

MY ARREST

It is interesting to note that I was first arrested in 1940 by the British Government. It is also pertinent to note that I was then sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment under the Indian Penal Code. It can as well be said that my active political life as a communist was initiated in that year by the grace of the colonial government.

Since then, I have been in and out of prison quite a number of times. The following will give an idea to the court as to how the succeeding governments have treated me as a hard-core "**criminal**".

- 1940 : Sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment for having published a booklet, "**Economic Effects of War**".
- 1941 : Re-arrested at the jail gates immediately after the above sentence was over and I was released from Tiruchirapalli jail. Detained under Defence of India Act.
- 1946 : Arrested by the Congress Government under what is known as Prakasam Ordinance and detained. Released in 1947.
- 1951 : Arrested and detained just before the first General Elections and after four years of underground life.
- 1955 : Arrested during mid-term elections for defiance of Section 144.
- 1962 : Arrested under Defence of India Rules.
- 1964 : Arrested in December and detained under Defence of India Rules.
- 1969 : Arrested in September under Preventive Detention Act. Released by the High Court on the 1st of December.
- 1969 : Arrested again on December 19th, at Madras, and chargesheeted under Section 121-A and other Sections of I.P.C.

The one feature of importance is that my arrest in 1940 and again in 1969 has been under the same Act-the Indian Penal Code promulgated in 1860.

What is the significance of this characteristic feature ?

As Marx had said in "**The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte**", *"An entire people which had imagined that by a revolution it had increased its Power of action, suddenly finds itself set back into a dead epoch and in order that no doubt as to the relapse may be possible, the old date again arise, the old names, the old edicts, which have long become a subject of antiquarian erudition, and the old henchmen, who had long seemed dead and decayed"*.

It is no wonder that, after 25 years of the so-called independence, I have been arrested under an Act promulgated in the year 1860 i.e., more than 100 years ago. How and why did it happen that the so-called "**non-violent**" revolution, led by the Indian National Congress, under direct management of a "Mahatma", and ruled under the unquestioned rule of his Protege, Jawaharlal Nehru, for more than 15 years, catapulted India not into a living epoch of progress, but into a dead epoch of stagnation, with all the old laws, henchmen, and old names? Whatever the outward changes in political control, nothing essential has changed either in our social set-up or in our economic organisation. The imperialist exploitation and violence in the rural areas has taken on a new intensity. Fundamentally, the administrative set-up with all its rules continues to be the same.

As Gunnar Myrdal has pointed out, the disintegration of the colonial power system and the emergence of independent national States does not automatically mean that any major socio-economic change has occurred in these ex-colonies. *"It should be remembered that economic and social conditions of South Asian countries today are not very different from those existing before disintegration of the colonial power system"* ("Asian Drama", Page 9.)

The Indian people, who had taken the anti-imperialist posture of the national leadership of the Indian bourgeoisie as genuine, were betrayed.

How and why did it happen ?

The Bourgeoisie and the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution:

For any Marxist, such a betrayal by the bourgeoisie is no surprise. As early as in 1905, Lenin had pointed out that the

bourgeoisie, in this epoch of imperialism and Proletarian Revolutions, cannot and will not fulfil the tasks of the completion of the Democratic Revolution.

He said : *"the Bourgeois Revolution is precisely an upheaval that most resolutely sweeps survivals of the past, survivals of the serf-owning system"*. But Lenin clearly pointed out that the *"bourgeoisie betrays its own self"* and that, *"the bourgeoisie is incapable of being consistently democratic"*.

"It is of greater advantage to the bourgeoisie for the necessary changes in the direction of Bourgeois Democracy to take place more slowly, more gradually, more cautiously, less resolutely, by means of reforms and not by means of a Revolution".

(*"Two Tactics of Social Democracy"*, Page 77)

Why is the Bourgeoisie afraid of Bourgeois Revolution? Why is it against clearing the ground of the survivals of the past? Why does the bourgeoisie want to spare the venerable institution of the serf-owning system as much as possible? Because the bourgeoisie is afraid that the peasantry and the workers might change the rifles from one shoulder to the other and march on further to the abolition of bourgeois property itself on the very ground of the serf-owning system.

Therefore, he had warned that the bourgeoisie will come to a **"wretched deal"** and that they are incapable of gaining a **"decisive"** victory, rather *"they do not even want a decisive victory."* *"They stand in too great a need of Tsarism, with its bureaucratic, police, and military forces for use against the proletariat, and the peasantry, to want it to be destroyed."* (Lenin, "Selected Works", Page 81) For this reason, *"the bourgeoisie will inevitably turn towards counter-revolution, towards the autocracy, against the revolution, and against the people as soon as its narrow, selfish interests are met, as soon as it recoils from consistent democracy."* (Page 115)

"That is why the bourgeoisie is incapable of carrying through the Democratic Revolution to its consummation." (Page 116)

This brilliant thesis of Lenin, of the bourgeoisie betraying itself has been so characteristically proved by the Indian bourgeoisie and its political arm, the Indian National Congress, that the Commander of its General Staff, the "**Mahatma**" and his associates proved themselves to be the greatest and surest friends of imperialism,

feudalism and the big bourgeoisie. It is no wonder that Gunnar Myrdal in his "Asian Drama" remarks that *"the British had good reason to be grateful for Gandhi's policy of non-violence"* (Page 143), since *"After independence the close relations with the former metropolitan countries were preserved and in some respects intensified."* (Page 125)

Indian Bourgeoisie's Despicable Betrayal :

How did this transfer of power take place between the colonial administration and the Indian bourgeoisie ? What were the factors that led to this *"peaceful transfer"*? What were the factors that led the British to be grateful to Gandhi and his associates? What is the significance of this transfer of power to the Indian people? These are some of the questions that will have to be gone into by us to understand the case in which I am involved.

The end of the Second World War, instead of mitigating the general crisis of Capitalism, intensified all its features at the end of the War. The smashing of Fascism, the historic role played by the Soviet Union under the leadership of Stalin in forcing defeat upon Fascism, and the impending victory of the advancing Chinese Revolution under the leadership of Mao Tse Tung and the Chinese Communist Party provided the decisive impulse which set in motion a movement of emancipation from colonial rule all over South Asia and beyond it into West Asia and Africa. The decline in power and prestige of the victorious imperialist states especially of Britain and France, and the rise of the proletarian state, the Soviet Union, as an international force to be reckoned with, immensely advanced the revolutionary potentialities of the liberation movements in all colonies.

It was under such a historical international set-up, that the post-Second World War situation witnessed a mounting mass upsurge of millions of people in India, militant demonstrations in protest against the trial of INA soldiers; the glorious revolt of the ranks of the Royal Indian Navy which forged the militant unity of all classes, castes, and communities; the open rumblings of revolt in the Army and the Air Force; all these revealed the growing maturity of the liberation movement in India. The proletariat was on its feet all over the country, and immense political strikes were the order of the day. The mass of the people in the Indian princely states were on the march, especially the peasants against feudal

exploitation. Thus, for the first time in India, the movement swept forward not only among the civilian population but also amongst the armed forces.

The British authorities were unnerved, and the Indian bourgeois leadership was flabbergasted. The twins met to disrupt and destroy the unity of the mass of people and the armed forces which was developing into an explosive force to sweep away the hundred year old imperialism and age old feudal serfdom. It was the signal of a new era in India. It revealed the disintegration of British authority at the very basis and in the machinery of its power. The Indian bourgeoisie fearful of the consequences of this unforeseen popular upheaval, hastened towards betrayal.

On 21st February, 1946, When the Indian soldiers refused to fire on the revolting Navy, British troops were called in and Admiral Godfrey broadcast his ultimatum that the *"overwhelming forces at the disposal of the Government will be used to the utmost. even if it means destruction of the Navy."* Vallabhai Patel, the strong man of the Congress, denounced the Naval ratings and endorsed the remarks of the Commander-in-Chief that there *"ought to be discipline in the Navy"*. Maulana Azad, the Congress President during this period of the final betrayal of the liberation struggle, declared that, *"strikes, hartals and defiance of authority of the day are out of place."* And Mahatma Gandhi struck the last nail when he condemned the Hindu-Muslim unity of this great uprising and the universal militant support of the masses as an *"unholy alliance."* *"That would have delivered India over to the rabble. I would not want to live up to 125 years to witness that consummation. I would rather perish in the flames."* A revealing statement indeed, betraying the fear of the upper classes of the growing revolutionary actions of various sections of the masses.

It is clear that the bourgeoisie did not want a decisive victory against imperialism. It is also clear that the bourgeoisie is incapable of carrying through the Democratic, anti-imperialist Revolution to its consummation. They are in too great a need of bureaucratic administration, its police and military forces built up by British imperialism in the course of its rule of 100 years and more, for use against the **"rabble"** - the proletariat and the peasantry. They certainly did not want this machine to be destroyed.

Thus the ball of despicable compromise with imperialism was set in motion. The final betrayal was the order of the day.

In the same manner that the Indian bourgeoisie was afraid of the revolutionary forces, so was imperialism afraid of its total extinction. Imperialism understood that it cannot control the Indian situation by force. According to Lt. General Sir France Taker the G.O.C., Eastern Command in India at the time, war-weary Britain, financially broken, could not stand the increase of substantial British forces in India to enforce British authority in a country aflame with revolt. He writes: *"ultimately we found that this garrison commitment was more than the industrial needs our impoverished country could stand. That was another strong reason for our leaving India and leaving it quickly"*. (*"While Memory Serves"*, Page 518). Sir Stafford Cripps, one of the main architects of the compromise for transfer of power told the British Parliament that to hold India, *"an expanded personnel in the Secretary of State's Services and a considerable reinforcement of British troops would have been required"*. *"I did not have any hesitation to reject"* this alternative, he added.

Therefore, the British Government felt the need for compromise, to relinquish its political hold in the area—thereby enabling Britain to preserve intact all its financial, industrial, and commercial positions in India.

Thus, both the Indian bourgeoisie and the British colonial power were anxious, for a compromise so that India could be **"saved"** from being delivered to the **"rabble"**.

Compromise and Transfer of Power :

Thus, in the immediate post-Second World War period, the British authorities finding themselves already weak in the changed correlation of forces in the international arena and facing an unforeseen revolutionary upsurge of all classes of the people in India, were showing eagerness to compromise with the Indian bourgeoisie. In the summer of 1945, an official Industrial Mission, headed by the top persons of Indian Industry, Mr. G.D. Birla and Mr. J.R.D. Tata, visited the U.K. and the U.S.A. to probe the atmosphere for compromise. It was the time when the Congress leaders were set free from the jails, and events moved swiftly. The Industrial Mission *"opened a new chapter of Indo-British Co-operation for the Mission found a definite change in the attitude of British Industries towards Indian Industrial Development and large British Industrialists were not merely reconciled themselves*

to the inevitability of industrialisation of India, but in many cases seemed to be in accord with India's political aspirations".

(Eastern Economist - June 29, 1945)

This green signal for compromise hastened the pace of events. The British Cabinet decided to transfer power. The Cabinet Mission arrived in Delhi. Soon Pandit Nehru headed an interim Government at the Centre. By August 15, 1947, transfer of power was announced. Lord Mountbatten as the First Governor-General of free India and Jawaharlal Nehru as the first Prime Minister under the 1935 Constitution of India proclaimed Indian independence.

Thus independence was proclaimed. The Union Jack was hauled down. The tri-colour was hoisted. *"At least the bride was brought home, but only after she had become a prostitute"*. The national leaders *"sought to cheat destiny by constitutional cunning"*. (Karl Marx, *"The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte."*)

Thus Indian independence was achieved peacefully and constitutionally, without a war of independence, without the need for an army of national liberation. The result was that, on August 15, 1947, the British Government transferred power in an orderly and cordial manner, bequeathing all its Indian institutions, organisations, and services to the new Indian Government.

(1) India thus became heir to the territorial integrity which was the outcome of the historical inter-play of Imperial policies and rivalries in the colonial era. As early as in 1921, the All India Congress Committee had passed a resolution reassuring the neighbouring countries that the Indian people would not recognise the nefarious deals of the colonial power, by declaring that the people of India regard most treaties entered into by the Imperial Government with the neighbouring States as mainly designed to perpetuate the exploitation of India by the Imperial power, and would, therefore, urge the States, having no ill will against the people of India and no desire to injure her interests to refrain from entering into any Treaty with the Imperial Power.

(*"Asian Drama"* Page 181)

But, with the transfer of power, the above solemn resolution by the ruling party which came to power was given the go-by. The newly independent India decided to maintain the status quo with

regard to territorial inheritances, and with regard to the buffer State policies that the British had applied to the small kingdoms bordering the Himalayas. The Government of India never doubted the wisdom of the policy of maintaining control which the British had established over the States of Bhutan and Sikkim. Consequently, the relations between the border States and India spilled tension. The results of the strong stand of the Government of India in relation to the borders in the North-West and North-East, its persistence in maintaining the borders of Imperialist Legacy, "**map or no map**" (Nehru, on November 20, 1950, in the Indian Parliament), and the "**forward policy**" it adopted, are too well known to be recounted here again. That the Government of India inherited Imperialist policies, along with the transfer of power, as its own policies to the detriment of Indian interests is clear by experience.

(2) The Indian Government inherited the military system from the British. "The Indian Army was part and parcel of the imperial Forces. *The British Indian Army had been kept aloof from politics and had been raised primarily to fulfil an imperial role Officers were carefully screened for their loyalty ... some, of course, were beneficiaries under the British rule and had a vested interest in maintaining it. Most of the officers had imbibed western ideas, culture, dress and social habits.*" (Brigadier J.P. Dalvi, "Himalayan Blunder", Page 345). They were also concerned with the law and order situation in India - a vital matter for colonial rulers.

Thus the Indian Army was developed as a mercenary army in the interests of the Imperialist power, completely cut off from the mainstream of the people, without national aims, and purposefully kept aloof from the political environment. It was such an army as this that the Indian Government received as a legacy from the British. Along with its anti-national legacy, the Indian Army continued to be under the supreme command of the British Commander-in-Chief, General Boucher for two years after August 15, 1947. Our Defence Services Education continued to be in the hands of the Imperialists, as was the case at the Defence Services Staff College at Wellington where, in October 1950 "*the Commandant, General W.D.A. Lontaigne, strode into the main lecture hall, interrupted the lecturer and proceeded to denounce our leaders for their short sightedness and inaction in the face of Chinese Action*", "*soon after the news of Chinese entry into Tibet.*"

(Brigadier J.P. Dalvi, "Himalayan Blunder", Page. 28)

Thus it was that the transfer of power was an insulting compromise between the Indian bourgeoisie and the Imperialists to safeguard India for their joint and agreed exploitations.

Just as 'independent' India inherited the mercenary army, created and developed for its own imperial purposes by Britain, so also the new India inherited "*the efficient instrument of power which the British had devised for ruling the country*". The new State took over the whole structure of the administration from the Village Official to the top-most Secretary in the Government of India almost intact. Thus feudal power in the countryside was adopted by 'independent' India. "*Naturally Civil Servants in India, as in Britain, have exerted political influence, individually and as part of Government alike. But, for the most part, this has been, again as in Britain, a regulating and stabilising influence that has worked against radical departures from the status quo-in other words a conservative force.*" ("Asian Drama" Page 263)

Jawaharlal Nehru, long before he became Prime Minister, had told the people of this country that "*of one thing I am quite sure, that no new order can be built in India so long as the spirit of the I.C.S. (Indian Civil Service) pervades our administration and our public services. Therefore, it seems to me quite essential that the ICS and similar Services must disappear completely before we can start real work on a new order. It is inconceivable that they will get the absurdly high salaries and allowances that are paid to them today*" ("An Autobiography", Nehru, Page 445). The Great Mahatma, writing to the Viceroy Lord Irwin in 1930, had remarked that a system that provides such monumental salary - "*what is true of Vice-regal salary is true, generally of the whole administration*" - "*deserves to be summarily scrapped.*" ("History of the Congress" by Pattabhi Seetharamaiah, Page 634). Did this system "*disappear completely*" as Jawaharlal Nehru "*wished*", or was it "*summarily scrapped*" as non-violent Mahatma politely called for. No. The betrayal of the National Revolution by the bourgeois leadership not only retained this administrative system but also its salary differentials between the higher and lower levels. Even the administrative habits and procedures - from May & S Parliamentary procedure to the secret files on the lower staff of the administration, introduced and evolved by the colonial administration to preserve law and order, - continue to rule even to this day.

How beautifully Marx, in his "Germany; Revolution and Counter

Revolution", portrayed the characteristic actions of the betrayers of the revolution ! He says : "A Ministry of Opposition Leaders of the United Diet was to be formed, and in return for its services to save the crown, it was to have the support of all the props of the old Government, the feudal aristocracy, the bureaucracy, and the Army ... They made use of the whole of the old State machinery for the purpose of restoring "order." Not a single bureaucrat or military officer was dismissed; not the slightest change was made in the old bureaucratic system of administration There was nothing altered in Prussia but the persons of the Ministers; even the ministerial staff in different departments were not touched upon." We can see that such was the case also in India after the transfer of power. As a matter of fact, the same British Governor-General continued, the same British Commander-in-Chief was the head of the armed forces, the same Secretariat and heads of departments as in the case of British were functioning, with all the glory and power.

Similar treason against its best allies - the peasantry, the working class, and the middle class, - was never committed in history.

Deal with Feudalism : The Princes

In the face of the unprecedented people's upsurge in the Indian princely States against the feudal order, the Indian bourgeoisie quickened its pace of compromise with the Indian princes to save them from the people's wrath. By 1950, most of the former princely territories had been integrated without serious prejudice to the existing social and economic privileges of the princes. As Myrdal in his "Asian Drama" succinctly puts it, "diplomacy, cajolery, and legalised bribery" were used to prejudice the Indian princes to join the Indian Union, with generous financial settlements, like emoluments through privy purses, exemption from innumerable taxes, with the retention of their titles, and many other privileges-all in contradiction to the spirit of the democratic revolution. Added to all these privileges the Government of India found lucrative assignments to quite a number of these princes in diplomatic service, Governorship of the States, membership of the delegation to United Nations etc. A considerate treatment of these relics of feudal power and privilege in the interests of maintaining stability and status quo is the fundamental synthesis of compromise with imperialism and accession to power.

The abolition of the zamindari system was another farce played on the people of India. With millions of acres of land left as personal property of the zamindars (and princes), having allotted to them huge palaces and forts as their individual property, the Government of India paid hundreds of crores of rupees as compensation for the abolition of the zamindari system. No precise estimates of the amount of compensation paid to the zamindars is available. One reckoning puts it at Rs. 670 crores. No fundamental change was ever intended in the social and economic relations by the farce of the abolition of the zamindari system. Jawaharlal Nehru, as early as in April 1948, had declared, in the Constituent Assembly his opposition to any fundamental change. He had stated in the Constituent Assembly that "one has to be careful of the steps one takes so as not to injure the existing structure too much - I am not brave and gallant enough to go about destroying any more." This fundamental declaration by the first Prime Minister of our country is a clear expression of the deal which the bourgeoisie and its representatives had arrived at, with Imperialism and Feudalism.

Nefarious Deal with Foreign Capital :

The Government, in the course of its decisions in the Constituent Assembly decided to remain within the 'Commonwealth', thereby giving a go-by to the famous resolution "PURNASWARAJ" passed at the Lahore Congress. The fears of foreign capital of its total extinction were laid at rest. On February 17, 1948, Prime Minister Nehru declared *there will not be any sudden change in the economic structure. As far as possible there will be no nationalisation of the existing industries.* Again, in concrete terms, it is a promise made to foreign finance capital and its then representative, the British Government, that the Indian bourgeoisie are prepared to collaborate with them in the exploitation of the Indian people for super profits.

On April 6, 1948, the Government's resolution on economic policy was published to further clear the apprehension of foreign financial interests. The resolution laid down that, except for munitions, railways, electricity, and atomic energy, "the rest of the industrial field will normally be open to private enterprise." - that is in favour of existing monopolies, including the imperialist finance capital. As a further clarification of the Government's policy and to clear whatever lurking fears the imperialist capital

might have, the explanatory Memorandum published along with the Resolution on Economic Policy, categorically states : *"the Resolution contemplates full freedom for foreign capital and enterprise in Indian Industry while at the same time assuring that it should be regulated in the National interest."* This part of the Resolution reveals the Indian Government's recognition of the need for foreign aid both in management and technical training and investment, and of the wisdom of welcoming foreign capital and skill to supplement Indian enterprise.

"Full freedom for foreign capital and enterprise in Indian Industry" became the declared policy of the Government of India headed by the most respected progressive, 'socialist' Nehru, - *'the jewel of India'*.

I do hope the Court can now clearly see as to why and how in the year 1971, I have been brought to this court charged under an Act, promulgated in 1860 by the then colonial government. It is clear that nothing has changed except certain forms of management of this society in the interests of imperialist capital, collaborating Indian bourgeoisie and feudal land lords. The content has remained the same even though certain forms of management have changed.

Thus the characteristic feature of the new government in the name of independent India was continuity of the old regime, of the old social and economic order, the same administrative machinery of Imperialism, the same bureaucracy, judiciary and the police. What wonder then that I am in this court charged under the very sections which the imperialists had used in the past to suppress the Revolutionary National Liberation movements in India.

Jawaharlal Nehru, about 14 years prior to his becoming the Prime Minister of India had told the country that *if any indigenous Govt. took the place of the foreign Govt. and kept all the vested interests intact this would not even be the shadow of freedom*".

("Whither India", 1933)

But deceptive progressive talk and conservative, reactionary practice, has been and is the policy of the bourgeoisie. The final culmination of this conspiracy of betrayal in the early post-'independence' period was the formation of the Constituent Assembly and the Constitution passed by it. The Constitution of

India is the epitome of the total betrayal of the people of India.

The Constituent Assembly and the Constitution of India :

The history of the Constituent Assembly is the history of the grand betrayal of the anti-imperialist, and anti-feudal aspirations of the people of our country. The very manner in which the Constituent Assembly took shape was incongruous and anachronistic. The members were elected to the Constituent Assembly on the basis of the Government of India Act 1935, which excluded 90% of the workers and peasants from voting right. Even the limited electorate did not directly elect all the members of the Constituent Assembly. The elected members of the State Assemblies formed themselves into an electoral college and elected certain members from their states. A few of the members of the Constituent Assembly were even nominated. Thus the Constituent Assembly did not have a single characteristic of a Constituent Assembly of a *FREE PEOPLE*.

As Marx had said of the German Diet in 1852, it was the *"bastered child"* brought to light by the incestuous intercourse with the old colonial constitution; and *"long since had sacrificed its virginity"* and young as it looked *"it was already turning grey hair and experienced in all the artifices of prating and pseudo diplomatic prostitution"*. It was an Assembly of liberal attorneys, and doctrinaire professors of British education and culture. It presented as the very essence of Indian intellect dominated by patriotism. In reality, it was nothing but a stage in which old and chicken-hearted political characters exhibited their impotence of thought as well as of action. After two years of debates and deliberations, which were not of even any theoretical value this great Assembly of incompetence produced the lengthiest constitution in the world, *"strikingly similar to the 1935 Constitution"*.

("Asian Drama", Page 266)

Is it any wonder that this so-called constitution of independent India is strikingly similar to the 1935 Constitution? When the ruling class had decided to maintain the *status-quo* in the economic and social conditions of the country, without any sudden change in the economic structure, without taking any step which would injure the existing structure - there could not be any fundamentally new constitution other than the one that was

already in existence. The mass of the people were deceived by the ruling class and its agents into believing that this Constitution is sacrosanct. But the bourgeoisie knows what it is adopting as the Constitution of India.

Alladi Krishnaswamy Ayyar, who was one of the architects of the Constitution proclaimed in the Constituent Assembly that *"we are not starting a Constitution anew after a revolution. The existing administrative structure which has been worked so long cannot be altogether ignored in the new frame work"*. (quoted in *"Indian Economy Since Independence"* by H. Venkatasubbaiah Page 29). The framers of the Constitution were clear in their minds that when the existing social, economic and administrative structure continues to function as in the past, a new Constitution, altogether, new from the existing one, is an impossibility. But to deceive the people, certain Directive Principles of State Policy were added to the Constitution, *"on the plea that they give expression to the Leftist conviction of the People"*, and because it was thought to be *"desirable to add these revolutionary desiderate to some thing which otherwise so much resembled the instrument of the defunct British Raj"*. (H. Venkatasubbaiah : *"Indian Economy Since Independence"*, Page 29)

Thus the Constitution was nothing but a superstructure built on the ready made foundation carefully and laboriously laid by imperialism. The Constitution was meant to legalise the existing legal and administrative net work with all its Acts and Rules; it was meant to strengthen the existing social and economic order. Thus the Constitution finalised the betrayal of the Indian people by the bourgeoisie, represented by the so called national leadership. With the enactment of the Constitution, the Indian bourgeoisie finally took over power in India to rule without serious prejudice to its structural integrity, constituted as it was at that time.

The dangers of growing contradictions, inherent in such a situation, leading to social revolution is foreseen by some of the intelligent architects of the Constitution. Rajendra Prasad, as President of the Constituent Assembly declared just before the adoption of the Constitution : *"Our constitution has provisions in it which appear to some to be objectionable from one point or another. We must admit that the defects are inherent in the situation in the country and the people at large"*.

What was it that was inherent in the situation and where would it lead to ? Ambedkar who piloted the Constitution as Chairman of the Drafting Committee was a little more explicit in his reply to the debate in the third reading of the new Constitution in the Constituent Assembly of India on 25th November, 1949. He said, *"On 26th January 1950 we are going to enter into a life of contradictions. In politics we will have equality, and in economic life we will have inequality. In politics we will be recognising the principle of one man one vote and one vote one value. In our social and economic life we shall, by reason of our social and economic structure, continue to deny the principle of one man and one value We must remove this contradiction at the earliest possible moment or else those who suffer with inequality will blow up the structure of political democracy which this Assembly has so laboriously built up."*

Thus the Constitution was a bundle of contradictions existing in the social set up of the day. The Constitution was intended to perpetuate the existing social and economic foundation of imperialist exploitation and feudal land-lordism. The Directive Principles of the Constitution were nothing but a sop, being : *"prompted by the fear of the power of the masses for revolt"*.

(H. Venkata Subbaiah : *"Indian Economy Since Independence"*)

The spectre of violent upheaval haunted the law makers, who adopted the policy of promises to the people through what are known as Directive Principles without sanctions and of concrete pledges with powers to implement, to safeguard all kinds of exploitation, including the perpetual grand loot of Imperialism and Feudalism.

Conclusion :

Thus we see that, at the height of the Indian peoples' movement for national liberation, the British colonialists reached a compromise with the big bourgeoisie and the big land-lords and turned over their rule to the latter two with the secret understanding that they basically kept the economic interests of the British Colonialists intact.

Consequently in the course of my Statement the Court will find that foreign investments have not only been safeguarded but have been allowed to grow with stupendous speed.

Even though certain privileges of feudal princes and

zamindars have been abolished, the feudal land system and in its wake feudal class and caste relations have not only been preserved as a whole but in some respects have been strengthened.

Added to this there has been increasing dependence of the Government on the foreign aid. Economic independence has become a mirage, even after 25 years of proclamation of independence.

India is a Semi-colonial and Semi-Feudal country even today, with the result that in the words of Gunnar Myrdal *"the action in this drama is speeding towards a climax " "tension is mounting, economically, socially and politically". "No one who listens to the public proclamations, reads papers, talks to people of various walks of life, watches the moves and counter moves in private and public affairs, compares pretensions with reality and declared aspirations with achievements, appraises the efforts and fulfilments, contemplates the extraordinary disparities present in almost everything that meets the eye, can fail to sense a fateful constellation of explosive potentialities for extremely rapid change and stubbornly formidable external difficulties and internal obstacles and inhibitions to change".*

("Asian Drama" : Page 34 and 35)

This tension today is at its height. The result is that Indian authority as represented by those in-charge of law & order, is more trigger happy in independent India than it was in British ruled India.

In the circumstance it is my duty to explain to the Court as to why I consider that the Indian National Liberation Struggle has not concluded and that we, representing the National Liberation Struggle today believe that it is the duty of the Indian people to continue the struggle with stead-fastness and vigour.

As Comrade Mao Tse Tung had declared *"the bourgeois democratic revolution can be considered to have achieved success only when the foreign imperialist forces and the domestic feudal forces have been in the main overthrown and an independent democratic state established."*

"This democratic revolution aims at establishing a social system..... a society of democracy; this society will have been preceded by a feudal society (which was semi-colonial, semi-feudal society for the last 100 years), and its successor will be a socialist society".

("May 4th Movement")