

jointly conducted, and through local united fronts between the Party and the local Congress and League masses— even committees wherever possible—between the Left parties and the Congress and League masses at other places, between the Party and other mass organisations in still other places. The fundamental basis, however, is the independent activity of the proletarian Party and its capacity to lead struggles of the masses and draw new masses into the fighting arena. The core of the new Front will be the Communist Party together with the mass organisations led by the Party, trade unions, kisan sabhas and students' and youth organisations. Round this must be gathered the militant following of the Left parties, vast masses from the Congress, the League, the States Praja Mandals, etc., so that a broad Democratic Front takes shape to meet the new situation.

In many provinces organised Left groups do not exist. There are thousands of unattached Leftists in all provinces. Unity of the Left parties is a weapon of drawing these thousands into the common front for joint action. In the South we must devote special attention to the unorganised Left; for Left unity will mean drawing these unattached thousands into the common fight. In other provinces also, Left unity ought to be an instrument of attracting unorganised Leftists who will now find an effective platform and instrument for implementing their Left aspirations. It will also attract other progressive Congressmen on specific issues.

#### *Congress, League and the Democratic Front*

The relation of the Congress and the League to the Democratic Front must be properly understood.

Both these organisations command the loyalty of lakhs of people, of vast sections of the anti-imperialist masses. Desperate attempts will be made by the leadership of these two organisations to keep these masses away from the struggle for the democratic revolution and from the Democratic Front by exploiting old loyalties and the memories of the anti-imperialist struggles. The forces of the democratic movement will be weak and paralysed if the bourgeois leaderships succeed in keeping the masses under the influence of these organisations away from the Democratic Front.

The Communist Party must devote the utmost attention to winning these masses away from the influence of the bourgeois leaders, through propaganda, joint campaigns and joint struggles.

Great and vital importance, therefore, attaches to bringing the masses of these two organisations inside the Democratic Front, in opposition to their leaders. It is, therefore, essential that the Leftists who are associated with these organisations should carry on a persistent

battle, both inside and outside these organisations, to unmask the policies of the leaderships and win over the masses for the democratic revolution and for joining the Democratic Front.

The Congress with its sixty-year old tradition of anti-British fight, and with the memories of national battles that it rouses, sways lakhs of anti-imperialists who earnestly desire to move forward. The name of the Congress is today used by the bourgeois leaders to keep popular opinion behind them in support of their collaborationist policy. What the people are unable to accept from the Central Government and the Provincial Ministries, is pushed through the Congress and public criticism is paralysed.

To abandon the fight for the Congress masses, to ignore their important role in the Democratic Front, will be tantamount to making a present of lakhs of people to the bourgeois leaders. Every attempt must be made to win over the Congress masses, to carry the fight against the bourgeois leadership right inside the Congress organisation itself on every burning issue. The Congress leadership, however, will neither accept the programme of the Democratic Front nor come into the Front, because it represents the bourgeoisie as a class and that class has gone collaborationist. But it is vital to win the Congress masses for the democratic movement. The Communist Party, therefore, attaches great importance to the work of consistent anti-imperialists and democrats inside the Congress, the work of disillusioning the masses and pressing forward for a democratic programme.

#### *The Socialist Party*

The Communist Party of India must take into consideration both the importance of the united front of the Left and its limitations.

Under the stress of the crisis and the militancy of the masses, under the stress of the August struggle and disillusionment of large sections of Congressmen with the Right-wing leadership, Left-minded elements strongly opposed to the capitalists are drawn to the Socialist Party. In places like Bombay, the Socialist Party has also a working class base. In places like Calcutta, it counts among its members old trade union leaders. It has got a large number of honest elements in its ranks who seek to work among the kisans, workers, students, to build mass organisations.

The Right-wing Congress leadership itself is afraid of the Socialist Party and at the same time wants to woo it.

The strength of the Socialist Party comes from the ranks who are overwhelmingly drawn from the petty bourgeoisie. The ranks hate the capitalists, are dissatisfied with the Nehru Government and

the compromise, and want to move forward. They consider themselves Socialist; in fact they are Left nationalists. Nonetheless, their urge for Socialism is real and though they are kept away from it by the misleading policies of their leadership, they constitute a current orientating towards the proletariat.

The building up of the united front of the Left involves the winning over of their ranks for the common task of pushing forward the democratic revolution and establishing a democratic State.

But the aspirations and the orientations of the Left ranks must be separated from the leadership and the programme of the Socialist Party. The ranks are being poisoned by the anti-working-class theories and formulations of the Socialist leadership, are given a distorted idea about Socialism and the international situation and are continually poisoned against the Communist Party and the revolutionary movement. Sharp exposure of the 'Socialism' of the Socialist leaders, their theoretical presumptions, their anti-Soviet and anti-Communist line, and their stand on Indian questions is an integral part of the struggle to build the united front of the Left.

In exposing the Socialist leadership it must be remembered that the leadership, barring the four or five at the top, has no uniform policy. In such cases a differentiated approach should be made.

The programme and policy laid down by the top leaders of the Socialist Party, including Jaiprakash Narain, Achyut Patwardhan, Ram Manohar Lohia and Ashoka Mehta, clearly reveal that behind the talk of Socialism lurks the sinister design to exploit the Left discontent of the ranks to transform the Socialist Party into a bourgeois constitutional party—His Majesty's constitutional Opposition, so to say. Both their international outlook and their national outlook reveal the same thing.

In its recent programme which is supposed to be a transitional programme to Socialism, the first stage in India's evolution towards Socialism, the party suggests a banal programme of administrative reforms, the high water-mark of its democracy not going beyond responsibility of the executive to the legislature. It requires an amazing boldness in these days to parade mere responsibility to the legislature as transitional steps to Socialism.

While the programme prattles about India being a republic, of expropriation of private property and enterprise 'with or without compensation,' it nowhere mentions struggle as being necessary for it. It pins its faith in constitutional opposition and acts as if the democratic revolution is already complete, the people are in power, and all that remains to be done is to take transitional steps to Socialism.

It openly preaches the illusion that Socialism may be achieved by constitutional means. It covers its advocacy of constitutionalism by calling it 'democratic means'.

In their demands for constitutional rights the Socialist leaders do not include the right of self-determination of national units like Andhra, Tamilnad, Maharashtra, and reveal that they have learnt nothing from recent Indian history.

In their economic programme they suggest the possibility of compensation before nationalising private property and they do not necessarily demand immediate nationalisation of heavy industries. On the contrary, their demand is immediate or early nationalisation, thus seeking an excuse to postpone nationalisation.

They talk of abolition of landlordism, living wage, etc., but having given up all struggle to change the social order, not having the courage to demand nationalisation at least in their programme, everything else becomes just the words of a bourgeois leadership giving electoral promises.

On the concrete issues of day-to-day importance, the Socialist Party leaders adopt anti-popular policies, support decontrol and help Big Business to exploit the people. They echo capitalist slanders about the working class not doing its duty, and help the bosses (Jaiprakash's letter to the Railway Board).

Forced by the ranks, they have to go in for strikes, but generally they oppose and even break strikes (strikes of drawers-in of Bombay textile mills and Ashoka Mehta's admissions). They disrupt the unity of the Trade Union Congress and the trade union movement and help the bosses' offensive, though their ranks want unity.

They concentrate their fire on the Communist Party—the mass actions led by it—and shamelessly support repressive measures against it (Ashoka Mehta's statement on the firing on Bombay students). Their members in the legislature support black measures like the Public Safety Bill in Bengal and they oppose and break protest strikes against them.

They are strong opponents of Left unity, of any co-operation with the Communist Party. They thus perform a disruptive role in the interests of the collaborationists.

From time to time the Socialist leaders give it out that they are leaving the Congress. This is an attempt first of all to pacify the ranks with Left talk about secession from the Congress, for the ranks are fed up with the vacillating policies of their leadership and think that they are the inevitable consequences of remaining inside the Congress. The talk of leaving the Congress pleases the Left ranks, for, it opens before them prospects of independent and militant political activity in opposition to the compromising leadership of the Congress.



The ranks hate the compromise and want to cut themselves off from the deadening grip of the policies of the Congress leadership and go in for an independent militant political line.

Nothing, however, is farther from the minds of the Socialist leaders. At present the talk about secession from the Congress only serves to keep their Left prestige with their ranks, and also it is a weapon of bargaining with the Congress leadership.

When the leadership decides to leave the Congress, it will not do it to go in for an independent revolutionary line but when it finds that it can now play the role of an independent bourgeois Opposition party, a parliamentary party for the next elections. The talk about secession from the Congress in the mouth of Socialist leaders is only an advertisement of their future plan to contest elections independently under the new constitution and try their luck at the ballot box. It is the result of their maturing into constitutional bourgeois leaders and has not an iota of revolution in it.

Their Statement of Policy reveals that they have drawn their theoretical understanding and appraisal of international events from the extreme Right-wing Social Democrats of Europe and America.

They repeat the worst slanders about the Soviet Union, calling it a totalitarian State and making it plain that they are opposed to a real Socialist revolution.

In their foreign policy they follow the hypocritical Bevin in advocating a 'third' group—which is only a cover to conceal their political alignment with American imperialism.

In their Statement of Policy they deliberately omit all reference to American imperialism, which means they will follow its dictates. Instead of concretely pointing out that a conflict does exist between the two camps—the camp of democracy and the camp of imperialism—they pose the conflict as being between Russia and the rest of the nations of UNO, thus screening American imperialism and its designs against democracy and freedom of all peoples and its conspiracy against the Socialist State.

And finally, by a trick of hand, they seek to do away with the main contradiction between capitalism and the working class by saying that the main contradiction is between advanced and backward countries—thus making a crude appeal to bourgeois nationalism and hiding the fact that the struggle of backward countries is part of the struggle for world Socialism and against the capitalist order.

This outlook enables them to say that a Socialist of backward countries must be an assertive nationalist, i.e., it draws and lends justification to any co-operation with any imperialist power in the name of nationalism.

The leadership of the Socialist Party is attempting to transform it into a collaborationist party behind the facade of Socialist phrases.

It must be ideologically unmasked and fought, and the ranks must be taught to see it in its real colours.

The ranks themselves do not accept this programme wholly. The Socialist Party is not a unified party but a heterogeneous combination. In winning over the ranks these points must be noted.

Nonetheless, a merciless ideological struggle must be carried on against the leadership. The ranks must be won over on the basis of Marxism, which a large section accepts, and on the basis of concrete issues; but we should have no illusions that the top leaders will ever agree to a joint front unless the ranks do it over their heads or press them to do it.

#### *Programme of the Democratic Revolution*

The programme of the Democratic Front and the Left parties should contain the following:

(1) Complete severance from the British empire and full and real independence.

(2) A democratic government representing the workers, toiling peasants and the oppressed petty bourgeoisie, opposed to collaboration with Anglo-American imperialism, allied to the democratic States working for peace and freedom of all nations.

(3) A constitution based on adult suffrage and proportional representation, guaranteeing full freedom and democracy to the common man and fundamental economic rights.

(4) Self-determination to nationalities, including the right of secession. A voluntary Indian Union, autonomous linguistic provinces.

(5) Just and democratic rights of minorities to be embodied in the constitution: Equality and protection to the language and culture of minorities, all liabilities, privileges and discriminations on caste, race and community to be abolished by law, and their infringements to be punishable by law.

(6) Abolition of Princedom and feudal rule in the Indian States and the establishment of full democracy. On the question of accession, exposure of the policies of the Governments of both India and Pakistan of parading accession to the Indian Union or Pakistan as a big triumph, and explanation to the common people that the urgent and primary task inside the States is the abolition of Princedom and feudal rule and the establishment of a people's democratic State. Accession before that is only slavery of the States' people, both to Princely autocracy and to the bourgeois rulers of the Indian Union. It is only after the people of the States become completely free that they will have real

liberty to decide the question of accession. At that stage the question will be decided by the wishes of the people.

(7) Freedom of the tribal and such other backward peoples from economic, cultural and political oppression, extension of full democratic rights to them, prompt and adequate State aid for their development, so that they may rapidly catch up with the advanced nationalities. The people of all contiguous, compact, predominantly tribal areas shall have regional autonomy. They may form autonomous areas within the provinces, enjoying full powers regarding general administration within the areas and specially regarding economic and cultural matters of regional importance. The people of such areas in suitable cases, may also form a separate province or provinces. The people of such areas or provinces shall have the right to secede from the State by a democratic verdict.

(8) Co-operation between the Indian Union and Pakistan for mutual economic aid in the interest of the toiling people; military and political alliance against imperialist intervention and foreign aggression; democratic foreign policy in co-operation with democratic States against Anglo-American bloc.

(9) Abolition of landlordism without compensation and distribution of land to the tillers of the soil. Abolition of the zemindary system must mean confiscation of *khas* lands of the non-cultivating landowners, and ensure land to sub-tenants and share-croppers. Liquidation of rural indebtedness and abolition of usury. Living wage for the agricultural labourers.

(10) Confiscation by the State of interests of foreign capital in banks, industrial and transport concerns, plantations, mines, etc., and nationalization of these concerns.

(11) Nationalization of big industries, big banks and insurance companies, guarantee of workers' control, minimum living wage, eight-hour day, etc.

(12) Economic plan to develop India's resources and removal of Big Business from strategic economic points. Control of profits in the industries in private hands.

(13) Repeal of all repressive legislation.

(14) Elimination of the bureaucratic administrative State apparatus and the establishment of a democratic administration with elected officials, guided by people's committees.

(15) General arming of the people and the establishment of a people's democratic army.

(16) The right to free education and compulsory primary education.

(17) Equal democratic rights to women.

The Democratic Front, and the Communist Party in building it up, will fight communal reactionaries, riot-mongers and protagonists of war between the Indian Union and Pakistan as enemies of the people. They will organize *Shanti Senas*, co-operate with all who stand for communal peace, and, in order to quell riots, will make use of every anti-riot measure of the Government. At the same time, they will expose the policy of national compromise which spreads riots and will call upon the people to defeat the game of the vested interests. They will also expose all communal acts of the members of the Government which abet feudal reaction.

To start with, it is not necessary that there should be a joint front of only those who agree with the entire programme of the Democratic Front. Immediate joint actions may start on specific questions. As joint actions develop and as Left co-operation develops, the correctness of the programme will be self-evident to all democratic elements, and the Front will be progressively realised as part of the experience of the Left and the masses as a whole.

Text supplied by the Communist Party of India, Central Office, New Delhi.

# Communist Party Calls On People To Renew Fight For Real Independence And Freedom

(The Central Committee of the Communist Party of India, elected by the Second Congress of the Party, has issued the following Statement of Policy, based on the political resolution adopted by the Congress. The full text of the resolution together with the amendments passed will be issued shortly.—Editor)

## The International Situation

THE Anglo-American imperialists are making desperate efforts to save the capitalist social order from its impending doom.

They are offering American credits to the war-torn European countries to bolster up reactionary regimes, forcing these countries to sell their economic and political independence to American imperialism.

They are giving economic and military aid to the reactionary Governments of China and Greece to suppress the democratic forces.

They are maintaining their domination over their colonies and dependencies by forming an alliance with "national" leaders who have political influence over the masses, by cheating the colonial peoples, forcing these leaders by giving big concessions to the national bourgeoisie.

They are frantically making political and military preparations to unleash a new world war against the Soviet Union and other democratic States.

The world is thus divided into two camps—the Imperialist Camp led by American Imperialism and the Anti-Imperialist Democratic Camp led by the Soviet Union.

The peoples' forces all over the world constitute the Democratic Camp and are stronger today than the forces of imperialism.

The Right-wing Social Democrats of every country in conformity with the needs of their capitalist rulers are disrupting the peoples' camp. Under dictates from American imperialism the Right-wing Socialists are coming out as a hypocritical force.

Conducting their fire against the Soviet Union, the Peoples' Democracies and the Communist Parties in defence of the capitalist order.

Despite the machination of American imperialism, the world Democratic Camp has been marching ahead since the defeat of the Fascist Powers in the Second World War.

The strength and prestige of the Soviet Union, the land of Socialism and working class rule, is tremendously growing. Peoples' republics in Eastern Europe, one people belongs to the toiling people led by the working class, constitute another big blow to world capitalism. The rise of the Communist Parties in European countries, enlarges the strength of the working class, stability of the present regimes and the maturity of the revolutionary movement.

The successful struggle waged by the Communist Party of China for liberation of the Chinese people strikes another powerful blow at the world imperialist order. The post war revolutionary struggle has brought the colonies on the path of armed struggle, achieving complete independence and democratic States.

While American imperialism, attacking the sovereignty of independent States, tightening its hold over subjugated nations, is leading the world towards another devastating war, the toiling class all over the world leading the toiling masses for the democracy of nations, peoples' democracy and lasting peace.

of living began to fight back. In 1946 the all-embracing strike wave reached unprecedented levels affecting two million workers and involving 12 million man-days lost.

Inflation, high prices, mass pauperisation of the peasantry, famine and landlords' offensive goaded the peasantry to desperation. The agrarian areas of India became huge volcanoes which started erupting every now and then. The desperation of the peasant was seen in the great Tehgha struggle in Bengal, the Telengana struggle in the Nizam's dominion, the struggle of the aboriginal agricultural workers (Warlis) in Bombay, the great struggle of the peasants of Bihar for Bakasht land.

Out of these struggles was coming forth the single demand—land to the tiller.

The oppressed people of the Indian States began to rise in revolt against feudal autocracy. Their struggles reached new levels as in Kashmir and Travancore.

**★ FOR DEFEATING IMPERIALIST CONSPIRACY FOR CONTINUED ENSLAVEMENT OF INDIA WITH AID OF VESTED INTERESTS**  
**★ TO CEASELESSLY STRUGGLE FOR A DEMOCRATIC FRONT TO ACHIEVE A PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC STATE**  
**★ AGAINST THE COLLABORATIONIST REACTIONARY POLICY OF THE CONGRESS LEADERSHIP AND "NATIONAL" GOVT.**

The popular struggles began to take a revolutionary turn resulting in political general strikes, armed clashes between the police and the people and barricade fights. The revolutionary spirit of the people affected the armed forces of the State, and the mutiny of the Royal Indian Navy struck terror into the hearts of the imperialist rulers and of the bourgeois national leaders.

Imperialism realised that it could no longer maintain its rule in the old way with the national bourgeoisie kept out of State power, that the support of the feudal classes alone was not enough to prop its tottering rule.

British imperialism, therefore, changed its strategy and adopted new methods to perpetuate its rule. This new strategy is embodied in the Mountbatten Award.

The acceptance of the Mountbatten Award is the culmination of the betrayal of the revolutionary struggle by the National Congress and the League leaderships.

Though the bourgeois leadership parades that independence has been won, the fact is that the freedom struggle of the common man has been betrayed and a national leadership has struck a treacherous deal behind the backs of the starving people, betraying every slogan of the democratic revolution.

Every feature of the Mountbatten Award shows that it does not really signify a retreat of imperialism but its cunning counter-offensive against the rising forces of the Indian people.

First, it has partitioned India on the basis of religion. Partition has enabled imperialism to create permanent hostility between Hindus and Muslims and work up war fever between the two Dominions when required in

Imperialist interests. Partition is a ready-made weapon to organise riots and sidetrack the revolutionary movement by war appeals. It is one of the biggest attacks on the unity and integrity of the democratic movement.

Secondly, the plan keeps the Princes, the age-old friends of the imperial order, intact and enhances their bargaining power.

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 consolidate the new line-up of imperialism, Princes, landlords and bourgeoisie.

Fourthly, the supreme organs of State are controlled by servants of imperialism. The final imperialist control will be maintained through military alliances.

What the Mountbatten Plan has given to the people is not real but fake independence. 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.

## Role Of The "National Government"

THE deeds and actions of the "National Government" since August 15 fully prove the above understanding of the purpose behind the Mountbatten Plan. They conclusively reveal the leadership of the National Congress as being a traitor leadership collaborating with imperialism.

The Constituent Assembly manned by the same leaders as led the "National Government" has prepared an authoritarian constitution. The toiling people will not get anything except the right to vote at long intervals. It 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. It makes the reactionary provision for Second Chamber in the Provinces, allows for nomination of members to the Second Chamber by Governors, thus ensuring that the vested interests and their spokesmen get a dominant voice in the Chamber.

The model constitution for the Provinces does not accept the basic right of nationalities to self-determination. 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 regrouping of tribal and other backward areas and formation of autonomous regions or Provincial Councils which these backward people cannot economically and culturally protect and develop themselves.

Under the constitution the basic and fundamental rights of the toiling people, such as right to work, right to living wage,

equal pay for equal work, right to old age, sickness and unemployment aid, do not find a place as fundamental rights constitutionally guaranteed by the State.

But the property and privileges of the vested interests are granted legal and constitutional 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 adequate compensation, thus preventing through a constitutional guarantee all plans of nationalisation of industries including foreign concerns.

Since August 15 the so-called National Government has been carrying out the plan of the Indian bourgeoisie to oppose nationalisation, suppress the workers, intensify their labour and freeze wages in the name of stopping the wage-price spiral.

It is ruthlessly suppressing all peasant movements of the complete satisfaction of the landlords. Even its halting agrarian reform proposals are saddled with compensation to the landlords and with no provision for the tillers. They retain landlordism under a different form. The proposed agrarian legislation is an attempt to split the peasant movement and to broaden the basis of the present bourgeois government.

The Provincial Governments under the guidance of the Central Government have passed Public Safety Acts which are freely used against the democratic movements of the workers, peasants and students.

The so-called National Government is crushing the States peoples' struggle against the Princely order and suppressing agrarian struggles in the native States. It is saving Princedom and sidetrack peoples' attention from democratic struggles by parading accession as a big popular triumph.

In the matter of minorities it is following a communal policy. Oppression of minorities has become a deliberate policy as is evidenced from Patel's praise of the RSS and alliance with the Hindu Mahasabha. So firmly is communalism entrenched in the so-called National Government that even after Gandhiji's assassination by an RSS man, no more arrests and prohibition measures in spite of angry anti-communal outbursts of the common people. The "National Government" instead of really suppressing communal bodies has taken the opportunity to suppress the Communists.

According to Nehru's own statement these communal and other reactionary policies of the "National Government" do not lead to any differences inside the Cabinet, there are no political differences but only "tempera-

mental" differences as Nehru himself calls them.

## Collaboration With Imperialism

THE policy pursued by the Nehru Government is one of collaboration with British and American imperialism. The British and American imperialists are securing strategic positions in India by "agreement" with the "National Government" who have agreed to no discrimination against foreign capital but encouragement of it, no nationalisation, no tariffs which are not agreed to and joint concerns for the exploitation of the Indian people. This policy logically means no full scale industrialisation of India but the growth of only such industries as suit the interests of American and British capitalists.

The foreign policy of the Nehru Government illustrates the same collaboration.

From the very beginning Pandit Nehru adopted a line of forming a so-called third bloc—a line which represented the interests of Big Business inasmuch as it kept India away from the Anti-Imperialist and Democratic Camp. Nehru refuses to take the side of the former camp and poses neutrality. This so-called neutrality between the aggressor and the non-aggressor, between the war-monger and the peace-loving camp, between the expansionist and the freedom-loving camps is only a mask to cover collaboration with the Anglo-American imperialists.

Recent months have torn the mask of "neutrality" from the Nehru Government's foreign policy. On all crucial issues the Indian delegation in UNO has taken an anti-democratic and pro-imperialist stand. It voted for "Little Assembly" devised to analyse the democratic forces inside UNO, it voted against immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea, on the question of representation of Ukraine in the Security Council it refused to be exploited by American imperialism.

On the questions crucial for the peoples of Asia in particular, on 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, so also 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 proved of the betrayal of the Indonesian freedom struggle, achieved through the latest truce, put through by the U.S.-sponsored and dominated Good Offices Committee and welcomed by President Truman.

The British imperialists are giving open hints about an anti-Soviet bloc including their overseas Empire. Along with this come reports about an alliance of South East Asian countries embracing India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon in agreement with Britain. There are also reports about Military Missions from Britain coming to India to help her defence properly organised.

This shows how the "National Government" representing the Indian bourgeoisie is dragging India into an anti-Soviet and anti-democratic bloc in a scheme of defence of America and British Empires in the East.

(Continued on page 11)

## British Imperialism in India

As soon as the war was over, an unprecedented wave of mass struggles had overthrown the imperialist ruler in China. The working class which had already secured any compensation against the rising cost





# COMMUNIST PARTY'S STATEMENT OF POLICY

Continued from page 1)

## Endeavour of Post-War Development

THE big change that has taken place in India's post-war politics is the salient fact that the Indian bourgeoisie in other words the Congress leadership which has been given up its oppositional and has become collaborative and therefore reactionary.

Two big facts have determined the course of the growing revolutionary upsurge has made the Indian bourgeoisie afraid of the mass movements to secure freedom from imperialism.

Secondly, the Indian bourgeoisie itself is in need of foreign capital in view of the shrinkage in the Indian market due to economic crisis. But this dependence on foreign markets is not only dependent on the U.S. and semi-colonies of Britain and America. This enables the Indian bourgeoisie to force in any condition before access to these markets is given.

The economic basis for this laboration was firmly laid in the war period itself. First, during the war period the Indian bourgeoisie became enriched by earning fabulous amounts of liquid capital has made the Indian bourgeoisie look in directions for investment.

Secondly, in the capitalist world the British and American imperialists possess the monopoly of capital goods which the Indian bourgeoisie so urgently needs. In order to secure them the Indian bourgeoisie is prepared to please the Anglo-American imperialists in any way except any terms.

The economic basis of this laboration has been further strengthened by the post-war capitalism, a crisis born of over-accumulation of capital, loss of capitalist markets, the new democracies, production crisis and over accumulation of goods is going wide and, finally the new era of a world-wide crisis of over production with collapse prices. The determination of the toiling people all over the world to solve the crisis in a revolutionary way is throwing the reactionary forces into one camp and their mutual conflicts of interests in the course of the crisis.

Thirdly, the Indian bourgeoisie is faced with the constant lowering of real wages and mass retrenchment. The entire country is enveloped in a chronic and the mass of peasants are being pauperised in an ever-ascending scale. Companies are accumulating in the hands of monopoly capitalists and traders, land is being concentrated in the hands of landlords. Impoverishment is growing on a mass scale amongst the lower-class toilers due to inflation, high prices, black market and retrenchment.

With existing price levels and inflation, the toiling people can't survive. The market when reached in the market when the illusion of too few goods will be shattered and the crisis will reveal itself as a crisis of overproduction because the impoverished toiling people can

not even buy the goods that are there.

The Indian bourgeoisie and its representatives, the leadership of the National Congress, controlling the so-called National Government, are trying desperately to retain their profits and position by shifting the burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of the toiling people.

They are trying to retain the existing land relations and feudal exploitation, attacking wage standards, forcing prolongation of working hours, demanding higher prices of goods or decontrol, opposing nationalisation for securing uncontrolled profits, effecting mass retrenchment and intensification of labour by rationalisation, attacking trade unions, kisan organisations and democratic liberties and ruthlessly suppressing workers and peasants.

To save their profits from the rapidly growing crisis and collapse of the Indian market they are seeking for crumbs of export trade from the colonial market dominated by Anglo-U.S. imperialism and selling the country to the imperialists by making capital deals with them for joint exploitation of India, integrating imperialist commonwealth relations, collaborating with imperialism war preparations and guaranteeing the suppression of labour and democratic struggles in India.

But this policy in its turn, leading to further impoverishment and fall in the purchasing power of the masses, only still further accentuates the crisis and hastens the doom of all reactionaries.

That is why, despite the communal offensive launched by reaction, the disruption and ruthless suppression practised by the Governments and national leaders, and the great illusion that the masses still have about the national leadership, the post-war upsurge of the masses goes on unabated. The strike wave of the workers reached its highest peak in the last few months. The battles in kisan areas have forged ahead, the Government servants and middle-class employees are a mass of seething discontent, the student masses have moved forward to heroic strikes.

Despite the treachery of the national leadership and the Right-wing leaders of the States peoples' movements in bartering away the freedom of the States peoples for an ignoble compromise with the British in the name of making interests of the bourgeoisie, the peoples of the States have been fighting heroically for ending feudal autocracy.

In Hyderabad, the people have started resisting with captured arms the armed might of the Nizam, distributing the land, increasing wages to agricultural labour and practically making the Nizam's rule non-existent in thousands of villages.

The people's disillusionment and upsurge are rapidly advancing. They are more and more demanding the establishment of real democracy, people's democracy, and a State embodying people's democracy.

The working-class in alliance with toiling peasants and other sections of the petty-bourgeoisie can alone fight for such a democracy and for solving the crisis in the people's way. Confiscation of foreign capital, nationalisation of all key and basic industries, radical improvement of workers' standard of living, abolition without compensation of all forms of landlordism and land to the tillers—such are the basic aims of the people's democratic revolution. The primary condition of such a democratic solution of the crisis is the establishment of a People's Republic based upon the hegemony of the working

class and direct rule of the toiling people.

A clean sweep must be made of all reactionaries. It means the "National Government" and Congress leadership and a new Democratic Front must be built up under the hegemony of the working-class to fight for a People's Republic and solve the crisis in the people's way.

## Democratic Front

THE Democratic Front must be built up through the struggle of the common people against exploitation and oppression. It must be based upon the alliance of workers, toiling peasants and other exploited middle-classes. It will be built up as a mass organisation directed towards a disciplined and united united mass organisation of the entire toiling people.

Unity of the Left forces has to be secured through common struggles for the success of the Democratic Front. In order to achieve Left unity, not only the dominant bourgeois leadership but also the bourgeois leadership of the Left parties must be exposed and their true colours revealed to the masses.

The leadership of the Socialists, for example, is pursuing a policy of supporting the bourgeois national leadership, cheating the masses by means of Socialist demagogy and anti-Communist, anti-Soviet slanders. This leadership and similar other leaderships of Left parties advocate Leftism in name but actually play the role of a Parliamentary bourgeois opposition and divert the consciousness of militant masses along false and disruptive channels. They disrupt the unity of the toiling people and thereby save the position of the reactionary forces.

## Democratic Programme

THE programme of the Democratic Front should be based on the following:

- (1) Complete severance from the British Empire and full real independence.
- (2) A democratic government representing the workers, peasants and other sections of the toiling people, opposed to collaboration with Anglo-American imperialism, allied to the democratic States working for peace and freedom of all nations.
- (3) A constitution based on adult suffrage and proportional representation, guaranteeing full freedom and democracy to the common man and fundamental economic rights.
- (4) Self-determination to nationalities including the right of secession. A voluntary Indian Union, autonomous linguistic Provinces.
- (5) Just and democratic rights of minorities to be embodied in the constitution, equality and protection to the language and culture of minorities, all liberties, privileges and discriminations based on caste, race and community to be abolished by law, and their infringement to be punishable by law.
- (6) Abolition of Princedom and feudal rule in the Indian States and the establishment of full democracy. On the question of accession, exposure of the policies of the Governments of both India and Pakistan and their accession to the Indian Union or Pakistan as a big triumph and explanation to the common people that the urgent and primary task inside the States is abolition of Princedom and feudal rule and establishment of a people's democratic State.

Accession before that is only slavery of the States peoples to British autocracy and the Indian bourgeois rulers of the Indian

Union. It is only after the people of the States become completely free that they can have real liberty to decide the question of their relation with the rest of India. At that stage the question will be decided by the wishes of the people.

(7) Freedom of the tribal and such other backward peoples from economic, cultural and political oppression, extension of full democratic rights to them, prompt and adequate State aid for their development, so that they may rapidly catch up with the advanced nationalities.

The people of all contiguous areas shall have regional autonomy. They may form autonomous areas within the Provinces, enjoying full powers regarding general administration within the areas and especially regarding the economic and cultural matters of directly area importance. The people of such areas in suitable areas may also form a separate Province or Provinces. The people of such areas or Provinces shall have the right to secede from the State by democratic verdict.

(8) Cooperation between the Indian Union and Pakistan for economic help, military and political alliance for defence, to pursue a democratic foreign policy in cooperation with the democratic States against the Anglo-American bloc.

(9) Abolition of all forms of landlordism without compensation and distribution of land to the tillers of the soil. Abolition of landlordism must mean confiscation of khas lands of the non-cultivating land-owners and ensure land to the sub-tenants and share-croppers. Liquidation of rural indebtedness and abolition of usury; living wage for the agricultural labourer.

(10) Confiscation by the State of interests of foreign capital in banks, industrial and transport concerns, plantations, mines, etc., and nationalisation of these concerns.

(11) Nationalisation of big industries, big banks and insurance companies, guarantee of workers' control, minimum living wage, eight hours' day, etc.

(12) Economic plan to develop India's resources and removal of Big Business from strategic economic points. Control of profits in the industries in private hands.

(13) Repeal of all repressive legislation.

(14) Elimination of the bureaucratic administrative State apparatus and the establishment of a democratic administration with elected officials guided by people's committees.

(15) General arming of the people and the establishment of a democratic army.

(16) The right to free education and compulsory primary education.

(17) Equal democratic rights to women.

Amongst the workers, peasants and other oppressed sections of the Indian people never was there so much response and so much understanding of the main slogans of the democratic movement; abolition of landlordism and land to the tiller; abolition of Princely autocracy, nationalisation of key industries and living wage; democratic liberties; etc.

The economic crisis is setting in motion colossal forces. The workers are fighting battle after battle with supreme courage and a reckless abandon and the situation is moving towards a general offensive on the part of the working class. On the agrarian front too the kisans are coming up in elemental upsurge, defeating repression, coming back again and again to the attack.

It is the task of the Party to lead all working-class struggles, unify and direct them for the achievement of the basic demands of the working-class and as a part of the struggle for the programme of the Democratic Front.

It is the task of the Party to lead the growing struggles of the peasantry, centring them around the demand, "Land to the Tiller", as well as the struggles of the other oppressed sections; and unite them for achieving the programme of the Democratic Front.

The Communist Party, by leading and directing the struggles towards this end and by coming out as the boldest opponent of imperialism, of the reactionary bourgeois national leadership and their henchmen will accelerate the process of disillusionment of the people and firmly establish the hegemony of the proletariat which is the only guarantee of a successful fight for people's democracy.

In the present period of world crisis the task of pushing the democratic movement ahead is the responsibility of the working class and its party, the Communist Party. It is therefore incumbent upon the toiling people and their true friends to strengthen and broaden the Communist Party. A mass party bureaucratic administrative State with a conscious membership apparatus and the establishment of a democratic administration and deeply rooted amongst the toiling people—such must be our watchword.

## TWO LAKHS C. P. WORKERS STRIKE AGAINST GOVT. LABOUR POLICY

IN spite of open threats of arrests and other dire consequences to strikers and their leaders given by the C.P. Government, about two lakh workers of the Province, employed in textile mills and other industrial enterprises, such as the Saraf Oil Mills, Central Glass Factory, Central Potteries, Saw Mills and the coal mines at Chhindwara went on a thoroughly successful token strike against the anti-labour policies and against repression of the Provincial Congress Government. In accordance with the decision of the C.P. Trade Union Congress.

Even on the day of the strikes huge police "arrangements" were made and a well-planned show of the Government's might was organised throughout the Province. Guards were posted at the gates of the mills and industries. Many workers and leaders were taken into custody. Nothing daunted the workers.

In fact, such was the sweep of this strike and the sentiment of the toiling people in its favour that in many places the sweepers also joined the strike at Nagpur the employees of the two Marathi dailies Maharashtra and Tarun Bhanrat also went on strike with the workers.

This is the biggest strike action ever of the working-class of C.P. and should give an indication of the mood and temper of the workers to those who are trying to drive them off their earnings to help their capitalist friends.

looking at partial struggles for partial struggles for partial struggles... pointed out that the imperialist-feudal-bourgeois order in India was collapsing and that the Indian bourgeoisie... the contrary, the policies of the Congress leadership... the Government are following the policy of propping up imperialism in a new way...

achievements to our credit. In the war as well as in the post-war period our Party has grown as no other Party, though had the Vaynami for its mistakes, it would have developed even ten times stronger. "Masses of people have fought for their demands, have fought glorious battles under the leadership of the Party. Our Party had the privilege of leading the biggest battles. Our Party was at the head of the students' struggles. Everywhere people say that the one Party which led the battles of the masses is the Communist Party. "Telengana is another big landmark in the history of struggles led under the leadership of our Party. Here we took the struggle to new qualitative heights with the explanatory pamphlet 'The Indian Union is a Tremble before the name of Telengana. For Telengana today means Communists and Communists mean Telengana. "No Party in India can claim to have led so many battles in

the post-war period as we have led. "No Party in India has to its credit struggles like that in Travancore, the glorious battle of Vaynami, the strike struggles in Combalore, the strike struggles in Amalner and lastly the agrarian struggle of Telengana. "In the recent past our leadership hesitated and vacillated. But the masses under our leadership have fought continuously and that has raised the prestige of our Party. "Remember that we are a force that is feared by the existing ruling class. The fear is real because we lead the majority of the organised working class, the majority of the organised peasantry, the organised students. We are a force and we should not underestimate ourselves. If in the past two years, in spite of these mistakes we achieved all this, then without these mistakes we must go forward today ten times more swiftly than ever before in the history of our Party and our people."

then its domination and its authority. "Thus lies have been multiplied like inflation of money. When there is inflation of money, the value of the coin decreases. In the same way the effectiveness of these lies decreases. Com. Bhownani Sen referred to the question of Kashmir and how imperialism was utilising it to create an open clash between the two Dominions. He pointedly referred to the mistake committed by the Party in connection with Kashmir. He exposed how we made the people believe that the march of the Indian Union was because of the march of the democratic forces for the purpose of freeing the Muslim peasant from the raiders. But what has been the result? The result was that after such a long period of warfare, Kashmir did not become free but was going to be under Anglo-American domination. This mistake, Com. Bhownani Sen pointed out, arose because we thought the Indian Union to be progressive and Pakistan reactionary. Out of this followed the logical conclusion that since the Indian Union is progressive, accession to the Indian Union is a progressive step. But what has happened? Princedom remains, landlords are still there, and it is the army of the Indian Union which dominates over the toiling people of Kashmir. Therefore we have to understand this question of accession and look at it from a new angle. In fact this posing of the question in terms of accession or non-accession is the weapon by which reaction seeks to divert the popular energy from the revolutionary direction. "We must not enter this trap," said Com. Bhownani Sen, "and for us there is no question of accession. Such accession will only lead to the forging of an alliance between the Government of the Indian Union or of Pakistan with Imperialist autocracy. "There can be no question of accession before the complete victorious democratic revolution has been achieved, before the toiling peasants have got land, before Imperialist autocracy is really liquidated and power has passed into the hands of the masses. It is after all this that the victorious people of the

States will decide their relation to the Indian Union or Pakistan. "The real way out," said Com. Bhownani Sen, "is the way of the heroic people of Telengana. The real solution to this question is on the field of battle. The heroic people of Telengana, the great example of their fight against autocracy, not only show what will happen inside the States, but also what will be the real future of India and Pakistan. This is the way of the victorious people must march to freedom and real democracy."

**Struggle Of New Type** "Therefore, we must respect this battle, this struggle inside Hyderabad, of the people of Hyderabad, as a struggle of a new type. We must be proud to say that here at least there is the force that will achieve Indian liberation. "Kashmir has gone to UNO. And the fate of Kashmir lies at the mercy of imperialism. But something else is happening in Hyderabad. The difference between Hyderabad and Kashmir is the difference between our understanding and our new understanding. Emphasising the point further to the loud acclamation of the delegates, Com. Bhownani Sen said: "In Hyderabad in 2,000 villages the spirit of the Nizam's administration has ceased to run, people's volunteers defend people's rule. In 2,000 villages people's democracy has been established. This is the difference between Kashmir and Hyderabad. "The question is whether the people will go the Hyderabad way or the Kashmir way; and our duty is to make the people go the Hyderabad way. If we can create this spirit of revolution among the masses, among the toiling people, we shall find reaction collapsing like a house of cards. "In the latter part of his report, Com. Bhownani Sen outlined the programme and the tasks of the Democratic Front in Pakistan and showed how they were exactly similar to those of the Democratic Front in India, and he again emphasised the fundamental importance of the independence of the movement for independence and people's democracy in both the states.

**REPORT ON PAKISTAN**

**T**HE next important report was made by Com. Bhownani Sen on Pakistan. It was in the nature of a question which had arisen because of the partition of the country and the separation of the territories of Pakistan and their incorporation into a new State. The question of the organisations of the Communist Party of India to the boundaries of the Indian Union and leaving the Communist Party units in the separated territories of Pakistan free to form a separate Communist Party was before the Congress for decision.

From this, it follows that henceforth the most important task that is before the Party is the uniting of the democratic movements in Pakistan as well as in the Indian Union. It is this unity which guarantees the liquidation of the existing order in a revolutionary manner. The route of his report, Com. Bhownani Sen raised and answered three questions: (1) What factors led to the formation of Pakistan? (2) What is the character of the Pakistan State and the Pakistan Government? (3) What is the future of Pakistan?

Com. Bhownani Sen's report placed this question in the correct perspective, emphasising the fundamental unity of the Communist movement throughout India. At the outset, Com. Bhownani Sen raised the question of two opinions or trends in relation to the Indian Union in Pakistan: one opinion or trend considered the Indian Union to be progressive, while in contrast it considered Pakistan to be reactionary; while another opinion or trend considered Pakistan at least an advance towards Muslim freedom from Hindu domination. Com. Bhownani Sen emphasised that we must make a fundamental appraisal from the overall outlook and resolve this controversy in a scientific manner. Both the Indian Union and Pakistan, he declared, were dominated by reactionary capitalists and landlords, collaborating openly with imperialism. It was wrong to think that the Indian Union was progressive as to assert that Pakistan was an advance towards the so-called Muslim freedom from Hindu domination.

Referring to the future of Pakistan, he pointed out that imperialism had not quit Pakistan nor had anything like Muslim freedom or any freedom whatsoever been established there. Imperialism is very much present in Pakistan; its representatives are going to collapse because of its economic weakness. Imperialism has not created Pakistan so that it may collapse. Out of these economic difficulties what is coming is not the automatic collapse of Pakistan but the further strengthening of the imperialist-landlord-bourgeois ruling class. There is already a talk of a military pact being under preparation and Mr. Jinnah has had some talks with imperialism which will remain within the British Commonwealth.

In reality there was no such thing as Muslim freedom; neither was there any such thing as Hindu domination. Did the Hindu worker oppress the Muslim worker? Did the Hindu peasant dominate over the Muslim peasant? On the contrary, they were one and all oppressed by the same people, imperialists and their landlord-capitalist allies. The Muslim League propagated the false theory of Hindu domination in order to conceal the real character, real purpose and real motive for partition, which was one of consolidating and safeguarding Muslim interests and resisting against the richer and more powerful Hindu competitors. They diverted the genuine indignation of the oppressed Muslim masses against imperialism and the vested interests into communal channels and played the game of imperialism which wanted to partition the country and keep both Muslims and Hindus enslaved.

Future of Pakistan Com. Bhownani Sen pointed out that unless the people in Pakistan stand up and fight the policies of the Government and of the League leadership, unmask and defeat them, their freedom cannot be realised. The future of Pakistan will be determined by the democratic movement of the people and the unity of the two democratic movements of India and Pakistan will together free both India and Pakistan from imperialist bondage. Polemising against the theory of automatic collapse of Pakistan, Com. Bhownani Sen said we must take a bold stand against this sort of demagoguery and expose the policy of the Congress leadership, who are putting across this propaganda in order to befoul the Indian people and keep them in a state of confusion and hostility with the people of Pakistan. Answering the three questions, Com. Bhownani Sen proceeded to show how imperialism was creating a permanent state of war between India and Pakistan. He pointed out that for the purpose of maintaining strained relations between the two Dominions, imperialism uses all its agents, spread lies both among Hindus and Muslims to ensure permanent hostility between these two so that it may be able to strengthen

From this central point, Com. Bhownani Sen emphasised the fundamental unity of the Communist movements both in India and Pakistan; they are faced with the same task of radically changing the existing order and building up really free independent people's democratic States in their respective countries.

the banner of proletarian internationalism, not only strengthened its bases among the workers and peasants, but also saved the country from what could have been a veritable disaster. The mistakes in that period arose from the misunderstanding that the military tactics of Fascism would automatically lead to the liquidation and elimination of imperialism itself and as such to the automatic liberation of all peoples. This wrong understanding which was part of the analysis given in "Forward to Freedom," underestimated the intrigues and sabotage that the imperialists were carrying out in the people's camp. The mistaken theory that imperialism was a prisoner in the people's camp made us forget the fact that imperialism continued to function in India even in the period of the anti-Fascist people's struggle. It was at every step the imperialist-feudal economy and its own rule, even at the cost of sabotaging the war against Fascist aggression. This total underestimation of the role of imperialism in the period of the people's war made us lose sight of the task of exposing imperialism and fighting with the framework of support for the anti-Fascist war. For instance, in connection with the food crisis and the Bengal famine we correctly exposed the role of the hoarders and blackmarketeers but forgot to expose the role of imperialism, to expose the policy of inflation and to bring the Indian bourgeoisie and of transferring the burden of the war on to the shoulders of the people was actually the root cause of the food crisis as

the Indian Union or of Pakistan with Imperialist autocracy. "There can be no question of accession before the complete victorious democratic revolution has been achieved, before the toiling peasants have got land, before Imperialist autocracy is really liquidated and power has passed into the hands of the masses. It is after all this that the victorious people of the States will decide their relation to the Indian Union or Pakistan. "The real way out," said Com. Bhownani Sen, "is the way of the heroic people of Telengana. The real solution to this question is on the field of battle. The heroic people of Telengana, the great example of their fight against autocracy, not only show what will happen inside the States, but also what will be the real future of India and Pakistan. This is the way of the victorious people must march to freedom and real democracy."

**REPORT ON SELF-CRITICISM**

**T**HE next important report placed before the Congress was the one on Self-Criticism, introduced by Comrade B. T. Ranadive. The delegates who had come to the firm determination to forge a new revolutionary line also wanted to be clear about the mistakes of their own as well as of the leadership, for without a clear understanding of the past mistakes there could be no firm understanding of the new revolutionary line, nor could there be any guarantee against future mistakes. Comrade Ranadive's report on self-criticism which the Party clear exposition of the reformist deviations and vacillations displayed by the old Central Committee in the execution of the otherwise correct line pursued by the Party during the period between the two Congresses of the Party.

In regard to the line adopted by the Party in the period of the anti-Fascist people's war Comrade Ranadive emphasised its fundamental correctness and the mistakes which the Party had been able to make because it adopted fundamentally correct proletarian stogans in that period. He pointed out that if the Communist Party had followed the line of the bourgeois parties and had gone in for a full-scale opposition to the anti-Fascist people's war with all its organised strength among the working-class and the peasantry, it would have saved the whole country. By holding firm the correct proletarian line the Communist Party not only remained true to the banner of proletarian internationalism, not only strengthened its bases among the workers and peasants, but also saved the country from what could have been a veritable disaster.

The mistakes in that period arose from the misunderstanding that the military tactics of Fascism would automatically lead to the liquidation and elimination of imperialism itself and as such to the automatic liberation of all peoples. This wrong understanding which was part of the analysis given in "Forward to Freedom," underestimated the intrigues and sabotage that the imperialists were carrying out in the people's camp. The mistaken theory that imperialism was a prisoner in the people's camp made us forget the fact that imperialism continued to function in India even in the period of the anti-Fascist people's struggle. It was at every step the imperialist-feudal economy and its own rule, even at the cost of sabotaging the war against Fascist aggression. This total underestimation of the role of imperialism in the period of the people's war made us lose sight of the task of exposing imperialism and fighting with the framework of support for the anti-Fascist war. For instance, in connection with the food crisis and the Bengal famine we correctly exposed the role of the hoarders and blackmarketeers but forgot to expose the role of imperialism, to expose the policy of inflation and to bring the Indian bourgeoisie and of transferring the burden of the war on to the shoulders of the people was actually the root cause of the food crisis as



well as the disastrous Bengal famine.

Similarly, while we were quite correct in organising the peasant struggle to grow more food, we tended to forget that the main fight against the imperialist-feudal agrarian structure should not be slackened.

We were right in preventing sabotage in production and avoiding strikes as far as it was consistent with the defence of the living conditions of the working-class, but it was not possible to raise or organise production as long as production remained in the hands of profiteering capitalists and the Imperialist Government for whom profit and not interests of the anti-Fascist war constituted the main guiding factor.

It was not only in connection with the attitude to Imperialism, but was extended out to the connection with the understanding of the day-to-day developments of the war that a number of mistakes were committed. We ignored changes in the military situation during the course of war, changes which would have enabled us to adjust our strategy to suit new conditions.

With the battle of Stalingrad, the tide of war, as the defeat of Fascism became certain, we could have adopted supple tactics in relation to the struggle against national fascism during the course of war, changes which would have enabled us to adjust our strategy to suit new conditions.

We were right in those days in demanding the release of national leaders and raising the slogan of national defence, but in fighting for these slogans we trailed too much behind the national bourgeois leadership, instead of taking an independent proletarian slogan of national defence.

Thus the two main reformist deviations of this period were:
1. that the edge of our fight against imperialism was dulled; and

2. that we began to trail behind the bourgeois leadership instead of opposing it through an independent policy.

This expressed itself in that the Left groups and parties which were only carrying out the policy of the bourgeois leadership, were attacked even more severely by us than the national leadership, calling the Left groups 'fifth column' and agents of the Fascist Powers.

This also expressed itself very sharply on the question of self-determination of nationalities to the Hindu-Muslim question. Undoubtedly the main slogan raised by the Party on the Hindu-Muslim question was the distorted expression of the existence of various nationalities in India was fundamentally sound. We were quite correct when we called for the self-determination of nationalities and we correctly expressed and fought the Congress leadership for its refusal to take its stand on that principle in order to build a joint front against imperialism.

But we did not ask the bourgeois-landlord leadership of the Muslim League as to where it stood in relation to the struggle of the masses against imperialism. On the contrary, we often applied the principle of self-determination in a manner which helped the separatist demand of the Muslim League for Pakistan.

This serious deviation arose mainly because in those days we were trailing behind the bourgeois leadership of both the Congress and the League and had illusions that the unity of the Hindus and Muslims and of the Congress and the League could be achieved by the bourgeois leadership themselves. It was because of these illusions that

we busied ourselves in working out a detailed 'practical' solution to null the separatist demand of the League leadership.

We did not see that the bourgeois leadership of the Congress and the League which were pursuing opportunist and compromising policies towards imperialism could not be united for a real anti-Fascist, anti-imperialist front. Teaching that the unity of the people of different nationalities, communities, and religions, could be achieved only by bringing the toiling and common people of both together in the common fight against imperialism and reaction, only by simultaneously exposing the demand of the dominant and separatist bourgeoisie, only by firmly standing for the right of self-determination of nationalities which could be really implemented by the people in the context of achievement of democratic revolution.

It was these two reformist deviations of the war period, namely, the underestimation of the dominance of imperialism and the trailing behind the bourgeois leadership and the faith in their anti-imperialist bonafides which were the root cause of the serious reformist deviation of the war period.

The result was that when the war came to its end, we failed to see the new rising post-war revolutionary upsurge, nor did we see the danger of a new wave of imperialism menacing by the rising revolutionary tide began to set in, namely, the collaborationist bourgeoisie in order to bring to an end the domination over the colonial people.

Instead there was a tendency to fall a prey to reformist theories about the independence of the national bourgeoisie and Socialism and to abuse struggle.

Our ranks began instinctively to lead the upsurge from about the end of 1944 to the beginning of 1945. We were able to see the existence of the revolutionary upsurge and we put our main slogans of developing the partial struggles for the improvement of the democratic revolution and for the seizure of power by the people.

The August Revolution of August 1946 was a great turning point. It gave the line clear to our ranks for the first time to lead the head the great struggles of the people for the release of national leaders and similar struggles in U.P. and Bihar which enabled our ranks to lead the anti-Fascist struggles against the feudal autocracy in Travancore and against the autocracy of the Nizam in Hyderabad.

Though the August Revolution gave our ranks the line to lead the struggles, there were many comrades who thought that it was time that there came into existence two independent Communist Parties. There was a trend inside the Central Committee which thought that the Communist Party of India should be split into two parties. In reality the fault of the August Revolution was that it averted from our ranks the need to lead the August Revolution gave a clear call for leading the struggles through the Congress and League leadership, for opposing the compromising policies of the Congress and League leadership, and for fighting for illusions about the oppositional role of the national bourgeois leadership.

It is real that it failed to characterise sharply the collaborationist role of the bourgeois leadership and to expose the forces which had become quite apparent after the formation of the Congress and League leadership, both the Congress and the League leaders were participating in the August Revolution. Towards the end of the year came the repression on the part of the Communist Party against 100 leading Communists were jailed without trial.

The reaction of the Congress and League leadership had opened its offensive against the rising upsurge. In the face of this offensive, the Communist Party leadership which had originally opposed the August Revolution as a left-sectarian reaction now turned its face towards a Right-reformist repudiation of the Revolution.

The formulation that the Interim Government was a Government of compromise and conciliation was a sharp criticism of the Congress Ministries which were supporting the workers and peasant struggles as agents of vested interests was condemned as incorrect. There were to be no clean cuts while only the bureaucracy which was in fact doing their bidding was to be attacked.

This was advocated mainly by Com. P. C. Joshi, representing the reformist trend inside the Congress. For a time others who had initiated the line of August Revolution were also misled by the illusion that the resolution on the Mountbatten Award of June 1947 was passed unanimously by the Central Committee.

For a time nobody saw the enormity of the deviation involved in the greatest betrayal of Revolution, in the treacherous deal which had struck with imperialism, the bourgeois leadership raised the hope of a united front with the bourgeoisie throughout the country.

We were ourselves taken in by this. When the hastily prepared Theses began in the Punjab, Delhi, and Bihar, we did not see them as the inevitable result of the imperialist-bourgeois collaboration with imperialism and its feudal allies which had begun to unfold itself with vigour. Instead of exposing that policy, we lined up behind Gandhi and Nehru and became supporters of the Nehru Government. We built up a theory of differences between the one hand and Nehru and Gandhi on the other to justify our uncritical support of the Government. In fact we were pursuing the same policy as the Government.

We forgot the simple truth that the rise of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its policy of collaboration with imperialism and its feudal allies which had begun to unfold itself with vigour. Instead of exposing that policy, we lined up behind Gandhi and Nehru and became supporters of the Nehru Government. We built up a theory of differences between the one hand and Nehru and Gandhi on the other to justify our uncritical support of the Government. In fact we were pursuing the same policy as the Government.

However, in the months after August 1946, the Central Committee out of their own experience soon began to discover how far the Government had departed from the revolutionary line which they had themselves begun to shape since August 1946.

In the meeting of the Central Committee which was held in Hyderabad in August 1946, the Central Committee took a firm stand and adopted the

statement of policy and the document for the Party Congress on the basis of the present situation. The thesis was framed. Com. Joshi who accepted the statement of policy, but did not vote in the meeting for the document.

Summing up his report on self-criticism, Com. Ranadive said:

"Today Com. Joshi unreservedly accepted the political thesis, though he will certainly have to struggle very much to make a complete turn. For a time there was a serious situation inside our Party. Reformism had in fact become the dominant trend. It would be wrong to think that all mistakes were made through the Bureau alone. There is no doubt that there was the major responsibility. But they were the delegates' assembly here which had to turn the light towards the correct line. It was their own mistakes and their experience of the struggles."

It is only through such Bolshevik self-criticism that we can, at this Congress, unify the entire Party behind the revolutionary line. We must force our own mistakes and their experience of the struggles. It is only through such Bolshevik self-criticism that we can, at this Congress, unify the entire Party behind the revolutionary line. We must force our own mistakes and their experience of the struggles.

Next to speak after Com. Ranadive had finished his report was Com. Joshi. He fully supported Com. Ranadive's report. He said that he himself had been a member of the Right-reformist deviations inside the Party and he was the last among the members of the Party to accept the political line of the thesis. He traced its ideological roots to the repudiation of Marxism and Leninism and to the adoption of the revisionist line as he made these points in the course of his one-hour speech.

On this issue there was a lively exchange of views. The Central Committee. It was made clear that the people's democratic State itself meant the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was also stated that in the present phase of the general upsurge of capitalism after the Second World War, a people's democratic State was a necessary stage in the class alliance led by the proletariat and becomes the instrument of the democratic revolution but also carried it forward to the achievement of socialism.

However, several delegates spoke in favour of the reference to the dictatorship of the proletariat must be explicitly there in the programme of the State. The principle of Marxism-Leninism was not unambiguously, no loopholes, for a people's democratic State. It was left on this point.

Finally, Com. Bhawan Sen moved a motion which added the words 'for the realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat' to the words 'people's democratic State led by the working-class'. It was accepted by Com. Adhikari and then by the Congress as a whole.

Election Of New Central Committee

On the concluding day of the Congress, the outgoing Central Committee placed before the Congress for adoption. It was an enlarged Central Committee. The majority of the old Central Committee members, also included in the new Central Committee, were drawn from the leaders of the mass struggles on the ground. It was a Central Committee truly representative of the Party. The Party was leading on various fronts throughout India.

The delegates wanted to be sure that the Party would have a firm majority for the Central Committee. The proposed Central Committee members to be elected were: Com. Joshi.

In the course of the discussion, the Central Committee members were moved to the panel and six more nominations were put forward in order to elect a fixed number for the Central Committee. The Central Committee members to be elected were: Com. Joshi.

Immediately after the election of the Central Committee, the Central Committee met during the Congress and unanimously elected Com. Joshi as the Secretary of the Party. Com. Ranadive's election was then announced to the great applause of the delegates.

The election of a Central Committee of three comrades, which was responsible for dealing with appeals over questions of discipline, and the adoption of the report of the Central Committee and the Action Commission (which approved the programme of the Party) were the main achievements of the Congress.

The Second Congress of the Communist Party of India was the historic Congress. It displayed a massive and united leadership and the leadership of the Party in evolving a revolutionary programme for the people's democratic revolution in India. It has made a decisive break in the history of the Party. The Party has now entered a new phase. The Party's programme and full confidence in the Party's leadership. The Party's programme and full confidence in the Party's leadership. The Party's programme and full confidence in the Party's leadership.

DISCUSSION ON REPORTS

The discussions on these reports must be made up, a similar criticism was made by the delegates. Right in the middle of this discussion came a stronger criticism from the delegates from Telengana, pointing out that the revolutionary struggle for the present epoch of maturing democratic revolution in India was being abandoned.

This last criticism was no sooner made than accepted by the Central Committee. The delegates from Telengana was given the opportunity to move a special resolution (published in the Appendix to the report) in a stirring speech that evoked thunderous applause, this delegate urged the Central Committee to be waged there, and appealed to the Congress to support it with all its strength and vigour.

The Congress responded to this moving appeal by adopting the resolution standing and amidst resounding cheers. After 34 delegates had taken part in the discussions, Comrade Ranadive summed up the entire discussion.

Greeting the soundness of the criticism made by many delegates, he said that the section on the Democratic Front would have to be changed and strengthened; regarding the agrarian crisis, the States' people's struggles, Com. Ranadive said that all these criticisms would be taken into account in the detailed analysis of the tasks on various fronts was made by the new Central Committee.

He finally asked that the Thesis be adopted by the Congress and the new Central Committee. The Congress adopted the Thesis for publication in the light of the discussion and the amendments were moved in the Congress. This proposal was accepted unanimously amidst great applause.

There was a discussion on the proposal to confine the Communist Party organisation to the boundaries of the Indian Union and to enable the Party units in the States to separate themselves as Pakistan to reconstitute themselves into a separate Communist Party organisation. The proposal was opposed by the proposal, saying that by allowing a separate Party to be formed in Pakistan, it would be giving the separatists and accepting the imperialist partition line.

In the course of the discussion on the proposal, Comrades Sajjad Zaheer and Ranadive explained why a separate Party was not necessary. They stressed of building a united Communist movement in the Indian Union, which would enable us to fight more effectively, to forge the unity of the Communist movement in the Indian Union and defeat the disruptors especially in Pakistan.

The Communist Party organisation in Pakistan would be responsible for shaping and formulating the policy and programme of the Party in the same way as the Party organisations in the Indian Union would be responsible for the same task in the Indian Union. The coordination of the task in the common struggle against their respective governments representing an unholy alliance of imperialism, the bourgeoisie and feudal elements, would with great firmness and united Communist movement and a victory And that of the democratic revolution in both the countries.

After this explanation, the resolution was passed by a large majority. After the discussion on the report of the Central Committee, the Congress authorised the new Central Committee to draft a complete analysis of the present situation and the

the delegates who had initiated the line of August Revolution were also misled by the illusion that the resolution on the Mountbatten Award of June 1947 was passed unanimously by the Central Committee.

For a time nobody saw the enormity of the deviation involved in the greatest betrayal of Revolution, in the treacherous deal which had struck with imperialism, the bourgeois leadership raised the hope of a united front with the bourgeoisie throughout the country.

We were ourselves taken in by this. When the hastily prepared Theses began in the Punjab, Delhi, and Bihar, we did not see them as the inevitable result of the imperialist-bourgeois collaboration with imperialism and its feudal allies which had begun to unfold itself with vigour. Instead of exposing that policy, we lined up behind Gandhi and Nehru and became supporters of the Nehru Government.

However, in the months after August 1946, the Central Committee out of their own experience soon began to discover how far the Government had departed from the revolutionary line which they had themselves begun to shape since August 1946.

In the meeting of the Central Committee which was held in Hyderabad in August 1946, the Central Committee took a firm stand and adopted the

statement of policy and the document for the Party Congress on the basis of the present situation. The thesis was framed. Com. Joshi who accepted the statement of policy, but did not vote in the meeting for the document.

Summing up his report on self-criticism, Com. Ranadive said:

"Today Com. Joshi unreservedly accepted the political thesis, though he will certainly have to struggle very much to make a complete turn. For a time there was a serious situation inside our Party. Reformism had in fact become the dominant trend. It would be wrong to think that all mistakes were made through the Bureau alone. There is no doubt that there was the major responsibility. But they were the delegates' assembly here which had to turn the light towards the correct line. It was their own mistakes and their experience of the struggles."

It is only through such Bolshevik self-criticism that we can, at this Congress, unify the entire Party behind the revolutionary line. We must force our own mistakes and their experience of the struggles. It is only through such Bolshevik self-criticism that we can, at this Congress, unify the entire Party behind the revolutionary line. We must force our own mistakes and their experience of the struggles.

## ECONOMIC POLICY

6 April 1948

STATEMENT ON INDUSTRIAL POLICY  
OF INDIAN GOVERNMENT

The Government of India have given careful thought to the economic problems facing the country. The nation has now set itself to establish a social order where justice and equality of opportunity shall be secured to all the people. The immediate objective is to provide educational facilities and health services on a much wider scale, and to promote a rapid rise in the standard of living of the people by exploiting the latent resources of the country, increasing production and offering opportunities to all for employment in the service of the community. For this purpose, careful planning and integrated effort over the whole field of national activity are necessary; and the Government of India propose to establish a National Planning Commission to formulate programmes of development and to secure their execution. The present statement, however, confines itself to Government's policy in the industrial field.

(2) Any improvement in the economic conditions of the country postulates an increase in national wealth; a mere redistribution of existing wealth would make no essential difference to the people and would merely mean the distribution of poverty. A dynamic national policy must, therefore, be directed to a continuous increase in production by all possible means, side by side with measures to secure its equitable distribution. In the present state of the nation's economy, when the mass of the people are below the subsistence level, the emphasis should be on the expansion of production, both agricultural and, industrial; and in particular on the production of capital equipment, of goods satisfying the basic needs of the people, and of commodities the export of which will increase earnings of foreign exchange.

(3) The problem of State participation in Industry and the conditions in which private enterprise should be allowed to operate must be judged in this context. There can be no doubt that the State must play a progressively active role in the development of industries, but ability to achieve the main objectives should determine the immediate extent of State responsibility and the limits to private enterprise. Under present conditions, the mechanism and the resources of the State may not permit it to function forthwith in Industry as widely as may be desirable. The Government of India are taking steps to remedy the situation; in particular, they are considering steps to create a body of men trained in business methods and management. They feel, however, that for some time to come, the State could contribute more quickly to the increase of national wealth by expanding its present activities, wherever it is already operating, and by con-

centrating on new units of production in other fields, rather than on acquiring and running existing units. Meanwhile, private enterprise, properly directed and regulated, has a valuable role to play.

(4) On these considerations, the Government have decided that the manufacture of arms and ammunition, the production and control of atomic energy, and the ownership and management of railway transport should be the exclusive monopoly of the Central Government. Further, in any emergency, the Government would always have the power to take over any industry vital for national defence. In the case of the following industries, the State—which, in this context, includes Central, Provincial and State Governments and other Public Authorities like Municipal Corporations—will be exclusively responsible for the establishment of new undertakings, except where, in the national interest, the State itself finds it necessary to secure the co-operation of private enterprise subject to such control and regulation as the Central Government may prescribe :

(i) Coal (the Indian Coalfields Committee's proposals will be generally followed).<sup>1</sup>

(ii) Iron and Steel.

(iii) Aircraft Manufacture.

(iv) Shipbuilding.

(v) Manufacture of telephone, telegraph and wireless apparatus, excluding radio receiving sets.

(vi) Mineral Oils.

While the inherent right of the State to acquire any existing industrial undertaking will always remain, and will be exercised whenever the public interest requires it, the Government have decided to let existing undertakings in these fields develop for a period of ten years, during which they will be allowed all facilities for efficient working and reasonable expansion. At the end of this period, the whole matter will be reviewed and a decision taken in the light of circumstances obtaining at the time. If it is decided that the State should acquire any unit, the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution will be observed and compensation will be awarded on a fair and equitable basis.

Management of State enterprise will, as a rule, be through the medium of public corporations under the statutory control of the Central Government, who will assume such powers as may be necessary to ensure this.

(5) The Government of India have recently promulgated a measure<sup>1</sup> for the control by the State of the generation and distribution of electric power. This industry will continue to be regulated in terms of this measure.

(6) The rest of the industrial field will normally be open to private enterprise, individual as well as co-operative. The State will also

<sup>1</sup> In August 1948 the Government of India introduced in Parliament the Mines and Minerals (Regulation & Development) Bill.

<sup>1</sup> The Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948.

progressively participate in this field; nor will it hesitate to intervene whenever the progress of an industry under private enterprise is unsatisfactory. The Central Government have already embarked on enterprises like large river-valley developments, which are multi-purpose projects of great magnitude, involving extensive generation of hydro-electric power and irrigation on a vast scale, and are calculated in a comparatively short time to change the entire face of large areas in this country. Projects like the Damodar Valley Scheme, the Kosi Reservoir, the Hirakud Dam, etc., are in a class by themselves and can stand comparison with any of the major schemes in America or elsewhere. The Central Government have also undertaken the production of fertilizer on a very large scale, and have in view other enterprises like the manufacture of essential drugs, and of synthetic oil from coal; many Provincial and State Governments are also proceeding on similar lines.

(7) There are certain basic industries of importance, apart from those mentioned in paragraph (4), the planning and regulation of which by the Central Government is necessary in the national interest. The following industries whose location must be governed by economic factors of all-India import, or which require considerable investment or a high degree of technical skill, will be the subject of Central regulation and control :

Salt; Automobiles and tractors; Prime Movers; Electric Engineering; Other heavy machinery; Machine tools; Heavy chemicals, fertilizers and pharmaceuticals and drugs; Electro-chemical industries; Non-ferrous metals; Rubber manufactures; Power and industrial alcohol; Cotton and woollen textiles; Cement; Sugar; Paper and newsprint; Air and Sea Transport; Minerals; Industries related to defence.

The above list obviously cannot be of an exhaustive nature. The Government of India, while retaining the ultimate direction over this field of industry, will consult the Governments of the Provinces and States at all stages and fully associate them in the formulation and execution of plans. Besides these Governments, representatives of Industry and Labour will also be associated with the Central Government in the Industrial Advisory Council and other bodies which they propose to establish, as recommended by the Industries Conference.

(8) Cottage and small-scale industries have a very important role in the national economy, offering as they do scope for individual, village or co-operative enterprise, and means for the rehabilitation of displaced persons. These industries are particularly suited for the better utilization of local resources and for the achievement of local self-sufficiency in respect of certain types of essential consumer-goods like food, cloth and agricultural implements. The healthy expansion of cottage and small-scale industries depends upon a number of factors like the provision of raw materials, cheap power, technical advice,

organized marketing of their produce, and, where necessary, safeguards against intensive competition by large-scale manufacture, as well as on the education of the worker in the use of the best available techniques. Most of these fall in the Provincial sphere and are receiving the attention of the Governments of the Provinces and the States. The Resolution of the Industries Conference has requested the Central Government to investigate how far and in what manner these industries can be co-ordinated and integrated with large-scale industries. The Government of India accept this recommendation. It will be examined, for example, how the textile mill industry can be made complementary to, rather than competitive with, the handloom industry, which is the country's largest and best organized cottage industry. In certain other lines of production, like agricultural implements, textile accessories, and parts of machine tools, it should be possible to produce components on a cottage-industry scale and assemble these into their final product at a factory. It will also be investigated how far industries at present highly centralized could be decentralized with advantage.

The Resolution of the Industries Conference has recommended that Government should establish a Cottage Industries Board for the fostering of small-scale industries. The Government of India accept this recommendation and propose to create suitable machinery to implement it. A Cottage and Small-scale Industries Directorate will also be set up within the Directorate-General of Industries and Supplies.

One of the main objectives will be to give a distinctly co-operative bias to this field of industry. During and before the last war, even a predominantly agricultural country like China showed what could be done in this respect, and her mobile industrial co-operative units were of outstanding assistance in her struggle against Japan. The present international situation is likely to lessen to a marked degree, our chances of getting capital goods for large-scale industry, and the leeway must be made up by having recourse to small-size industrial co-operatives throughout the country.

(9) The Government, however, recognise that their objective, viz., securing the maximum increase in production, will not be realized merely by prescribing the respective spheres of the State and of private enterprise in Industry; it is equally essential to ensure the fullest co-operation between labour and management and the maintenance of stable and friendly relations between them. A resolution on this subject was unanimously passed by the Industries Conference which was held in December last. Amongst other things, the Resolution states :

'... The system of remuneration to capital as well as labour must be so devised that, while in the interests of the consumers and the primary producers, excessive profits should be prevented by suitable methods of taxation and otherwise, both will share the product of their common effort, after making provision for payment of fair wages to labour, a fair return on capital employed in the industry and reasonable reserves for the maintenance and expansion of the undertaking.'



Government accept this Resolution. They also consider that labour's share of the profits should be on a sliding scale, normally varying with production. They propose, in addition to the overall regulation of industry by the State, to establish machinery for advising on fair wages, fair remuneration for capital, and conditions of labour. They will also take steps to associate labour in all matters concerning industrial production.

The machinery which Government propose to set up will function at different levels, central, regional and unit. At the Centre, there will be a Central Advisory Council, which will cover the entire field of industry, and will have under it Committees for each major industry. These Committees may be split up into sub-committees dealing with specific questions relating to the industry, e.g., production, industrial relations, wage-fixation, and distribution of profits. The regional machinery under the Provincial Governments will be Provincial Advisory Boards which, like the Central Advisory Council, will cover the entire field of industry within the province; they will have under them Provincial Committees for each major industry. The Provincial Committees may also be split up into various sub-committees dealing with specific questions relating to production, wage-fixation and industrial relations. Below the Provincial Committees will come the Works Committees and the Production Committees attached to each major industrial establishment.

The Works Committees and the Production Committees will be bipartite in character, consisting of representatives of employers and workers only, in equal numbers. All other Committees will be tripartite, with representatives of Government, employers and workers.

Government hope that the machinery proposed will substantially reduce the volume of industrial disputes. In the case of unresolved conflicts, Government trust that management and labour will, in their own interests and in the larger interests of the country, agree to settle them through recognized channels of conciliation and arbitration, which will be provided by Government. The Industrial Relations Machinery, both at the Centre and in the Provinces, is being strengthened, and permanent Industrial Tribunals are being established for dealing with major disputes.

The Government of India are also taking special steps to improve industrial housing as quickly as possible. A scheme for the construction of one million workers' houses in ten years is under contemplation, and a Housing Board is being constituted for this purpose. The cost will be shared in suitable proportions between Government, employers and labour, the share of labour being recovered in the form of a reasonable rent.

In order to ensure quick decisions on the various matters arising out of the Industrial Truce Resolution, Government are appointing a Special Officer.

(10) The Government of India agree with the view of the Industries Conference that, while it should be recognized that participation of foreign capital and enterprise, particularly as regards industrial technique and knowledge, will be of value to the rapid industrialization of the country, it is necessary that the conditions under which they may participate in Indian industry should be carefully regulated in the national interest. Suitable legislation will be introduced for this purpose. Such legislation will provide for the scrutiny and approval by the Central Government of every individual case of participation of foreign capital and management in industry. It will provide that, as a rule, the major interest in ownership, and effective direction will be in Indian hands; but power will be taken to deal with exceptional cases in a manner calculated to serve the national interest. In all cases, however, the training of suitable Indian personnel for the purpose of eventually replacing foreign experts will be insisted upon.

(11) The Government of India are fully alive to their direct responsibility for the development of those industries which they have found necessary to reserve exclusively for State enterprise. They are equally ready to extend their assistance to private or co-operative enterprise in the rest of the industrial field, and in particular, by removing transport difficulties and by facilitating the import of essential raw materials to the maximum possible extent. The tariff policy of Government will be designed to prevent unfair foreign competition and to promote the utilization of India's resources without imposing unjustifiable burdens on the consumer. The system of taxation will be reviewed and readjusted where necessary to encourage saving and productive investment and to prevent undue concentration of wealth in a small section of the population.

(12) The Government of India hope that this elucidation of their intentions on fundamental aspects of industrial policy will remove all misapprehensions, and they are confident that a joint and intensive effort will now be made by labour, capital and the general public, which will pave the way for the rapid industrialization of the country.



4 November 1948

SPEECH: DR AMBEDKAR

Mr President, Sir, I introduce the Draft Constitution as settled by the Drafting Committee and move that it be taken into consideration.

The Drafting Committee was appointed by a Resolution passed by the Constituent Assembly on August 29, 1947.

The Drafting Committee was in effect charged with the duty of preparing a Constitution in accordance with the decisions of the Constituent Assembly on the reports made by the various Committees appointed by it such as the Union Powers Committee, the Union Constitution Committee, the Provincial Constitution Committee and the Advisory Committee on Fundamental Rights, Minorities, Tribal Areas, etc. The Constituent Assembly had also directed that in certain matters the provisions contained in the Government of India Act, 1935, should be followed. Except on points which are referred to in my letter of the 21st February, 1948, in which I have referred to the departures made and alternatives suggested by the Drafting Committee, I hope the Drafting Committee will be found to have faithfully carried out the directions given to it.

The Draft Constitution as it has emerged from the Drafting Committee is a formidable document. It contains 315 Articles and 8

Schedules. It must be admitted that the Constitution of no country could be found to be so bulky as the Draft Constitution. It would be difficult for those who have not been through it to realize its salient and special features.

The Draft Constitution has been before the public for eight months. During this long time, friends, critics and adversaries have had more than sufficient time to express their reactions to the provisions contained in it. I dare say that some of them are based on misunderstanding and inadequate understanding of the Articles. But there the criticisms are and they have to be answered.

For both these reasons it is necessary that on a motion for consideration I should draw your attention to the special features of the Constitution and also meet the criticism that has been levelled against it.

Before I proceed to do so I would like to place on the table of the House, reports of three committees appointed by the Constituent Assembly: (1) Report of the Committee on Chief Commissioners' Provinces, (2) Report of the Expert Committee on Financial Relations between the Union and the States, and (3) Report of the Advisory Committee on Tribal Areas, which came too late to be considered by that Assembly though copies of these have been circulated to Members of the Assembly. As these reports and the recommendations made therein have been considered by the Drafting Committee it is only proper that the House should formally be placed in possession of them.

Turning to the main question. A student of Constitutional Law if a copy of a Constitution is placed in his hands, is sure to ask two questions. Firstly, what is the form of Government that is envisaged in the Constitution; and secondly, what is the form of the Constitution? For these are the two crucial matters which every Constitution has to deal with. I will begin with the first of the two questions.

In the Draft Constitution there is placed at the head of the Indian Union a functionary who is called the President of the Union. The title of this functionary reminds one of the President of the United States. But beyond identity of names there is nothing in common between the form of Government prevalent in America and the form of Government proposed under the Draft Constitution. The American form of Government is called the Presidential system of Government. What the Draft Constitution proposes is the Parliamentary system. The two are fundamentally different.

Under the Presidential system of America, the President is the chief head of the Executive. The administration is vested in him. Under the Draft Constitution the President occupies the same position as the King under the English Constitution. He is the head of the State but

not of the Executive. He represents the nation but does not rule the nation. He is the symbol of the nation. His place in the administration is that of a ceremonial device on a seal by which the nation's decisions are made known. Under the American Constitution the President has under him secretaries in charge of different departments. In like manner the President of the Indian Union will have under him ministers in charge of different departments of administration. Here again there is a fundamental difference between the two. The President of the United States is not bound to accept any advice tendered to him by any of his secretaries. The President of the Indian Union will be generally bound by the advice of his ministers. He can do nothing contrary to their advice nor can he do anything without their advice. The President of the United States can dismiss any secretary at any time. The President of the Indian Union has no power to do so so long as his ministers command a majority in Parliament.

The Presidential system of America is based upon the separation of the Executive and the Legislature. So that the President and his secretaries cannot be members of the Congress. The Draft Constitution does not recognize this doctrine. The ministers under the Indian Union are members of Parliament. Only members of Parliament can become ministers. Ministers have the same rights as other members of Parliament, namely, that they can sit in Parliament, take part in debates and vote in its proceedings. Both systems of Government are of course democratic and the choice between the two is not very easy. A democratic Executive must satisfy two conditions: (1) It must be a stable Executive and (2) it must be a responsible Executive. Unfortunately it has not been possible so far to devise a system which can ensure both in equal degree. You can have a system which can give you more stability but less responsibility; or you can have a system which gives you more responsibility but less stability. The American and the Swiss systems give more stability but less responsibility. The British system on the other hand gives you more responsibility but less stability. The reason for this is obvious. The American Executive is a non-Parliamentary Executive which means that it is not dependent for its existence upon a majority in the Congress, while the British system is a Parliamentary Executive which means that it is dependent upon a majority in Parliament. Being a non-Parliamentary Executive, the Congress of the United States cannot dismiss the Executive. A Parliamentary Government must resign the moment it loses the confidence of a majority of the members of Parliament. Looking at it from the point of view of responsibility, a non-Parliamentary Executive being independent of Parliament tends to be less responsible to the Legislature, while a Parliamentary Executive being more dependent upon a

majority in Parliament become more responsible. The Parliamentary system differs from a non-Parliamentary system inasmuch as the former is more responsible than the latter, but they also differ as to the time and agency for assessment of their responsibility. Under the non-Parliamentary system, such as the one that exists in the USA, the assessment of the responsibility of the Executive is periodic. It takes place once in two years. It is done by the electorate. In England, where the Parliamentary system prevails, the assessment of responsibility of the Executive is both daily and periodic. The daily assessment is done by members of Parliament, through questions, resolutions, no-confidence motions, adjournment motions and debates on addresses. Periodic assessment is done by the electorate at the time of the election which may take place every five years or earlier. The daily assessment of responsibility which is not available under the American system is, it is felt, far more effective than the periodic assessment and far more necessary in a country like India. The Draft Constitution, in recommending the Parliamentary system of Executive has preferred more responsibility to more stability.

So far I have explained the form of Government under the Draft Constitution. I will now turn to the other question, namely, the form of the Constitution.

Two principal forms of the Constitution are known to history—one is called Unitary and the other Federal. The two essential characteristics of a Unitary Constitution are : (1) the supremacy of the Central polity and (2) the absence of subsidiary Sovereign polities. Contrary-wise, a Federal Constitution is marked : (1) by the existence of a Central polity and subsidiary polities side by side, and (2) by each being sovereign in the field assigned to it. In other words, Federation means the establishment of a dual polity. The Draft Constitution is a Federal Constitution, inasmuch as it establishes what may be called a dual polity. This dual polity under the proposed Constitution will consist of the Union at the Centre and the States at the periphery, each endowed with sovereign powers to be exercised in the field assigned to them respectively by the Constitution. This dual polity resembles the American Constitution. The American polity is also a dual polity, one of it is known as the Federal Government and the other the States Government and these correspond respectively to the Union Government and the States Government of the Draft Constitution. Under the American Constitution the Federal Government is not a mere league of the States nor are the States administrative units or agencies of the Federal Government. In the same way the Indian Constitution proposed in the Draft Constitution is not a league of States nor are the States administrative units or agencies of the Union

Government. Here, however, the similarities between the Indian and the American Constitutions come to an end. The differences that distinguish them are more fundamental and glaring than the similarities between the two.

The points of difference between the American Federation and the Indian Federation are mainly two. In the USA this dual polity is followed by a dual citizenship. In the USA there is a citizenship of the USA. But there is also a citizenship of the State. No doubt the rigours of this double citizenship are much assuaged by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States which prohibits the States from taking away the rights, privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States. At the same time, as pointed out by Mr William Anderson, in certain political matters, including the right to vote and to hold public office, States may and do discriminate in favour of their own citizens. This favouritism goes even farther in many cases. Thus to obtain employment in the service of a State or local government, one is in most places required to be a local resident or citizen. Similarly in the licensing of persons for the practice of such public professions as law and medicine, residence or citizenship in the State is frequently required; and in business where public regulation must necessarily be strict, as in the sale of liquor, and of stocks and bonds, similar requirements have been upheld.

Each State has also certain rights in its own domain that it holds for the special advantage of its citizens. Thus wild game and fish in a sense belong to the State. It is customary for the States to charge higher hunting and fishing licence fees to non-residents than to its own citizens. The States also charge non-residents higher tuition fees in State colleges and universities, and permit only residents to be admitted to their hospitals and asylums except in emergencies.

In short, there are a number of rights that a State can grant to its own citizens or residents that it may and does legally deny to non-residents, or grant to non-residents only on more difficult terms than those imposed on residents. These advantages, given to the citizen in his own State, constitute the special rights of State citizenship. Taken all together, they amount to a considerable difference in rights between citizens and non-citizens of the State. The transient and the temporary sojourner is everywhere under some special handicaps.

The proposed Indian Constitution is a dual polity with a single citizenship. There is only one citizenship for the whole of India. It is Indian citizenship. There is no State citizenship. Every Indian has the same rights of citizenship, no matter in what State he resides.

The dual polity of the proposed Indian Constitution differs from the dual polity of the USA in another respect. In the USA the

Constitutions of the Federal and the State Governments are loosely connected. In describing the relationship between the Federal and State Governments in the USA, Bryce has said :

‘ The Central or national Government and the State Governments may be compared to a large building and a set of smaller buildings standing on the same ground, yet distinct from each other. ’

Distinct they are, but how distinct are the State Governments in the USA from the Federal Government? Some idea of this distinctness may be obtained from the following facts :

(1) Subject to the maintenance of the republican form of Government, each State in America is free to make its own Constitution.

(2) The people of a State retain for ever in their hands, altogether independent of the National Government, the power of altering their Constitution.

To put it again in the words of Bryce :

‘ A State (in America) exists as a commonwealth by virtue of its own Constitution, and all State authorities, legislative, executive and judicial are the creatures of, and subject to the Constitution. ’

This is not true of the proposed Indian Constitution. No State (at any rate those in Part I) has a right to frame its own Constitution. The Constitution of the Union and of the States is a single frame from which neither can get out and within which they must work.

So far I have drawn attention to the differences between the American Federation and the proposed Indian Federation. But there are some other special features of the proposed Indian Federation which mark it off not only from the American Federation but from all other Federations. All federal systems including the American are placed in a tight mould of federalism. No matter what the circumstances, it cannot change its form and shape. It can never be unitary. On the other hand the Draft Constitution can be both unitary as well as federal according to the requirements of time and circumstances. In normal times, it is framed to work as a federal system. But in times of war it is so designed as to make it work as though it was a unitary system. Once the President issues a proclamation, which he is authorized to do under the Provisions of Article 275, the whole scene can become transformed and the State becomes a unitary state. The Union under the proclamation can claim if it wants (1) the power to legislate upon any subject even though it may be in the State list, (2) the power to give directions to the States as to how they should exercise their executive authority in matters which are within their charges, (3) the power to vest authority for any purpose in any officer, and (4) the power to suspend the financial provisions of the Constitution. Such a power of converting itself into a unitary State no Federation

possesses. This is one point of difference between the Federation proposed in the Draft Constitution, and all other Federations we know of.

This is not the only difference between the proposed Indian Federation and other Federations. Federalism is described as a weak if not an effete form of Government. There are two weaknesses from which Federation is alleged to suffer. One is rigidity and the other is legalism. That these faults are inherent in federalism, there can be no dispute. A federal Constitution cannot but be a written constitution and a written Constitution must necessarily be a rigid Constitution. A federal Constitution means division of sovereignty by no less a sanction than that of the law of the Constitution between the Federal Government and the States, with two necessary consequences, (1) that any invasion by the Federal Government in the field assigned to the States and vice versa is a breach of the Constitution and (2) such breach is a justiciable matter to be determined by the Judiciary only. This being the nature of federalism, a federal Constitution cannot escape the charge of legalism. These faults of a federal Constitution have been found in a pronounced form in the Constitution of the United States of America.

Countries which have adopted federalism at a later date have attempted to reduce the disadvantages following from the rigidity and legalism which are inherent therein. The example of Australia may well be referred to in this matter. The Australian Constitution has adopted the following means to make its federation less rigid :

(i) by conferring upon the Parliament of the Commonwealth large powers of concurrent legislation and few powers of exclusive legislation.

(ii) by making some of the Articles of the Constitution of a temporary duration, to remain in force only ' until Parliament otherwise provides '.

It is obvious that under the Australian Constitution, the Australian Parliament can do many things which are not within the competence of the American Congress and for doing which the American Government would have to resort to the Supreme Court and depend upon its ability, ingenuity and willingness to invent a doctrine to justify it in the exercise of authority.

In assuaging the rigour of rigidity and legalism the Draft Constitution follows the Australian plan on a far more extensive scale than has been done in Australia. Like the Australian Constitution, it has a long list of subjects for concurrent powers of legislation. Under the Australian Constitution, concurrent subjects are 39; under the Draft Constitution they are 37. Following the Australian Constitution, there are as many as six Articles in the Draft Constitution where the provisions are of a temporary duration and which could be replaced by