

Well, gentlemen, I do not wish to take up any more of your time and thank you again for the honour you have done to me. I shall always be guided by the principles of justice and fairplay without any, as is put in the political language, prejudice or ill-will, in other words, partiality or favouritism. My guiding principle will be justice and complete impartiality, and I am sure that with your support and co-operation, I can look forward to Pakistan becoming one of the greatest Nations of the world.

I have received a message from the United States of America addressed to me. It reads :

"I have the honour to communicate to you, in Your Excellency's capacity as President of the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan, the following message which I have just received from the Secretary of State of the United States :

"On the occasion of the first meeting of the Constituent Assembly for Pakistan, I extend to you and to the members of the Assembly, the best wishes of the Government and the people of the United States for the successful conclusion of the great work you are about to undertake."

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE OFFICE OF
GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF PAKISTAN¹

I. COMMISSION OF MUHAMMAD ALI JINNAH

GEORGE THE SIXTH by the Grace of God of Great Britain,
Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King
Defender of the Faith.

To Our Right Trusty and Well-Beloved Muhammad Ali Jinnah.

GREETING

I. We do by this Our Commission under Our Sign Manual, appoint you, the said Muhammad Ali Jinnah, to be, during Our pleasure, Governor-General of Pakistan with all the powers, rights, privileges, and advantages to said office belonging or appertaining.

II. And we do hereby authorize, empower and command you to exercise and perform all and singular the powers and duties conferred and imposed upon Our Governor-General of Pakistan by and under provisions of the Act passed in this the tenth and eleventh year of Our Reign intituled the Indian Independence Act 1947.

III. And that they and We do hereby authorize and empower you in Our name and on Our behalf to grant any offender convicted in exercise of its Criminal Jurisdiction by any Courts of Justice within Our territories in Pakistan a pardon either free or subject to such lawful conditions as to you may seem fit.

IV. And We do hereby further authorize and direct you to cause this Our Commission to be read and published in the presence of the Chief Justice or other Judge of the Federal Court or in the presence of the Chief Justice or other Judge of the High Court of any of the Provinces in Our Dominion of Pakistan.

V. And We do hereby further authorize and direct you to take the Oath of Allegiance and the Oath for the due execution of the Office of Our Governor-General of Pakistan in the form hereto appended which Oaths the said Chief Justice of the Federal Court or other Judge of the said Court or Chief Justice or other Judge of the High Court of any of the Provinces in Our said Dominion shall and is hereby required to tender and administer unto you.

VI. And We do hereby further authorize and require you by yourself or by any other person to be appointed by you in that behalf to administer to every person appointed by you to hold office as a Minister and to every person appointed by you to be a Chief Commissioner the Oaths of Allegiance and Office and of Secrecy hereto appended.

¹ Texts of these Commissions have been supplied to the author by the Cabinet Secretariat, Government of Pakistan, Karachi.

VII. And We do hereby direct that every person who under this Commission shall be required to take an Oath may make an affirmation in place of an Oath if he has any objection to making an Oath.

GIVEN at Our Court at Balmoral this fourteenth day of August in the year of Our Lord 1947 and in the eleventh year of Our Reign.

BY HIS MAJESTY'S COMMAND.

Listowel.

I, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, do solemnly affirm true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of Pakistan as by law established, and that I will be faithful to His Majesty King George the Sixth, His Heirs and Successors, in the Office of Governor-General of Pakistan.

INAUGURATION OF PAKISTAN CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

*Speech on the Inauguration of the Pakistan Constituent Assembly
on 14th August, 1947*

Your Excellency, I thank His Majesty the King on behalf of the Pakistan Constituent Assembly and myself for his gracious message. I know great responsibilities lie ahead, and I naturally reciprocate his sentiments and we are grateful for his assurance of sympathy and support, and I hope that you will communicate to His Majesty our assurance of goodwill and friendship for the British nation and himself as the Crown head of the British.

I thank you for your expressions of goodwill and good wishes for the future of Pakistan. It will be our constant endeavour to work for the welfare and well-being of all the communities in Pakistan, and I hope that everyone would be inspired by the idea of public service, and they will be imbued with the spirit of co-operation and will excel in their political and civic virtues which go to make a great nation and help to advance its greatness.

I once more thank you and Lady Mountbatten for your kindness and good wishes. Yes, we are parting as friends and sincerely hope that we shall remain friends.

I wish to emphasise that we appreciate the spirit in which those in the Government service at present and in the Armed Forces and others have so willingly and ungrudgingly volunteered themselves provisionally to serve Pakistan. As servants of Pakistan we shall make them happy and they will be treated equally with our nationals. The tolerance and goodwill that great Emperor Akbar showed to all the non-Muslims is not of recent origin. It dates back thirteen centuries ago when our Prophet not only by words but by deeds treated the Jews and Christians, after he had conquered them, with the utmost tolerance and regard and respect for their faith and beliefs. The whole history of Muslims, wherever they ruled, is replete with those humane and great principles which should be followed and practised.

Finally, I thank you for your good wishes for Pakistan, and I assure you that we shall not be wanting in friendly spirit with our neighbours and with all nations of the world.

New Delhi
24 November 1947

My dear Vallabhbhai,

As you know, a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee was held in New Delhi a week ago. This meeting considered the present situation and passed a number of important resolutions. You must have seen these resolutions in the newspapers. Nevertheless, I am sending you a copy of some of the resolutions bearing on general policy.

Many of the members of the Cabinet are also members of the All-India Congress Committee and they took part in these discussions and in the passing of these resolutions. Naturally, therefore, it is their desire as well as mine that the policy followed by Government in regard to these matters should be in line with the resolutions passed by the AICC.

I would draw your special attention to the last resolution, i.e., the resolution on Congress objectives. This resolution is in the nature of a general directive for the formulation of an economic programme. It is vague as it is because a committee has been asked to draw up this programme. Nevertheless, it signifies clearly what the Congress is aiming at and what, I trust, the Government will work for.

It is becoming increasingly important that the Government of India should lay down its economic, industrial and labour policy as speedily as possible. Some attempt has been made from time to time to deal with the problems separately. It is hardly a satisfactory method. Some kind of a comprehensive picture must be seen towards which we can work in each individual sector. Hence it is necessary that we should consider this problem in its entirety and lay down a more or less precise policy.

Probably the best way to do so will be to consider the report of the Advisory Planning Board with the recommendations of the Economic Sub-Committee which was formed some time ago.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru

The Hon'ble Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel

A.I.C.C. RESOLUTION ON CONGRESS OBJECTIVES

Political independence having been achieved, the Congress must address itself to the next great task, namely, the establishment of real democracy in the country and a society based on social justice and equality. Such a society must provide every man and woman with equality of opportunity and freedom to work for the unfettered development of his or her personality. This can only be realised when democracy extends from the political to the social and the economic spheres. Democracy in the modern age necessitates planned central direction as well as decentralisation of political and economic power in so far as this is compatible with the safety of the State, with efficient production and the cultural progress of the community as a whole. The smallest territorial unit should be able to exercise effective control over its corporate life by means of a popularly elected Panchayat. In so far as it is possible, national and regional economic self-sufficiency in the essentials of life should be aimed at. In the case of industries, which in their nature must be run on a large scale and on a centralised basis, they should belong to the community, and they should be so organised that workers become not only co-sharers in the profits but are also increasingly associated with the management and administration of industry. Land, with its mineral resources, and all other means of production as well as distribution and exchange must belong to and be regulated by the community in its own interest.

Our aim should be to evolve a political system which will combine efficiency of administration with individual liberty, and an economic structure which will yield maximum production without the creation of private monopolies and the concentration of wealth and which will create a proper balance between urban and rural economies. Such a social structure can provide an alternative to the acquisitive economy of private capitalism and the regimentation of a totalitarian State.

With a view to drawing up the economic programme for the Congress in accordance with the above-mentioned principles and the election manifesto of the Congress dated 19 December 1945, the following committee is appointed:

1. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru
2. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad
3. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan
4. Prof. N. G. Ranga
5. Shri Gulzari Lal Nanda
6. Shri J. C. Kumarappa
7. Shri Achyut Patwardhan
8. Shri Shankarrao Deo—with powers to coopt.

16 November 1947

THE LIGHT HAS GONE OUT

FRIENDS AND COMRADES, the light has gone out of our lives and there is darkness everywhere. I do not know what to tell you and how to say it. Our beloved leader, Bapu as we called him, the Father of the Nation, is no more. Perhaps I am wrong to say that. Nevertheless, we will not see him again as we have seen him for these many years. We will not run to him for advice and seek solace from him, and that is a terrible blow, not to me only but to millions and millions in this country. And it is a little difficult to soften the blow by any other advice that I or anyone else can give you.

The light has gone out, I said, and yet I was wrong. For the light that shone in this country was no ordinary light. The light that has illumined this country for these many many years will illumine this country for many more years, and a thousand years later, that light will still be seen in this country and the world will see it and it will give solace to innumerable hearts. For that light represented something more than the immediate present; it represented the living, the eternal truths, reminding us of the right path, drawing us from error, taking this ancient country to freedom.

All this has happened when there was so much more for him to do. We could never think that he was unnecessary or that he had done his task. But now, particularly, when we are faced with so many difficulties, his not being with us is a blow most terrible to bear.

A madman has put an end to his life, for I can only call him mad who did it and yet there has been enough of poison spread in this country during the past years and months, and this poison has had an effect on people's minds. We must face this poison, we must root out this poison, and we must

face all the perils that encompass us, and face them not madly or badly, but rather in the way that our beloved teacher taught us to face them.

The first thing to remember now is that none of us dare misbehave because he is angry. We have to behave like strong and determined people, determined to face all the perils that surround us, determined to carry out the mandate that our great teacher and our great leader has given us, remembering always that if, as I believe, his spirit looks upon us and sees us, nothing would displease his soul so much as to see that we have indulged in any small behaviour or any violence.

So we must not do that. But that does not mean that we should be weak, but rather that we should, in strength and in unity, face all the troubles that are in front of us. We must hold together, and all our petty troubles and difficulties and conflicts must be ended in the face of this great disaster. A great disaster is a symbol to us to remember all the big things of life and forget the small things of which we have thought too much. In his death he has reminded us of the big things of life, the living truth, and if we remember that, then it will be well with India.....

It was proposed by some friends that Mahatmaji's body should be embalmed for a few days to enable millions of people to pay their last homage to him. But it was his wish, repeatedly expressed, that no such thing should happen, that this should not be done, that he was entirely opposed to any embalming of his body, and so we decided that we must follow his wishes in this matter, however much others might have wished otherwise.

And so the cremation will take place on Saturday in Delhi city by the side of the Jumna river. On Saturday forenoon, about 11-30, the pier will be taken out at Birla House and it will follow a prescribed route and go to the Jumna river. The cremation will take place there at about 4 P.M. The place and route will be announced by radio and the Press.

People in Delhi who wish to pay their last homage should gather along this route. I will not advise too many of them to come to Birla House, but rather to gather on both sides of this long route from Birla House to the Jumna river. And I trust that they will remain there in silence without any demonstrations. That is the best way and the most fitting way to pay homage to this great soul. Also, Saturday should be a day of fasting and prayer for all of us.

Those who live elsewhere, out of Delhi and in other parts of India, will no doubt also take such part as they can in this last homage. For them also, let this be a day of fasting and prayer. And at the appointed time for cremation, that is 4 P.M. on Saturday afternoon, people should go to the river or to the sea and offer prayers there. And while we pray, the greatest prayer that we can offer is to take a pledge to dedicate ourselves to the truth, and to the cause for which this great countryman of ours lived and for which he has died. That is the best prayer that we can offer him and his memory. That is the best prayer that we can offer to India and ourselves. JAI HIND.

28 February-6 March 1948

GENERAL THESIS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY (EXTRACT)

II CHANGES IN INDIA DURING WORLD WAR II AND ECONOMIC BASIS
OF COLLABORATIONIST POLICY OF THE BOURGEOISIE

... Indian Big Business was counting on India's sterling balances amounting to Rs 1,600 crores for large-scale import of capital goods without any difficulty about securing foreign exchange. The bourgeoisie thought that it could successfully negotiate a deal over this vast sum and secure capital goods at the earliest opportunity.

But the British and American imperialists have joined hands to repudiate the major part of these sterling debts and forced India to agree to it for the sake of paltry concessions or the release of a very small part of it.

The British, of course, never intend to pay back the sterling balances but only hold out the bait of releasing part of them as a weapon to secure new economic bargains.

America also wants that India should not be paid back the major part of these balances so that she does not get capital goods to any appreciable extent and her bourgeoisie is made dependent on American or British mercies.

The terms of the Anglo-American Loan Agreement of 6 December 1945, entered into between the Government of the United States and the United Kingdom, lay down in clause 10:

‘The settlements with the sterling area countries will be on the basis of dividing these accumulated balances into three categories: (1) balances to be released at once and convertible into any currency for current transaction; (2) balances to be similarly released by instalments over a period of years beginning in 1951; and (3) balances to be adjusted as a contribution to the settlement of war and post-war indebtedness and in recognition of the benefits which the countries concerned might be expected to gain from such a settlement.’

The sub-clause (3) is an open proposal to liquidate a substantial part of the balances with the bait that benefits might follow from such a settlement.

Thus the British and American imperialists are using the very debt which Britain owes to India to beat India down, to force India to scale it down in return for some benefits in the shape of capital goods, or in the alternative, to stick to her debt and forego any benefits. Immediately, that is, till India has not made a final settlement, they are not releasing any part of the balances for importing capital goods, though a part is released to import food at extortionate prices.

In order that India should be able to pay for the import of capital goods, when they are not paid out of the balances, India must export her own products to other countries and earn sufficient dollar or sterling. In the absence of a foreign loan, or utilisation of the sterling balances, India has no other way of importing capital goods except what she earns through her exports.

The sum earned by India through exports is too little to finance the requirements of Big Business and it is thus brought to face the bitter truth that for its very existence it is dependent on America or Britain. It will have to wait for years if it were to depend on mere exports for financing its need of capital goods. In fact, it will not be able to replace old machinery for years this way.

The refusal to pay back the balances, the insistence on financing imports of capital goods through foreign exchange earned in exports, are devices of imperialism to strengthen the economic dependence of India on the British and American imperialists and force the Indian bourgeoisie down to servile economic agreements.

They are also instruments of drawing the Indian bourgeoisie into the Anglo-American economic net, baiting it by the offer of larger export markets in Anglo-American colonies.

The repeated entreaties for releasing at least a part of the sterling balances show the dependence of the Indian bourgeoisie on imperialist mercies.

The Indian bourgeoisie itself is already in need of foreign markets in view of the falling Indian market due to the economic crisis. It knows that unless some outlet is given Indian industry might collapse in a big way.

But this dependence on foreign markets is nothing but dependence on the colonies and semi-colonies of Britain or America, which enables the latter to force down any conditions before access to these markets is given. The foreign exchange earned through this trade will constitute a mere trifle in relation to India's capital requirements and will constantly goad Indian Big Business to shed all the formal trappings of independence and come as a beggar for alms and completely depend on imperialism.

Indian Big Business itself, in its ambition, is looking to widespread foreign markets—to the entire South East Asia—and looking upon itself as the inheritor of the mantle thrown off by Japan. The Indian bourgeoisie realises that its plan of expansion cannot be realised without foreign markets, and members of the Union Government are already talking about exports to South East Asiatic countries. The desire to exploit the peoples of South East Asia with the help of imperialists is one of the most powerful factors in bourgeois politics. The need for foreign markets is the logical conclusion of a desire to develop industries on a capitalist basis with the colonial order kept intact.

Both for its immediate needs—replacement, immediate exports to avoid collapse of industry—and its big plans of expansion of industry, import of capital goods, finding of new markets, release of sterling balances, the national bourgeoisie needs collaboration with imperialism, as without imperialism it will not even be able to run its industry regularly, nor expand it.

The businessmen know that these are the crucial years when either industry expands, new markets are captured before the other nations suffering from war devastation come out as competitors, or they go bankrupt. That is why they need collaboration very badly.

This desire for collaboration, therefore, takes the shape of retaining the colonial order and willingly inviting foreign capital for joint concerns. They agree to make wide and sweeping concessions to foreign capital in return for securing access to other colonial markets.

The secret of the joint concerns, planned by Indian big businessmen but not yet executed, is this. The Indian capitalists finding no other way of getting capital goods are prepared to accept the most extortionate terms from the monopolists of these goods.

The full meaning of this collaboration is seen in the terms demanded by imperialism and accepted by the Indian bourgeoisie.

Foreign capital through the Havana Trade Pact is demanding full equality, full compensation in case the State takes over any concern; that no measures of nationalisation be carried through, a demand which the Indian Government, itself opposed to nationalisation, has found easy to satisfy through its recent statement of policy when it says that there will be no nationalisation for five years; it demands that no discrimination be made between home and foreign capital; that tariff walls be not raised against foreign capital without previous consultation; and that full security be offered to it, meaning security against labour and State intervention.

These terms, accepted by the Indian bourgeoisie, were openly put in the several speeches of the arrogant American Ambassador to India, Dr Grady. Speaking in April 1947 in New York, Dr Grady demanded a fundamental reorganisation of India's taxation structure to suit the needs of the American imperialists for unhampered exploitation of India.

'He was of the opinion that the obstacles to maximum economic co-operation such as the present complicated tax structure that hampered the conduct of manufacturing operations in India by foreign companies could be removed by treaties or agreements'—in short, the State should not encroach through taxation on the profits of the foreign concerns.

Demanding a war on protective tariffs, etc., in the name of world recovery and American assistance and sympathy, Dr Grady stated (Calcutta, 28 October 1947):

'Until there is truly one world trading system with bilateralism, preferences and all other forms of exclusive trade advantage eliminated or at least in the process of progressive reduction, world prosperity will be shackled. . . .'

Speaking in November 1947 in Calcutta, Dr Grady said: 'that he was not in a position to state what attitude the Export and Import Bank would take for advancing loans to India if the Government of India decided to go ahead with wholesale plans of nationalisation. But if a middle course between private enterprise and State institutions was followed then he believed there would not be much difficulty. . . .'—thus openly coming out against any genuine nationalisation.

To these insolent demands the reply of the Indian Union Government has been one of meek acceptance with only verbal modifications here and there.

Speaking to the Associated Chambers of Commerce in Calcutta on December 1947, Pandit Nehru said:

'We cannot have any special privilege for any foreign interest in India. There is a large field especially for the next few years and we

want co-operation with other countries during the process of India's development, and I think British and other foreign interests that exist in India will and should have this large field open to them.'

This open welcome to foreign interests, seeking to dominate India, though verbally qualified by a declaration of no special privileges, shows how the Government is begging for foreign help.

In practice it accepts one by one all the terms which the foreign capitalists want.

At the Industries Conference, which met in January 1948 in New Delhi, the Government gave a secret understanding to the Indian capitalists that there would be no nationalisation for at least five years to come, thus accepting the demand of Dr Grady. The resolution which the Conference passed on foreign capital kept quiet on all the insolent demands made, and contended itself by saying that the conditions under which foreign capital is invested in India should be regulated by national interests, and private deals between Indian and foreign capitalists should have the formal approval of the Government.

What results from this is not industrial revolution, not the freeing of agrarian economy from feudal bondage, but the establishment of a few industrial concerns as give some outlet to the accumulated capital without endangering the interests of Anglo-American imperialism; the establishment of such concerns as fits in with the Anglo-American scheme of exploiting the world and drawing India into its war plans.

If this is welcomed by the bourgeoisie it only reveals the narrow and anti-national character of its intentions. But for the mass of the people it only means continuation of feudal exploitation, low wages, no industrial revolution, but continued poverty, unemployment, crisis and famine—the price of tying India to the capitalist order, of collaboration and joint exploitation. That is where the Indian bourgeoisie, and the national leadership which represents it, are taking India—to economic dependence on the Anglo-Americans, subservience to them and to growing poverty for the people.

The collaboration thus represents an economic and political alliance against the democratic revolution through which alone the people can liberate themselves from the yoke of the colonial order, of landlordism, of the Princes and of foreign and home capitalists. It is directed against the agrarian revolution, against the nationalisation of industries, a living wage and planning, and against the widespread industrial expansion which can only be realised on the basis of nationalisation. It is calculated to guard the present order with the bourgeoisie playing the role of a junior partner to imperialism. . . .

III POST-WAR REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE AND NEW POLICIES OF IMPERIALISM AND INDIAN BOURGEOISIE—NEW CLASS ALIGNMENT

The deep economic crisis and the intensified imperialist exploitation of the war years, which have brought unbearable suffering and starvation to the broad masses of the toiling and common people and sharpened their political consciousness and militancy, continued to operate as a mighty force in the post-war years behind the rising revolutionary fight of the masses.

Despite the secret military plans to crush the struggle which British imperialist statesmen hatched behind the curtain, while they publicly talked of a peaceful transfer of power and of quitting India; despite their backstair intrigues to pitch the Congress and League against each other and provoke a fratricidal war; despite the compromising, disruptive and anti-struggle policies pursued by the Congress and League leaderships; the tempo, the sweep and the militancy of the struggles of the workers and employees in the cities, of the peasants and tenant-serfs in the countryside, of the common people in the feudal autocratic States went on rising steadily in 1945-6.

The tide of the struggle swept even into the armed forces leading to mutinies and rebellions, strikes and hartals in the imperial armies. Gandhi's non-violent India, guarded by the bourgeoisie for more than a quarter century against any militant action, now suddenly resorted to arms. The development of the struggles into armed clashes signified a new stage of the revolutionary struggle—the final phase when the toiling masses and the common people rise in defiance of imperialism and the victory of the democratic revolution becomes imminent.

The second characteristic feature of the situation was the great role played by the working class in these struggles—economic and political. The strikes of the working class became the great cohesive and centralising force when the bourgeoisie was abjuring struggle and the National Congress was withdrawing from it. In fact, many of the glorious struggles took place in the teeth of opposition from national leaders.

The developing strikes for economic demands and the mass participation of the working class in the political protest strikes were leading the entire struggle in the direction of an all-India general strike, supported by the armed forces and government servants.

India has never seen such a sweep; never seen the armed forces collapsing so easily before popular pressure; never seen the working class fighting with such abandon and courage.

It was the eve of the total collapse of imperialism.

The heroic fighting spirit of the striking workers was shown in the case with which the workers responded to the call for protest strikes

on every national and anti-imperialist issue. It was seen in the rapid spread of strike enthusiasm to other employees, to bank clerks, peons, primary teachers and to government servants.

A similar movement started in the armed forces. In 1945 when it was known that tens of thousands of the captured patriotic INA men were being maltreated in several concentration camps, and when the victory-mad imperialists launched a treason trial against the INA leaders, the whole country rose in flaming indignation and demanded their unconditional release.

In November 1945 the students and the workers of Calcutta became the spearhead of big protest hartals and strike demonstrations. They marched under the joint flags of the Congress, the League and the Communist Party and were fired upon by the police and the military. It was then that the first martyrs of the post-war period fell.

In January 1946 the British Commander-in-Chief had to bow down before the popular storm and release the INA prisoners.

Hard on the heels of the Release-INA demonstrations, and powerfully influenced by them, came the discontent in the ranks of the Royal Indian Navy and the Royal Indian Air Force.

The naval officers, bewildered and panic-stricken by strike for their demands in the ships and shore establishments. [*sic*] They demonstrated for their demands in the city, demanded the release of INA men and the withdrawal of the Indian troops from Indonesia. They ran up the Congress, League and Red Flags on their ships.

The naval officers, bewildered and panic-stricken by the new revolutionary spirit in the navy, sought to suppress them by arrests and bullets. [*sic*] Then it was that these navy men seized their ships and fired back. By their heroic, though short-lived, resistance the navy men of Bombay and Karachi heralded the beginning of a new period of revolutionary upheaval. Their revolutionary spirit and united action sent a thrill through the ranks of all branches of the Indian armed forces.

Men of the RIAF struck in several places in fraternal solidarity with the RIN. The Indian troops, wherever they were called out against the revolting men, refused to fire.

The Indian working class, led by the Communist Party, instinctively saw in the naval rising a historic turning point in our freedom struggle and supported it by total protest strikes and hartals in Bombay, Calcutta, Trichinopoly, Madras and Madura.

The total strike and hartal in Bombay on February 22, 1946, which came as an instantaneous counter-challenge to Admiral Godfrey's insolent threat to destroy the revolting navy and despite the opposition of Sjt. Vallabhbbhai Patel and the Congress leadership, struck panic

into the hearts of the imperialists. They called out White troops with tanks and armoured cars to spread terror and murder in the streets. Over 200 citizens fell victims to their bullets in two days.

The naval rising and the great solidarity action staged by the advance guard of the Indian working class in its support were not isolated incidents. They were a flaming signal which announced to the world that a volcanic discontent, an anti-imperialist urge, was smouldering in the minds of the Indian people and their armed forces, ready to be united and harnessed for the final annihilation of the rotten structure of the imperialist-feudal rule.

One has only to recapitulate the striking events and mass actions of the first six months of 1946 to be convinced of the truth of this.

Within a week of the RIN strike, more than 300 military sepoy stationed at Jubbulpore struck work and paraded throughout the streets with all the three flags, Congress, League and Red (March 4).

On March 8 the workers and citizens of Delhi observed a protest strike and hartal against the victory celebrations. The Town Hall was attacked and set on fire.

On March 18 the Gurkha soldiers of Dehra Dun revolted in protest against insulting remarks by officers.

Delhi policemen went on hunger strike for wage increase and the military was used to arrest them.

Policemen of Allahabad went on hunger strike in protest against ration cut (March 19).

Ten thousand Bihar policemen went on strike on April 3.

Side by side with this beginning of insurrectionary atmosphere in the armed forces and the police, a tremendous strike wave was rising among the working class.

This terrific pace of events in the rest of India was producing the first repercussions among the peoples of the feudal autocratic States.

The people of Kashmir launched in May 1946 a movement for the end of the autocracy of the Dogra House and for the immediate introduction of a democratic constitution. The Ruler promptly arrested Sheikh Abdulla and unleashed a reign of terror against the Kashmiri people, who, however struck back and performed marvels of heroic resistance.

It was clear that a new round of States' people's struggles this time for the final abolition of Princely autocracy, was being heralded by the fighting people of Kashmir, and the people of the rest of India were preparing to support them.

Thus the countrywide movement which grew round the demand for the release of the INA men and the naval rising of February marked the beginning of a new period which was not just of mounting

discontent and unrest but one which immediately placed on the agenda the democratic revolution and the task of vanquishing imperialism and its collaborators.

The paralysis of the imperialist system was seen not only in the breakdown of its economic structure, the poverty and hunger it created, but in the disintegration of the armed and the police forces which were no longer able to resist the popular pressure and revolutionary upheaval.

Imperialism saw the writing on the wall and opened negotiations with the two bourgeois parties, the Congress and the League. But it was not only imperialism that was frightened by the menace of the approaching revolution. The bourgeois leaderships of the National Congress and the Muslim League clearly saw that the struggle of the masses was getting beyond control and was bringing to the forefront the working class and the exploited masses. They, therefore, were eager for compromise and began to attack the militant struggles of the people.

The policies pursued by the leaderships of the Congress and the Muslim League corresponded to the bourgeois vested interests which they represent and not the anti-imperialist and democratic aspirations of the vast masses that they claim to lead.

Both the leaderships resiled [*sic*] in panic from the manifestations of mass upheaval against the imperialist-feudal rule and were ready to welcome the Cabinet Mission as soon as it was announced and to seek co-operation with imperialism.

When the Cabinet Mission came with its plan, the Congress leadership turned even more anti-struggle. Its Ministries let loose a wave of repression against the working class and peasant struggles. It set its face against the struggles of the States' peoples in order to appease the Princes and betrayed the struggle of the Kashmiri people. Instead of rejecting the plan with its non-sovereign constitution-making body and retention of the Princes, as a plan of masked British domination and as one based on the imperialist policy of divide and rule, it accepted it with minor criticisms.

The leadership of the National Congress, representing the interests of the Indian capitalist class, thus betrayed the revolutionary movement at a time when it was on the point of overthrowing the imperialist order. It only exploited the movement to win the maximum concessions possible for its own selfish interests and disrupted for the time being the growing revolutionary movement. By detaching the Congress from the movement, by isolating these spontaneously developing militant struggles, by repressing them, the national leadership played the game of disrupting the battle against imperialism and pursued a policy of suppressing it.

The leadership of the Muslim League, representing the interests of the Muslim capitalists and landlords, had always played a disruptive and anti-national role through its policy of communalism, its slogan of division of India and its general policy of obstructing the national emancipatory struggle headed by the Congress. The Muslim League leadership capitalised the backwardness of the Muslim masses and the failure of the national reformist leadership to draw the Muslim masses into the common struggle, and succeeded in giving the freedom urge of the Muslim masses a distorted expression. The hypocritical talk of 'Muslim freedom', of saving the Muslims from the Hindus, stood exposed when in connection with the RIN strike in Bombay, Mr Jinnah came out against the participation of Muslim workers and people in the common demonstration, and betrayed his fear of independent mass action.

Throughout this period the Muslim League did its best to keep the Muslim masses away from the developing revolutionary wave but did not always succeed. It had sometimes to start demonstrations on its own (demonstration in Calcutta for the release of INA prisoner Rashid Ali) to give an outlet to the anti-imperialist sentiment of the Muslim masses. The Muslim League leadership was concentrating only on blackmailing the Congress and through obstruction to secure its separatist demand of Pakistan.

It also, therefore, readily took to negotiations on the basis of the Cabinet Mission's Plan. The Muslim League leadership thus betrayed the revolutionary movement and revealed itself once more as an agency of upper-class interests, out to sell the freedom movement for its own selfish gains.

British imperialism, standing in immediate need of erecting a barrier to the revolutionary movement, saw the necessity of placating the Congress to the utmost limit. It realised that only by using the Congress leadership against the revolutionary movement could the imperialist order be saved.

At the same time, having drawn the Congress into negotiations, imperialism fully exploited the fear of the Congress leaders of revolution, their need for economic help from Britain, their conflict with the League, and the independent existence of the Princely autocracy, to make them willingly accept the Mountbatten Plan.

The original Cabinet Mission Plan did not provide for direct partition; this was a concession made to Congress pressure. But as soon as the purely Congress-manned Interim Government came into existence the pressure of riots was worked up, taking advantage of the 'Direct Action' launched by the League. Pressure was also worked later through Cabinet members of the Muslim League, when it after-

wards joined the Government, making it impossible for the Congress to function the Government. The leaders of the Congress were thus forced to accept partition of India.

Real Face of the Mountbatten Award

The Mountbatten Award comes as a culmination of the betrayal of the revolutionary struggle by the National Congress and the League leaderships.

Though the bourgeois leaderships parade the story that independence has been won, the fact is that the freedom struggle has been betrayed and the national leadership has struck a treacherous deal behind the back of the starving people, betraying every slogan of the democratic revolution.

The Mountbatten Plan partitioned India. The national bourgeois leaderships of the Congress and the Muslim League, which had always opposed the solution of the communal problem on the basis of the just and revolutionary principle of self-determination of nationalities, accepted the imperialist solution of partition on the basis of religion. This enabled imperialism to organise the ghastliest riots and mass butchery of minorities, creating permanent hostility between Hindus and Muslims, and to work up war fever between the two States when required in imperialist interest. The partition is a ready-made weapon to organise riots and side-track the revolutionary movement by war appeals. It is one of the biggest attacks on the unity and integrity of the democratic movement and is also used to weaken the bourgeoisie of both the States *vis-à-vis* imperialism.

Secondly, the plan keeps the Princes, the age-old friends of the imperial order, intact and enhances their bargaining power, enabling the national leaders to parade their accession as a great triumph, for the Princes are now supposed to be independent.

Thirdly, the leading economic strings are still in the hands of the imperialists, who successfully use them to make the bourgeoisie move against the masses, crush the democratic revolution and establish a new line-up of imperialism, Princes, landlords, and the bourgeoisie.

The Mountbatten Plan is the expression of this alliance against the democratic revolution—an alliance which seeks to drown the revolution in blood. It crowns the process of bourgeois vacillation with final capitulation. It is the fruit of the national leadership's compromising policy, culminating in an avowedly anti-national, anti-people and anti-revolutionary policy.

What the Mountbatten Plan has given to the people is not real but fake independence. Through this award British imperialism

partitioned India on communal lines and gave to the bourgeoisie an important share of State power, subservient to itself.

Britain's domination has not ended, but the form of domination has changed. The bourgeoisie was so long kept out of State power and in opposition to it; now it is granted a share of State power in order to disrupt and drown the national democratic revolution in blood.

The supreme organs of the State, the army, the navy, the air force, and the bureaucracy, are controlled by the servitors of imperialism. They are dominated by upperclass elements, officered by them, by old bureaucrats who have pronounced pro-British sympathies and bitterly hate all democratic advance. And the final imperialist control will be registered through military missions and military advisers, 'willingly accepted' by the Indian Government.

The behaviour of the military, the police and the civil service in face of the riot offensive of communal elements clearly demonstrates how anti-popular, anti-democratic and pro-imperialist elements control these organs of the State—elements on which the bourgeoisie safely relies for the law and order of collaboration.

At the same time the representatives of the bourgeoisie, the traditional leaders of the national movement, are handed over the reins of government, while being dominated by imperialism through trade pacts and an open military alliance which is in the process of formation.

The Mountbatten Award does not really signify a retreat of imperialism but its cunning counter-offensive against the rising forces of the Indian people. This is demonstrated by the communal carnage and the set-back to the democratic and anti-imperialist struggles after August 15.

British imperialism was forced to change the forms of its domination as a result of the growing popular upsurge for freedom and democracy during the war and post-war days. Faced with the alternative of quitting India, it has given a share of power to the capitalists and landlords in order to be able to remain. To parade this new status as national freedom or as national advance is to shield imperialist designs and the subservience of the national bourgeoisie.

National Government and the People

The deeds and actions of the 'National Government' since August 15 fully prove this understanding of the purpose behind the Mountbatten Plan.

The establishment of the Central Government headed by Pandit Nehru has not solved a single problem of the democratic revolution. Its establishment does not mean that the Indian people have won

either freedom or independence, nor does it ensure that they will be moving in the direction of democracy and freedom for the people.

On the contrary, the Government has already made a big move in the opposite direction—against the interests and freedom of the people. It is linking itself with the Anglo-American bloc of imperialist Powers—a bloc which seeks to crush all democratic revolutions and to create satellite States. It is manœuvring to find an advantageous position for itself in the Anglo-American bloc.

The recent acts of the National Government prove beyond doubt that its policy is to suppress freedom and democracy.

The Constituent Assembly, manned by the same leaders as lead the National Government, is preparing an authoritarian constitution. The working class and the Indian people will not get anything except the right to vote at long intervals and that too only for the provincial assemblies. The constitution framed by the Constituent Assembly will be a constitution for the upper classes to rule the oppressed millions in the interests of joint exploitation by the Indian and British capitalists.

The constitution provides for arrest without warrant and detention without trial; it authorises the provincial Governors to act in their discretion, legislate by ordinance and rule by proclamation, thus usurping the powers of the legislature and overruling them in the name of grave emergency.

It includes the reactionary provision for second chambers in provinces and allows for nomination of members to the Council by the Governor, thus ensuring that the vested interests and their upper-class spokesmen will have a dominant voice in the Chamber.

The model constitution for provinces further does not accept the basic right of linguistic national units to self-determination, thus expressing clearly the reactionary bourgeois interests which seek to dominate the different nationalities.

It does not provide for proportional representation, without which the progressive political parties and the various minority groups cannot get fair representation. It does not provide for freedom and self-determination of the tribal and other backward peoples enabling the formation of autonomous regions or provinces, without which these backward people cannot economically and culturally protect and develop themselves.

Under the constitution the basic and fundamental rights of the toilers, such as right to work, right to a living wage, equal pay for equal work, right to old-age, sickness and unemployment aid, are denied and do not find a place in the fundamental rights which the new State of India is bound by the constitution to guarantee and protect.

While these rights of the mass of toilers are not guaranteed, the property and the privileges of the vested interests are specifically granted protection by a clause in the fundamental rights that no property of a person or corporation shall be taken over for public use except by payment of compensation, thus preventing through a constitutional guarantee all plans of nationalisation of industries including foreign concerns.

The Government is carrying out the plan of Indian Big Business to oppose nationalisation, suppress the workers and demand more production through longer hours of work; intensification of labour and rationalisation; freezing of wages in the name of stopping the wage-price spiral; sabotaging the implementation of gains secured by the workers (railway agreement); holding forth no hope of legislation for a living wage, social security or curtailment of management's power of dismissal; assuring the capitalists of full freedom to loot the people in the name of building a 'mixed economy', while slandering the workers for the fall in production, demanding an increase in the hours of work. In short, it is passing the burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of workers to keep up capitalist profits.

The control of the Government by the national leadership has placed an additional and powerful weapon in its hands to sabotage the revolutionary struggles against Princely autocracy. It has persistently raised illusions that Princely autocracy can be fought through governmental pressure and has utilised them to enter into accession agreements with the Princes which keep autocracy intact. By parading accession as a big triumph, attention is sidetracked from the democratic struggles inside the States. The latest act of betrayal is the Standstill Agreement with the Nizam.

In a number of bigger States the bourgeois leadership has used the popular movements against Princedom to get limited constitutional reforms which do not give power to the people but give a minor share of power to the bourgeoisie. In exchange it has joined hands with the Princes to defend feudal exploitation and oppression of the people and to disrupt and suppress all popular democratic movements.

The policy that the Government follows can only be described as one of supporting feudal reaction and sabotaging the revolutionary anti-feudal, anti-imperialist struggle.

In the matter of civil liberties and democratic rights, the provincial Governments, under the guidance of the Central Government, have passed the blackest acts—Public Safety Acts—which are freely used against the rising workers' and peasants' movements and against the students; hundreds are detained without trial, externed or interned.

The leadership of the Central Government has applied the brake to the agrarian legislation of the provincial Ministries, which itself is an attempt to cheat the peasant in the name of the abolition of landlordism. Saddled with compensation and with no provision for aid to the tiller, the legislation is not even a mild reform, retains landlordism under different forms, and is an attempt to split the peasant movement and disrupt the growing forces of the agrarian revolution. It is an attempt to broaden the basis of the present bourgeois government.

In the matter of minorities, the Government follows a communal policy, which is essentially the bourgeois way of inciting majority-minority conflict. This leads it to practice discrimination and favourism against the minorities, depriving them of their fundamental democratic rights, and to retreat before the more ruthless and direct incitement of communal conflict by feudal-imperialist reaction, which has resulted in the mass murder of minorities in certain areas.

The admission of Hindu Sabha leader, Shyamaprosad Mukherjee, into the Cabinet and the retention of Akali leader, Baldev Singh, in the important position of Defence Minister, taken together with the open encouragement given to communal reaction show how the Government itself wanted to use the weapon of communal division, even before the mass massacres had started in the Punjab.

Thus for the Government, the oppression of the minorities is a conscious and deliberate policy.

This policy, carried to its greatest lengths by Sardar Patel with his praise of the openly communal Princes (Patiala, Bharatpur, Lawanagar) and of the RSS, and his viciously communal incitement of Hindus against the Muslims and Pakistan, has lent added strength to these forces. The result is seen in the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi by a leading organiser of the RSS.

So determined are the leaders of the Government to utilise and safeguard their use of this communal weapon that even after the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi, every effort is made to screen and protect reaction; angry people demonstrating against them are arrested and even shot down, a farce is enacted of arresting some of them—while in reality every occasion is utilised to find an excuse to say a good word for the communalists and save them from the anger of the masses.

The arrests of Hindu Mahasabha leaders, etc., took place because the angry masses set the pace and compelled the Government to take steps against these communalists.

Even the banning of the RSS by the National Government has been carried through due to the tremendous mass indignation against

it, and is only a cover for its continued policy of shielding and allying with that organisation and the elements behind it.

According to Pandit Nehru's own statement this policy does not lead to any differences inside the Cabinet; even on this issue there are no political differences, but only temperamental differences. This should be enough to demonstrate the strong pull of communal reaction on the National Government.

Government's Economic Policy

While refusing to develop the industries of our country by nationalising key and vital industries, the Government, at the same time, is encouraging the export drive in the interests of Indian Big Business and at the expense of the people. This is a part of the plan of collaboration with the Anglo-American bloc, since these export markets can only be secured in collaboration with the imperialists. By securing foreign exchange through these exports, Indian Big Business wants to purchase machinery for new industries with the help of the Anglo-American imperialists. Thus, again, it has to depend on the Anglo-American capitalists for its industries.

This double economic dependence on the Anglo-American capitalists, both for the market for Indian products and for purchasing new machinery, necessitates a servility and abject surrender to them; and Big Business, helped by the Government, is preparing to sell out India's future to the Anglo-American imperialists.

The latter are demanding a number of concessions and fundamental rights—no discrimination against foreign capital, no nationalisation, no tariffs which are not agreed to, joint concerns for the exploitation of the Indian people, full security to them—all of which are embodied in the Draft Trade Charter being discussed at Havana and disclose that Indian Big Business and the Government are mortgaging Indian economy to Anglo-American capital in their selfish interests. The natural result of this is not only economic but indirect political domination, so that both the economy and political freedom of India are being mortgaged to the Anglo-American monopolists.

Government's Foreign Policy

The foreign policy of the Government follows the class interests it represents. From the very beginning Pandit Nehru adopted a line of forming a so-called third bloc—a line which represents the interests of Big Business inasmuch as it kept India away from the democratic camp and opened the way to the imperialist camp.

Recent events have torn off the mask of neutrality from the Government's foreign policy. On all crucial issues the Indian delegation

has taken an anti-democratic and pro-imperialist stand—Korea, 'Little Assembly,' Ukraine. On the question of Ukraine it allowed itself to be exploited by the USA and took the hypocritical stand that India stood against Ukraine because South East Asia was not represented.

On the questions crucial for the peoples of Asia in particular, e.g., the American-directed Kuomintang war against the Chinese people and the French colonial war in Viet Nam, it has remained silent and refused to act; while on the question of the Japanese Peace Treaty, it has virtually lined up with Anglo-American imperialism. Over the American-backed Dutch war against the Indonesian people, it has approved of the betrayal of the Indonesian freedom-struggle, achieved through the latest truce, put through by the US-sponsored and dominated Good Offices Committee and welcomed by President Truman.

Foreign policy depends on economic policy and India is also rapidly lining herself up with the Anglo-American bloc in matters of foreign policy. Her diplomats are already uttering anti-Soviet slanders, e.g., Sir Maharaj Singh's statement on war propaganda.

The British imperialists are giving open hints about an anti-Soviet bloc including the overseas territories of Britain, indicating that the role that India will have to play is to support the Western bloc economically, especially with her raw materials.

Speaking in the House of Commons on January 22, Mr Bevin, Britain's Foreign Minister, stated in connection with the formation of a bloc of Western European Powers :

'The overseas territories of these countries (Britain, France, Holland, etc.) should be brought within this Union, so that this tremendous co-operation would stretch through Europe, the Middle East and Africa to the Far East. . . . The Western organisation of Europe must be economically supported. That involves the closest possible collaboration with the Commonwealth and overseas territories, not only the British, but the French, Dutch, Belgian and Portuguese territories overseas. These territories are large primary producers and are capable of great development.'

Along with this come reports about an alliance of South East Asian countries—embracing India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon and in agreement with Britain—an alliance of an entirely 'defensive' nature; the aim of this 'bloc' as openly reported is to 'prevent the spread of communism in South East Asia,' which really means suppressing all struggles for freedom and democracy in South East Asia and bringing these countries directly into the imperialist camp. The Indian bourgeoisie, which is playing the role of chief agent of the imperialists for

the formation of this bloc, wants all South East Asian countries to fall in line with them, that is, give up the struggle for freedom and join the imperialist camp, because it wants to prevent the Indian people from being affected by the revolutionary struggle in these countries and also because it wants to get some foothold in these markets, with the help of imperialism, by keeping the colonial order intact.

There are also reports about military missions from Britain coming to India to keep her defence properly organised; reports which openly state that British statesmen do not want India or Pakistan to have any defence policy out of the orbit of the British Commonwealth, i.e., independent of British imperialism.

That is where the Government and Big Business are dragging India—from the freedom struggle to the Anglo-American camp.

New Role of the Bourgeoisie

How is it that a Government headed by the national leaders and one which came to power on the crest of a wave of popular struggles should pursue these policies?

That is so because the national leaders, who headed the popular struggles all these years and who are now in the government, represent the class interests of the national bourgeoisie, the industrial bourgeoisie.

The leaders of the Government including Pandit Nehru and Sardar Patel represent the interests of the Indian capitalist class, and the formation of the Government after August 15—after what is known as the transfer of power, but which in reality is the sharing of power—has meant an immense change in the position of the national bourgeoisie *vis-à-vis* the people and their struggles.

Formerly the national bourgeoisie and its leaders had to rely on the masses, mass struggles, etc., to secure concessions, share in power, etc., to advance their own interests. The bourgeoisie was excluded from political power, it had no real opportunity to develop industries and had no political power over the people.

The post-war revolutionary upsurge forced imperialism to change its strategy, in order to be able to strike at the democratic forces all the more ferociously.

Imperialism makes big concessions to the bourgeoisie and hands it over governmental power to rule the Indian people in its own narrow selfish interests.

At the same time, the State it has won is dependent on imperialism and is a satellite State.

In the new State, therefore, the national bourgeoisie shares power with imperialism, with the latter still dominant indirectly.

This is the secret behind the reactionary policy of the National Government. The bourgeoisie has ceased to play an oppositional role; it has renounced mass struggles to get concessions from imperialism; it is now depending on the new State and its control over the Indian people to use them as pawns in its bargaining with imperialism, whenever differences and conflicts arise. These conflicts will be solved at government level by offering new concessions to imperialism through Customs, lowering of tariffs, securing of joint concerns, etc.

The bourgeoisie, therefore, has turned its face away from the masses, and gone over to collaboration. That is why its Government consistently adopts an anti-mass, anti-democratic policy.

In the past, the bourgeoisie, and the national leadership which represents it, were in opposition to imperialism; now they have given up that opposition. This is the new change brought about by the transfer of power on August 15.

Henceforward the march of the democratic revolution will have to proceed directly in opposition to the bourgeois Government and its policies, and the bourgeois leadership of the Congress.

Game behind the Riot Offensive

The fact that the Government is manned by popular leaders and that it arose on the crest of a wave of mass struggles has concealed the class character of the Government and the change in the position of its class.

The riot offensive, inspired and engineered by the imperialists and their feudal reactionary agents, and their denunciation of the National Government has led many people to believe that the feudal reactionaries were attacking a revolutionary Government and that it was the business of the people to line up unconditionally behind the Government. This is a totally wrong understanding of the situation.

The unleashing of communal riots in the Punjab, UP and the Indian States, the massacre of tens of thousands of innocent Hindus, Sikhs and Moslems, the forcible extermination and expulsion of minorities, the terrible sufferings and hardships inflicted on innocent men, women and children, and the economic chaos arising from all this, were pre-planned and organised by the imperialist-feudal counter-revolutionary forces. The object was to disrupt and drown the people's democratic revolution in blood. The main attack was against the people who were moving forward through strikes, armed conflicts and revolts of States' peoples to a democratic revolution.

The attempt of the forces of counter-revolution was to sidetrack the revolutionary discontent into communal channels, disorganise the people and through it consolidate a line-up of all the vested interests

against the mass movement, a line-up in which the bourgeoisie will move more to the Right, allying with feudal and communal interests all the more, so that a stronger front against the masses, could be created.

This was to be achieved by strengthening the openly communal elements inside the Government, to appease Hindu communal reaction and surrender to the Princes on the question of maintenance of autocracy, by strengthening the consistent communal policy of Sardar Patel and checking the inconsistent and vacillating policy of Pandit Nehru.

There is no doubt that the deeply laid plot of counter-revolution very nearly succeeded in creating confusion, vacillation and demoralisation in the ranks of the people and of political parties. The main objectives were forgotten and a tendency to line up behind the Government in panic was noticed.

The imperialists and their agents would precisely like such a lining-up of the working class and democratic forces behind the Government, as it would lead to the giving up of all efforts to carry through the democratic revolution and to the doing away with all opposition and criticism of the Government in its policy of combating all national democratic advance.

For such a policy ensures the success of their strategy. Why are riots on a mass scale possible today? Precisely because the national bourgeois leadership has, through its anti-national compromise, disorganised the forces of revolution and allowed the reactionaries to divert the discontent.

Communal riots are the direct result of the imperialist conspiracy and bourgeois compromise. Imperialism has strengthened the basis of communal riots in four ways: (i) partition which made one community hostile to another; (ii) fixation of boundaries in a manner that roused communal bitterness to its height; (iii) independent position for the States which could manoeuvre between India and Pakistan and play one against the other in a most vicious manner; and (iv) communal poisoning of most of the army chiefs and bureaucrats, which has resulted in the use of the State machinery for spreading riots.

Imperialism is instigating communal riots in order to create conditions in which the national bourgeois leadership will be increasingly forced to submit to imperialist domination, and the common toiling people will be forced to submit to the leadership of the upper classes. It also aims at smashing people's unity and crushing all democratic movements.

Fascist elements like the RSS, Hindu-Moslem-Sikh communal reactionaries and bureaucratic administrators trained up by

imperialism are the chief agents for provoking riots. The Princes and landlords are at the head of them. But the bourgeoisie, including sections of the leaderships of the Congress and the League, has also played a leading part in communal riots, though certain sections of the Congress and the League leaderships have taken a stand against them.

Sections of the national bourgeois leadership also provoke riots as a matter of policy—as part of their policy towards the minorities. The policy of compromise with British imperialism, the policy of relying on it in the conflict between the Indian Union and Pakistan, leads straight to the massacre of minorities as a weapon of intimidating the Government of the other Dominion. The massacre of Muslims, for instance, is a part of the game of intimidating Pakistan, of replying to anarchy with anarchy—a game which suits the interests of the British excellently. The minorities have become a big pawn in the game of power politics of the compromisers.

A section of the bourgeois leadership encourages and protects communal armed bands for using them against political opponents and democratic movements and for strengthening the Princes and other vested interests; they even incorporate communal armed bands into the police, Home Guard and army.

Another section of the bourgeois leadership, while continuing the policy of compromise and thus creating conditions for riots is scared by riots when they actually occur, due to the disorganisation of administration, trade, etc. They take only palliative measures to stop the extreme forms of riots and anarchy.

The workers, peasants and progressive intelligentsia are the most determined forces that resist all riots, just because riots smash all democratic movements. In fighting riots, they must make use of all opportunities including the government measures to combat them.

But until the bourgeois policy of collaboration with imperialism and feudalism and its hostility to the principle of self-determination are successfully defeated, riots will take place again and again.

Not only communal riots, but other kinds of riots between one nationality and another, between the advanced castes and backward castes, between the tribal people and others, will also take place until full democracy and self-determination of the people are achieved and the imperialist hold over the organs of the State is completely smashed.

A determined fight against the reactionary policy of the Congress and the League leaderships is, therefore, essential to end the possibility of all riots. An end to these riots can only be brought about by complete elimination of imperialist domination and full democratic progress.

Unmask the Compromisers and Communalists

The policy of compromise with feudalism and imperialism has already bred riots and will breed more riots. Compromise feeds counter-revolution, and it is so in the case of India also.

The hands of all national leaders are equally tainted with compromise and they are all responsible for the mounting offensive of the communal elements.

Unless their compromising policies are exposed before the people, unless the people see the connection between them and the riot offensive and push their policies back, the feudal-imperialist offensive cannot be defeated.

It is, therefore, wrong to draw basic distinctions between different national leaders on the question of their approach to the communal problem. Sardar Patel who takes an openly communal stand, and Pandit Nehru who comes out against riots and for the protection of the Moslem minority also, both move in the vicious circle created by compromise. In the final analysis, Pandit Nehru has no independent line and has to fall in line with Sardar Patel.

Pandit Nehru's own stand, which regards Hindu communalist reaction only as a reaction to Moslem communalism, and does not see in it the forces of counter-revolution; his indulgence in threats of reprisals against Pakistan on the Kashmir issue; his failure to take a bold stand against the Hindu Mahasabha and the RSS even after Gandhiji's assassination; his full acquiescence in the policy of the Central and provincial Governments of utilising this assassination in order to strike at the democratic, revolutionary and really anti-communal forces in the country—all these only show that Nehru has completely surrendered to Patel's policy.

The Party will utilise every opportunity to fight riots and will make use of every measure taken by the Government to stop riots. It will regard riots as an offensive against the revolution but, at the same time, will have no illusion that the National Government can or will fight against riots.

In doing this, it is, no doubt, the duty of the Party to utilise every anti-riot utterance of men like Nehru and counteract the openly communal policy of other leaders. Such utterances, acts and propaganda have some importance inasmuch as they enable us to expose more easily men like Patel who are nearest to feudal reaction.

Patel and Nehru

Not only on the question of riots but also on the question of democratic policies, there exist illusions about Nehru.

Nehru is seen as a fighter against Patel's policies and almost made to appear as the leader of the democratic forces. Every verbal opposition of Nehru to Patel is magnified. It is thus that an illusion is created that if Nehru's hands are strengthened as against Patel, the Government will be transformed into an instrument of the people's will.

This estimate of Nehru is anti-Marxist and serves to tie down the masses to the bourgeois leadership. It must be clearly understood that Nehru is as much a representative of the bourgeoisie as Patel is. They both defend the class policies and interests of the bourgeoisie which is now collaborating with imperialism.

Today, Nehru is following the same policy as Patel. It is so in the matter of foreign policy, of the States, of decontrol, of industrial policy, etc. He often outdoes Patel on vital issues. He denounces strikes of the working class as a stab in the back.

In fact all shades of difference within the bourgeois camp (such as those between Nehru and Patel) are entirely subordinated to the new basic realignment of the class as a whole, namely, its role of collaboration with imperialism. Both Nehru and Patel represent this collaborationist class, and all differences between them are being and will be solved within the fundamental framework of the collaborationist policy of that class as a whole. The working class cannot go forward without fighting the policy of this class. That is why today it is anti-Marxist for the working class to base its strategy on 'differences' within the bourgeois camp such as 'Patel-Nehru' differences.

It is thus clear that the Central Government, manned by leaders of the National Congress, is the avowed enemy of the national democratic revolution. Marxism-Leninism has always taught that in the period of declining capitalism—of the general crisis of capitalism—the bourgeoisie cannot lead the democratic movement to victory, that it betrays it and goes over to the opposite camp, and that it is the working class which must lead it.

National Leaders and the Masses.

We must remember that those in charge of the Government are still looked upon by the majority of the people as their leaders and the Government is still looked upon as a National Government in contrast to the previous imperialist Government.

The masses do not yet realise that the National Government is collaborating, that the country is being sold to Anglo-American imperialism, that the policies of the leadership are leading to riots, that the Government is being run in the interests of Big Business; they still believe it to be a freedom Government and are the victims of national sentiments and national illusions about the Congress

leadership. The trusting masses of our country, though they are getting rapidly disillusioned with the National Government, have not yet lost their faith in Nehru, their faith in the Congress, and though repeatedly betrayed, they yet cling to old illusions.

Any criticism of the National Government which does not take into account these sentiments about it is likely to defeat its purpose.

If in criticising the policies of the Government, we do not base ourselves on concrete instances, if we do not patiently argue on the basis of a series of such instances and bring the masses to the point at which they can for themselves see the truth about our characterisation of the policies of the National Government; if we do not take into consideration the strong ties of loyalty that still bind the people to the Congress, our criticism will not impress the people and will not succeed in its aim of making them break away from their collaborating leaders.

At the same time, the rapid economic deterioration and disillusionment of the masses have created conditions for the successful unmasking of these reactionary policies—conditions which did not exist in the past.

To be able to move the masses into action for the fulfilment of the democratic aims, the working class must tear them away from the bourgeois leadership and build a new movement based on a new understanding of national unity.

V AGAINST IMPERIALIST-BOURGEOIS CONSPIRACY FORGE A NEW CLASS ALLIANCE . . . PROGRAMME OF DEMOCRATIC FRONT . . .

Masses Fight Back

The establishment of the Congress Ministries and subsequently of the National Government, the communal offensive launched by reaction, and the disruptive role played by the Congress have not diminished the post-war upsurge. Its causes lie deeper than the mere formation of government, for, they directly follow from the exploitation of the Indian masses which has reached unbearable proportions.

Though the Congress leaders in the beginning were successful in creating new hope among the people that things could be remedied through the National Government, the process of disillusionment has been quickened since August 15, and the upsurge is asserting itself more and more. Through their common fights and day-to-day struggles, through their co-operation for their demands, all these sections more and more come to realise that their poverty and exploitation can be ended only by a triumph of the democratic movement. Never was

there so much understanding of the main slogans of the democratic movement: abolition of landlordism and land to the tiller; abolition of autocracy; nationalisation of key industries and a living wage as the cornerstone of any stable life for the people.

But today the people in their disillusionment are learning something more, and that is, that a Government manned by leaders in whom they had utmost faith cannot discharge a single responsibility and cannot give them either land, peace or bread. More and more the people are coming to the conclusion that the National Government is guided by the vested interests; more and more they are seeing the link between the Indian capitalists and the national leaders. Out of this disillusionment will come the demand for another government, and it is the duty of the Communist Party to consciously guide the people in fighting for that demand boldly and decisively.

The programme of the democratic movement can be implemented only when the State power belongs to classes which are interested in full democracy and from which all opponents of democracy are excluded. Such a State will be based on the alliance of workers, peasants and the oppressed petty bourgeoisie, under the leadership of the working class. It will be a people's democratic State based on the alliance of anti-imperialist classes, workers, peasants and the oppressed petty bourgeoisie, under the leadership of the working class, and from which all collaborationists and exploiting elements are excluded. It will be based upon direct rule of the toiling people in place of the present bureaucratic system.

The existing correlation of forces, in which every step forward of the popular struggle is to be taken not only in opposition to imperialism but in opposition to the bourgeoisie also, clearly shows that the old phase of the bourgeois democratic revolution is over, a phase in which the bourgeoisie was in the anti-imperialist camp. Today the entire trend of events demands a democratic State of workers, toiling peasants and the oppressed petty bourgeoisie as the only rallying slogan to surge forward to the defeat of imperialism and its bourgeois allies, and emancipation of the people. It means that the people's democratic revolution has to be achieved for the completion of the tasks of democratic revolution and the simultaneous building up of Socialism. This can be assured by establishing firmly the leadership of the working class over the other sections of the toiling people.

New Class Alliance

To defeat the bourgeois-imperialist conspiracy, to defeat the combine of imperialism, feudalism and the bourgeoisie, it is necessary to marshal the forces of the revolutionary people in a new way, that is, to forge a

new alliance of all the classes for whom the success of the democratic revolution is vital. The democratic State cannot be realised without such an alliance and unity of the people.

The spontaneous movement of the workers, peasants and middle classes against economic exploitation and political repression itself gives the form of the new front. It is the duty of the working class and the Communist Party to combine this growing upsurge into a new Democratic Front reflecting the unity of the fighting masses. The basis of this new Democratic Front is the common struggle against exploitation and political subjection. The Front will, therefore, include the fighting masses and all those fighting organisations which help it to go forward against the treacherous policy of the national bourgeoisie and the designs of imperialism.

The Communist Party, the working class and the mass organisations led by the Communist Party will be the core of this Front. The militant following of the Left parties and all genuine Leftists in these parties will be important partners in the Front. The Front will grow by drawing inside it the entire fighting masses as well as the anti-imperialist following of the Congress and the League so that the broadest unity of the common people can be built in the struggle for freedom and democracy.

It must be clearly understood that though the Front will include several political parties, trade unions, kisan sabhas, student and youth organisations and other bodies, it will not be a mere coalition of several organisations. On the contrary, it must become the genuine fighting alliance of the masses against imperialism, feudalism and the bourgeoisie.

For building such a Front the Communists shall seek the co-operation of all Left parties and elements. They will strive to establish unity of action with Left parties. But the cardinal thing for the Communists to remember is that the struggle for building the Democratic Front is inseparable from the struggle to establish working class hegemony, that is, to win the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie for the fighting programme and policy of the working class.

It must also be stressed that in course of its development the Democratic Front will have to be directed, through persistent struggle for a common programme and progressive realisation of working class leadership, towards a disciplined and firmly united mass political organisation functioning democratically and based solidly on the unity of the people.

The Democratic Front, therefore, must not be looked upon as an organisation representing a top alliance between Left parties. It is a Front based on the masses. It is an alliance between the working

class, the peasantry and the progressive intelligentsia. This Front becomes strong and capable of decisive action to the extent that it becomes unified both politically and organisationally under working class leadership, to the extent that the working class secures the confidence of its allies and is able to win them for its programme and policy.

Unless the Communists realise all this, there is every danger of repeating the mistakes of the past, of Right opportunism masquerading as Left unity, and making the working class trail behind the vacillating class.

Under the impact of the crisis and as the result of growing disillusionment with the Government, larger and larger sections of masses will be set in motion. The process of radicalisation will be hastened even among the most backward strata. It will be the task of the Democratic Front to draw all these sections into the common movement, forge the fighting alliance of the people, co-ordinate and integrate the various partial struggles and develop them as part of the fight for the ending of imperialist-feudal-bourgeois domination. Only under the firm guidance of the working class and only by developing as the united mass organisation of the fighting people, the Democratic Front can carry out these tasks.

United Front with left Parties

The United Front of Left parties in the present situation will be a powerful lever to build the new Front, disillusioning and activating the Congress and League masses, the States' peoples and other sections, and in building a united movement for the democratic revolution.

The independent strength of the Communist Party of India and the general Leftward swing of the people enhance immensely the strength of Left forces and make them the base and spearhead of the new unity.

The Communist Party must, therefore, seek immediate agreements with Left parties for joint action, for common understanding of the problems of the democratic movement and for building a front against the compromisers and their real masters. At the same time, the Party must note that discredited and dishonest elements and groups sometimes come forward as a Left force, exploiting the anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist anger of the masses. The Party must expose and fight such groups, especially groups having connections with organisations or professing policies which are internationally accepted as counter-revolutionary.

The building of the Democratic Front is a process of struggle. It advances through a series of joint campaigns and partial struggles,