

VIII. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE INDIAN QUESTION

M. N. ROY

I. THE POSITION OF IMPERIALISM AND THE CHARACTERISTIC OF INDIAN ECONOMY

1. Until the beginning of the twentieth century India was a victim of the classical form of imperialist exploitation, supplying market and raw materials to the metropolitan (British) industries. The policy of imperialism was to keep India in a backward state of economy—an agricultural reserve and monopoly market for the British industries. British capital exported into India was mainly for the purpose of building railways, harbours, irrigation works, etc., to extend trade and tap greater sources of raw materials. By far the larger portion of the capital exported was loaned to the government of India for the above purposes (80 per cent of the British capital invested in India was loaned to the Indian government). The principal sources of imperialist profit were trade and interests on loan guaranteed by the government. (£20,000,000 is a recurring annual charge on the Indian Exchequer to pay the interests on the loan raised in England.)

British capital invested in India directly (not as a loan to the government) went also largely for railway-building; only a small amount in such non-competitive industry as tea plantation. Finance capital was the backbone of imperialist domination. Development of modern industries in

India was inimical to the interests of metropolitan industries which wanted an absolute monopoly of the Indian market. Capital accumulated as a result of industrial prosperity at home was exported to India not to foment there the growth of competitive means or production, but to enlarge the market for the products of the metropolitan industries. The growth of indigenous industries with Indian capital was obstructed by all means. They had not only to meet the competition of the much more highly developed British industrial system; they were subjected to legal disadvantages (tariff laws on the principle of free trade). An economically backward country was subjected to intense capitalist exploitation. The result was improvement of the bulk of the population; over-crowding of the agricultural industry; and unsteadiness of the entire economic life of the country. The periodical famines costing tens of millions of human lives were the evidence of the chronic unsteadiness of the national economy.

Considerable wealth was accumulated by the Indian landowning class and the trading bourgeoisie. The imperialist policy of obstructing the growth of modern industry in India prevented the transformation of this wealth into fluid capital. The major portion of this wealth was locked up in government securities, thus tying the pioneers of the Indian bourgeoisie to imperialist finance. The other outlet was usury which became ruinous for the peasantry. In this way the bourgeoisie became partner of the landlords in the business of exploiting the peasantry. The entire credit system was monopolised by imperialist finance blocking all the avenues of profitable and productive investment for native capital. The national bourgeoisie grew as an integral part of the imperialist economy—participating in the trade controlled by imperialist finance and as rentiers deriving their income through banks also controlled by imperialist finance.

2. The post-war crisis of capitalism forced British imperialism to change its old economic policy of keeping India in industrial backwardness. Already in the beginning of the war it was felt that in her economic backwardness

India was a weak link in the chain of the British empire. The more far-seeing imperialists recognised the necessity of changing the old policy and recommended that new methods of exploitation should be adopted to meet the new situation. (The viceroy, Hardinge's memorial to the imperialist government in 1915.)

The exigencies of war expedited the plan of industrialisation. The armies on the eastern front (Mesopotamis, Gallipoli, East Africa, etc.) could be supplied only from India. Arms, ammunitions, transport vehicles, army outfit should all be manufactured in India. Indigenous metallurgical and engineering industries, that had for years struggled to grow in the face of imperialist competition, suddenly received state patronage. In 1916 was appointed the Indian Industrial commission presided over by the leading spokesman of the "forward policy" to examine and report upon the possibilities of further industrial development in India.

After two years' investigation the commission recommended that the government must play an active part in the industrial development of India (Report on Indian Industrial Commission 1916-18). The same commission also recommended that "it is vital for the government to ensure the establishment in India of these industries whose subsense exposes us to grave danger in the event of war".

Another consideration contributed to the change of the old policy. Taking advantage of the inability of Britain to supply the Indian market with manufactured goods, owing to the militarisation of home industries and dislocation of maritime transport, Japan seriously threatened British monopoly of the Indian market. Japan could be kept out of the Indian market only by increasing the industrial production in India. The disabilities under which the cotton industry (the oldest and largest industry owned almost exclusively by native capital before the war) had laboured during decades, were partially removed, so that it could increase production and resist Japanese encroachment on the Indian market. Eventually, Indian cotton industry was granted practical protection (import duty of 11.5 per cent)

British capital flowed into the partially protected Indian cotton industry.

For decades the Lancashire textile interests had dominated British policy in India. To protect and further these interests the doctrine of free trade was imposed upon industrially backward, agrarian India. The abandoning of that traditional policy and adoption, in its stead, of the policy of "discriminating protection" marked a radical change in the position of British imperialism in India. The swing from Cobdenism to Baldwinism indicates that the basis of British imperialism (in India) is shifted from trade capital and trading finance to industrial and banking capital. There is a fundamental difference between the imperialism in the period of capitalist prosperity and imperialism in the period of capitalist decline.

3. The colonial exploitation of India is no longer for imperialist expansion—the result of capitalist prosperity. Now it is a means for capitalist stabilisation. The forms and methods of the exploitation, therefore, are changing. Imperialism wants to plunder India more than ever; but it lacks the wherewithal. Hundred and seventy years' brutal exploitation ruined the country. The standard of living of the masses sank lower and lower. Today imperialism must have a larger and steadier market to overcome the industrial depression at home. India cannot provide the required market, if she is kept in a backward and unsteady economy. Nor can Britain export sufficient capital to develop the potentialities of the Indian market. The accumulation of capital in England is on the decline. Sufficient capital cannot be exported without injuring the industries at home (testimony of J. M. Keynes).

The profits derived from past investments in India go to England mostly in the form of raw materials. These are necessary for the upkeep of the home industries. The profits from past investments can, therefore, be used to meet now capital demands in India by depriving, on the one hand, home industries of raw materials, and by the industrialisation of India, on the other. Unless the raw materials are transformed into manufactured goods, they cannot be

converted in India into money capital ready for re-investment.

4. Apart from her enormous reservoir of natural riches and labour power, India, possesses a very considerable amount of wealth, which could not be converted into productive capital owing to the old policy of imperialism. To harness this wealth for the benefit of imperialism is the present policy. Industrialisation of India is the corollary of this policy. If India could be industrialised mainly with Indian capital, but under imperialist financial and political domination, British capitalism might survive the present crisis.

Industrialisation of India immediately creates a market for the British metallurgical and engineering trades. Development of the productive forces will raise the purchasing power of India. Direct exploitation of Indian labour in more productive forms will increase the total amount of surplus value produced. Granting the native bourgeoisie the share, imperialism will derive greater profit than ever. The capitalist accumulation in India, which will be very rapid and large, owing to the superfluity and cheapness of labour power, will more than compensate for the decline of accumulation in England. Industrialisation of India will thus strengthen the position of imperialism—will be a factor contributing to the stabilisation of capitalism—provided that it takes place within the framework of the British empire.

5. Imperialism must proceed very cautiously in this new path which is as likely to lead it out of the post-war crisis as to destruction. The implication of the new policy is a gradual “de-colonisation” of India, which will be allowed to evolve out of the state of “dependency” to “Dominion status”. The Indian bourgeoisie, instead of being kept down as a potential rival, will be granted partnership in the economic development of the country under the hegemony of imperialism. From a backward, agricultural colonial possession India will become a modern, industrial country—a “member of the British Commonwealth of free nations”.

India is in a process of "decolonisation" in so far as the policy forced upon British imperialism by the post-war crisis of capitalism abolishes the old, antiquated forms and methods of colonial exploitation in favour of new forms and new methods. The forces of production, which were so far denied the possibilities of normal growth, are unfettered. The very basis of national economy changes. Old class relations are replaced by new class relations. The basic industry, agriculture, stands on the verge of revolution. [The prevailing system of landownership which hinders agricultural production is threatened with abolition.] The native bourgeoisie acquires an ever-growing share in the control of the economic life of the country. These changes in the economic sphere have their political reflex. The unavoidable process of gradual "de-colonisation" has in it the germs of disruption of the empire. As a matter of fact, the new policy adopted for the consolidation of the empire—to avoid the danger of immediate crush—indicates that the foundation of the empire is shaken. Imperialism is a violent manifestation of capitalist prosperity. In this period of capitalist decline its base is undermined.

6. The recommendations of the Industrial commission to encourage the growth of modern industries in India were followed up by the decision of the government to place with manufacturers in India orders for government requirements, railway materials, etc. This gave tremendous impetus to the iron and steel and engineering industries. British concerns projected and actually established large engineering works in India (Asiatic Steel Corporation, Peninsular Locomotive Company, etc.). In 1923, the policy of protection, which had already been practically in operation though not in general, received legislative sanction. The British government of India adopted the principle of "discriminate protection".

Measures were also taken to create conditions for the capitalist development of the country. Relatively heavy taxes added to the other forms of exploitation had reduced the purchasing capacity of the masses to the very minimum. The British government of India set up a committee

(the Taxation Enquiry Committee) to determine the taxable capacity could be readjusted so as to remove the limitation on the internal market. Finally, the bottom-rock of the whole situation was touched. Capitalist development of the country cannot take place without solving the agrarian problem.

7. The landowning classes have always been the ally of the British power in India. As a matter of fact, in the earlier stages of its domination in India British imperialism created a class of tax-farming landlords as its social basis, so to say. While the agricultural industry was brought directly under capitalist exploitation in certain parts of the country by the introduction of modern irrigation system, generally the feudal (and in some places the primitive communal) character of the ownership of land was preserved. The check upon the growth of modern industry and destruction of the handicrafts caused serious over-crowding of the land. The pre-capitalist system of land-tenure, under capitalist exploitation, led to such continuous parcelment of holdings that in the majority of cases the holdings became what is characterised as "non-economic". The land held in tenancy by the peasant is so little and split up in such minute fragments scattered far away from one another that to cultivate it even only for consumption is not economic employment of labour power. On the basis of such a bankrupt system of agricultural production is reared a superstructure of capitalist economy. The peasantry constitutes nearly 75 per cent of the Indian population. Their purchasing power is the basis of the Indian market. To increase the buying capacity of the peasantry, that is, to rescue the agricultural industry from its present bankrupt backwardness, is an indispensable principle of the capitalist development of the country. To increase agricultural production, to modernise the methods of cultivation, has become the cardinal principle of British economic policy in India. The present viceroy is an agricultural expert. A Royal commission on agriculture is working to find the way and means to improve the agricultural industry. This can be done only changing the present system of land tenure—by abolishing the feudal

character of landownership. But this imperialism will not do. It cannot hastily destroy the social basis, on which it had largely rested for a hundred and fifty years. The implication of the present "forward" agricultural policy is, however, that imperialism is changing its orientation from the feudal landowning classes to the bourgeoisie. Here again imperialism must go cautiously, as it were, not to alarm its old faithful ally—to reassure it of continued support—question of landownership has been excluded from the terms of reference of the Royal commission on agriculture.

The policy is to create conditions for capitalist development not at the expense of the feudal landlords, but by driving the poor peasantry from the land. It is sought to create a class of well-to-do peasants through official cooperative credit banks. It is estimated that the policy of agricultural reform will in a year or two create a market for a million steel ploughs, thousands of oil pumping-stations and considerable quantities of other implements required for modern method of land cultivation. This immediate benefit for capitalism will be followed up by an increase of the agricultural production raising the purchasing power of the peasantry. A more far reaching result will be the movement of the population from the village to the towns. The labour-power tied up at present with non-productive land-holding will be released and made available for modern industrial production.

8. India never had her independent credit system. Her national economy has always been the victim of the fluctuation of silver price. British banks (the so-called Exchange Banks as the Hong Kong-Shanghai Bank, the Chartered Bank, the Eastern Bank, etc.) controlling the foreign trade of India were opposed to any stable monetary system. That was the policy dictated by trading and financial interests. In the new situation India must have a credit system based upon a stable currency. The accumulated wealth of the country cannot be converted into fluid productive capital in the absence of credit, a stable currency. The British government is now engaged in tackling this problem: how the accumulated wealth of India can be har-

ficance of bourgeois revolution (Marx). Now, the unaccomplished part of the bourgeois revolution takes place in India also under the protection of British imperialism; but in this period of capitalist decline its significance is counter-revolutionary. For example, Stolypin land reform is introduced in India not on the initiative of the native bourgeoisie; it is done by imperialism, often in the face of bourgeois nationalist opposition. To deal with the dangerous situation created by the peasant revolt in the post-war years the British government introduced tenancy reforms in the provinces where the revolt was the most acute. In the province of Bengal the reform could not be carried because of the unanimous nationalist (bourgeois) opposition. It is again imperialism that is approaching (cautiously and superficially) the agrarian problem as an indispensable pre-condition for the capitalist development of the country. The nationalist bourgeoisie has never tackled the problem. As a matter of fact, they are stout defenders of the present system of landownership. In the revolutionary period of 1921-22, the National Congress led by Gandhi, openly supported the landlords in the face of the countryside peasant revolt. The Swaraj Party repeatedly reassured the landowning classes that it was opposed to any attack upon their position and landed them as the pillars of Indian culture.

11. The bourgeoisie in a colonial country becomes a revolutionary factor in so far as it initiates and leads the struggle for the creation of condition for economic progress obstructed by imperialist domination. By adopting the policy of promoting the capitalist development of India British imperialism deprives the nationalist bourgeoisie of its revolutionary role. Under the present conditions the native bourgeoisie grows not as enemy of imperialism; it becomes its silly-junior partner, protege. Exploitation of human labour is the basic condition of capitalist development. The new economic policy of British imperialism in India sharpens the class differentiation and ripens the class struggle in the face of which nationalist struggle based upon capitalist antagonism loses its importance. The policy of im-

perialism in this period of capitalist decline does not cut across the general interests of the bourgeoisie in the advanced colonial countries like India. The antagonisms between the two cease to be that between the oppressor and oppressed; it approximates the "moral" antagonism inherent in the capitalist system. On the other hand, common interests and the common fear of revolution draw them together ever-closer in a united front in the class struggle—to exploit and oppress the working class.

12. Indian bourgeoisie outgrows the state of absolute colonial suppression not as a result of its struggle against imperialism. The process of the gradual "decolonisation" of India is produced by two different factors, namely, 1) post-war crisis of capitalism and 2) the revolutionary awakening of the Indian masses. In order to stabilise its economic basis and strengthen its position in India, British imperialism is obliged to adopt a policy which cannot be put into practice without making certain concessions to the Indian bourgeoisie. These concessions are not conquered by the Indian nationalist bourgeoisie. They are gift (reluctant, but obligatory) of imperialism. Therefore, the process of "de-colonisation" is parallel to the process of "de-revolutionisation" of the Indian bourgeoisie.

The influence of the imperialist war and the Russian revolution broadened the social basis of the Indian nationalist movement. It outgrew the narrow limits of the bourgeoisie and intellectual professional classes. It assumed a mass character and mass form. For the first time in its history, in spite of the reactionary bourgeois leadership that still dominated it, it objectively placed before itself the task of overthrowing imperialist domination and of liquidating the social backwardness of the country resulting from it. The bourgeoisie had not contributed to that revolutionisation of the nationalist movement. They even did not place themselves at its head post-factum. On the contrary, as soon as the nationalist movement assumed a revolutionary mass character, the big bourgeoisie turned against it and cooperated with imperialism in fighting it. The leadership of the newly revolutionised nationalist movement fell upon

the weak and unwilling petty bourgeoisie which debilitated the movement by imposing upon it a reactionary ideology and reformist programme. That revolutionary development of the nationalist movement, which the big bourgeoisie opposed and the petty bourgeoisie dissipated, was the internal factor that caused (rather expedited) the change of the imperialist policy. Therefore, the position yielded by imperialism is a conquest of the masses usurped by the bourgeoisie, as was always the case in bourgeois revolutions.

13. Imperialism is obliged to bribe the Indian bourgeoisie not only to broaden its base in India, not only as the corollary to the policy of increasing colonial plunder by the introduction of changed methods and forms of exploitation to meet the changed world conditions. The collaboration of the Indian bourgeoisie is necessary for the defence of the position of British imperialism in the entire East and in case of the projected war against the USSR.

India cannot be made the military base of British imperialism in the East unless complete support of the native bourgeoisie is assured. Should the Indian bourgeoisie be kept in the pre-war condition of absolute colonial suppression, they would look upon the USSR as an agency of deliverance, as the Chinese bourgeoisie did for a time. In that case they would not help imperialism to combat the penetration into the masses of the influence of the Russian and Chinese revolutions. But the Indian bourgeoisie "with a stake in the country—with a perspective of self-aggrandisement under the protection of imperialism—as is the case now, are as afraid of the "Bolshevik Menace" as their imperialist patrons..."

All these factors taken together determine the character of the Indian nationalist bourgeoisie. It is no longer a revolutionary force. Not only from the point of view of the internal conditions of India, but from the point of view of the present world conditions also the Indian bourgeoisie is rallied on the side of counter-revolution. It cannot and does not lead or participate in the struggle for national freedom (completely outside the British empire). Indian

national revolution has passed its bourgeois stage. It must still realise a programme which, objectively and historically, is the programme of bourgeois revolution; but it is no longer a bourgeois revolution, because it can and will succeed only by breaking the bounds of capitalist society.

14. The readjustment of the relation between British imperialism and Indian bourgeoisie, however, cannot be without hitches. Imperialism naturally seeks to buy the collaboration of the Indian bourgeoisie for the least possible price. The Indian bourgeoisie, on the other hand, desire to have more economic advantages and political rights. Consequently, on the basis of a united front against revolution, there goes on a parliamentary struggle between the two. Then, the contradictory interests of the different sections of the bourgeoisie, influence the situation. For example, the interests of the industrial and trading bourgeoisie clash on the policy of the protection. But while the financial group of Bombay are not altogether opposed to the scheme of a Reserve Bank (of issue) with share-capital, the manufacturing and trading interests unitedly join with the professional classes in their demand that the Reserve Bank should be a state bank. Owing to the unevenness of the level of its development, and owing to the inner contradictions of capitalism, the Indian bourgeoisie as a class cannot collaborate with imperialism always on all questions. Now, one or more sections support or agree with the imperialist policy and the others are in the opposition (parliamentary); and then, vice versa.

Taking advantage of the conflict of sectional interests imperialism splits the nationalist bourgeoisie, politically, this rendering their parliamentary opposition ineffective. The entire energy of the bourgeoisie is at present concentrated to secure further constitutional reforms which will enable them to carry on the parliamentary struggle for power more effectively. Imperialism, of course, will not yield the monopoly of state power; therefore, on the background of ever closer agreement on the basic economic issues, there will always be a parliamentary struggle. Without over-estimating it and always knowing its superficial

character, this parliamentary struggle should be used for the development of the revolution. In the next stage of the national revolution the role of the bourgeoisie will be limited to this.

III. THE DRIVING FORCES AND PERSPECTIVE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL REVOLUTION

15. The compromise between imperialism and the native bourgeoisie does not weaken the struggle for national freedom. On the contrary, it enters a revolutionary stage. The nationalist bourgeoisie have never been revolutionary. They never fought for national freedom. They always sought for an agreement with imperialism on the basis of economic and political concessions made by latter. The nationalist movement all along bore the stamp of the reactionary and compromising character of the bourgeoisie. Except in the case of the politically backward and socially reactionary petty bourgeois secret societies, the official programme of the nationalist movement has always been "constitutional reform" evolving in the post-war revolutionary period to "Dominion Status inside the British Empire". The debacle of bourgeois leadership releases the nationalist movement from the reactionary influence and limited political outlook. The programme of the movement reflects the objective demands of the workers, peasants and petty bourgeois masses whose interests cannot be defended and furthered except by completely overthrowing imperialist domination.

16. In the new era of agreement and compromise between imperialism and the native bourgeoisie the economic and political conditions of these classes will not appreciably improve. On the contrary, they will grow worse. The collaboration (united and anti-revolutionary front) between British imperialism and the Indian bourgeoisie is realised by the former conceding to the latter a large share in the proceeds of the exploitation of the Indian masses. The cooperation of the nationalist bourgeoisie is not secured at the sacrifice of imperialist interests. The share of the native bourgeoisie will be increased by a corresponding increases

in the surplus value produced by the Indian working class. The nationalist bourgeoisie frankly declares that for "national prosperity" the people must make sacrifice. (We recognise that in the efforts to attain a prominent position in the industrial world, India will have to pay a price. The economic well-being of India, which we aim at in the tariff policy which we recommend, cannot be obtained without making a sacrifice—from the minute of dissent of the Indian members of the Fiscal commission.)

In this new era of protectionism, the consuming public (majority of the population) will be obliged to contribute ever more for the enrichment of the native bourgeoisie and imperialism deriving benefit from industries thriving behind high tariff walls. The peasantry will be obliged to pay higher prices for agricultural implements, clothing and other manufactured goods. "Modernisation of agriculture" will be realised by creating a class of well-to-do peasants at the expense of the poor peasantry. Agricultural production will be increased, internal market will be extended, by driving the poor peasantry to wage-slavery either on capitalist farms or in factories.

The artisans will be further ruined. The destruction of handicrafts will also ruin the small traders connected with this industry. Extension of banking facilities will bring the rural trade more under the domination of urban capital squeezing the independent small trader out of the run. The urban petty bourgeoisie (poor professional classes, teachers, students, employees, small traders, etc.) will have to bear the burden of heavy indirect taxation in the shape of higher prices and rents. The petty intellectuals in India are completely proletarianised. They are an over-produced commodity thrown in ever-increasing numbers on the glutted market. A proletarianised class can save itself only through a social revolution—by the radical change of the political-economic system that has caused its proletarian industrialisation intensifies the exploitation of Indian labour. Since the future of British imperialism considerably depends upon successful harnessing of the cheap labour-power of the colonial proletariat for more productive pur-

poses, it will keep the Indian working class on the lowest subsistence level. The native bourgeoisie are a willing party to the violent exploitation and suppression of the working class, because their prosperity also depends on the unpaid labour of the Indian proletariat. Intensified exploitation of the Indian proletariat will cement the alliance between imperialism and the native bourgeoisie.

17. The movement for national freedom, as the political expression of these oppressed and exploited classes (constituting the overwhelming majority of the population) becomes a revolutionary struggle not only against imperialism, but also against its native allies, capitalist and land-owning classes. Class-struggle coincides with national struggle. The anti-imperialist struggle will develop and triumph as an anti-capitalist struggle.

The immediate political task of the national revolution still remains to overthrow imperialist rule and establish in its place a national democratic state. But the fact that the social basis of the national revolution is the oppressed and exploited classes, the democratic state established by it will not be the hypocritical bourgeois democracy. The class struggle, which is the driving force of the Indian national revolution, is not the struggle between two classes representing two forms of property. Indian nationalist movement in certain stages was a movement dictated by the interests of the bourgeoisie but the Indian national revolution will not be a bourgeois revolution. The motive force of the Indian national revolution is the struggle between the exploiting and exploited classes. Therefore its political task is not to realise parliamentary democracy which is the organ of bourgeois dictatorship.

Being essentially a struggle between exploiting and exploited classes, Indian revolution will be victorious under the leadership of the proletariat. But the revolution will reach the final victory through successive stages of development. The petty bourgeoisie, which participate in the national revolution, are identified with certain forms (decaying) of private property; therefore they will not

directly accept the leadership of the proletariat. Neither they, nor the peasantry will accept the programme of proletarian revolution. These classes can be and should be mobilised in a revolutionary struggle for democratic freedom removing their economic grievances, under the hegemony of the proletariat. Democracy is an end in itself for the class (bourgeoisie) which converts the "democratic" state into an instrument of its dictatorship. For the proletariat it is a means to an end—a step to socialism. The objective programme of the proletariat (socialism) will not be imposed upon the national revolutions; but by exercising hegemony in the national revolutionary struggle the proletariat will push it towards democratic freedom higher than bourgeois-parliamentarism.

By virtue of the fact that the Indian national revolution will develop and finally succeed as a struggle against capitalism, the proletariat becomes its driving force. All the other classes oppressed and exploited, fully or partially, directly or indirectly, by capitalism come under the influence of the proletariat. By exposing the counter-revolutionary character of the bourgeoisie; by emphasising upon the necessity of a revolutionary struggle for the complete overthrow of imperialism; by denouncing the programme of "equal partnership within the British Empire" as opposed to the interests of the Indian masses, by advocating revolutionary democratic freedom for all the oppressed classes; by putting forward demands to safeguard and further the interests of the peasants and petty bourgeois masses; and by placing itself in the forefront of the entire national revolutionary struggle the proletariat will conquer the leadership of the national revolution.

18. The petty bourgeoisie, particularly the intelligentsia is an important factor in the Indian nationalist movement. They are not satisfied with the compromising politics of the big bourgeoisie. They generally desire freedom from imperialist domination. Lately, they have repeatedly pleaded before the National Congress the programme of complete independence. Nevertheless, the petty bourgeois intellectuals are unable to liberate themselves from capi-

talist orientation, on the one hand, and reactionary semi-feudal social ideology, on the other. They will still go a long way with the revolution; but will eventually betray as their prototypes did in China. Sinn Feinism, Kemalism, American democracy are their ideals. Even fascism penetrates among them and Mussolini is idealised.

Indian intellectual petty bourgeoisie grew out of the landowning class. The system of land tenure in several provinces of British India is such as to accommodate a whole series (sometimes as many as ten) (of) rent-receiving middlemen between the owner and the cultivator. The urban petty intelligentsia is closely connected with this class as middle-owners grafted upon the system of feudal-capitalist landownership.

Owing to this intimate relationship with a backward economic system, the petty bourgeois intelligentsia is generally very reactionary in social orientation. Religion, mysticism, Gandhism, etc., have a strong hold upon them. This deprives their political radicalism (desire for complete independence) of practical value. It is usually dissipated in small terrorist societies without political programme and perspective. The political radicalism of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia cannot influence the nationalist movement, because there is no social force to back it up. For direct class interests, the petty intelligentsia are hostile to any readjustment of the existing system of landownership, which is the basic objective demand of the peasantry. In this respect they are more reactionary than imperialism.

While judging the relative revolutionary value of the petty bourgeoisie in the national-liberation movement these facts should be taken into consideration. National revolution cannot triumph in India except as an agrarian revolution, nearly 75 per cent of the population being peasants. The class that, by its very existence, is hostile to a radical change of the system of landownership sucking the life-blood of the peasantry, cannot play a very important role in the national revolution. On the contrary, just as in China, the radical petty bourgeois intelligentsia will

betray the national revolution as soon as its agrarian character will become sharp.

IV. THE NATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY PARTY:
ITS PROGRAMME AND PROBLEMS

19. The struggle against imperialism and the reactionary politics of the native bourgeoisie (together with the land-owning classes) must be carried on with more vigour than ever by the proletariat, peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie. There must be a NATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY PARTY, representing these classes, to lead the national revolution. All the existing nationalist parties are dominated by capitalist and landowning elements. None of them stand upon the platform of national revolution. They are all parliamentary parties not developing any appreciable activity among the masses.

Considerable petty bourgeois elements were in the Swaraj Party. But the Swaraj Party itself is totally discredited. Last year the bourgeois right wing went out of the party and organised a new party frankly with the programme of cooperation with imperialism. Still, the Swaraj Party did not change its bourgeois orientation and remained wedded to the bankrupt tactics of parliamentary opposition. The petty bourgeoisie is completely disillusioned and are leaving the party. The party now exists only as a parliamentary group and election machine. By changing its name to Congress Party last year it captured the lifeless carcass of the National Congress. The petty bourgeois nationalist masses still swear allegiance to the Congress which, however, is not an organised party and is not the same as the Congress (ex-Swaraj) Party.

The petty bourgeois nationalist masses, nominally under the banner of the Congress, have been, of late, giving vent to their opposition to the compromising politics of the bourgeois nationalist parties, including the Swaraj Party. This general opposition has taken organised forms all over the country (Political Sufferers' League, Congress Karni Sangha, Indian Republican Association, All-India Volun-

teers' Corps, Indian Republican Army, etc.). None of these more or less revolutionary left wing nationalist bodies has a clear political programme. They represent the tendency of the petty bourgeois masses to find forms of activities other than the parliamentarism and constitutional agitation advocated by the bourgeois nationalist parties. The revolutionary development of the national movement finds the most mature expression in the Workers and Peasants Party.

20. The National Revolutionary Party will not be a party only of the workers and peasants. The petty bourgeois masses (as distinct from the consciously reactionary intelligentsia) must participate in the struggle for national freedom. The proletariat must help them to overcome their reactionary tendencies, and push them on the road to national revolution. In spite of their political radicalism, the petty bourgeois masses will not enter in the party of the working class. Nor is it desirable that the working class party should be flooded by the petty bourgeois elements (excluding the peasantry). The National Revolutionary Party should be the rallying ground for all the classes that still carry on and must carry on the struggle for the complete overthrow of imperialism and the establishment of revolutionary democratic power. These are, primarily, the proletariat, peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie.

21. The workers and peasants parties (which have now been federated into a national organisation) are in reality more petty bourgeois than working class parties. In Bengal, for example, a number of small landlords are to be found among the leaders of the party. The individual members (excepting the communists' trade unions and peasant unions can enter the party as collective members) are mostly petty bourgeois intellectuals. Nevertheless, the leadership of the workers and peasants parties is controlled by the communists.

This state of affairs stamps the party with a communist colour and the petty bourgeois masses stay away from it. If the Workers and Peasants Party is meant to be the Communist Party in disguised form, then its class character

must be clearer—small landlords must be expelled from its leadership; but if it is to become the national revolutionary mass party, it should abandon its working class appearance and it should not be so much identified openly with the Communist Party. Its very name is an obstacle to its development in that direction.

The Workers and Peasants Party cannot be the substitute for the Communist Party. As the driving force of the national revolution the proletariat must have its own party; but still there is ample room for a revolutionary nationalist party. The proletariat must enter it and actively participate in its leadership. In the present Indian conditions the proletariat, operating through the Communist Party, must take the initiative to hasten the rise of a national revolutionary mass party.

22. The principal points in the programme of the national revolutionary party are: a) complete overthrow of imperialist domination; b) establishment of a revolutionary democratic state based upon the oppressed classes (majority of the population); c) liquidation of decayed feudal power embodied in the native states as a support for imperialism; d) agrarian revolution (abolition of landlordism by confiscation without compensation, nationalisation of land and complete repudiation of peasants indebtedness); e) nationalisation of public utilities (railways, waterways, telegraphs, etc.), of basic industries (mines, iron, steel), of the tea plantations and of big banks; f) industrialisation of the country under the control of the revolutionary democratic state; g) modernisation of agriculture through cooperatives; state credit to agriculture; h) freedom of religion and worship; i) guarantee for national minorities; j) close alliance with USSR and other oppressed peoples in the struggle against imperialism.

When the bourgeoisie try to bind the Indian people perpetually to the British empire with the theory of "equal partnership", the slogan of complete independence must be pressed more energetically than ever. Any class or section, that does not fully accept this programme and is not

ready to participate actively in the struggle for its realisation has no place in the nationalist revolutionary party. It is an illusion that the bourgeois nationalist parties can be induced to accept the programme of complete independence and that of the revolutionary mass action that it implies. Neither will the National Congress accept the programme as long as it is dominated by the bourgeoisie. The National Revolutionary Party should enter the Congress (not the Congress Party) and strive to capture its leadership. Since there are still petty bourgeois elements inside the Congress Party, a left wing opposition should be developed therein with the object of pushing the bourgeoisie in the parliamentary struggle against imperialism and finally to liberate the entire petty bourgeoisie from the domination of capitalist politics. The antagonism between imperialism and native capital should be fully utilised by supporting the national bourgeoisie in the parliamentary struggle against imperialism. But the nationalist bourgeoisie should not be supported when the implication of their struggle against imperialism is the aggrandisement of native capitalism at the expense of the masses (for example, protectionism).

In comparison to the present colonial Indian government, parliamentary democracy is an advanced form of state. Parliamentary democracy is a progressive force when the bourgeoisie is a revolutionary class, because it is the political organ of bourgeois dictatorship. In view of the fact that the Indian bourgeoisie is not a revolutionary class, parliamentary democracy has no place in the political evolution of India. The programme of the national revolution cannot be the establishment of a state which will deliver the political power to the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. The revolutionary democratic national state must be controlled by the oppressed majority. It will be a pyramidal structure based upon councils of delegates elected by the organisations of workers, peasants, employees, teachers, students, artisans, small traders, etc., etc. By uniting the legislative and executive functions in the delegates' councils (local, district, provincial and national) a

real democratic state-power will be established. The rights of democracy will not remain confined to casting votes periodically. Peoples' representatives will not only make laws, but will have the power and responsibility to enforce them.

Such a system based upon professional and economic interests will eliminate the question of communal (religious and caste) representation. The National Revolutionary Party must condemn the introduction of religion into politics. The reactionary religious prejudices of the petty bourgeoisie must be combated as harmful for the national revolution. Religious beliefs and forms of worship should be mutually respected.

The native states are the stronghold of feudal reaction. As puppets of the British, the native princes are loyal supporters of imperialism. National revolution cannot take place in two-thirds of the country (British provinces) leaving the remaining one-third of feudal backwardness. Therefore the princes are no less hostile to the national revolution than the British. Imperialism plans to mobilise the support of the princes as a check upon the revolutionary movement in the entire country. By creating a federation of native states, imperialism plans to break up India into two parts—in one of which British will share power with the native bourgeoisie, while in the other she will have the supreme power. Nevertheless, bourgeois nationalism has always kept clear of the native states, which are looked upon as precious remnants of India's past freedom and glory. The bourgeois nationalist parties often defend the absolutism of the native princes as against "British interference". The National Congress frankly places the native states outside the pale of its activities. Owing to unbearable feudal oppression, the peasantry in many a native state revolt. The peasant movement is suppressed with brutal ferocity. The national revolutionary party must support the demand of the peasantry in the native states. It must advocate the elimination of these relics of feudal backwardness and absolutism from the face of free India.

The peasantry constitutes nearly 75 per cent of the entire Indian population; therefore the active support of the peasantry will be the determining factor in the struggle against imperialism. The national revolutionary party will not have the support of the peasant masses unless it advocates a radical change in the present land ownership which ruins the peasantry. The British power in India is traditionally based upon the landowning classes. Abolition of landlordism, nationalisation of land and ensuring land to the tiller for cultivation will release the revolutionary energy of the peasant masses and will be a blow to imperialism.

The power of the revolutionary democratic national state will not be secure if British imperialism and native bourgeois dominate the economic life of the country through the possession of the means of transportation, basic industries and finance. Therefore these should be brought under democratic control as a result of the national revolution. Large productive concerns, like tea plantations, built up by Indian labour but owned by British capital should be confiscated and become national property.

V. THE AGRARIAN PROBLEM

23. National revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is essentially an agrarian revolution. The agrarian problem is the fundamental problem of the Indian revolution. In spite of the fact that, unlike China, India is a modern capitalist state (The League of Nations places India among the eight leading industrial countries of the world), she is overwhelmingly an agrarian land. Agriculture still remains her basic industry. Nearly 75 per cent of her population live on the land. The fundamental task of the revolution taking place in such conditions is to solve the agrarian question. The galvanisation of feudal relations, the backwardness of the agricultural industry and the bankruptcy of the peasantry are the results of capitalist (imperialist) exploitation of the generally pre-capitalist modes of production; therefore the agrarian problem in India cannot be solved inside the limits of capitalist

society, as was done by the European bourgeois revolutions. The bourgeoisie "freed" the serfs from feudal bondage, but they cannot free the peasantry from capitalist exploitation without hurting their own class. Indian national revolution is not a bourgeois revolution, because as such it cannot solve the agrarian question.

24. The agrarian situation is not uniform throughout the country. It varies from province to province. Between largescale capitalist farming (tea plantations, etc.), on the one extreme, to primitive community ownership, on the other, there exist multifarious forms of landownership. This lifeless stratification has been caused by colonial exploitation which hindered normal social development. (Before the British conquest, India had been for 700 years under the medieaval mussulman imperialism.) The land is overcrowded. Over 75 per cent of the population are engaged in the cultivation of land. Millions of families must earn their livelihood from two acres of land broken into small fragments.

In nearly half of British territories the land is owned by landlords who generally possess more or less feudal character. The landlords pay to the government tax, fixed of their perpetually (as in Bengal) or for a certain period. The landlords' lands are rented out to tenants. Often there are a whole series of non-cultivating middlemen between the landlords and the peasants. In some places the tenancy is fixed subject to increase of rent, in other the landlord can oust the tenant any time. Often nearly the half of peasants production goes away in the form of rent and feudal dues. In the native states covering one-third of the entire country, the landownership is feudal. Practical serfdom obtains there.

In another half of the British territories the ownership of land is vested in the state which rents out the land directly to the tenants either individually or collectively. The rent is usually as high as 35 per cent of the gross produce. The peasants are not secure on the land. The rent is increased from time to time according to this valuation of the land. The peasants must leave the land if they do not

agree to pay the increased rent. In the backward regions (Sindh, north-western frontier provinces and partly Punjab) the old village communities, as such, however, have long been disrupted. The village has lost its economic self-sufficiency. Through trade and usury capitalism dominates the economic life of the remotest village.

25. The peasantry is deeply in debt. The total agricultural indebtedness of the country is calculated at about 6,000,000,000 rupees. There are about 240 millions peasants (including women and children) in the country. The interest in this debt is not less than 12 per cent on an average. Often the usurer charges as much as 200 per cent. In this situation the majority of the peasantry is practically in debtors' prison. The per capita (including women and children) indebtedness of the peasantry is 25 rupees as against the annual income of 27 rupees. This is bankruptcy. After harvest practically the entire produce of the land and his labour is taken away from the peasant in rent, taxes and interests. He borrows further from the usurer mortgaging the next harvest and his whole life.

This heavy and chronic indebtedness influences agricultural production adversely. The purchasing power of the peasantry sinks lower and lower. In order to check the process British government has introduced the system of cooperative credit. This only brings the peasantry under a more advanced form of capitalist exploitation.

26. The peasantry is revolting against this unbearable condition. Ever since 1918, agrarian discontent has grown more and more widespread taking violent expressions from time to time. In 1921-22 the country was the scene of actual peasant uprising. Gandhi's promise to begin a "no-tax" campaign raised the nationalist movement immediately to an acutely revolutionary level. The peasant masses flocked under the nationalist banner. When they began to act, they were not only violently suppressed by imperialism, but were betrayed and denounced by the National Congress led by Gandhi.

Imperialist repression supported by the counter-revolutionary attitude of the nationalist bourgeoisie, however,

could not liquidate the growing discontent of the peasantry. Sporadic peasant revolts take place every day in some or other part of the country. The situation is so serious that imperialism is forced to introduce some measures of juridical reform which, however, does not affect the situation essentially.

27. The task of the national revolution is to solve the agrarian problem—the basic problem of the country under present conditions. The national revolutionary party must give concrete shape to the objective demands of the peasantry. Only by mobilising the revolutionary energy of the peasant masses can the national revolution be successful.

The radical solution of the agrarian problem—that is, rescue of the peasantry from the present economic bankruptcy—demands liquidation of the remnants of feudalism and nationalisation of land as pre-conditions. Fighting for the realisation of this goal the peasantry must put forward the following demands: a) reduction of land to 10 per cent of the net production; b) fixity of tenancy; c) abolition of feudal dues; and d) repudiation of the peasants indebtedness. These partial demands must lead up to the demand for the abolition of landlordism.

The proletariat acting through the Communist Party must lead the peasantry in the struggle for the realisation of these demands. The Communist Party must organise the peasant masses in peasants' unions which should become the organs of agrarian revolution. The peasants' unions must be united into a national organisation to guarantee concerted action. The peasants' union should enter the national revolutionary party as collective members. Individual members for the communist party should be recruited from the leading elements of the peasants and unions in ever-increasing numbers. Agrarian revolution can take place in India only as a step towards socialism; therefore it must be under communist proletarian leadership. The petty bourgeoisie will go to a certain point; it may or may not go to the end. Unless the leadership of the peasant movement be completely communist, it will be betrayed by the petty bourgeoisie in the revolutionary crisis.

VI. THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE NATIONAL REVOLUTION

28. The proletariat is the class, which under Indian conditions can alone solve the problems of the national revolution. Except under the influence of the proletariat, the petty bourgeoisie will not be able to carry on a revolutionary struggle against imperialism so necessary for the salvation of their own class from the present economic bankruptcy and political suppression. Left alone, they would fall victim to reactionary social ideology and would follow the bourgeoisie into the camp of counter-revolution. The basic problem of all problems, the agrarian question, cannot be solved by the bourgeoisie. They are against an agrarian revolution, because the Indian agrarian question cannot be solved within the framework of capitalism. The petty bourgeoisie independently cannot advocate an agrarian revolution because of their relation with a decaying form of landownership. They approach the agrarian question from a reactionary point of view (somewhat like the Russian socialist revolutionaries). They advocate resurrection of the village community system which has been long disrupted by capitalist penetration of village economy. Their programme of "village reconstruction" is utopian. The village is destroyed by capitalism. It cannot be constructed except as a part of socialist economy reared upon the ruins of the capitalist system. The slogans for the revival of village communities and village reconstruction are objectively, if not consciously counter-revolutionary because they defuse the class issues, obstruct the development of class struggle in the village. The peasantry themselves are too backward to be an independent political factor. They either follow the bourgeoisie when these latter struggle against feudalism for the establishment of capitalism; or become an ally of the proletarian leadership, agrarian discontent can sometimes be diverted in the channel of reformism thereby strengthening the position of capitalism. The present agrarian policy of British imperialism in India tends in this direction. The proletariat, being by its very nature divorced from all forms of

property, can alone lead the peasantry in the agrarian revolution.

Thus the relation of class forces places the proletariat in the forefront of the national revolution. The interests of the proletariat demands complete overthrow of imperialism, establishment of a revolutionary democratic state, relentless struggle against the compromising politics of bourgeois nationalism, revolutionary mobilisation of the petty bourgeois masses and agrarian revolution. The Indian national revolution can succeed only as an anti-capitalist movement; and anti-capitalist movement must be led by the proletariat. Reversely, because of the fact that the proletariat is the only class that can radically solve all the problems of the Indian national revolution, this is bound to outgrow the bounds of bourgeois revolution.

29. In order to accomplish this historic task the proletariat must operate through its own party. The Communist Party is an essential factor in the national revolution. It must act as a lever of the whole situation.

The first and foremost task of the Communist Party is to organise and train the proletariat to play its role in the national revolution. In spite of the fact that the Indian proletariat is objectively charged with a great political task, it is very young, politically immature and organisationally weak. Labour movement (trade unions) began in India hardly ten years ago. In this short time the proletariat have tasted the bitterness of class struggle. The strike-wave that swept the country in 1919-21, together with the simultaneous agrarian discontent, raised the nationalist movement immediately from impotent bourgeois reformism to the high level of revolutionary mass struggle which would have overthrown imperialist power had it not been sabotaged, misguided and finally betrayed by the petty bourgeoisie. Since then, in many a struggle the proletariat have learnt valuable lessons. The labour movement has been greatly freed from the domination of petty bourgeois nationalist politician. It is outgrowing the pernicious influence of the apostles of humanitarian social service and mutual help. Trade unions are becoming real proletarian

organisations—organs of class struggle. The proletariat will become more class conscious and ready for the revolutionary struggle only under the leadership of the Communist Party.

30. The trade unions are still weak. Only 25 per cent of the workers employed in large factories are organised. The millions and millions of transport workers, plantation coolies and handicraft workers are not yet organised. The 40 million of land proletariat are entirely untouched as yet. To assume the initiative for the organisation not only 5 millions industrial proletariat, but of the multitudes of land workers and handicraftsmen is the essential task of the Communist Party. While organising the unorganised masses, the Communist Party must penetrate the existing trade unions, develop their class character and capture the leadership.

In spite of the revolutionary spirit and fighting capacity of the proletarian masses (as demonstrated in many a big strike and lock-out) the trade unions are largely dominated by reformist theories. As a reaction to the domination of the labour movement by petty bourgeois nationalist politics, "economism" has gained considerable ground in the Indian labour movement. The theory is that the workers should leave politics alone and organise themselves to improve their economic conditions by collective bargaining and mutual help. This tendency is encouraged by imperialism, although the native bourgeoisie are generally hostile to trade unionism. Experienced in class struggle, imperialism knows that under proletarian influence the nationalist movement will become revolutionary; therefore it seeks to switch off the young trade unions into the blind-alley of reformism. In this imperialism receives the cooperation of the Indian liberal intellectual (objectively agents of the bourgeoisie) and of the reformist labour leaders of England.

The Communist Party must resolutely fight against all attempts to corrupt the Indian labour movement with reformism. The bourgeois liberal trade union leaders (Joshi, Chandrika Prasad, Chamanlal, Jhabwala, etc.) working under the influence of the "labour imperialism"

of the British Labour Party, should be exposed and denounced as agents of capitalism which they objectively are. The emissaries of British "Labour imperialism" coming to India to encourage and promote the growth of reformist labour organisations should be attacked and their sinister motive should be explained to the proletarian masses.

31. Even the disease of parliamentarism is penetrating the Indian labour movement. To tie the proletariat to parliamentarism in a country without parliamentary democracy, would be ridiculous, if it were not a conscious effort to misguide the young proletariat. Reformism in the labour movement is a by-product of capitalist prosperity. There is not much ground for reformists in India. The capitalist development of the country will be realised by exploiting the working class more intensely. If the standard of living of the Indian proletariat is allowed to rise. Industrialisation of India cannot be a means of the stabilisation of British capitalism. The economic conditions of the Indian proletariat cannot be improved unless imperialism is completely overthrown. Parliamentary institutions based upon an electorate embracing two per cent of the population cannot be the instrument which can be used even for legislation in favour of the working class. The present economic and political situation is antagonistic to the interests of the working class. This situation can be reformed only at the expense of the working class. Therefore, the task of the working class is not to find a *modus vivendi* in this situation, but to change it radically to make a revolution.

The Communist Party must explain this to the proletariat in popular literature, public meetings, trade union, clubs, etc. The proletariat can, however, be organised firmly and educated effectively only in actual struggle. The Communist Party must become the leader of the proletarian masses not only by explaining their historic role to them, by combating the reformist theories and by ideological propaganda, but also, and above all, by placing itself at the forefront of the class struggle, by fighting for the everyday demands of the proletariat.

32. In addition to the broad political issues of the national revolution such as overthrow of imperialism, revolutionary democratic state, agrarian revolution, nationalisation of mines, railways, heavy industries, etc., the labour movement must be developed in the struggle for the realisation of the following immediate demands: a) an eight-hour day; b) minimum wage; c) weekly payment of wages; d) defence of women and child labour; e) advanced social legislation; f) freedom of speech, press and association; g) right to strike. Demands for the protection of handicraft and land-workers should be added.

In the course of the struggle upon these partial demands it will be clear to the proletarian masses that even their elementary grievances cannot be remedied under the present political and economic situation. Thus, the elementary economic struggle of the working class will be developed into a political struggle, class-struggle will be the leaven of the nationalist struggle.

The Communist Party participates in the struggle for national freedom as the conscious vanguard of the proletariat. It must take active part in the development of the national revolutionary party of the proletariat, peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie. These forces of the national revolution are ready to be mobilised and led in the fight. The initiative can come and must come only from the proletariat.

VII. IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

33. The basic task of the Communist Party is to organise itself as the political organ of the proletariat closely connected and consciously supported by the toiling masses. The Communist Party will be able to discharge its leading role in the national revolution only when it has accomplished the basic task. The Communist Party will win the confidence of the masses, will become the actual leader of the working class by actively participating in and leading the daily economic struggle of the proletariat and peasantry. Trade unions (already in existence and those

to be organised) and peasant unions should be the principal domain of communist activities.

While admitting in its ranks de-classed intellectuals, the Communist Party must be the party of the proletariat, not only in name, but in reality. The majority of the membership must be workers and peasants. The leadership of the party should be proletarianised as much as possible under the present Indian conditions.

34. Ideological development of the leading cadre of the party is an essential necessity. The Communist Party of India must have a thoroughly Marxian leadership in order to resist the penetration of reactionary ideology in the working class. There cannot be a Communist Party without communist theory. Reformism is growing rapidly among the liberal intelligentsia of India. It will corrupt the working class and obstruct the revolution if it is not combated from the very beginning. The Communist Party must be able to face the native Gandhism and imported fabianism with scientific Marxism. While it will be tactically inadvisable to attack religion in the beginning, the Communist Party must carry on an ideological struggle against the reactionary theory about the "spirituality" of Indian culture. India is full of theories ideolising pre-capitalist feudal culture (Gandhism, Tagorism "back to the village", etc., etc.). To expose the counterrevolutionary significance of these theories is absolutely essential for quickening the class-consciousness of the proletariat and to further the cultural progress of the entire country.

The Communist Party must build up a party press. The production and circulation of propaganda literature containing Marxian examination of all the aspects of the local situation which must be increased. The party press must picture the daily life of the proletariat and peasantry and should express the voice of the working class.

35. The Communist Party must take a leading part in the growth of a national revolutionary party (the Workers and Peasants Party). It must bring the workers and peasant masses under the banner of national revolution. The political importance of the petty bourgeoisie must

not be underestimated, but the national revolutionary party should not be allowed to drift under petty bourgeois ideology and leadership. The national revolutionary party must be based upon militant action of the masses under proletarian hegemony. Mass agitation must be carried on throughout the country. Mass demonstrations, political strikes, peasant revolts should be organised to back up the programme of the national-revolutionary party and the partial action—an economic strike in a small industry or the peasant movement in the remotest village should be connected with the broad political issues—overthrow of imperialism and establishment of revolutionary democratic power. Parliamentary struggle between imperialism and the nationalist bourgeoisie should be utilised to develop mass agitation.

The immediate tasks of the Communist Party of India are: a) To organise itself as the party of the proletariat; b) to capture the leadership and win the confidence of the proletariat and peasant masses by active participation in their daily struggle; c) to enlarge the party numerically by recruiting members from the proletarian and peasant organisations.