions, play a progressive part. At the same time Indian state capitalism differs from its counterpart in China, where it is being consistently employed by the people's government to expedite the building of socialism.

Lenin repeatedly emphasised that state capitalism is a step towards socialism. But further steps are required too—steps that will sub-

stantially change the ownership of the means of production, ensure a considerable increase in output, fuller employment, a larger national income, higher living standards for, and higher political and public activity by, the working people.

The Indian leaders believe that the building of a "socialistic pattern of society" will require much time. In opening the debate on the five-year plan in the council of states in May, premier Nehru declared that India's development would be a process of absolute and relative growth of the state sector which would thus come to control an ever larger share of the nation's economy.

The present international situation and the fact that India has such friendly neighbours as the USSR and the People's Republic of China, on whose experience and economic cooperation it can draw, lead one to believe that, given close cooperation by all the progressive forces of the country, there is the possibility for India to develop along socialist lines.

But, of course, between possibility and reality lies a complicated path which will require much effort and the overcoming of considerable resistance from the reactionary forces, particularly the forces of international reaction. India's advance along the socialist path will evidently be slower than that of, say, China, and, as is obvious from what has been said above, will differ in many respects. But only dogmatists can fail to understand these peculiarities and try to squeeze realities into their own artificial schemes. Socialist development is bound to differ in accordance with the conditions prevailing in different countries. The multiplicity of forms of the socialist development is but a reflection of the multiplicity of the historic, economic and social conditions in various countries.

II

The achievement of political independence squarely faces every underdeveloped country with the all-important problem of determining the direction and pace of social and economic development. The People's Republic of China, the Korean Democratic People's Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam are firmly embarked on the socialist path. In other former colonies in Asia and Africa the problem is being searchingly discussed in government councils, parliaments, universities, labour and other organisations, and by scientists, writers and businessmen. Of course their views vary widely, but the significant thing is that there is almost no open advocacy of capitalist development. Even organisations that speak for the national bourgeoisie—chambers of commerce, business conferences, etc.—avoid advocating such development. The only ones who favour it are publications controlled by foreign monopoly interests.

The capitalist path is not popular in underdeveloped countries. This is partially attributable to the fact that Asians and Africans quite rightly associate capitalism with colonialism, and colonialism in whatever shape or form is abhorred and detested. But there are also other considerations.

The underdeveloped nations are anxious to overcome their economic backwardness in the shortest possible space of time. Hence the all-out effort to build an integrated national economy, industrialise the country, extend its transport facilities, raise agricultural levels, improve living standards, wipe out mass unemployment, and so on.

The very independence of these new Asian and African states depends upon the quick accomplishment of these tasks. For they have no desire to remain agrarian and raw-material appendages of the imperialist powers or, to use an expression current in Asia, to be the wood-choppers and water-carriers of the industrial capitalist nations.

Can capitalism accelerate their advancement? Can it help them to achieve their chief goal integrated development of the national productive forces?

Most of the underdeveloped countries possess enormous natural resources water-power, a wide range of minerals, fertile land, valuable tropical woods, etc. But utilisation of these potentialities on any appreciable scale requires, as a rule, substantial initial outlays and planned effort over a period of many years.

Will foreign capital supply the necessary funds? Obviously not. Western financiers have no interest in promoting the economic advancement of Asia and Africa. By its very nature, capital seeks quick returns, and under presentday conditions its motto is often "after us, the deluge". In most Asian and African countries the national bourgeoisie is economically weak and unable to compete with the western monopolies. For all these reasons, it is only the governments—and moreover governments that aim not at ensuring the capitalists' profits, but at economic development and higher living standards—that are in a position to make these big investments and initiate long-term constructions efforts. Let us examine some of the concrete aspects of the problem.

Many of the underdeveloped countries are richly endowed with hydropower resources. The total hydropower potential of Asia (without the USSR) is estimated at 1000 million kw; the figure for Africa is 700 million kw, and 600 million for South America. But only a tiny fraction of this reserve has been tapped. Even in India, which is ahead of other underdeveloped areas in this respect, only about 1 per cent of available water-power has been developed.

Effective and rational application of water power is possible only

in integrated projects supplying electricity, irrigation, flood-control and water-transport. This requires not only very costly installations, but planned and coordinated development of the various branches of the economy. In short, it calls for a well-thought-out long-range economic strategy. Properly speaking, the advanced capitalist countries have nothing comparable to such combined development plans based on largescale hydropower projects. For the big trusts and banks are reluctant to tie up their capital in schemes that will pay off many years later, especially when their effect is expressed not so much in dividends as in a general heightening of economic standards.

True, reference is sometimes made to the Tennessee valley authority in the United States. It has been advertised as the 'ideal of economic democracy', and even as a 'socialist island in the capitalist world', but neither of those descriptions is valid.

The TVA received large government funds for the construction of a series of hydrotechnica projects, and thrived at a time when the American monopolies urgently needed large quantities of cheap electric power to expand production of explosives and other war goods. When that factor ceased to operate, the TVA lost its former significance.

Several Asian countries, notably India, have chosen a different path, namely, planned integrated development of available hydro-power resources for the benefit of the nation. The central and state governments are erecting a number of combined hydroengineering works, including such major undertakings as the Bhakra-Nangal system, the Damodar valley development, and the Hirakud project. The same pattern is to be followed in Burma, Indonesia and Egypt.

Egypt's outstanding project is, of course, the famous Aswan dam. When completed, it will produce up to 10,000 million kw per year, increase the national arable by one third, prevent devastating floods and sharply raise revenue from agriculture.

Similar projects could be launched in other parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America. But they are well-nigh impossible in a private-enterprise economy. It is characteristic that no western firm has evinced any interest in largescale hydropower development in India or Egypt. Local private capital has neither the desire nor the means to undertake construction which will pay back only after a period of many years.

The western powers display interest only if there is some chance of making these projects pay off politically. That has been their approach to the Aswan plan. Egypt was promised financial assistance, but on condition that it consented to foreign control of its finances and economy. The Egyptian government indignantly rejected these shackling terms, and Washington and London lost all

interest in the Aswan scheme and withdrew their offer of financial support. President Nasser exposed their policy when he told a public meeting in Alexandria on 26 July:

"The imperialists do not want to see us an industrial nation capable of producing everything we require. I cannot recall any instance of American aid designed to further industrialisation. There have been no signs of that; American aid has other objects."

This episode of the Aswan dam is striking evidence that any underdeveloped country which hopes to receive disinterested western assistance in solving its vital economic problems is working under a delusion.

Atomic energy, primarily for generating electric power, is another very important factor in the development of economically backward areas. Most underdeveloped countries lack sizable or conveniently located deposits of coal and other fuels, but many have deposits of atomic raw materials. India, for instance, has huge reserves of thorium in monazite sands in the coastal areas of Travancore-Cochin and other states. Prime minister Nehru has said his country must make a leap from the age of dung fuel to the age of atomic energy. Indian scientists are already working on an extensive program of research and experimentation in preparation for that leap.

However it cannot be made on the basis of private enterprise, as the experience of the United States clearly demonstrates. For ten years now American corporate interests have been holding up large-scale construction of atomic power plants, preferring to concentrate on production of atomic weapons. Resistance by the electric concerns, anxious to retain their profits, has played a big part. The underdeveloped countries, on the other hand, are endeavouring to employ atomic energy as a basic factor in developing modern techniques and raising national living standards. Obviously, the job is far too big for local private capital, and atomic energy is bound to develop as a state-owned industry.

Much the same applies to mineral resources. Most underdeveloped countries, as mentioned above, possess rich and varied deposits. Prospecting, however, is only just being started and has to be developed on a much larger scale before actual mining operations can begin. Here too local private capital cannot contribute much, and foreign capital will step in only if there is a clear prospect of quick and huge profits. It readily develops deposits that do not require much investment. One example is Middle East oil, where big profits are being made on remarkably small outlays. That explains the monopoly scramble for control of the Middle East fields.

Capitalist concerns that undertake prospecting in underdeveloped countries (for handsome remuneration) not infrequently conceal or falsify their own findings. Several years ago an American oil com-

pany was given a concession to prospect for oil in West Bengal, one of the potentially richest parts of India. It was given especially favourable terms, and its activities were highly publicised, but so far the practical results have been nil. India has decided to entrust prospecting in other parts of the country to a government organisation employing foreign experts.

The foreign monopolies are still less interested in the industrialisation of underdeveloped countries, particularly in their heavy-industry development. More, their policy is deliberately to prevent industrialisation. Witness the conditions laid down in a report submitted to the US congress in June 1955 by the Hoover commission: "In the 'Asian-African arc', with the possible exception of Japan, no large manufacturing projects be undertaken and no large industrial plants constructed, except for production of strategic materials; otherwise all industrial aid be confined to small industries." That should kill all hope of foreign monopoly capital assisting the industrialisation of economically backward countries.

The national bourgeoisie, with few exceptions, possesses neither the means nor the technical facilities for building up heavy industry.

The conclusion to be drawn from all these facts is that in underdeveloped countries heavy industry, especially iron and steel, power, engineering and chemicals, can develop only as part of the state sector. That view is fully confirmed by the record of the past few years.

The previous article noted that in India, power and heavy-industry development was financed by the state. In Burma, the key industries and mines are state property. In Indonesia, all the major projects of the five-year plan (1956-60) will be built by the central government, with local governments and private interests concentrating on smaller undertakings. The same system is being followed in Ceylon, Egypt and elsewhere. Nor is this being done out of ideological considerations. It follows logically from the experience of postwar years, which shows that underdeveloped nations cannot, under prevailing conditions, build heavy industry by customary capitalist methods.

The same applies to agriculture. All the underdeveloped countries are predominantly agrarian, with the vast majority of the population living in rural areas. Farming techniques are backward, harvest yields low, and animal productivity lower still.

Capitalist penetration in agriculture leads to mass impoverishment of the tillers, deprives them of their land, tends to develop a one-crop farm structure which makes the country entirely dependent on imports for its food supply. The big plantations are usually foreign-controlled (tea in India and Ceylon, rubber in Malaya, Indonesia, etc.), and are a source of rich profits for a small group of capitalists. For the peasant population they mean brutal exploitation and

appropriation of the best land; for the nation as a whole they spell reduction of food-crop areas (as in Ceylon and several Latin-American countries).

As often as not, modern capitalism retains and supports precapitalist, feudal survivals and hinders consistent agrarian reform. Yet the experience of China convincingly demonstrates that a rapid rise in agricultural production is possible only through far-reaching land reform and the development of consumers', marketing, credit, producers' and other cooperatives.

Based on the activity of the masses and systematically assisted by the state, the cooperative movement can liberate the small peasant (and the handicraftsman and artisan) from landlord and usurer oppression, enable him to employ more efficient farming methods and increase productivity. Under certain conditions, cooperatives in underdeveloped countries can become the nuclei of a new economic type, the rudiments of a new, noncapitalist system. Premier Nehru has repeatedly pointed to the vast prospects for cooperative development, and president Nasser has appealed for an end to feudalism and monopoly rule, and the creation of a "cooperative socialist society" in Egypt.

What must be particularly emphasised is that the all-round and stable advance of agriculture in economically backward countries is possible only on the basis of industrialisation, only when industry is in a position to provide the requisite number of machines and implements, mineral fertilisers, insecticides, irrigation equipment, etc. Industrialisation and agricultural development are inseparably connected.

The people, the workers, are the chief production factor in any country. What would capitalism bring the working folk of underdeveloped countries? Only greater unemployment—which even today is a difficult social problem—and greater exploitation to multiply the profits of native and especially foreign monopolists. Moreover statistics show that foreign concerns export the larger part of their profits.

The economic plans now being evolved in a number of underdeveloped countries can be carried out only with the active participation of their workers and peasants, their young technical intelligentsia, scientists, students, etc. But this is only possible if the labour effort of the masses goes to promote the welfare of the people, not to swell the profits of foreign capitalists and the domestic monopolies tied with them. That is why the capitalist path meets with so little support in these new independent countries. On the other hand, there is a constant search for new forms of social and economic advancement. The capitalist path, the negative features of which are so obvious, has no appeal for the masses and for progressive-minded political leaders.

41. New Perspectives

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE JAYAPRAKASH LETTER

I thank you for your letter dated 5 November, 1956.

I hope this will mark the beginning of a much-needed exchange of views between you and other friends in the Praja-Socialist Party on the one hand and us, the Indian communists, on the other. The problems which we all who stand for socialism have to deal with today are so vast, the differences between us on those problems are so serious and yet our ultimate objectives are so common that an exchange of ideas and views will be of great help for all of us and for movement.

I take it that it was these considerations that prompted you to write your letter which I have studied with utmost care and profound interest. I have done so not merely because it comes from a valued friend and a person who occupies an eminent position in our country, but also because it raises a number of questions which have been agitating us and over which we ourselves have been pondering deeply.

In writing this reply I am not interested, let me assure you in meeting your arguments with counterarguments. That sort of thing, I fully agree, will be a wasted effort and will take us nowhere. I am however disappointed with your letter. Its ideas are not new and its spirit is not what we expected from you. Your approach appears to us to be so defective, your appraisal of the world com-

This pamphlet, published in December 1956, gives the text of Ajoy Ghosh's reply, dated 21 November, to Jayaprakash Narayan's "Letter to Communist Friends" of 5 November (given as appendix here).

munist movement, of its record and of the socialist system so onesided, your assertions so sweeping that one wonders whether despite your being "motivated by the friendliest of sentiments", you are not unwillingly resorting to precisely what you have pleaded against, viz the attempt to "score points".

Onesided Appraisal

Many of the statements made in your letter are such that one cannot but ask whether you are displaying that regard for truth which you have rightly demanded of us.

According to you, all that has happened in the USSR is that "after forty years of revolution, human freedom and human dignity lie trampled in the dust". Is this a correct appraisal?

For you the abolition of capitalism and landlordism and the ending of exploitation of man by man seem to mean nothing. Nor do you seem to attach any importance to the fact that in the USSR and in other socialist states, it is the mass of the people—the workers, the peasants and the working intelligentsia—that exercise power at all levels, through their elected organs. The gigantic achievements of the USSR in every sphere, the transformation of a backward country into a mighty industrial power, the liquidation of illiteracy and the tremendous cultural advance, the freeing of women from age-old bondage, the awakening to a new life of the peoples oppressed and held in subjugation by tsardom—do you think that all these have no significance in determining what attitude one should adopt towards that country? Have the evils that have undoubtedly taken place justify your condemnation of the whole system, without any attempt to understand the causes of the successes as well as the historic conditions in which these evils occurred?

We maintain that despite the grievous mistakes that were committed—mistakes many of which could have been avoided but many of which were also inevitable because of

the unique nature of the attempt to build a new society radically different from all past societies in the midst of a hostile world—the USSR has achieved something which no country achieved before. The system that prevails there is, with all its shortcomings, a socialist system. The impact of this system has been worldwide and has profoundly influenced the minds of men as well as the whole course of history.

Let me tell you that this is not our view alone. This view has been expressed by men like Rabindranath Tagore and Romain Rolland. This view has been expressed by leaders of your own party. I would remind you of what the late Acharya Narendra Deva said in his presidential address to the All India Congress Socialist Party conference in May 1934:

"It (socialism) is no longer a mere principle and dogma, but is being translated into action, at least in one country. The Russian experiment is going on before our eyes and we can study the experiment and form our own conclusions. Russia is the only land without unemployment. . . . The foundation of a socialist economy has been well laid. . . . the fact that the Soviet state is progressing rapidly despite the hostility of an antagonistic world, and even in the midst of widespread economic crisis, is in itself a proof positive that it has a message to give. . . . the Russian experiment has undoubtedly much to teach and has facilitated the task of others who may have to embark upon the socialist experiment."

Will you say that this whole evaluation was wrong?

Today the ideas of socialism have come to dominate the minds of men. People in all countries are gravitating towards these ideas. Could this have taken place without the concrete demonstration of the superiority of socialism over capitalism? And in the demonstrating this superiority, is it not the USSR that has played the pioneering role?

Not merely the USSR built the first socialist society, overcoming heavy odds, but it saved humanity from the horrors of fascism. It rendered fraternal aid to the people's democracies of Europe and to our great neighbour China to rebuild their economy. When you seize upon certain departures from and violations of the principles of equality between nations which occurred in the relations between the USSR and some socialist states to describe the policy of the USSR as a "new kind of colonialism"—are you stating the truth? Which imperialist country gave such assistance to an underdeveloped country as the USSR, to take only one example, has given to China?

Further, what have you to say about the economic and other agreements which the USSR has made with such countries as Indonesia, Egypt and India—agreements which have been warmly acclaimed even by bourgeois circles, agreements which are of considerable assistance to these countries for the strengthening of their national freedom and national economy? Do all these facts substantiate your thesis about a "new kind of colonialism".

You have asserted that for the USSR "peace has come to mean preparedness for war". Is this not the very opposite of truth? Is it not the USSR which alone among the great world powers, in the years before the second world war, stood by the victims of aggression and strove to maintain peace? What about the Geneva conference in bringing about which the USSR played an outstanding role and which led to relaxation of war tension? What about the proposals made by the USSR for destruction of atomic weapons, for liquidation of military bases in other countries, for reduction of armaments? You may not like the Warsaw pact and the state of military preparedness which the socialist states have had to undertake but is it your demand that the USSR should disarm itself in face of the menace presented by imperialist war preparations and the NATO? If it did that, what would have happened to the socialist world? What would have happened

to Egypt in the recent crisis? Does not the whole world recognise the decisive role that the USSR has played in this crisis in frustrating the attempts of the imperialists, in defending the freedom of the countries of Asia and Africa, and in preserving peace?

By emphasising the outstanding achievements of the USSR and its role in world affairs, we are not for a moment minimising the gravity of the mistakes and shortcomings that have occurred. But the first thing we want to stress is that these mistakes did not change the basic character of socialist society. Secondly, these mistakes have been revealed by the leaders of the USSR themselves with a boldness and candour that no government has ever done. Thirdly, a process of rethinking, a process of reexamination, a process of deep and thorough-going reforms has been started and is going forward with increasing momentum. You have, in your letter, focused attention only on the mistakes but paid little attention to these factors.

You have asked how was it that we were kept in dark for such a long time about what Khrushchov has revealed and you have even suggested that it is impossible that leaders of the communist parties did not know the facts. The truth is that we did not know them until they were brought to light by the CPSU leadership itself.

But when you say that the "whole noncommunist world was talking about these facts for nearly three decades" and therefore we should have accepted them, I am forced to ask you: Do you think that all that the "noncommunist world" talked about the USSR has proved correct? What about the wild stories about the USSR spread by "the noncommunist world" in the years after the October revolution? What about the stories about abolition of family and suppression of religious rights? What about the reports about the disintegration of Soviet economy and the failure of the five-year plans? What about the

confident prediction about the industrial and military weakness of the USSR and about its speedy collapse in face of Hitler's invasion? Have all these 'assessments' of the "noncommunist world" proved correct? And if they have not, are we to be blamed for relying far more on the statements of the leaders of the USSR than on leaders of the "noncommunist world"?

At the same time, we agree that we were wrong in idealising everything in the USSR. We should have paid more attention to the criticism of the USSR made by socialist and noncommunist democrats. We agree that among us and in other communist parties, the tendency developed of defending everything done by the USSR, of condemning everyone who criticised any aspect of Soviet policy. We are deeply conscious of the damage this has done to the cause of communist-socialist unity and even to the cause of socialism. We are determined to abandon this attitude.

But are you justified in claiming that what you stated about the USSR in the past and what you are stating now is the truth? If we were wrong in hailing the USSR as a "faultless model", are you right in painting it as a "hideous thing", with scant regard for truth and conveniently ignoring all facts which do not suit your thesis? Is this the "Marxian objectivity and revolutionary freedom of the human mind" which you set before us as a model?

Your appraisal of the work of the communist parties suffers from the same defect of onesidedness as your appraisal of the USSR. Communist parties all over the world, if one is to believe you, are nothing but "puppets of Moscow". If that were so, how do you explain the triumph of revolution in China? How do you explain the fact that in France and Italy, the communist parties have a greater mass following than any other party? How do you explain even the position which the Communist Party of India has attained as a major force in our own country?

If the communist parties had been what you imagine them to be, then they could never have grown into the **mass force** which they are. They would have remained small sects. The very fact that despite ruthless repression and terror, despite slander and misrepresentation and despite—let us add—many serious mistakes, the communist parties in a large number of countries have succeeded in enlisting in their ranks many of the best sons of the working people and count millions among their adherents—this very fact proves that they are **genuine patriotic parties**. There is no question, therefore, on our part of being ashamed of our past or of denying it. We are proud of what the communist movement has achieved, proud of the sacrifice made by countless martyrs of that movement, while at the same time we recognise our failings and shortcomings in many spheres.

I would ask you another question. You have built up an apparently formidable case against the world communist movement and the socialist countries by focusing attention on and exaggerating their shortcomings and mistakes. We too are deeply conscious of these shortcomings and mistakes. We are striving to find out how and why they occurred and how they should be eliminated. But have you tried to find out why it is that despite all these, no movement in contemporary history has won such massive victories as the communist movement. Communism today is not merely an ideal, nor even only a movement. Over a vast area inhabited by more than one-third of the world population, the ideas of communism have triumphed.

You might ascribe this only to deceit and violence. But did not the enemies of communism have at their disposal far greater means of deceit and violence? Did they not use these means? If, despite all that communism has attained victories that no one can deny, if it has won the adherence of hundreds of millions of people all over the world, then does it not become necessary for one who desires to find out the truth, to probe deeper than you

have done? Are you not, in your own words, "making a nonsense of Marxism" by your assertion that all victories of communism are due to the practice of "untruth and violence"?

You call us "rational human beings". We too expect a rational approach on your part. Then only we can jointly study the causes of the achievements of world communism, as well as its defects and shortcomings so that we may arrive at conclusions which would strengthen our common movement and purge it of weaknesses.

Poland and Hungary

You have cited Poland and Hungary as examples of the new kind of colonialism which the USSR is practising. You totally ignore the fact that it was due to the efforts of the USSR that Poland, Hungary and several other states were freed from Hitler's rule and also the fact that the assistance of the USSR helped them to fight reaction in their own country and take to the path of socialist industrialisation. It has been frankly admitted that in the relations that developed between the USSR and these countries, the principle of equality of nations was not always adhered to and this did damage to their mutual relations. But this is now being corrected.

You are, I am sure, like all of us, happy at the developments that have taken place in Poland—where the gains of the socialist revolution have been retained and further fortified by the reforms that are taking place. This itself should impel you to reexamine your proposition that the evils which occurred are inherent in the social system that was built.

We have been profoundly distressed by the happenings in Hungary. Our stand on this issue has already been made clear in the columns of our paper and in the speeches of our comrades in the parliament. It is to be deeply regretted that such things occurred after eleven years of people's

democratic rule and which, incidentally, reveals the enormity of the mistakes, misdeeds and even crimes committed by the government of Hungary both in internal sphere and in its relation to the USSR.

It is to be deeply regretted that the popular movement for democratic reforms was joined in by reactionaries who, with imperialist help, brought about an armed uprising against the socialist system and to deal with which the government had to call in for assistance of Soviet troops.

But when you say that in relation to Hungary, the choice that we have to make is between freedom and slavery, we are forced to ask you whether you consider the developments that took place there after the 31st of October as a movement for freedom. The mass butchery of communists, of workingclass leaders and their families, the attempt at restoration of capitalism and landlordism by the Horthy fascists, directly aided by foreign imperialists and the conversion of Hungary into a war-base against the socialist world—do you think all this would have meant freedom? Would this not have been a supreme tragedy for the Hungarian people? Would this not have accentuated the danger of world war? Would this not have imperilled the whole socialist world and created a dangerous situation, paralysing the action of the USSR at a time when the freedom of Egypt and with it of the whole of Asia and Africa faced a grave menace—a menace which only the decisive intervention of the USSR could and did avert?

You may say that all this talk about restoration of capitalism, imperialist aid and war-danger is a mere smoke-screen to cover the imperialist designs of Russia. In that case, how do you explain the far-reaching changes that are taking place in the relation between Poland and the USSR by methods of negotiation and by peaceful efforts? Why was it that president Tito who certainly, even you would agree, does not favour Russian domination, stated on 16 November that "Soviet armed intervention which

displaced Nagy government turned out to have saved socialism in Hungary, was necessary and was the lesser of the two evils" because "the alternative would have been chaos, civil war, counterrevolution and a new world war"?

At the same time, I admit that on the issue of Hungary, divergence of opinion about the propriety of the action taken by the USSR is possible and even inevitable because of the complexity of the issue involved. Our party thinks that in the situation that developed, such action, however painful, was essential in the interest of the Hungarian people and socialism, in the interest of world peace, in the interest of the freedom of Asian and African people. Whether our position is correct or not, history alone will show. But in any case, we shall not call all those who criticise Soviet action as being agents of imperialism just as we expect them to recognise our bona fides. Your statement that the "future of communism" depends on the stand that communist parties take on the question of Hungary—which means that they will have proved their independence if they condemn the USSR and their subservience if they do not—oversimplifies the whole issue and cannot, therefore, be the basis of our attitude.

In your recent statements you have condemned the USSR for intervention in Hungary. You may think you are right in doing so. But how is it that you have not, even once, if I am not mistaken, mentioned the role of the USSR in halting Anglo-French aggression in Egypt? Is this not significant? Does this not reveal a prejudiced mind? Why is it also that while dismissing in one sentence the peace policy of the USSR—"peace has come to mean preparedness for war"—you have kept silent over the concrete measures taken by the USSR for peace—measures that have been praised even by many bourgeois leaders?

One of your observations on Yugoslavia surprises me. We were undoubtedly wrong in the attitude we adopted

towards Yugoslavia. You have rightly criticised us for that. I would not have minded if that criticism had been sharper. But you also state that "events have happened in the country in recent months that are somewhat disturbing". I do not know what these events are that you are referring to. Are you perturbed because in recent period Yugoslavia has drawn closer to the other states of the socialist world? I hope such is not the case but I would like you to clarify the meaning of your observation.

On Proletarian Internationalism

While roundly condemning the socialist states and communist parties, you have kept silent over the record of social democracy, or as it now calls itself, democratic socialism—its record in the sphere of abolition of private property, in the sphere of ending the rule of the rich over the poor, in the sphere of liberating the enslaved colonial peoples. Is it because that that record will not bear scrutiny and close examination and will present a revealing content?

You have criticised our "false conception of internationalism". Certainly that conception had a number of defects—particularly in the nature of relations that should exist between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the one hand and other communist parties on the other. But will you deny that the internationalism that we preached and practised has given something new to the world?

What have you to say in regard to the fact that the Communist Party of Great Britain was the one party that consistently supported the Indian national movement for full freedom, while the British Labour Party which professes "democratic socialism" joined hands with the Tories to suppress that movement? What have you to say about the contrast between the attitude of socialists and communists of France on the question of Algerian freedom and on the crisis that developed over the issue of Suez? I would also remind you of what stand the Israeli socialist leader

who attended the recent Asian socialist conference at Bombay took on the issue of Egypt and ask you to contrast it with the stand taken by the Communist Party of Israel (*New Age*, 4 November 1956, p 13).

Do you want us to be ashamed of this internationalism or repudiate it? I am sure you will not do that.

It is one thing to say that in the relations that developed between the CPSU and other communist parties, as well as in the relations between the USSR and several socialist states, there were departures from the principles of proletarian internationalism. It is a totally different thing to assert that the internationalism which we have professed and practised is false, without content and a cover for subservience to the USSR. A half-truth, especially if exaggerated out of all proportion, can be, you will admit, more misleading than even a lie.

Man, System and Theories

I would now like to take up some of the fundamental questions you have raised.

You have stressed that man—his moral and material welfare and growth—must be the goal of all social endeavour. And you have asked us: What is it that we are fighting for? For a system or certain values of life? For theories or for men?

The criterion that you have stated is correct. But your poser is misleading and fallacious.

The desire for all-round progress of man is not a new desire. It has been the motivating spirit behind the efforts of the noblest representatives of humanity in all epochs. It has been the ideal which they all set before themselves. But as history tells us, this ideal was never realised. It was Marxism that showed that this age-old ideal could become a reality only in a society where classes were abolished. And Marxism also pointed out that class society could not be abolished by mere efforts to change the nature of man, by mere exhortations to people to shed their evil

habits but by the organised action of the masses led by the working class who had to create a new social system.

If you agree with these basic postulates of Marxism, and I think all socialists accept them, you would readily see that the question which you have asked, viz whether communists are fighting for certain theories or for man, for a system or certain values of life, is a question that suffers from serious defects. The basic assumption of such a question is that political theories and social systems are of little relevance in determining as to what ensures the full growth of man and what makes it possible for mankind as a whole to realise certain values. If that assumption is accepted, we go back to the concept that the evils that prevail in present society are due to the evils that persist in the minds of men and all that is needed is an effort to change human nature.

Can such an effort succeed? For answer, it is not necessary to refer to other countries. It is enough to examine what has happened in our own country. Our national movement was led by a person of outstanding moral stature, one who not merely preached lofty ideals but practised what he preached and set a model before the whole nation. Yet the state that has come to be established in India, through the victory of the movement which Mahatma Gandhi led, is one which certainly does not uphold the moral values which he preached although it is headed by his staunch lieutenants. You have yourself characterised our present rulers as being "triggerhappy". Is this due to the inherent evil in their nature or is it due to the social system which they represent and uphold?

Hence one cannot separate theories and social systems from man and human values. Therefore we say that to ask us what we are fighting for—for theories or man, for a system or certain values of life—is not a correct thing to do. Certainly our objective is the uplift of man. But it is only in a social system which has abolished private ownership of means of production, which has put an end to all exploitation of man by man, which has banished

crises and unemployment, which has made use of science and technology for raising the standard of life of the people—only in such a society does it become possible to ensure all-round advance of man and realise those moral values which we all cherish. And the movement for the ushering in of such a society can succeed only if it is guided by certain theories—which themselves are not petrified dogmas but constantly grow and develop.

Defence of Human values

We fully concede, and this is one of the lessons which has been sharply impressed on us by recent events, that abolition of capitalism and of classes, while they alone create the **indispensable conditions** for the uplift of man and his full development, they do not **automatically** realise this aim. Even in a socialist society there can take place grave defects, excesses and even crimes, both inside the country and in the relation between socialist states which are totally indefensible. Even after the abolition of classes, a continuous, sustained and determined struggle has to be waged to protect democracy and extend it, to uphold human values, to inculcate the spirit of goodness, tolerance and brotherhood among the people. It is necessary to create guarantees and even to bring about necessary modifications in the system in many spheres, so as to ensure the fullest measure of control by the people over the government not merely in the execution of policies but also in their formulation. If these tasks are neglected or not given due weight, socialism does not flower fully, the human spirit gets curbed and stifled, the development of man is hampered. Hence it is that the process of reexamination that started with the 20th congress of the CPSU has gone forward in all socialist countries and has already led to important results.

One may not be satisfied with what has been already achieved in these spheres. One may demand a deeper examination of the causes that led to the tragic events. One may demand more thoroughgoing reforms. These

certainly are matters on which valuable suggestions can be made by us and by all who like you stand for socialism, and rightly stress that socialism should mean all-round progress of man.

Unfortunately you have not done that. On the basis of the many mistakes and misdeeds that have taken place in the USSR, you condemn the whole social, economic and political system that has developed there. By what would you replace it? By the kind of democracy that prevails in capitalist countries—the democracy where the rich oppress the poor? Evidently that cannot be your aim. Then what is your alternative? And how do you seek to achieve that alternative?

Throughout your letter there is not even the faintest indication of a reply to these crucial questions. And this constitutes, let me tell you, the gravest weakness of not merely your position, but of the position of all those who take a negative attitude towards the socialist states and towards that the world communist movement has already achieved.

Would it not be much better to adopt another approach? To recognise, without equivocation, that the establishment of the power of the working masses on one-third of the world is the greatest event in recorded human history. To recognise the gigantic advance that has already been made in this world in the realisation of many ideals of socialism. To recognise at the same time that in many important and even vital aspects, this world has not yet attained the ideals which socialism set before itself. To devise ways and means by which these defects can be remedied, guarantees created against their recurrence and the achievement of our ideals ensured. To point out, while recognising its successes, the shortcomings of the world communist movement and of the communist parties.

We expected such a scientific and helpful approach from you but are disappointed.

You have asked us to think deeply over what you have

said. We shall certainly do so. But is it not necessary that you too think over the happenings of last few years and reexamine your own views? You seem to be thoroughly convinced that your present position on all the issues that divide us is absolutely correct and you have virtually asked us to accept that position. Is this a proper attitude to take? Such an attitude, I fear, is not conducive to the creation of that atmosphere which is needed in order that we may make joint endeavour to arrive at a common understanding with regard to the world situation and the tasks of the socialist movement in our own country.

Corrections Needed in Our Views

All that I have said should not be taken to mean that we are not conscious of the need to correct our own views. Bourgeois democracy, as has been repeatedly stressed by Marxists, is not and cannot be full democracy. But that does not mean—and Marxism has never said that—that it is all sham. It constitutes a big advance over what prevailed in past societies. Socialism has to recognise this advance and carry it forward. In socialism and in socialism alone can the noble principles of liberty, equality and fraternity find their historic fulfilment, and the socialist society itself can grow only if it keeps these principles in mind and consciously strives to realise them. Then alone, together with advance in other spheres, will take place that flowering of human mind, that moral and spiritual uplift of man which we are all striving for.

Nor does our criticism of your attitude towards the USSR mean, as I have already stated, that our own attitude has been correct. While defending the socialist achievements of the USSR it was our duty and responsibility to have criticised those policies, methods and acts which constituted a violation of the principles of socialist democracy. That we did not do. You may say that even today we are blindly following the USSR and cite Hungary as an example. On that point I have already explained our attitude and while you may not agree with it,

you will, I hope, accept that it represents our genuine conviction.

One of our gravest failings in the past has been not to act in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist precept that socialism will be realised in each country through a movement which, while basing itself on the principles which are common to all countries, also recognises the specific features, the specific traditions of each country. Also that the socialist society itself will reveal a variety of forms and the path to socialism will differ from country to country. We have stressed, in several statements, that we believe in the possibility of socialism being achieved in our country without resort to violence and civil war and we are striving our utmost to realise this possibility.

Appeal to All Socialists and Democrats

In the end, I would request you to take into account the gravity of the world situation, as well as the condition of the people in our own country and realise the imperative necessity of all socialist and democratic forces in the country coming together.

Despite the ceasefire that has taken place in Egypt the situation remains tense and full of dangers. The imperialists have not abandoned their plans. They are hatching new conspiracies against world peace and against the freedom of the Asian and African countries. If they succeed in their efforts, not merely our national independence will be imperilled but the world will be plunged into a war the like of which it has never known.

Our country has attained a great status in world affairs by its role in defence of peace and against colonialism. It is cooperating with all governments in the world, whether socialist or capitalist, for relaxation of international tension and peaceful solution to problems of international dispute. But our two parties and other socialist and democratic forces in the country cannot afford to be com-

placent and leave these issues in the hands of the government alone. Only if we all come together and build up a powerful mass movement, only then will our country be able to back the peaceloving declarations and moves of the government with effective mass action—action, for example, calculated to force the imperialists to withdraw their forces from Egyptian soil. Also, only our unity will help in overcoming the vacillations and weaknesses that persist in the government's own policy—vacillations and weaknesses such as are seen in its attitude towards the British commonwealth.

In the internal sphere, the political, social and economic problems confronting our people demand urgent tackling and solution. We are in such a situation that with correct policies we can rapidly overcome our economic and cultural backwardness and ensure a life of prosperity and happiness for our people. But the policies which the government is pursuing are, despite some modifications that have taken place in certain spheres, such that they hamper the speedy realisation of these objectives. It refuses to take firm and energetic measures against foreign monopolists, big landlords and Indian big business. It imposes new burdens on the people and attacks their already miserable living standard. Largescale eviction of peasants, dismissal and retrenchment of workers and middleclass employees, steep rise in prices and heavy taxation—these are some of the results of the government policies. Civil liberties are trampled underfoot. The trend towards authoritarianism is growing.

Vast number of people in all classes and sections, including many members and followers of the Congress, are coming out against these policies. The ideas of socialism are gaining ground. The possibility is growing of forging a broad united front of all socialist, patriotic and democratic forces in defence of the interest of the people and for policies which would take our country forward. People expect socialists and communists, as the most advan-

ced forces in our nation, to take a lead in the carrying out of these tasks.

All this, I hope you will agree, renders it imperative that we change our attitude towards each other, try to understand each other and seek the maximum agreement so that, despite the differences which continue and which will have to be resolved by prolonged discussion, we are able to join hands in defence of peace, in defence of national freedom and in the service of our people.

I am sorry that this letter, in many respects, has assumed a form which you would consider a "political reply" and a "rejoinder". If that be your criticism, all that I would say is that your own letter was such that I found it difficult to deal with in any other way.

I hope, however, that neither you nor we shall stop here. I also hope that besides correspondence, the leaders and members of our two parties, as well as of other socialist parties in the country, will meet frequently, discuss issues of common interest and concrete problems facing the people and strive to evolve common line of action whenever possible. That process has already started. On many issues we have been able to stand together and fight together. We look upon this as one of the most significant developments of recent period, a development which the mass of people have welcomed, and we hope that you with your political and moral influence will help to carry forward this process.

Appendix

LETTER TO COMMUNIST FRIENDS

I venture to address a few words to my communist friends. I am using the word 'friends' deliberately, because there are many persons in the CPI (Communist Party of India), particularly in the ranks of its leadership who were my close colleagues in the Congress Socialist Party.

From world press reports it appears that the 20th congress of the Russian communist party has set in motion everywhere in communist circles a revolutionary process of thought and action. I believe the Indian communist party is not an exception. I am therefore writing these friendly words to help this process.

I hope every communist realises the tremendous significance of Khrushchov's speech and the events that have followed. Many interpretations have been given of the true motives behind Khrushchov's revelations. The motives are not important, however, for whatever they might be, there is no doubt that they were political. The more important thing is that an official admission has been made of staggering crimes committed by a leadership that had been apatheosised for a generation and in a country that had been held up as an ideal to be followed by the whole world. The people everywhere are bound to turn and ask the communists, "Is this the hideous thing you have been wanting to sell us"?

The first question then that the communists must answer for themselves is: How could it be possible that they were kept in the dark so long about the facts that Khrushchov has revealed? Was not the whole noncommunist world talking about these facts for nearly three decades? The 'revelations' of Khrushchov were indeed no revelations at all. It is impossible that the communists—at least their leadership—did not know the facts. Why then did they remain silent so long? No satisfactory answer has been given so far to this question.

Another question arises: Are the communists going to stop where Khrushchov has led them? Are they not going further in search of the truth? Is the truth not of any service to communism? Can communism be built on a foundation of lies? Has Khrushchov revealed everything? Has he denounced all the crimes committed in the name of communism? Has he confessed his own crimes? If Kirov's murder was a crime, what about the murders of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin and the rest? If 'enemies of the people' was a vulgar and fraudulent charge trumped up by Stalin to destroy political opponents and rivals, did the same charge when applied to Beria and his 'gang' become honest and consistent with

'socialist legality'? Will the communists again put on blinkers made for them in Moscow and refuse to see anything beyond? Will again a new set of lies guide the world communist movement? Will not the communists again put on blinkers made for them in Moscow and refuse to see anything beyond? Will again a new set of lies guide the world communist movement? Will not the communists, instead, proclaim and assert their Marxian objectivity and the revolutionary freedom of the human mind?

A yet more important question is: How could the Russian communist party and the Russian people allow for thirty years and more the crimes listed by Khrushchov to be committed in their name? To advance the 'cult of the individual' as an answer is to insult the meanest human intelligence, and to make nonsense of Marxism. Stalin was undoubtedly one of the most forceful personalities that the world has ever produced, but can it be doubted that he was able to do what he did because of the social, economic and political system that was created in Russia in the name of Marxism and communism? To isolate Stalin from that system and to condemn the one without even questioning the other is surely not a Marxian analysis of a historical phenomenon. Mere denunciation of Stalin and the cult of the individual cannot reform or change that system. And, as long as that system is held up as a communist heaven, communism stands selfcondemned.

Khrushchov's performance, therefore, should be an occasion for serious reexamination of current communist faith. What is it that the communists want? What are they fighting for? For theories or for men? For a system or for certain values of life? Are the means the desideratum (sic!) or the ends? Is power in itself the sole objective? Is nationalisation or collectivisation a means to an end, or is it the end itself? Is man, the human being, an end in himself, a being of supreme significance or just a tool in a social engineering operation.

It seems the communists are unable to see the wood for the trees. They appear to have lost sight of the final goal and the ultimate values. If the shock that Khrushchov's speech has delivered releases the communists from their self-hypnotism and forces their eyes open to the forgotten values, it would have rendered an unintended but nevertheless an undying service to the cause of communism.

What were the values which communism had set before itself? Were they not human freedom, human dignity, human fellowship, equality, peace? Was not freedom conceived on so grand a pattern as ultimately to encompass the withering away of the state itself and substitution of an "administration of things" in the place of the "administration of men"? Did not the concept of equality find its fullest expression in the noble idea, "from each according to his

capacity, to each according to his needs"? Did not fellowship embrace in a wide sweep the whole human race? The 'revolutionary violence', the dictatorship of the proletariat, 'democratic centralism', nationalisation, collectivisation—all these were meant to be means to those glorious ends. What has happened to those ends? Are they even in sight any more? After forty years of revolution, human freedom and human dignity lie trampled in the dust. The state, far from withering away, has become an all-powerful monster. Equality is a distant dream. International brotherhood has degenerated into a new kind of colonialism against which Poles, Hungarians—as the Yugoslavs before them—are presently struggling so heroically. Peace has come to mean preparedness for war.

I wonder what my communist friends in India are thinking about all this. For years past they have abused and reviled those—like my humble self—who tried to open their eyes to the truth. Now, when the communists themselves have torn off the veil, will they refuse to use their eyes? I am not interested in anticommunism or in antirussianism. Indian socialists have been severe critics of stalinism and Soviet totalitarianism but they have never been opposed to communism in principle. Wherever communism showed any indications that it had not degenerated into a tyranny and had some concern at least for its basic values, we were quick to extend our hand of friendship. Thus we were the first in this country to hail Marshal Tito and communist Yugoslavia at a time when the communists from Prague to Peking were denouncing Tito as a 'fascist dog' and Yugoslavia as a camp-follower of western imperialism. I might add that this interest in Yugoslavia still abides, though events have happened in that country in recent months that are somewhat disturbing. To return to my point, the question is: Have the communists of today enough courage and revolutionary spirit to deny their past, to forswear the false roads, to reject the dross, to suppress their lust for power, so that they might recapture the grand vision of original communism and make it a living reality?

The communists in this country, as elsewhere, have made themselves laughing-stocks by acting as puppets of Moscow. But now there is a refreshing breeze blowing through communist corridors of 'equality', 'independence', 'national sovereignty'. This is a most reassuring symptom of the undying vitality of the human spirit, which cannot forever remain enslaved and which alone is the ultimate guarantee of human freedom. The question is: Have the Indian communists spirit enough to declare their independence of Moscow and to choose their own road to socialism? My communist friends might reply that they have in fact been always independent. It would be a pity if they said so, because they know that would be a lie and no one would believe them any way. That is exactly

what Stalin's stooges in Poland and Hungary always said, but have they not been repudiated by the 'independent' communists and the peoples of those countries? It is time that the communists learnt that falsehood does not pay. The human being is a curious animal. He is ever enquiring, ever after the truth. In the course of his enquiry he has discovered religion, science, philosophy, art and the rest. If the communists, or whoever else, tried to stuff lies into the human mind, they might succeed for a time, but eventually the truth-seeking nature of man would assert itself and the truth would be out. Therefore the communists would do well to admit frankly that misled by a false conception of internationalism, they had hitherto been subservient to Moscow and to announce without mincing their words that henceforward they would function independently. Let me make it clear that even a declaration of that sort would not be enough. The CPI must convince the Indian people by its action of its independence and loyalty. This will take time. One thing the communists must do in order to carry conviction is to explain to the people where and how do they differ from what has been or is being done in Russia. Hitherto they have held up Russia as a faultless ideal. That ideal lies shattered now. If they go on pretending that nothing has happened, or that once the devil of the piece has been put in his place, everything has been righted, no sensible person will have any regard for them. 'Communism' then might make some little 'progress' by bamboozling some people for some time, but that could never lead to the harbour of a classless society of the equal and the free.

In this connection events have posed an urgent question for the communists. Russia has just launched a brutal attack against the Hungarian people in a bid to crush their struggle for freedom and self-determination. Will the CPI stand up for freedom or for slavery, for Hungary or Russia? The future of communism depends on the answer to this question.

This process of self-analysis and clarification should lead the communists to the basic questions that I have posed for them, or rather that have been posed by recent events. The most basic of all these questions is: Will the communists continue to base their philosophy and practice on *untruth and violence*? Will they continue to call dictatorship democracy, 'bureaucratic degeneration' (to use Togliatti's phrase) or, in other words, state capitalism socialism, colonialism revolution? Will they not discard the appearance for the reality? Will they not pursue the truth? And most important of all, can they do all this without forswearing violence? Violence has appeared to offer a shortcut to revolution. But in spite of colossal violence, has the revolution yet arrived in Russia? The answer cannot but be 'no'—unless we have only a negative conception of revolution, and

unless we again shut our eyes to the shattered ideal and persist in calling black white, or unless we equate mere economic growth with communism or socialism. Economic growth—even rapid economic growth—has been known to occur under capitalism and fascism. Socialism and communism stand for a way of life and not merely production statistics or military might. This does not mean that socialism or communism does not stand for economic growth, but not at the cost of its values.

Untruth and violence were originally meant to be used only against the 'enemy', the tsarist order, but they became a habit—and an inveterate habit at that. Untruth and violence have been, and are being, used against the people, the party and one another.

It is true that many others besides the communists—such as the bourgeois-democrats of Great Britain headed by Eden and the social-democrats of France headed by Mollet—have also to learn that untruth and violence are evil and must lead to evil. But do not the communists claim that they have something far better to offer? I most humbly submit that they cannot offer anything better by practising greater untruth and violence.

I am aware that I shall be laughed at for preaching truth and nonviolence to the communists. But I have faith in human reason and I do consider communists too as rational human beings. In this age of nuclear weapons, the meanest human intelligence has come to understand that any largescale violence, such as a global war, must at all costs be prevented. No one today believes in big violence. But faith still lingers on in petty violence. It is not too difficult for the human mind to grasp that if petty violence remains, big violence cannot be stopped forever. The former gives birth to the latter. Let me add again that not only communists but many others besides have to learn this lesson, including our own trigger-happy rulers. But the communists if they are true to their professions of peace and brotherhood should learn the lesson before the others.

All existing communist regimes are the offspring of violence—physical violence. And since their establishment they have never submitted themselves to the verdict of the people. Elections have no doubt been held, but in the absence of opposition parties and civil liberties, they have been like Hitler's elections. Communists denounced the latter, but justified their own one-party rule in the name of their own kind of 'democracy'. The party system as evolved in the west is certainly not an ideal form of democracy, but the one-party system is far worse. The Indian people would want to know if the communists are prepared to be guided by their democratic verdict or would attempt to rule by force.

Physical violence is not the whole of the story. There is such a thing as the 'legal' violence of the state. Let me give an example.

Students of Russian agriculture have often observed that, were the peasants of Russia given an opportunity to express themselves freely without the fear of any consequences, the majority of them would leave the collectives. This may be blasphemy, or in the accepted style of speech, 'fascist slander', but the point is, would communism be justified in forcing collectivisation upon unwilling peasants in the name of planning, production or socialism? What is supreme: The party or the people, theory or men? True, men might be foolish enough not to understand what was good for them. But has any one the right to force his opinions on the people? I personally doubt whether the imposition even of the majority over the minority is ideal democracy. At best it may be called limited democracy. But the reverse order would doubtless be a tyranny. Are the Indian communists prepared to denounce such tyranny?

I do not wish to make this long address longer. Only I should like once again to remind communist friends that man—his moral and material welfare and growth—is the goal of all social endeavour. Any step or measure that puts man in the background and glorifies organisation, party, society, state, nation, planning, production, science or what not, is not revolution or progress but reaction and must be rejected. I wonder if my friends would agree.

Finally, I hope my friends will not satisfy themselves merely with a political reply. I am sufficiently acquainted with communist thought and expression to write a withering rejoinder myself. But that sort of thing would be wasted effort. I therefore beseech my friends not to worry about scoring points against me, but to think deeply over what has been said. I might appear to be harsh occasionally, but let me assure every one that I have been motivated by the friendliest of sentiments.

42. J. V. Stalin

Seventy-seven years ago, on 21 December 1879, was born J. V. Stalin, the great comrade-in-arms of the immortal Lenin, founder of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Faithful disciple of Marx, Engels and Lenin whose teachings he upheld and enriched, Stalin made a great contribution towards socialism in the USSR and towards the development of the world communist movement.

He played an outstanding role in the struggle against tsardom and in the struggle against the forces of counter-revolution in the period of the October revolution and civil war.

When, after the death of Lenin, the young Soviet state faced grave dangers from all sides, when right- and left-wing factions were striving to diviate the party from the path of Leninism, the central committee of the CPSU under the guidance of Stalin unflinchingly battled against their harmful theories, trends and machinations—guarding the unity of the party, defending the heritage of Lenin, rallying the masses in the fight for building socialism.

SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION: ITS WORLD HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE

Routing the external and internal enemies whose success would have led to the restoration of capitalism, the mighty edifice of the socialist society was created—demonstrating to the whole world the creative power of the working class freed from the shackles of capitalism. It was an achievement of which there exists no parallel in recorded history.

This article by Ajoy Ghosh, general secretary, was published in *New Age*, 23 December 1956, on the occasion of the 77th birth anniversary of Stalin.

This achievement has profoundly influenced the course of events in the present epoch. It has profoundly influenced the minds of men all over the world.

"The bourgeoisie of all countries asserts", said Stalin in his report at the 18th congress of the CPSU, "that the people cannot get along without capitalists and landlords, without merchants and kulaks. The working class of our country has proved in practice that the people can get along perfectly without exploiters.

"The bourgeoisie of all countries asserts that the working class, having destroyed the old bourgeois system, will be incapable of building anything new to replace the old. The working class of our country has proved in practice that it is quite capable not only of destroying the old system but of building a new and better system, a socialist system, a system moreover to which crisis and unemployment are unknown.

"The bourgeoisie of all countries asserts that the peasantry is incapable of taking to the path of socialism. The collective-farm peasants of our country have proved in practice that they can do so quite successfully.

"The chief endeavour of the bourgeoisie of all countries and of its reformist hangers-on is to kill in the working class faith in its own strength, faith in the possibility and inevitability of victory... If the successes of the working class of our country, if its fight and victory serve to rouse the spirit of the working class in the capitalist countries and to strengthen its faith in its own power and in its victory, then our party may say that its work has not been in vain. And there need be no doubt that this will be the case."

In these words, marked by the comprehensiveness and lucidity that characterised all the utterances of Stalin, was summed up the world-historic significance of the victory of socialism in the USSR, its powerful impact on the consciousness of men in all countries. The ideas of socialism, in less than two decades after the 18th congress of the CPSU, triumphed in many countries of Europe and Asia, proving

conclusively that the working people have learned the lesson held out by the experience of the USSR. All the mistakes that have been committed in the USSR in carrying out this gigantic task of building socialism cannot blur the significance of this glorious achievement—a landmark in humanity's march towards the cherished goal of communism.

PLANNING—ITS LESSONS FOR OTHER COUNTRIES

It was the central committee of the CPSU headed by Stalin that, following the behest of Lenin, first demonstrated the necessity and possibility of economic planning—the necessity and possibility of mobilising the entire resources and manpower of a vast country and harnessing them to the task of national reconstruction in order to overcome age-old backwardness in the shortest possible period and take to the path of all-round progress. The very idea was one which when first formulated appeared to many to be utopian and was dismissed by the bourgeoisie as the fantastic dream of mad men.

But within a short period, they ceased to sneer.

Today none scoffs at the idea of planning. It has come to be accepted, even by many bourgeois circles, especially in countries whose development has been retarded, that for the task of national reconstruction to be carried out with the utmost rapidity reliance on the profit motive of the capitalists is not enough. It has come to be accepted that planning is essential for all-sided progress, that this planning, if it is to succeed, must involve restriction of the power and of the sphere of activity of monopoly capitalists, that special emphasis has to be laid on heavy industries which constitute the basis of a country's economic strength and the foundation for advance.

STALIN'S CONTRIBUTIONS

Implementing Lenin's program of socialist industrialisation, the USSR transformed itself from a backward agricultural country into one of the mightiest industrial powers

Lenin's plan for the unification of small scattered individual peasant households into big mechanised socialist farms was carried out. In the concretisation and further elaboration of these plans, in the practical leadership for their implementation, J. V. Stalin made outstanding contribution.

Of great significance for the development of Marxism-Leninism were several of the theoretical works of Stalin. These works, which combined profundity of thought with simplicity of expression in a manner which has seldom been equalled, played an immense role in instilling socialist consciousness in the advanced workers and in rearing a whole generation of communists.

The name of Stalin is inseparably associated with the solution in the USSR of one of the most complex problems in the history of human society, the national problem.

A determined opponent of bourgeois nationalism in every form, Lenin at the same time repeatedly stressed the great importance which the party of the working class must attach to the national question so that national inequalities are eliminated and all nations acquire full opportunities for their development.

Lenin's teachings on the national question were further elaborated and developed by Stalin. The nations oppressed by tsardom awoke to a new life, registered advance in every sphere and the Soviet was welded into a family of nations.

Stalin drew pointed attention of the working class of Europe to the movements of national emancipation waged by the countries of the east, movements which were of great revolutionary significance in the world struggle against imperialism. As early as 1918, he made the classic formulation whose correctness the entire history of the last

15 years has borne out, that the October revolution has created a bridge between the socialist west and the enslaved east—having created a new line of revolution against world imperialism, extending from the proletarians of the west, through the Russian revolution, to the oppressed nations of the east”.

HIS NAME WILL LIVE

Today, when under the impact of the emergence of socialism as a world system and of the emergence of increasing number of countries of the east as sovereign states, the whole imperialist system is breaking down, when bonds of close friendship and cooperation have been established between the socialist world and the free countries of the east, when those bonds have been further strengthened by them in defence of the freedom of Egypt—and by the decisive role of the USSR in halting Anglo-French aggression—in such a period these words of Stalin acquire a new and profound import.

Stalin's teaching that peace can be defended only if the peoples of the world take the cause of peace in their own hand and fight for it, guides millions of partisans of peace all over the world in the struggle against the instigators of a new war. The USSR stands out as the most resolute defender of peace and of the cause of friendship between peoples.

In the course of construction of socialism in extremely difficult historic conditions, a number of serious mistakes were committed by Stalin—mistakes in the sphere of theory, in the sphere of socialist law and socialist democracy, in the sphere of relation between nation within the socialist world. These mistakes which became specially pronounced in the latter period of Stalin's life, due to the growth of the cult of the individual and to other factors, have had grave consequences. These mistakes have to be and are being corrected and their lessons learned.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding these mistakes, the name of Stalin will always be cherished by mankind as one of

the greatest Marxists of all times, as a towering personality and a titan of thought and action, as a man who dedicated his life to the service of the working people and to the cause of socialism. His contribution to the cause of emancipation of mankind will continue to inspire millions all over the world.

43. Forward to Election Battle

The second general election of our republic commences on 25 February. There are barely two months to go before nearly 170 million men and women go to the polls to record their verdict on the past and their mandate for the future.

On the formative period of our republic with their inevitable clashes of ideas and policies, the coming general election cannot but assume historic significance. Indeed this election comes as a challenge to the future of our people and of our country. The challenge has got to be met with all the forces that the vanguard of Indian democracy—the parties of the democratic opposition—can command.

In the years that we have left behind since the first general election, our people have fought many a bitter battle in defence of their vital interests as for the larger interests of the country. And these battles have not been fought in vain. They have resisted many attacks of the government and of the exploiting classes. They have thwarted many fond plans of reaction and they have won many significant and inspiring victories as well. The saga of popular struggles is too long a tale to be recounted here.

In the coming election, the achievements of the people have to be consolidated, their endeavours and struggles carried forward into still greater victories. What is going to be the direction of our political and economic life tomorrow very much depends on the outcome of the election battles that we face today. Let there be not the slightest mistake about it.

Politbureau statement published in *New Age*, 23 December 1956.

Our people want to see their country play an increasingly beneficial role in world affairs, for the peace and happiness of the human race. They want to rebuild their country and so rebuild it that it does not become a paradise for the princes and landlords, monopolists and speculators. They want to wipe out every vestige of the colonial past and so reorganise the society that our teeming millions are speedily lifted from the pit of want and hunger, disease and death, and firmly set on the broad road to a new, prosperous life.

National reconstruction has naturally become a rallying point for the people but not in the sense the present ruling classes and the government understand it.

The masses stand for such programs of national reconstruction and such lines of development as will ensure all-round progress in our political, economic and social life.

THEY WANT their living conditions, material as well as cultural, to continuously improve.

THEY WANT to be saved from the nightmare of unemployment, from landlessness and destitution, from the tyranny and oppression of mounting taxes and soaring prices.

THEY WANT habitable houses to live in.

THEY WANT medical facilities for their families, education for their children and so on and so forth.

That is why they have refused to submit to the misleading exhortations of the ruling classes which, in the name of national reconstruction, deny the workers, peasants, middleclass employees, teachers and students and other sections of the community their legitimate demands. Our people have refused to live on doubtful promissory notes on the future when the fruits of their labour are stolen by a handful of exploiters on whom are showered all the blessings of the congress regime.

The failings and injustices, exploitation and oppression of the congress raj could have been much lessened if the

monopoly of political power which the Congress, to our great misfortune, enjoys today was not there. This monopoly of power has been used in the service of reaction and for bolstering up reactionary policies.

IT HAS fostered soullessness and cynicism in the ruling circles, fed obstinacy and arrogance among the rulers.

IT HAS permeated every pore of the government with fostering corruption and unbelievable inefficiency. It has encouraged authoritarian trends which spell serious threats to our democracy.

IT HAS hardened bureaucracy and enabled it to spread its deadening influence at all levels of public administration.

IT HAS even stifled the voice of those who stand for progress inside the ruling party itself. Finally this monopoly of political power has provided incentives for mass arrests, wanton police firings and various other methods of suppression of democratic rights and liberties.

The breaking of this monopoly of political power by defeating the Congress in as many constituencies as possible and by strengthening the Communist Party and democratic opposition, therefore, stands out as the central objective of the coming general election. The realisation of this objective on a national scale is well within our reach if only the parties of the democratic opposition will close their ranks and unitedly confront the party in power.

This indeed is what our people expect of the leadership of parties of the democratic opposition. This is what we all must still try to achieve. Life has proved that unity is the mainstay of our strength. It is unity that sets the masses in historic motion and brings about national upsurge. All this we so desperately need for meeting the challenge in a way worthy of our great people in all their fighting traditions. The communists will redouble their efforts for forging this unity and they fervently desire that others of the democratic opposition will join with them in this task.

Here we also want to stress that the coming election battles are going to be the severest we have yet known. The power of wealth, the pull of privilege, the invidious manipulations of the state apparatus will all be on the side of the ruling party in order to defend its monopoly of political power. But the communists and their fellow-fighters disdain these ill-sought advantages. They will rely on the unity and strength of the people, on their sound democratic instincts and flaming patriotism—on the activity and mobilisation of the broad masses. They will rely on the superiority of their policies which have already stood the test of life. The coming general election will, above all, be a battle of alternative policies.

The Communist Party of India, championing the interest of the downtrodden masses, has put forward policies which conform to the interest of the Indian people and ensure all-sided national advance. In furtherance of these policies, members of our party have led battles of the working people in every part of the country. In furtherance of these policies, they have put forward concrete proposals in parliament and in the state legislatures—proposals which have won the support of a large number of democrats in every party. Today a gigantic battle has to be fought to explain these policies to our people and win their support for them.

In order to explain the policies we stand for among the masses and draw them in their millions into fighting positions, WE MUST strengthen and widen our bonds with all sections of the democratic people.

We MUST reach every home and share our thoughts with every voter.

WE MUST combine ceaseless political campaigning with vigorous organisational activities.

Right from this moment, let every member of the Communist Party, every one of our sympathisers and friends whose role is of supreme importance, regard himself or herself a soldier mobilised on the battle front. Only through such personal example can they inspire others into similar activity.

So let us all roll up our sleeves and plunge here and now into the election battle as we have never done before. If we play our part with devotion and courage, there is nothing on earth which can deprive the democratic opposition of the historic successes that await us. Nothing can save the Congress from losing its monopoly of political power.

Index

- Abdullah, Sheikh. 258, 260-61, 264-65
Abyssinia, 216
Acheson, Dean. 92, 109, 379
Afghanistan, 260
Ahmad, Muzaffar, 55, 61
Ahmad, Z. A., 61
Ahmedabad, 105, 110, 151, 155, 252
Akali party, 113, 303, 349, 433, 577
All India Congress Committee (AICC), 150, 172, 408, 478, 480, 593
All India Congress Socialist Party, 616, 633
All-India Kisan Sabha (AIKS), 300, 350, 355-56
All-India Party Conference, Calcutta (1951), 1, 19, 42
All India Trade Union Congress (AITUC), 119, 149-51, 154, 156-57, 159, 163, 169, 175-76, 180, 239-47, 250-51, 263
Alvares, Peter, 465
Ambedkar, 98
American Federation of Labour, 150
Amrita Bazar Patrika, 591
Andhra, 58-59, 69, 90-91, 95-96, 100, 114, 201, 208, 224-25, 300, 306, 315, 326, 328, 339, 358, 361, 365, 367, 371, 394-97, 415, 431, 491, 572
Andhra Committee of CPI, 55, 60
Andrews, C. F., 154
Apte, 465
Assam, 358, 365-66, 372, 584
Aswan dam, 610-11
Attlee, 487
Australia, 212, 528
Avadi resolution, 589, 605-606
Baghdad Treaty, 482, 527, 530, 566
Bandung Conference, 418, 471, 477
Bao Dai, 388
Bapat, Senapati, 467
Basu, Joyti, 55, 61
Belden, Jack, 279
Bengal, 67-70, 83, 89, 91, 94, 99, 101, 105, 107, 114, 225, 268, 281-82, 298, 300-301, 326, 328, 358, 365-66, 369, 490, 492, 577, 587
Beria, 517-18, 633
Bhakhra-Nangal, 484, 606, 610
Bhave, Vinoba, 58
Bhilai mill, 607
Bhopal, 87
Bihar, 67, 95, 99, 105, 107-108, 326, 328, 358, 361, 365-66, 372, 394, 490, 492, 574, 587
Birla, G. D., 409, 606
Bombay, 68, 79, 104-105, 110, 114, 119, 136, 139-42, 155, 159, 162, 171, 173, 183, 224, 233, 247, 251-52, 300-301, 313, 328, 358, 373, 465-66, 468, 470-71, 474, 478, 491-92, 574, 587, 593, 625
Bose, Subhas, 151

- British TUC, 150
 Brown, Irving, 248
 Bukharin, 633
 Bulganin, N. A., 418, 484-86, 526, 539
 Burma, 36, 71, 122, 212, 498-99, 501, 504, 604, 610

 Calcutta (also struggle, strike etc.) 68, 104-105, 137, 139, 175, 198, 211, 223, 274, 277, 298, 300, 305, 308, 394, 466, 470
 Ceylon, 53, 75, 212, 217, 498, 528, 604, 613
 Chandernagore, 79
 Chaudhari, Madhukar, 469
 Chiang Kai-shek, 38, 388, 391
 Chinese Red Army or Liberation Army, 46
 Chitale, V. D., 465, 469
 Chittaranjan Loco Works, 484, 607
 Chou En-lai, 213, 216, 375-77, 384, 386, 418, 526
 Churchill, Winston, 383
 Colombo plan, 64
 Congress Party (or Govt), passim
 Commonwealth (British), 63, 78, 203, 214-15, 220, 291, 328, 383-84, 420, 528, 530-31, 566
 Cominform, 281, 488
 Comintern, 281
Communist Manifesto, 496
 Communist Party of France, 509
 Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB), 624
 Communist Party of India, Second Party Congress (Calcutta), 20, 44
 Third Party Congress (Madurai), 11, 284-320, 327, 407
 Fourth Party Congress (Palghat), 495-574

 Communist Party of Israel, 625
 Communist Party of Soviet Union (CPSU), 19, 618, 639, 641
 18th Congress of CPSU, 640
 19th Congress of CPSU, 211
 20th Congress of CPSU, 495-522, 574-83, 600-601, 627, 633
 Cooch-Behar, 54, 68
Crossroads, 55, 202, 209, 253, 264
 Cuttack, 68
 Cyprus, 530
 Czechoslovakia, 213

 Dalmia, 594
 Damodar Valley Project, 137, 607, 610
 Dandavate, Madhu, 474
 Dange S. A., 61, 119, 273, 469
 Das, C. R. 151
 Delhi, 87, 105, 107, 154, 323, 358-59, 365-66, 375, 379, 469, 471, 493
 Delhi agreement (on Kashmir), 258, 262-64
 Desai, Khandubhai, 409
 Desai, Morarji, 467
 Deshmukh, C. D., 400, 404
Discovery of India (Nehru), 605
 Dravida Kazhagam, 100
 Dulles, John Foster, 376

Eastern Economist, 403-404
Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR (by Stalin), 211
Economist, 383
 Eden, (Anthony), 637
 Egypt, 103, 122, 212, 499, 604, 610, 612-13, 617-18, 622-23, 625, 630, 643
 Eisenhower, 376
 Engels, Frederick. 18. 37, 43, 45, 188, 214, 387, 506, 639

- Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industries, 425, 606
- Five-Year Plan, 127, 206, 221, 225
- Five-Year Plan—A criticism, 409
- First Five-year Plan, 441, 539
- Second Five-year Plan, 452, 537, 590, 593
- Forward Bloc, 100-101
- Forward Bloc (Marxist), 99, 112, 114, 270
- Ganatantra Parishad, 88-89, 113
- Gandhi, M. K. (Gandhian ideology, Gandhism), 48, 125, 151, 155-56, 190, 303, 626
- Geneva Conference on Kashmir, 482
- Germany (or German imperialism), 285-86, 517, 524
- Ghosh, Ajoy, 183, 202, 273, 377, 394, 398, 481, 495, 588, 614, 639
- Giri, V. V., 153, 390
- Girni Kamgar Union, 242
- Goa, 137, 289, 373, 433, 464-80, 482-83, 527-28, 531, 553-54, 566
- Goa Vimochan Sahayyak Samiti, 465, 471, 478, 480
- Godbole, 465
- Gopalan, A. K., 55, 58, 61
- Gore, N. G., 465
- Greece, 110
- Gujarat, 572, 587
- Gurkha League, 108
- Hallsworth, 153
- Harding (British chief-of-staff), 383
- Haryana, 576
- Hind Mazdoor Sabha (HMS), 136, 156-59, 163, 176, 240-46, 253-54, 311
- Hind Mazdoor Seva Sangh, 155-56
- Hindu, 452
- Hindu Mahasabha, 81, 88, 265, 433
- Hindustan Times, 410
- Hirakud dam, 137, 607, 610
- History of the CPSU (B), 115, 194
- Hitler, 483, 505, 517, 619, 621, 637
- Ho-Chi-Minh, 388
- Holland, 386
- Hoover Commission, 412
- Howrah, 79
- Hungary, 621-23, 635-36
- Hyderabad, 58-60, 65, 69, 88-90, 92-93, 110-11, 114, 267-68, 270, 276-77, 283, 304
- ICFTU, 152-53, 156, 158, 244, 248
- I.L.O., 150, 311
- Indian Iron and Steel Co., 441
- INTUC, 110, 150, 152, 156, 158-59, 162-63, 239-49, 251-54, 311, 468, 554
- Indochina, 36, 122, 289, 381, 482
- Indonesia, 122, 385, 498, 508-509, 604, 610, 613, 617,
- International Federation of Trade Unions (IFTU), 153
- Iran, 103, 122, 212
- Italy, 110, 157, 506, 619
- Jaisoorya, M. N., 267, 273, 280
- Jain, A. P., 593
- Jallianwala Bagh, 471
- Jana Sangh, 88, 265, 433, 465, 575, 577
- Japan, 137, 604
- Jedhe, K. M., 465-66

- Jharkand Party, 89, 108
 Jordan, 498
 Joshi-Giri group, 154, 156
 Joshi, N. M., 153
 Joshi, S. M., 465
 Josh, Sohan Singh, 61
 Jullunder, 183
- Kakdwip, 69
 Kamenev, 633
 Kamgar Kisan Party, 49
 Kanpur, 105, 153-54, 171
 Kanpur Conspiracy Case, 155
 Kashmir, 17, 70-72, 78, 115, 225-26, 258-66, 287, 290, 303-04, 380-81, 464, 527-29
 Kerala, 91, 96, 104, 114, 326, 339, 358, 365, 368, 372, 491, 577
 Khadilkar, R. K., 465
 Khrushchov, 481, 485-87, 505, 517, 526, 579, 581, 607, 618, 633-34
 Khud khash lands, 331, 337
 Kirov, 633
 KLP, 395, 397
 KMPP, 87-88, 100-102, 107, 110, 112
 Kolar Gold Fields, 591
 Korea (or Korean people, war etc), 31, 33-34, 70-71, 79, 85, 105, 122-23, 132, 135, 203-204, 213-14, 216, 260, 284, 286, 290, 292, 375, 379, 385, 416-17, 476, 482, 523, 608
 KSP, 273
 Kuomintang, 212-13
 Kutch, 297
- Labour Party, 157, 514, 624
 Lancashire, 140
 Lal Communist Party, 99
 Laos, 289
 Lal, Sunder, 58
 Lenin, V. I., 18, 36, 41, 43, 45, 105, 111, 188, 190, 193-94, 209, 211, 387, 507, 600, 602, 639, 642
 Lever Brothers, 447
 Limaye, Madhu, 467
 Liu Shao-chi, 194, 279
 LPPD, 209
- Madras, 67, 92, 105, 111-14, 139, 183, 186, 199-200, 268, 277, 301, 358, 367, 369, 491
 Madhya Pradesh, 106, 233, 313, 358, 365, 372, 593
 Madras Binny strike, 172
 Maharashtra, 58, 96, 99, 106, 114, 282, 358, 365, 367, 372, 465, 491-93, 572, 574, 587
 Malabar, 69, 83, 90, 102
 Malaviya, H. D., 408, 583
 Malay or Malaya, 33, 36, 70-71, 103, 122, 212, 216, 290, 381-82, 530
 Malenkov, 202
 Manchuria, 21, 46
 Manila Treaty, 396
 Manipur, 69, 207
 Mao Tse-tung, 194, 279
 Marshall Plan, 121-22, 157-58
 Marx, Karl, 18, 37, 43, 45, 188, 211, 387
 Meerut Conspiracy Case, 155
 Merchant Wadia: *Our Economic Problem*, 413
 Mill Mazdoor Union (MMU), 251
 Mollet (France), 637
 Mountbatten, Lord, 380, 487
 Mukherjee, Bankim, 61
 Muslim League, 433
 Mysore, 358, 365
- Naga (hill problem etc.), 584-86
 Nagpur, 104, 159
 Nagy Government, 623
 Nanda, Gulzarilal, 402, 606

- Nandedkar, 467-68
 Narayan, Jayaprakash, 226, 614-38
 Narendra Deva, Acharya, 616
 Nasser, 611, 613
 NATO, 212, 525, 528
 Nehru, Motilal, 363
 Nehru, Jawaharlal (or Nehru govt.), 31-33, 38-40, 56, 63-65, 67-69, 82, 85, 87, 104, 110, 151, 156, 220, 226, 236, 297, 302-303, 363-64, 367, 372, 376, 393, 398-415, 418-19, 451, 467-68, 470-71, 474-75
 Nepal, 65, 75
New Age, 209, 321, 373-74, 377, 398, 464, 478, 481, 490, 572, 575, 579, 584, 587, 625, 639, 645
New Times, 209, 603
 Nixon, Richard, 290
 Nizam (of Hyderabad), 56, 265, 475
 Nu, Thakin, 71

 October Revolution, 515, 523, 601, 618, 639, 643
One Step Forward, Two Steps Back (by Lenin), 193-94
 Orissa, 88, 91, 94, 99, 107, 113, 358-59, 365-66, 372, 492, 574, 592

 Pakistan, 6, 16-17, 34, 38, 53, 62, 70-72, 75, 78, 80-81, 129, 200, 207, 212, 226, 236, 258-61, 263-65, 286-88, 327, 329, 354, 382-83, 386, 445-46, 455, 529, 531, 566, 604
 Panchshila, 476, 479, 486, 530
 Pandit, Vijayalaxmi, 380
 Pant, G. B., 155
Party Letter, 239, 267
 Patel, Sardar Vallabhbhai, 89, 155-56, 367, 374
 Patil, Rajaram, 463

 Payment of Wages Act, 143, 230
 Peasants and Workers Party (PWP), 270
People's China, 495
People's Daily, 495
 Pondicherry, 321-22, 373, 464
 Portugal (or Portuguese authority, rule etc.), 373, 465, 467, 469, 475-76, 480
 Praja Party, 395, 397
 Praja Socialist Party, 184, 199, 224, 226-227, 230, 244-45, 270, 273, 302-3, 308, 349, 395, 431, 433, 464, 551, 553-54, 556, 614
Pravda, 34, 512
 Poland, 621-22, 635-36
 Punjab, 67, 88, 91, 94, 99-100, 106, 200, 303, 326, 329, 368, 575-76
 Purcell, 153

 Radek, 633
 Rai, Lajpat, 151, 154
 Rajagopalachari, C., 111, 155
 Rajasthan, 88-89, 106, 298, 328, 365-66, 414
 Raj, K. N., 593
 Ramadhyani, R. K., 443
 Ramamurti, P., 267
 Rama Rajya Parishad, 433
 Ranchi, 108, 137
 Rao, Kala Vanket, 101
 Reddi, Gopala, 101
 Reddi, Ravi Narayana, 94
 Red International of Labour Unions (RILU), 153, 169, 174
 Red TUC, 169
 Rhee, Syngman, 286, 379
 Rolland, Romain, 616
 Royists, 154
 RSP, 99-100, 270
 Rubinstein, Modesta ("A Non-capitalist Path for Underdeveloped Countries"), 588, 590, 592, 594, 599-600, 603

- Sacco-Vanzetti Case, 153
 Salazar, 472
 Sardesai, S. G., 465
 Sarvodaya Plan, 349
 Saurashtra, 87
 SEATO, 382-84, 392, 528, 530, 566
 Shroff, M., Govindlal, 267
 Sindhri Factory, 137
 Singh, Bhagat, 281
 Singh, Sardar Karnail, 469
 Sitaramayya, Pattabhi, 367, 372
 Socialist Party, 88, 91-92, 98-99, 107, 110, 112, 157, 244-45, 551, 553-54, 556
 South Africa, 115
 South Indian Railway workers' strike, 68
 Soviet Union, (USSR or Russia), 18, 21, 43-46
 Spain, 216, 508
 Stalin, J. V., 18, 34, 43, 45, 122, 167, 188, 190-91, 194, 202, 209-11, 216, 387, 507, 511-14, 516, 519-20, 579-80, 633-36, 639-44
 Stevenson, Adlai, 264
 Sundarayya, P., 394

 Taccavi loans, 344, 351
 Tagore, Rabindra Nath, 616
 Tamilnadu, 283, 328, 339, 369, 572
 Tamilnad Tailors' Party, 89
 Tata, 441
Tata-Birla Plan, 126
 Tebhaga, 83, 326
 Telangana, 44, 55-60, 69, 83, 93, 100, 190, 276, 283, 326, 328, 358, 365
 Tennessee Valley Authority, 610

The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, (by Engels), 506
 Tibet, 384
 Tilak, J., 465, 466
Times of India, 594
 Tirth, Ramanand, 58
 Tito, Marshal, 635
 Togliatti, 636
 Tripura, 69, 89, 90-91, 94, 114-15, 190, 231, 297, 300, 306, 493
 Trotskyites, 172
 TU Act of 1926, 146
 Tunisia, 122

 UNO, 33, 70-72, 78, 115, 258-261, 285, 279, 566
 UP, 67, 89, 107, 114, 268, 299, 301, 326, 328, 358-59, 365-66, 394, 594
 UTUC, 159, 240-41, 253-54

 Venkatrao, B.S., 280
 Vienna Conference (for peace), 199, 213
 Vietnam, 33, 71, 85, 103, 203, 212-13, 216, 285, 287, 289-90, 375, 416-17, 476, 498, 500, 523, 608

 WFTU, 156-58, 246, 248, 254-55
What Is To Be Done? (by Lenin), 194
 World Bank, 130
 World Peace Council, 285

 Yugoslavia, 517, 623-24, 635

 Zinoviev, 633

