

G. ADHIKARI
PAKISTAN
AND
INDIAN
NATIONAL
UNITY

PUBLISHED BY LABOUR MONTHLY



Labour Monthly

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

Founded 1921

Sixpence

Occupies a premier position amongst political periodicals. Its treatment of political issues and its factual studies of economic and industrial matters have given it a unique authority amongst serious-minded men and women interested in the final defeat of Fascism and the advance of progressive causes. *Labour Monthly* also publishes pamphlets on specific subjects within the scope of its general purpose.

G. ADHIKARI

**PAKISTAN
AND
INDIAN NATIONAL
UNITY**

with a Forward by
BEN BRAWLEY

FOREWORD

Comrade G. M. Adhikari, whose speech is here reprinted in pamphlet form, is one of the outstanding Communist leaders in India. As a student in the early twenties he came to Europe. He became a Doctor of Science of Berlin University, and it was in Berlin that he first linked up with the Communist Party. He returned to India at the end of 1928, immediately took part in activity, and within a few months he was arrested in connection with the Meerut Conspiracy case on March 20th, 1929. He spent approximately 4½ years in prison in connection with this. On his release he immediately threw himself into the Party work again. He was interned in 1934, escaped from internment and worked underground continuously until the ban on the Communist Party of India was raised in June last year.

The Communist Party held a very important meeting in September 1942. It was the enlarged plenum of the Central Committee. All leading Communists, with the exception of those still in prison, were present—representatives from all the provinces. Its capable Marxist analysis of the questions with which it was confronted, and the lead it gave to the Nationalist movement and the Peasant and working-class movements of India, indicate that the Communist Party of India now ranks as an extremely important factor in the politics of India and in the world to-day. Comrade Adhikari introduced the Resolution on Pakistan and National Unity. The full text of his speech is given here, and the resolution is appended at the end. His statement presents a very important new approach to the question of Nationalities in India. We believe that this document will stand as a classic on the National question, and that it merits very careful attention and consideration.

It is essential for a clear understanding of the present situation and for India's future fully to grasp the fact that it is not a question of religion but of nationality. The slogan of "Pakistan" is used by Mr. Jinnah to mislead the Moslem masses who strive for freedom. Our Party in India refuses to pander to the reactionary Pan-Islamic sentiments or to the other extreme Hindu domination.

As the document shows, they fight to win the whole National Movement to support a policy for a completely free and democratic India, with guarantees that no oppression of one nationality by another shall take place.

The acceptance of the policy put forward here—the right of self-determination of each nationality as unconditional—would in fact create the conditions which would make irresistible the demands for a completely independent India.

It is a real contribution to Indian political thought and shows that the Indian National Movement has developed through stages, and corresponding to these stages, the nature of the problem and the nature of the approach to it.

It is useful also in this country, where it is still important to make the exposure of all methods of divide and rule, of playing on differences between the Indian people for the benefit of alien rule.

In the report Comrade Adhikari cites an interesting quotation from Stalin in

1912, when he made specific reference to India: "In the case of India too it will probably be found that innumerable nationalities, till then lying dormant, would come to life with the further course of bourgeois development." This is an amazing example of Marxist understanding being able to foretell the nature of future developments.

BEN BRADLEY.

Pakistan and Indian National Unity

The question of national unity, of Hindu-Muslim unity, has always been before our country, and therefore only if we see its evolution side by side with that of our national movement, can we understand it properly in its present phase. The question itself has gone through different phases of development alongside with the different phases through which our national movement itself has gone. However, only such a historical dynamic treatment of the problem can enable us to understand its significance to-day, in to-day's phase of our national movement. Old ways of looking at the problem, old solutions, still persist in our understanding, and quite naturally so. These tendencies, these outmoded ways of thinking, which really form the deviations of to-day, have to be brought out and nailed down sharply not only in terms of principles, but also in terms of historical evolution, otherwise they cannot be rooted out. Comrades raise several doubts, several questions. Where do these arise from? From nowhere else except our own former approach to the problem before the outbreak of the war. That is why a historical-political review is necessary, a review of how the question of Hindu-Muslim unity is developed through the three different phases of our national movement. Only in this way can we understand the significance of Pakistan and of the demand for the self-determination of nationalities, only in this way can we understand exactly why these demands have arisen *now at this time* and not before.

If we look back and examine the evolution of the problem, we find three distinct approaches to the problem in three distinct periods, each one corresponding to a particular phase of our national movement.

In the first and earliest period, it was the fundamental axiom of the national movement (which was itself in its earliest period) that India is one nation; the difference between the Hindus and the Muslims is only one of religion; the stronger the national urge among the masses of both religions grows, the sooner this difference will go off and Hindus and Muslims will grow together as one. At this period, propaganda for unity on the basis of nationalism against imperialism was considered an adequate solution of the problem. Such propaganda was carried on by the Liberals in the earliest period of the national movement and the Liberals at that period were the leaders of the incipient national movement. The Liberals, who were the earliest nationalists, just argued: "What is needed to solve the problem is nationalist consciousness." This period lasted till about 1921, when it reached its culmination in the Khilafat-Congress unity.

The second period lasts from 1921 up to about 1930. In this period, with the further development of the nationalist movement, comes a further development of the problem of Hindu-Muslim unity too, side by side with the former, in fact as an integral part of the former. In this period, the nationalist bourgeoisie grows, gets consolidated as leaders of the nationalist movement. Alongside with this growth, we find clashes and conflicts between the bourgeoisie of the two sections;

arising side by side with this, as the other side of the very same process, the class movements of the workers and Kisans* grow up. Thus we have two simultaneous aspects: one, clashes and conflicts among the vested interests; the other, growing unity among the rising movement of the Kisans and the working class. The problem of Hindu-Muslim unity was, therefore, posed in this period thus: "The whole conflict between the two sections is confined to the bourgeoisie and the vested interests; the masses of either section have nothing to do with this conflict. Unite the masses of both sections on economic issues, on common struggles for economic demands, and the problem will be solved."

The third period begins from 1937, from the time of the Congress Ministries. This is the period of the developing offensive of Fascism on a world scale. On a world scale, the question of forging national unity for fighting against Fascism begins to come to the forefront, the problem of Hindu-Muslim unity comes on the agenda. On the other hand, with the sharpening of the war-crisis, the question of *power* comes to the forefront. It is this, the rapid sharpening of the war crisis and of the crisis of imperialism, which makes the Hindu-Muslim problem assume a new form. At this time, the demand of the day becomes no more one of constitutional concessions, no more one of communal versus joint electorates, but one of *power*. The war-crisis poses sharply before the Indian people the problem of *winning power*. It is at this time that the Muslim League comes out with its demand for a separate state or states for Muslims. This is the new form in which the Hindu-Muslim question appears now, the demand of the Muslims for their own state. The agitation of the Muslims as "oppressed communities" is brought more and more into political controversies. The outbreak of war brings the problem of unity of the Indian nation for winning power, urgently on the agenda, simultaneously develops the controversy of "Pakistan versus the independence of India."

It is when we see the problem in such a historical-political perspective that we are able to distinguish three approaches to the problem and three corresponding aspects of it. Thus, only can we see how each of three approaches arises from, and fits, a particular phase of development of our national movement. We are able to see the new development of the present period and the corresponding necessity for the proletariat to make a new approach to the problem to suit this particular development.

Let us now take each of these periods separately and in detail.

THE FIRST PERIOD

The first period is the one in which our national movement is at the lowest phase of its development. The upper layers of the "intellectuals" and the professional middle-class are alone in the movement and are its leaders. These Liberal intellectuals, who have drunk deep at the fountain of Victorian Liberalism, see in Britain an example for India to emulate. For them the ideal

* The Kisans are the peasantry of India; the Kisan Sabhas are the peasant leagues.

becomes: "India is to unite and be a nation like England." They don't see the specific difference between England and India; they don't see the different features that characterise Indian development. Their propaganda is for social reform, in order to convince people that religion is an irrelevant issue. The whole problem is looked upon as one of chucking out religion from politics. "Religion does not bother the British people, why should it bother us?" this is how they argue. This is how the problem is seen by the narrow politics of the Liberals of those days, who want to transplant British traits and British institutions on to Indian soil and who see in this their highest ideal.

As the nationalist movement develops, two things emerge. The one is the rising imperialist challenge which says: "India is not even one nation, how can she govern herself?" As against this, as an answer to this insolent challenge, the new nationalist movement of 1906-18 asserts that India is a nation, and therefore *can* govern herself. This assertion became the banner of the rising nationalist movement at this period. "We are a nation exactly as much as England is," so declares the nationalist of this period. The demands of the movement at this period, correspondingly, are for the same parliamentary democratic institutions that Britain has, because "India is a nation as much as Britain is." The basis of the national movement at that time, as opposed to the imperialist challenge, is the assertion that India is a nation.

In this period, together with the nationalist movement, grow up also certain prejudices, arising from the characteristic features of this very movement. It is these prejudices which, carried over into the further period, act as a hindrance to the development of national unity. What are these prejudices? The national movement at that time was dominantly Hindu in colour, it was led by the Hindu petty-bourgeoisie. The nationalism of that period, therefore, expresses itself in the garb of Hindu ideology. The idea that India is one nation becomes inextricably interwoven with ideas depicting the one-ness of India in Hindu religious terminology. Born thus, this religious terminology and these associations remain in popular consciousness long after that stage is passed. The dominance of Hindu leadership left a special Hindu cultural impress upon the nationalist movement. The idea that India is one became connected with the idea that the cultural unity of India is a *Hindu cultural unity* - an association that becomes a great drag and hindrance later on.

THE SECOND PERIOD

In 1920-21, the industrial bourgeoisie, burst out of the war and the war exigencies of British imperialism begins to come to the forefront of the nationalist movement. The question of Hindu-Muslim unity, which was till then purely one of joining together for "petitioning" the British Government (the Lucknow Pact of 1916), appears in the new form. The Hindu and Muslim masses are stirred up by the post-war upsurge. It was a time when the Muslim masses were rising up. The Muslim countries of the Middle East were rising against British imperialism, the dismemberment of the old Turkish Empire by British imperialism stirs up

Muslims throughout the world. The Khilafat movement was a reflection of this upsurge of the Muslim nationalities in the East. The Khilafat movement and the rising nationalist wave in India join hands. Both the sections—Hindus and Muslims—unite for struggle against British imperialism. But even in this struggle, the issues are not yet clarified and sharpened. Though the struggle is a mass struggle, the basis of the demands is yet liberal; it is only the form that is revolutionary. The whole question of unity is posed as unity on the basis of nationalism, of asserting national freedom, against British imperialism, the whole thing is yet restricted to the middle classes. The issues have not yet gone down to the masses, to the extent that the demands are not actually their demands. On the part of the Muslim masses, their participation in the struggle was to a large extent due to the religious pull. It was not the concrete democratic demands of the masses that united them in the struggle, but the demands of the leaders which for the time being were joined against Britain. It was the pure top agreement between the Khilafat and the Swarajists, based on the demands of the top leaderships. The unity thus achieved therefore collapsed as soon as the struggle collapsed. As soon as the Chelmsford Reforms came, the unity collapsed.

The collapse of this unity marks a definite watershed demarcating the period before from the one after. From this time on, we see on the one hand the slow, though thwarted and distorted, development of the industrial bourgeoisie, its conflict with imperialism and the conflict within its own ranks amongst its own different sections; on the other hand, the rising working-class movement, through which the Hindu and Muslim masses get united together.

Such are the dual characteristics of the period now opening—growing conflict between two sections of the bourgeoisie and between the bourgeoisie as a whole and imperialism, on the one hand, and the growing working-class and peasant movement on the other. This latter welds the masses together and class unity grows.

Under the impact of the characteristics of the period, the communal problem is looked upon as a *mere middle-class problem of conflict between the two bourgeoisies*. “Only the workers can come together in common struggle. And the basis of this common struggle can only be economic.”—So runs the argument. The communal problem is sought to be solved through the economic end. The defect of this viewpoint is not that it is completely wrong, but it represents only a partial aspect of the matter—that the solution to the problem of the conflict of the bourgeoisie is to be found in the coming together of the masses of the proletarians and the semi-proletarians. This class explanation is put in a vulgar economic way—that the problem is merely one of middle-class rivalry and the solution to it is common economic struggles of the masses. It is this outlook which made the Congress Socialist Party put forward its “practical” solution of the communal problem —“Give cultural rights to the Muslims”—a “practical” solution which was the same as the “practical” policy of the dominant section of the bourgeoisie itself.

During this second period, we find that as the strength of the national movement grows, the need of imperialism to split it, to disrupt it, grows greater. This is the period between the smash-up of the first Civil Disobedience movement and of the second, the period of the offensive of imperialism between the years (roughly) 1924-32. This is the phase of the so-called “communal riots,” a phase when a particular technique is used by imperialism to disrupt the national and working-class movements.

There had been communal riots prior to 1900, but the character of these riots was different. Then there was all the frenzy of mass pogroms. In the 1924-34 period, however, there is much less of communal frenzy and more of paid goondashahi (hooliganism). The new riots clearly bear the hallmark of the disruptive technique of imperialism. It shows that the Muslim masses are no more urged by religious frenzy as of old, but deliberate provocation by paid goondas (hooligans) has to be used.

We will jump over the period of the second Civil Disobedience movement. The conflict between the Congress and the Muslim League was not great. The League stood at best partly neutral. New sections of radical masses were in the movement, and the League did not make any attempt actively to oppose it.

After the collapse of the movement comes a new upsurge of the working-class and Kisan movement. This new upsurge is the link which brings us to the present phase.

THE THIRD PERIOD

The rise of the working-class and Kisan movements, the terrific political activity all over the country preparatory to, and following upon, the Congress elections—these mark off the beginning of the third period. Three things happen now: first, on a countrywide scale, capitalist development which had begun, though in a distorted and thwarted manner since the war, begins spreading in a horizontal way, though not vertically. That is to say, while capitalist development by no means progresses in depth, what little of development there has been begins to spread all over the country; it begins spreading from parts to which it had hitherto been restricted to all other parts of the country. This is what is meant by horizontal development. Capitalism goes on penetrating into parts of the country hitherto untouched. This development brings in its train problems of acute competition and rivalries between different sections of the bourgeoisie themselves. Secondly, is the upsurge of the working-class and Kisan movements. Thirdly, the new constitution comes into operation and the various parties and bourgeois sections are called upon to take up clear political positions.

During the period of the Congress Ministries and after, we find the rise of sharp jealousies, friction and competition between the different sections of the bourgeoisie, between the bourgeoisies of the different province, of different parts of India. The independent horizontal development which sets in now spreads in a very uneven manner: when a “backward” province reaches a particular level and is in a position to fight for more, then further uneven

development brings in its train sharp competition. This is the first time when during and after the elections of 1937, the so-called “inter-provincial” jealousies begin to appear on the scene. The demand of the Karnatakis for a “Sanyukta Karnatak,” the demand of the Andhras for a separate province, the demand of the Oriyas for their rights, the friction between the Bengalis and the Beharis—all these begin to come to the fore. In Karnatak, for example, the Lingayat community, till now politically not very conscious, for the first time wake up to political consciousness during the Congress elections, and they put up their own candidates for the Congress elections even though that candidate was himself a Congressman.

There is really a deep basis behind these conflicts and demands—so deep that it reflects itself even inside the Congress organisation itself. The factional struggles inside the Karnatak Congress leadership at the election time has been mentioned above. This split only reflects the conflict between the Maharashtrian Brahim (landlord) money-lending group which had dominated the whole of Karnatak till then and the rising Lingayat middle class (merchant). The conflict, however, has two aspects or sides: on the one hand, it is a conflict between the two bourgeoisies; on the other, it is a reflection of the fact that the *Lingayat peasantry is for the first time roused to political life and enters struggle*. It is *this latter aspect* that assumes more and more importance during this period and gives a *radically revolutionary turn* to the whole problem of national unity. It is to this aspect that we should now devote detailed attention.

As the national movement grows wider, the conflict between the top sections of the bourgeoisie begins to assume *new forms*. What are these new forms, what is their content? It is this that needs to be understood carefully; this understanding alone will give us the key to the *essence* of the problem of national unity in this period.

As the national movement descends from the lower middle class to the peasantry, the national question which till now was a simple question of conflict between the Indian people as a whole and British imperialism now becomes *more complicated* and takes on *new complicated forms*. *National unity itself more and more assumes the form of multi-national unity*. The problem can no more merely be confined within the simple straitjacket of unity of India as a whole against British imperialism. Within this fundamental and broad framework, arise problems of *multi-national unity* within India itself, problems of various dormant nationalities for the first time waking up to life, problems that demand urgent solution as a preparatory step to the solution of the fundamental problem of Indo-British relationship.

This aspect, the aspect of national unity taking on a rich variegated *multi-national* pattern, is very real, as becomes clear during this period. One has to go into its roots to understand it in its proper setting and to separate its disruptive aspect from the equally vital progressive and unifying aspect. A correct solution should be based not only on what is happening in the present, but also on the

future—such solution should lead to a greater unity of India in the future.

During the 1935-9 period the national movement really becomes broader and sweeps over every nook and corner of the country hitherto left comparatively untouched. It goes deep into the masses, broad masses of the peasantry and the people for the first time wake up to active political and national consciousness. The peasantry in most provinces *advance from their own narrow sectional consciousness to all-India consciousness*, but they make this advance to all-India consciousness *in terms of their own linguistic and sectional consciousness*. For example, taking the Karnatak example given above, the Lingayat peasantry really becomes all-India conscious, but they proceed to and understand this all-India consciousness *through, and in terms of, their own Lingayat language and consciousness*. The Congress itself recognised this basic feature in the step it took of forming linguistic provinces. The national movement led by the Congress, as it spreads over each province, takes on the *colour* of that particular province. To put it in a rough though picturesque way, the all-India national movement resembles a stream which, while it flows through the soil of each province, naturally takes on the colour of the soil of that province. *The stream becomes a multi-colour stream, though it still remains one stream flowing in one direction.*

Such a thing happens only when the national movement goes down into the ranks of the peasantry. Vice versa, such a thing *necessarily* happens when the national movement goes down into the peasantry. This is the essence of Stalin's statement that "*The national problem is dominantly a peasant problem.*" The masses in particular linguistic areas approach all-India national consciousness through the end of their own particular "nationalist" consciousness. The spread of all-India consciousness rouses up this "particular-nationalist" consciousness, the one cannot be separated from the other. Each of these becomes for the masses the means of achieving the other. Such a development takes place, a development of a rich variegated multi-national pattern, only when the national movement goes down into the masses of the peasantry. This is the deep and rich significance contained in Stalin's statement that the "National question is dominantly a peasant question."

This close interlinking between the rising all-India political consciousness of the masses on the one hand, and the waking-up to life of a multi-national pattern on the other, each reacting on, and in its turn helping, the other— it is this which forms the *progressive content* of the rivalries and conflicts of this period. The other part of it, the husk, is of course manifested in competitions among the top bourgeoisie, such as the Bengal-Bihar competition, etc.

This shows the *real maturity of the national movement, the real maturity of this multi-national consciousness*. It is this same maturity which brings out into the forefront the fact that the problem is *no more a mere problem of cultural separation and cultural freedom. The real basis is the full-throated urge of every nationality within this multi-national pattern for its fullest and freest development, free from all oppression and hindrances. The demand is for full*

and unfettered political and economic existence, as the only way of full and free development under the new conditions. The demand for freedom from British imperialism is crystallised, in the case of each awakening nationality, in this demand for full and unfettered political and economic existence. The former problem cannot be solved separately from, in opposition to, the latter. It can only be solved through the latter.

This is the demand which we call the demand of every nationality for self-determination. This demand becomes the progressive lever by means of which alone the various nationalities can be rallied and mobilised shoulder to shoulder, for the rightful demand of India, this demand becomes the progressive lever for the richest and the highest flowering and development of every individual nationality itself. Diversity becomes the lever for strengthening unity, for enriching and developing that very unity.

To the communists, this development is already becoming quite clear. But to the ordinary patriot, this new aspect of the communal problem, as a *problem of multi-national consciousness*, has not yet become patent. We, the communists, are able to see our way into the future by means of our theory and our ideology. By means of this, we are able to see quickly these elements in the present which are bound to develop in the future. The slogans of our national movement should not be slogans which are counterposed to, which stand in the way of, the stages of future development, but should be such as will take us on along with the stream of future historical development and will assist such development.

That is why we say that a basic understanding of this new turn in the development of the "communal problem," of this new phase, is urgent and vital.

The Party itself has been groping its way towards this new understanding for a long period. Our resolution at Mantavaripallam (1938) took the first step forward in this direction. We were the only people at that time to see that Congress-League unity is the key to national unity. We were the only people at that time to urge negotiations between the Congress and the Muslim League. We were the only people at that time to see the transformation and change coming over the Muslim masses, The Congress Socialist Party and other parties did not recognise any new turn in the situation, they still saw the problem in the old way "the Muslim masses will come over to us and the League leadership will get isolated."

What are the developments in the Muslim League during this time? At the time of the Congress elections, a section of the Muslim intelligentsia came over to the Congress and supported it. The radical election platform of the Congress was the main reason. The League's opposition to the Congress candidates was not very successful. But after the elections, the failure of the Congress to forge coalition ministries, the acts of commission and omission of the Congress ministries in some of the provinces—all these are fully exploited by Jinnah. All such small points are seized upon and Jinnah is able to mobilise the Muslim masses by means of these. The most radical

section of the national leadership, still blind to the new developments spreading among the Muslim masses, sees in the growing League influence only an aspect, which is really only one part of it : they explain that the "reactionary" League leadership is exploiting the "backwardness" of the Muslim masses. As a solution they put forward the programme of "mass contact."

We Communists on the other hand, saw the other aspect too. We of course saw the growing rivalry between the bourgeoisie of both the sections (a rivalry which came out quite sharply in its true form as competition for concessions and interests in the case of some provinces, e.g. United Provinces) ; but side by side with this we saw *the other, the progressive aspect too*. We saw in the situation, looking forward to the future, *not* the "backwardness" of the *Muslim masses, but* their forwardness, their advancing *political consciousness*. We saw them seeing nationalism through their own individual nationalist eyes. *We saw in their growing "nationalities consciousness" what it really is, a reflection of anti-imperialist nationalist consciousness in the mirror of their own life. We saw this as a forward step.* By bringing together the Congress and the League and joining them on *common demands*, we knew that we could give a *progressive expression to this upsurge of the Muslim masses and of the Muslim nationalities, we could weld this into a firm anti-imperialist unity.*

It was in our Party Letter of May 1941 that we really took a basic advance step in this direction. Formerly, in 1938, we used to assert that India was a *homogeneity, a homogeneous piece*. Our ranks looked at the problem in a *static, non-historical manner*. The Marxian theory of *development of a nation, that nationalities emerge and grow in the process of historical evolution ...* this theory had not entered their consciousness. *Old attitudes, outmoded approaches, still persisted in their consciousness*. That is why some of our own comrades started quoting R. P. D.'s *India To-day* against our Party letter of May 1941. Palme Dutt had written these parts of his hook as early as 1937 or so. He was describing the development of that time; he was not attempting to go beyond those problems. His object was to show the unity and one-ness of India *as against British imperialism* ; his object was *not to go beyond this scope and to attempt a historical charting out of the future developments in the national sphere.*

It is a static non-historical conception of a nation that lies behind most of the misconceptions and doubts regarding this problem within our own Party ranks. *A nation is a historical product of bourgeois development and evolution*—this is the basic starting point with which Stalin begins his classic article on the National Question. The idea that India has always been a nation—such an idea is *non-Marxian and has no basis in reality*. Such an idea was quite all right for the earliest nationalists, at a period when the nationalist movement was in its infancy. But to-day, to persist in such an understanding, is to *forget all the intervening years of historical development; is to be completely blind to the*

realities of the present situation.

In fact, Marx himself went to the root of the Indian problem when he wrote “The foundation for the unification of India in a modern sense was laid by the British conquest.” This foundation was laid by exploitation. It is this unification, unification in a *relative and historical sense*, that is taken by people as a fact *existing irrespective of history and of historical development. In this sense*, however, the controversy, whether India is a nation or not, is *wrong, and irrelevant. The unity of the national movement is asserted and stressed by the fight against imperialism—it is this which has given the impress of national unity to India.* It is *this aspect which R. Palme Dutt stresses in his India To-day.* This aspect is *governing the struggle of the Indian people as a whole against British imperialism.* It is an aspect of *governing a particular relative sphere.* It has nothing to do with assertions like “India is a nation like England, Germany, etc.,” not in this sense.

This *national development grows in different forms in different countries. according to the historical peculiarities of development of each country.* There are cases where different tribes are welded into a nation by bourgeois development. The classical examples of such cases are England and Germany—where there is a national homogeneity on the basis of one language, one race. etc. But besides this type, there is also a second historical type, where national development takes a different form. In this type, the grouping together of various tribes by bourgeois development takes a *multi-national shape.* Examples of this are the Tsarist Empire, the old Austro-Hungarian Empire, etc. In this type of development, a dominant nation, with a high degree of bourgeois development, unites within its State boundaries various other nations, nations which have not yet grown to full nationhood, but which with increasing bourgeois development find their national development thwarted and suppressed by the dominant nation and its centralised State. As the bourgeois development goes on, inside such a “multi-national” State, conflicts grow up. The various nationalities begin to acquire national consciousness themselves, and this growing national consciousness begins to assert itself in the urge for separate political and economic existence.

Such was the picture of Tsarist Russia in the 1911-12 period, the period when the national question comes up in sharp form before the R.S.D.L.P.* It could not be said at that time that all the various elements inside Russia had grown to full nationhood. But this *process* was clearly visible: we find this process clearly described in Stalin's book. Each growing border nationality was pitching its own separate tent, was making its own separate camp. The national movement was rising up fast. We see in this period in Russia a classical example of the effects of bourgeois development inside multi-national states, of new nationalities arising

* Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, earlier official name of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

and radically revolutionising the entire political scene. The Mensheviks saw in this, of course, only one aspect of it—the so-called “disintegrating” aspect. The Bolsheviks were quick to see the “progressive aspect” and to use this to develop the revolutionary unity and activity of the masses of all the nationalities to a higher level.

We can thus see that within a multi-national state, *historical development constantly brings into the forefront ever new nationalist urges, ever new eases of nationalist consciousness*. Nationalities lie dormant within the womb of historical development, at a particular state they acquire sufficient strength to assert themselves, and then seemingly “new” problems crop up. ... To have a static conception of a nation is to be blind to all such development, is to be *blind to historical development and reality*. Let us take the case of our own country. There have been different nationalities, not yet grown to full nationhood, lying dormant within it. Actually it was the foreign power, by its conquest and consequent shattering of all the old forms of economy, which started the process of “national” development. Before this foreign conquest, India was mainly of a feudal-village economy and, therefore, could not be called a “nation” in the modern bourgeois sense of the term. Before the British conquest of India, there was no part of India which can be described as a nation in the bourgeois sense. How, then, does this “national” development begin under the British in a typically *uneven way*? Such an uneven development had already set in even under a pre-capitalist economy, due to various historical and geographical causes. But this uneven development is *accentuated* by imperialism. *This accentuated uneven development, imposed by imperialist exploitation and by the imperialist-imposed distorted thwarted forms of capitalist development*, gives rise in course of time to various problems. In certain parts, bourgeois development comes earliest; these parts naturally lead the national anti-imperialist movement and at that stage we ourselves were not conscious that we were actually a multi-national state. As bourgeois development goes on spreading, and as the masses of the people and specially the peasantry in all parts of India wake up to political consciousness, then it is that *individual national movements begin to arise within the framework of the all-Indian national movement against imperialism*.

It was this unrest of the border nationalities, their democratic movement for self-expression within the broad framework of the struggle against Tsarism, that characterises the Russia of 1912-14. Bourgeois separatist movements arise in the border nationalities, seeking to take advantage of, and exploit, this democratic sentiment of the masses. As against this, the labour movement in the border regions led by the Bolsheviks seeks to combat this separatist tendency and to *unite all the nationalities* for struggle against Tsarism, this is the crux of the national problem that came up before the Bolshevik Party in 1912. The Bolsheviks realised that only by recognising the *essentially democratic and progressive character* of this striving of the nationalities for self-determination, only by

conceding this as a right, could they fight the bourgeois separatist tendencies successfully and forge unbreakable all-in unity against the Tsarist autocracy. The Bolsheviks demarcated clearly between two things: (1) The awakening to national consciousness of new nationalities, an awakening which was historically progressive and found its expression in the demand for self-determination; (2) the way in which the bourgeoisie within these nationalities were seeking to *take advantage* of this essentially democratic urge of the masses and lead it into their own separatist class channels. They realised that to grant the first is the only way to defeat the second and to forge a greater revolutionary unity of all the masses than ever before.

Similarly, here too in our own country, the problem of *unifying the different sections of our people against imperialism, for the war of liberation against fascism arises at a time when the spread of the national movement has aroused various dormant nationalities of our land to life, when new “national” urges are beginning to appear under this impact.* Unless we recognise this fact, we cannot find the key to unity to-day.

It is when we examine the present period that the full force of Stalin’s remark comes out before us: “ *In the case of India, too, it will probably be found that innumerable nationalities, till then lying dormant, would come to life with the further course of bourgeois development.*”

It is this all-important factor that needs to be taken into consideration in finding the key to national unity in to-day’s critical situation. *The Hindu-Muslim problem is set within this very framework and forms part and parcel of this framework – of the awakening of new nationalities to life.* A correct solution of the *communal problem cannot* be found unless we recognise that it is, *in its democratic essence,* a problem of the rising nationalities.

A mechanical posing of the problem, trying to transpose things bodily from the framework of the Soviet Union on to India – these methods won’t do. Such ways amount only to *constitutional solutions, juggling with categories of lawyer-like constitution-mongering. Remaking of administrative boundaries, ethnographic surveys*—such are the *banal methods* to which the problem is reduced by people like Sikander Hayat Khan.

What is missed out in all such *constitution-mongering formula* is the very *essence* of the matter—namely, the need of *revolutionary unity of the people to fight imperialism and to defend the land from fascism.* The solution of Lenin and Stalin is *not* a “constitutional” solution, but a *revolutionary solution.* We Communists keep in the forefront of our attention the fact that *no nationality can have scope for free development unless and until all imperialist and feudal fetters are shattered and broken up.*

We Communists recognise, and explain clearly to the people, two things : (1) The problem of nationalities can only be solved *in a firm and lasting manner* under Socialism when the disuniting factor of the bourgeoisie disappears; (2) But at the same time, a *partial solution* is also possible *under capitalism, but only*

under conditions of complete and full democracy. The solution which the C.P.S.U. put forward in 1917 was one of attaining *complete democracy, of a radical complete democratic revolution.*

This is what is stressed in paragraph 1 of our Resolution. That our solution is *not a constitutional solution*, that the *corner-stone of our policy* is the *unity of the masses as the vanguard of the national movement.*

This is the crux of the problem which the bourgeois-reformists entirely pass over. The problem to-day is not a constitution-mongering problem of remaking boundaries. The question of communal unity must be seen as a *revolutionary question of forging revolutionary unity of all sections of our people to break imperialist-feudal rule. The breaking of this rule is the precondition to the people being able to remake boundaries in a democratic way.*

But developments have to be taken into account in their *actual reality, not in abstraction.* Hence the nationalities and the national urges are to be taken *as they are.* This should be the starting-point. *Hence to unify these various nationalist strivings in terms of our all-India national struggle, how to give these various national urges the dominant impress of all-India national consciousness—this is the problem.*

All the *present and past historical forms of oppression* of the masses of the various nationalities have to be *concretely* taken into account. The present oppression by the zamindars and the various feudal elements, old historical forms of oppression, all these have to be considered. Place before the masses a *concrete real picture* when all this oppression will go, let this picture *inspire them for united action to-day. To bring together all the peoples, to bring together the urge of the various nationalities for freedom on to a common platform, the platform of the United National Front—this is our task.*

Our policy with respect to the Hindu-Moslem problem fits into this general framework. *This policy has to be sharply and clearly demarcated from (1) the stand of Jinnah and the separatists, (2) the stand of the National Congress leadership, (3) the stand of the Akhanda Hindustan-Wallas.*

Our solution is *simultaneously a solution fighting against two extreme evil tendencies.* The first is the *separatist tendency* brought in by the *bourgeoisie of each nationality.* In Russia, one dominant nationality, the great-Russian nationality, was lording over all the other nationalities. The bourgeois separatists of the other nationalities started disruptive separatist movements which would *in effect disrupt the unity of the peoples of Russia as a whole against Tsarism, divide the ranks of the proletariat and the peasantry and in effect hand them over to the tender mercies of the bourgeoisie of each nationality.* The Mensheviks, on the other hand, declared: Russia is one and indivisible. Don't pander to the 'prejudices' of each nationality." This stand of the Mensheviks only meant *in practice supporting the oppression of the dominant Great-Russian nationality, it only meant in practice adding grist to the mill of the bourgeois separatists.* The Mensheviks were in action the agents of Great Russian dominant

imperialism. While the bourgeois separatists were only trying to take the masses *away* from the *common struggle* against Tsarism, to divide the unity of the masses in the Social-Democratic movement, to prevent the union of the toilers of all nations; their slogan of "separation" was creating conditions *not for the liberation of the peoples, but for their further enslavement*.

The Bolsheviks under these conditions put forward two slogans, *two slogans which were inseparably inter-related*: (1) Unity for common revolutionary struggle, (2) *Federation of all the nationalities in a democratic Russia, each nationality having the right of self-determination to the point of secession. Only by giving these two slogans together was it possible to fight the Mensheviks and, at the same time, to isolate the influence of the bourgeois separatists.*

In India, too, in a different setting of course, similar tendencies are at work though in a modified form. The dominant national oppression is, of course, the imperialist oppression. But *inside the national movement itself, because of the unequal development of the various nationalities*, certain sections are more developed and more powerful, certain others less developed and weaker. This factor *breeds mutual distrust and suspicion* inside the national movement. The Muslim masses fear that they will be oppressed and exploited by Hindu India. Is this fear entirely justified? To find an answer to this, we have to look not into the subjective feelings and sentiments of the people, but into *objective developing reality. The uneven bourgeois development itself creates conditions wherein one dominant nationality may be in a position to stifle the growth of less developed and weaker nationalities in a free India.* We saw tiny germs of this even during the period of the Congress Ministries. That is why we say that such a fear is quite an *understandable* fear. It is the duty of the national movement and of the proletarian party to take this *reality* into consideration and so *formulate the programme of the U.N.F. as to dispel this distrust*, a picture of free India, *free for every nationality*, must be placed *concretely* before all sections of the people.

Conditions must be created so that this inequality and uneven development should be used *not against the people, but in favour of the people. The inequality should not become a factor retarding unity against imperialism and fascist invasion. The bourgeoisie uses it for disunity. The proletariat on the other hand uses the advanced technique of the forward nationalities to help the backward nationalities and to bring them up, more quickly and easily, to the level of the advanced ones.*

The proletarian party should put forward before the entire national movement a picture of a free and *democratic India, with guarantees that in such a free and democratic India, no oppression of one nationality by another shall take place.* Only in this way can we picture those people who under the slogan of the "one undivided India" theory, *seek to cover up oppression of backward nationalities.* Only in this way can we, at the other end, *at the same time direct a sharp edge against those who use the existing inequalities to rally the masses under the banner of Pakistan, to pander to reactionary Pan-Islamic sentiment under the*

cover of old religious prejudices, to turn the masses away from the common freedom movement.

The Pan Islamic theory in fact played a prominent part in discussions in the Soviet Union on the national question in the immediate post-war period. The Bolsheviks would have no truck with it, their policy of granting the right of self-determination to all the nationalities removed the ground right from under the feet of the Pan-Islam-Wallas. Pan-Islamism is, in fact, a *weapon of disunity*. It is a weapon in the hands of the separatists. By putting the slogan of "extra-territorial loyalty" in the forefront, it prevents national unity for the freedom struggle. It must be exposed in this manner; it must be linked up with the question of unity for struggle.

To the Muslim masses, our explanation must be such as to *disillusion them about Pakistan*. Make them understand, *concretely, in a manner that sinks into their national consciousness*, what exactly they want. Explain to them the *patriotic consciousness that binds them to their homeland, and that finds expression in nationalist aspirations*. The picture you put before them should *enthuse and inspire* the Muslim masses. Put before the Muslim a *picture of free life in his homeland, in the land of his forefathers, among his fellows*. This is his *real need*, the need which is conceded by the grant of the right of self-determination to all nationalities. The urge for Pakistan in the religious sense is *unreal*. *Only as long as his real democratic right is not conceded, only so long will he cling to Pakistan, not out of religious urge, but in the hope that Pakistan will give him his real democratic right. The concrete democratic right, the concrete democratic essence* of his demands should be explained to him.

In fact Pan-Islamic propaganda has *not* taken in India. From 1931 to 1932, idea of Pakistan has been there vaguely in the minds of sections of the Muslim intelligentsia. But it *was never brought out till a decisive stage was reached*. It is brought out *at a time when war is declared and the Congress demands a declaration from the British Government. Only at a moment when all sections of people in the country realise that the freedom of the nation is on the tapis, only then is "Pakistan" brought out*. The Congress demands independence; Jinnah demands Pakistan.

Another fact is to be realised, and that is the *growing influence of Jinnah and the League leadership over the Muslim masses*. The League gets more popular in most of the provinces. It was amidst these conditions that Jinnah put forward his slogan of Pakistan in March 1940. The importance of the slogan must be gauged *in relation to the world situation, in relation to the war*. India was in ferment. It was thought at that time that the slogan was mere bluff. But this is wrong. The Congress had put forward non-co-operation as an *oppositional weapon* to extort power from imperialism. In exactly the: same way, the *Muslim League, too, knowing that the Muslim masses are anti-war and anti-imperialist, takes to a game of power politics. It puts forward a parallel slogan to that of the Congress, in order to share power, at the same time to get the backing of the*

Muslim masses who are anti-war. And over and above all this, the slogan takes advantage of, and distorts, the rising nationalist urge of the Muslim nationalities, talks of "Our Homeland," etc.

This is how the slogan of Pakistan has to be assessed. To forget the last factor mentioned above, namely, the democratic core within the Pakistan demand, the core which the Muslim masses really demand, is to remain blind to realities. Such blindness will lead us all to common disaster.

In March 1940 was held the Azad Muslim Conference: at Delhi. At that time itself, we Communists had realised that a change had taken place in the situation; we had realised that the time had come when the right of self-determination had to be granted to the various nationalities. We had realised that the unity of Hindu and Muslim masses for winning freedom could *only* be forged if the slogan of Pakistan was countered with the fundamentally democratic slogan of self-determination for all nationalities.

Then came the Nagpur Conference of the All-India Students Federation in December 1940, at which our students tried to put forward a correct policy, but bungled and created confusion. The Party had to rectify the errors immediately afterwards.

But a considerable amount of confusion still exists even among our own ranks on the issue of Pakistan, on the approach towards the problem. The "appeasement" theory — "Give Jinnah what he wants"—*this theory is essentially a bourgeois reformist solution. Its root is the conception of unity as a mere top unity. This approach does not think in terms of developing a dynamic unity of the Hindu and the Muslim masses, does not think of unity as a developing people's movement. It is this theory which leads, as in the case of Rajaji's experience, to the notion that unity cannot be achieved—naturally enough, a theory which depends for unity purely on the subjective goodwill of individual leaders cannot lead anywhere else except to defeatism and demoralisation. Not "Give Jinnah what he wants," but create the basis for giving the Muslim masses their just democratic demands and lay the basis thus for unbreakable unity between the Hindu and Muslim masses, unity to achieve national government, unity to defend our common land.*

To the Muslim masses, you have to bring to their consciousness the *real democratic meaning of the urge* which makes them turn to Pakistan. Explain to them how the grant of self-determination to all nationalities *really satisfies this urge fully and freely.*

To the Hindu masses a *differentiated approach* is necessary. The Congress-minded Hindu has a greater number of years of mature national movement behind him. What you have to convince him is *that greater and greater unity will result from the grant of self-determination to all nationalities.* Remember that he has no conception at all of a multinational state in his consciousness. By convincing the Congress-minded Hindus in this manner alone can you *isolate the Hindu-minded communal reactionary.* Such elements are really not very popular

or influential within our national movement. They can be isolated only by *destroying the curious distrust which is being created by certain writers between Hindu and Muslims on the ground that they are fundamentally different*. Ambedkar, for example, in his book on Pakistan, trots out the reactionary theory that Hindus and Muslims are fundamentally different, they can never unite. Only *by putting before the Congress-minded Hindus a picture of a multinational India in which the problem of Indian unity is solved in a higher and more lasting manner* – only thus can you convince him.

Now the problem arises of how we are going to *concretise things*. *It is not necessary to make deluded, ethnographic surveys*. This is *neither politically necessary nor practically feasible*. Still a general approach has to be attempted. The basic criterion for such a concretisation is *how near our solution genuinely satisfies a genuine urge, how near it conies to the democratic essence contained in the Pakistan demand*. The idea is not to "cheat" the Muslim masses into unity, the idea is to *find out the seed of a genuine urge*. *Neither hair-splitting ethnographic surveys nor the "tricking" theory*.

The Baluchis who are Muslims speaking Baluch are 98-99 per cent. of the inhabitants of Baluchistan and the States of Kalat. So in this case no difficulty arises.

Take the *Pathans* next. They are Muslims. They are more than 90 percent, of the population of the North-West Frontier Province. They are *not* under Jinnah's influence. Still even in this case when the Pakistan slogan was brought forward by the Muslim League, the Pathan nationalities felt that they could fight if effectively by raising the slogan of the right of self-determination of the Pathans in their homeland. At Allahabad, the Pathan delegation would not vote against Rajaji's resolution. To avoid being forced to vote against Rajaji's resolution by the Right Wing they slipped out of the meeting. They appreciated the position put by us very much. This feeling among the Pathans clearly shows the correctness of our policy.

In the Punjab, the western districts have a Muslim population of over 60 per cent. on an average, in many cases this percentage exceeds 70 or 80. The question is not merely one of numerical preponderance. *The dominant impress of the particular nationality on the life of the area must be there*. All the western districts bear the dominant impress of a district nationality with a contiguous territory beyond the River Sutlej with a language, culture, etc. That is why we grant the right of self-determination to the Muslims of Western Punjab. The Muslims in the other part of the Punjab, of course, will form an interspread minority in the eastern districts. They want only their *own schools, their cultural freedom*. These rights of course would be granted to them.

Take Sindh. The question arises here: are the Sindhis as a whole a nation? I think that the Sindhis as a whole form a distinct nationality. Granting them the right of self-determination of course satisfies the aspirations of the Sindhi Muslims. A stickler for arguments might here ask: When a plebiscite comes up

regarding the issue of separation, do the Sindhis as a whole vote or do only the Sindhi Muslims vote? The answer is that this question must be *settled by negotiation*. The question does not arise to-day, it all depends on the way in which the *movement* arises, and can be developed. Ours is *not* a constitutionalist approach, granting the Sindhis the right of self-determination is enough to *settle the problem of unity and united struggle to-day*.

Then comes the question of Bengal. Our first formulation is that *the Bengalis form a nation* and so should be given the right of self-determination. But the problem of the Eastern and Northern districts of Bengal also is there. Here, generally speaking, there is a Muslim population of more than 60 per cent. On the one hand, it is correct to say that Bengalis are a nation and Bengal should have its own separate State. In fact, there is much more in common between the Bengali Hindu and the Bengali Muslim than there is between the Bengali Muslim and, say, the Pathan. But at the same time, the Muslim peasantry of Eastern Bengal *has* a common special cultural complex which has made its impress on Eastern Bengal as a separate entity. No rigid formulations can be made, there are such things as *transitional forms*. The crux of the problem is: *how can we unify the oppressed peasantry of East Bengal to share and enrich the cultural heritage of Bengal for the common struggle?* The solution put forward in our resolution *on the one hand enables the peasantry of East Bengal to share and enrich the common cultural heritage of Bengal: on the other hand it enables us to unite them and to convince them that they would be better off if they joined the Bengali State. It satisfies the urge and by this very means paves the way for their joining the Bengali State later on. Such a solution alone will enable us to isolate the separatists and pave the way for a political revolutionary path.*

The interspersed Muslim minorities in the other provinces, What do they want? Their cultural rights are guaranteed. It is these very rights that formed the bone of contention in most cases during the Congress Ministry period in the United Provinces. It is these very rights that were utilised by the Muslim Leaguers. These are very *concrete demands*. The question of minorities in this case is *no more on religious ground, it has already been shifted on to the modern political plane*. That is why the guarantee of cultural rights, etc., is enough in these cases.

It is the constitutionalist whose first question is: "Whether to separate or not." But Communists say: *When we grant the right of self-determination as an unconditional right, then this right becomes the hall-mark of sovereignty, of equality*. The way in which we should pose the question of nationalities is: *How shall we define the nationalities so as to create conditions where there will be the fullest and freest flowering and development of national characteristics?* We keep two aspects in mind, two aspects which *cannot be separated*: (1) *Right of separation* ; (2) *Object of unification*. Our solution itself is *no static solution*. In the Soviet Union, for example, after the Revolution itself, a number of nationalities attained full-fledged nationhood in course of time. Hence we

steadily keep before ourselves the two criteria: (1) the grant of the right of separation *dispels distrust and creates unity here and now*. (2) We should so demarcate the nationalities that in a free and democratic India, the nationalities will *grow and flower, will develop towards Socialism*.

Lastly, it must not be forgotten that *The question of how, when, whether, etc., to separate, cannot and must not be decided to-day. The grant of the right of separation should not be confused with the actual exercise of this right, it should not be confused with the actual expediency of separation in this or that particular case. This latter question can only be decided at any particular moment, in any particular case, in terms of whole social development.*

Unite all the nationalities for freedom, for national defence, this is our fundamental aim. Do we get a weapon in our hands in order to unite with the Muslim masses here and now and isolate the separatists? Do we define nationalities in such a way that in a federated democratic India every nationality will be able to develop fully and freely ? These are the two fundamental criteria of the practical application of our policy.

Resolution

September 19th, 1942.

ON PAKISTAN AND NATIONAL UNITY

All-in national unity based on communal harmony and Congress-League joint front is to-day an urgent and pressing necessity to solve the present national crisis, to win National Government from the hands of the British imperialist bureaucracy and to defend our Motherland against the fascist aggressor. This has brought the controversy of Pakistan versus the unity of India sharply to the forefront. The Communist Party, therefore, lays down the main principles of the Communist policy on this issue.

1. The Communist Party draws together the toilers of all castes, communities and nationalities in common class organisations (Trade Unions, Kisan Sabhas, etc.). It unites them politically as the vanguard of the united national front for achieving the freedom of our country and democracy. This is the corner-stone of the policy of achieving communal unity.

2. To build the united national front of the peoples of the various communities and nationalities that inhabit India, for the defence and freedom of our country, it is, however, necessary to dispel the mutual distrust and suspicion that exists among them. This is a remnant of memories of past historical oppression and of present social inequalities arising out of the feudal imperialist exploitation. For this purpose, the basic rights of the communities and nationalities must be recognised and they must be made an essential part of the programme of the united national front.

3. The programme of the U.N.F. must declare that in Free India there will be perfect equality between nationalities and communities that live together in India. There will be no oppression of one nationality by another. There will be no inequalities or disabilities based on caste or community. To ensure this the

national movement must recognise the following rights as part of its programme for national unity.

(a) Every section of the Indian people which has a contiguous territory as its homeland, common historical tradition, common language, culture, psychological make-up and common economic life would be recognised as a distinct nationality with the right to exist as an autonomous state within the free Indian union or federation and will have the right to secede from it if it may so desire. This means that the territories which are the homelands of such nationalities and which to-day are split up by the artificial boundaries of the present British provinces and the so-called "Indian States" would be re-united and restored to them in free India. Thus free India of to-morrow would be a federation or union of autonomous states of the various nationalities, such as the Pathans, Western Punjabis (dominantly Muslims), Sikhs, Sindhis, Hindustanis, Rajasthanis, Gujerathis, Bengalis, Assamese, Beharies, Oriyas, Andhras, Tamils, Karnatikis, Maharashtrians, Meralas, etc.

(b) If there are interspersed minorities in the new states thus formed their rights regarding their culture, language, education, etc., would be guaranteed by Statute and their infringement would be punishable by law.

(c) All disabilities, privileges and discriminations based on caste, race or community (such as untouchability and allied wrongs) would be abolished by Statute and their infringement would be punishable by law.

4. Such a declaration of rights inasmuch as it concedes to every nationality, as defined above, and therefore to nationalities having Muslim faith, the right of autonomous State existence and of secession, can form the basis for unity between the National Congress and the League.. For this would give to the Muslims wherever they are in an overwhelming majority in a contiguous territory which is their homeland, the right to form their autonomous States and even to separate if they so desire. In the case of the Bengali Muslims of the Eastern and Northern Districts of Bengal where they form the overwhelming majority, they may form themselves into an autonomous region as the State of Bengal or may form a separate State. Such a declaration therefore concedes the just essence of the Pakistan demand and has nothing in common with the separatist theory of dividing India into two nations on the basis of religions.

5. But the recognition of the right of separation in this form need not necessarily lead to actual separation. On the other hand, by dispelling mutual suspicions, it brings about unity of action to-day and lays the basis for a greater unity in the free India of tomorrow. National unity forged on the basis of such a declaration and strengthened in the course of joint struggle in the defence of our motherland is bound to convince the peoples of all Indian nationalities of the free Indian union or federation that will emerge after the war of liberation is won, for the common defence of freedom and democracy achieved and to build on that secure basis a greater and grander unity of India than our country has ever seen.

In spite of the apparent conflict and seemingly insoluble difficulties, the

burning desire for unity is taking firmer hold of the people who to-day follow the Congress or the League. Under the stress of the growing menace of fascist invasion and of the present national crisis, the leaderships of the two organisations also have moved closer together and in the direction of the very solution given in this resolution. There is no room whatsoever for defeatism on the question of unity. The Communist Party calls upon all patriots to join hands with it in popularising the principles laid down herein and thus speed up the realisation of Congress-League Unity, which is to-day the only path of national salvation for our Motherland in the hour of her gravest peril.

