

Socio-Economic and Political Analysis of India's Semi-Colonial & Semi-Feudal State Character

This document was written by a Comrade of CPI(ML) almost two years back. We are treating it as a positive and a good effort. This document summarized and composed various facts, figures, and analysis, as given in Comrade T.Nagi Reddy's famous book, "INDIA MORTGAGED" as well as from some survey reports. Now we are giving Part-1 of this document and remaining parts will appear in the forthcoming issues.'

Preface

It is a matter of great concern for the toiling masses of our country that, even after elapsing a prolonged period of 74 long years since the British Imperialist forces transferred the state power of India into the hands of the Indian authorities in 1947, India has not yet been able to become a developed Industrialised country. The country not only remained to be underdeveloped but even the basic requirements like food, clothing, shelter, education, and medical treatment of most of the toiling people of our country are not yet been fulfilled, although there has been no scarcity of natural resources, manpower or intellect in our country. Then what is the actual cause behind this back wardness? Where does the problem exist?

The problem exists in the state character of our country. In 1947, the state power has been transferred to the hands of such an exploiting class of our country, which is not only power-mongering and extremely self-interest oriented but at the same time is a great tout of Imperialist forces, – the big comprador bourgeoisie and big landlord class of our country and their political entity – the Indian National Congress Party. And with the nexus of all these internal exploiting classes as well as the world Imperialist forces, our country has been subjected to all-out exploitation for a long period and therefore, it has remained to be a Semi-Colonial and Semi-Feudal country. In a nutshell, this is the main reason why our country remained in a poor, underdeveloped, and backward condition, even after 74 years of achieving the so-called 'Independence' in 1947.

In this context, we will first discuss our Semi-Colonial state of affairs and later, the Semi-Feudal character will be dealt with in detail.

Before we proceed towards analyzing in detail the Semi-Colonial state character of India, let us first discuss in detail what is meant by a Semi-Colonial State Character. And in this respect, various descriptions and analyses, as given by Com. Lenin will certainly be the most appropriate and acceptable definition for every one of the communist fraternity. So, let us proceed towards that end.

Lenin, in his famous book "Imperialism : The Highest Stage of Capitalism", has given a very comprehensive and analytical description in this regard and also that of Imperialism,

since the subject matter is directly related to imperialist exploitation. It is therefore important that we, first of all, go through the various analytical descriptions of Lenin on both Imperialism and Semi Colonialism as well.

Lenin wrote, - "Imperialism is capitalism in that stage of development in which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital has established itself; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun; in which the division of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist powers has been completed." ('Imperialism: the Highest Stage of Capitalism,' page - 106).

Before this, Lenin explained how the finance capital operates, -

"Finance capital is such a great, it may be said, such a decisive force in all economic and in all international relations, that it is capable of subjecting, and actually does subject to itself even in states enjoying fullest political independence; we shall shortly see examples of this. Of course, finance capital finds most 'convenient' and is able to extract the greatest profit from such subjection as involves the loss of the political independence of the subjected countries and peoples. In this connection, the semi-colonial countries provide a typical example of the middle stage'. It is natural that the struggle for these semi-dependent countries should have become particularly bitter in the epoch of finance capital when the rest of the world has already been divided up." (ibid, page - 97).

"We have seen, the first and second world wars between the imperialist powers to re-divide the world. After World War-I, the victorious powers robbed the vanquished powers and tried to force them out of contention. At the same time, World War-I ended with the emergence of a socialist state, the USSR. Till then, the national movements of colonies and Semi-Colonies were weak. But, in World War-II, the imperialist countries, which were vanquished in the previous war, started a most aggressive war, forming an Axis power. The other imperialist forces first tried to direct the war against the USSR but failed. World War-II turned out to be an anti-fascist war, but at the same time, the national movements all over the world also developed. After World War-II, the Allied forces won, but except for the US imperialist, all other imperialist forces became very weak and also faced the wrath of the national movements in their colonies. Moreover, with the successful revolution in China and the East European countries, a strong socialist camp emerged. Under such a situation, imperialist forces had only two choices. Either to continue to suppress the national movements and strive to maintain their colonies, which is most convenient for finance capital, or to transfer power, before being forced to, by arrangement into the hands of such people, who would serve the interests of finance capital. Thus, instead of direct rule, indirect rule of imperialism would continue. The imperialists preferred the latter because the former could lead to their overthrow, lock stock, and barrel.

This change of policy of Imperialism did not change the character of Imperialism. It was the same colonial policy in a new form, instead of running the states directly, indirect method of ruling through their own trained agents, and in some cases, puppets were employed. This colonial policy in a new form is called neo-colonial policy; this method of rule is the neo-colonial method of rule. This was clearly explained by the Communist Party

of China, during the Great Debate in the article 'Apologists of neo-colonialism'. It said – 'The facts are clear. After World War II, the imperialists have certainly not given up colonialism, but have merely adopted a new form, neo-colonialism (emphasis ours). An important characteristic of such neo-colonialism is that the imperialists have been forced to change their old style of direct colonial rule in some areas and to adopt a new style of colonial rule and exploitation by relying on the agents they have selected and trained.'

It is clear that the content of the colonial policy of Imperialism did not change, the change was in form. The content did not change because, even under the indirect rule, the imperialists strive for total subjugation, such subjugation as 'involves loss of political independence of subjected states.'" (Quoted from a write-up titled – 'Colony - Neo-Colony - Semi-Colony', by Comrade Alope Mukherjee).

So, from the overall description, as given above, it is clear that there is a lot of difference in the form and content of the neo-colonial policy of imperialism. Because, even during the period of direct colonial rule, there were some countries, which were made to suffocate for having been enmeshed in the net of finance capital, although, these countries were not direct colonies. That means, colony or neo-colony, whatever it may be, the main policy of Imperialism is exploitation (internal content) and all kinds of its democratic theories are nothing but the show up of its humanitarian face (external form). This policy of changing its form and keeping the content as it is has been named by the imperialists as 'de-colonization'.

Now let us further look into some other quotations of Com. Lenin in this context –

"Typical of this epoch is not only the two main groups of countries: those owning colonies and colonies, but also the diverse forms of dependent countries which, officially and politically are independent, but in fact, are enmeshed in the net of financial and diplomatic dependence. We have already referred to one form of dependence – the semi-colony." ('Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism', page - 101).

"The 'semi-colonial' states provide an example of the transitional forms which are to be found in all spheres of nature and society." (Ibid, page - 97).

"In this connection, the semi-colonial countries provide a typical example of the middle stage.'" (Ibid, page -97).

What is meant by this 'transitional form' and 'middle stage'? This means they have not faced 'loss of political independence', but their political independence is tending towards loss of independence. They are in the middle stage' because they are neither totally independent nor totally subjugated. The transitional form also means that, even within that tendency towards loss of independence, there might be varying degrees of dependence at different states and also at different times. Moreover, in these states, different imperialist powers contend among themselves to bring them to total subjugation. This has been clearly stated by Lenin – "It is natural that the struggle for those semi-dependent countries should have become particularly bitter in the epoch of finance capital, where the rest of the world has already been divided up." (Ibid, page- 97).

Actually, in semi-colonies, several imperialist powers contend with one another to first bring it under one's unitary hegemony than to colony. We have seen such contention in our

own India between US-led Western Powers and Soviet Social Imperialists. During the late 1960s and first half of the 1970s, the Soviet Social Imperialists almost turned India under its unitary hegemony. The contention rose to a peak when an internal emergency was declared and Soviet Social Imperialists welcomed it. In such countries, the bureaucratic big bourgeoisie is compradors. They cannot and do not have the strength to break out of the clutches of the finance capital, not because they do not want to have it, but because they do not have the capital to compete with imperialist finance capital, rather have to depend upon it for their survival and growth. This finance capital may come as Foreign Direct Investments or Foreign Institutional Investments or loans to the big bourgeoisie advanced by foreign banks like Deutsche Bank, Morgan, Credit Suisse, Standard Chartered, Goldman Sachs, etc. Because semi-colonial states are of transitional forms, their dependence is also varying from state to state. (The last two paragraphs are quoted from Com. Alope Mukherjee's write-up - Colony, Neo-Colony, and Semi-Colony).

Therefore it is clear that Semi-Colonial countries, despite having political independence, economically are so much dependent on Imperialism that they gradually become enmeshed in the net of Imperialist finance capital, and as a result, bit by bit they proceed towards loss of independence.

Thus, from the various quotations of Com. Lenin as mentioned above and the subsequent description of the post 2nd World War situations, whatever features as regards imperialistic exploitation policy, as well as characteristics of semi-colonial countries, has emerged, are as follows –

Feature 1) – In the post-second world war period, imperialism, in its moribund and decaying stage, has adopted the policy of exporting finance capital to underdeveloped and backward countries. This has been one of their most useful and effective policies of exploitation.

Feature - 2) – In Semi-Colonial countries, imperialism, instead of their direct rule, consigns the reigns of power into the hands of their trained and loyal agents.

Feature - 3) – In the process of establishing their trained agents into a state power in these backward countries, the big bourgeoisie class comes to be the most reliable and dependable associate of imperialism, because as they took birth to the sperm of imperialism and in the womb of feudalism, they always remain loyal to their imperialist masters and therefore, right from the beginning, these big bourgeoisie are of comprador characteristics. Their self-interest in accumulating more and more capital is closely linked with the process of exploitation of the imperialist finance capital.

Feature - 4) – Despite political independence, these backward and Semi-Colonial countries, in an effort to develop their own country in a steady and planned manner, take on the initiative to acquire huge amounts of foreign loans and thereby get enmeshed in the net of imperialist finance capital. And as a result, they emerge into a financial crisis and gradually proceeded towards loss of political independence.

It is, therefore, logical to analyze the above four features in the context of India's Socio-Economic and political perspective, which will automatically conclude as to whether the state character of India is semi-colonial or not.

Accordingly, we will now analyze these four features, one by one, based on various facts, figures, and historical pieces of evidence available with us, right from the period of British rule in our country.

Analysis of Feature 1) – In the post-second world war period, imperialism, in its moribund and decaying stage, has adopted the policy of exporting finance capital to underdeveloped and backward countries. This has been one of their most useful and effective policies of exploitation :

“After World War-II, the imperialists have been forced to change their old style of direct colonial rule and exploitation. They have adopted a new style of exploitation by relying on certain agents in newly independent countries. Through economic ‘aid’ of other forms such as direct investments, the imperialists make all efforts to retain these countries as the market for their goods, as an outlet for export of capital, and as a source of raw materials, to plunder the riches and suck the blood of the people of these countries. This new colonialism is more pernicious and sinister than the old form of colonialism. The imperialists adopt every means available to preserve colonial exploitation of the peoples of the former colonies by adopting new forms and new methods. They try to retain, extend and strengthen their hold through various levers of economic control.

One of the most important plans adopted by imperialism in its various forms of export of capital – private and government – is ‘aid’ capital, the latest form of export of capital adopted by imperialist countries to continue their hold in the former colonial countries, ‘export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance.’ (Lenin).

There is a belief that aid is a kind of dis-interested international magnificence: Those who propagates this view are deceiving the people in the face of clear evidence of its role as a weapon of influence and control. President Kennedy, without disguising the role of ‘aid’, said in 1961 that, “foreign aid is a method by which the United States maintains a position of influence and control around the world, and sustains a good many countries which would definitely collapse or pass into the communist bloc”. Therefore, aid is a means to maintain the influence and control’ over countries to which it is given, to ‘sustain countries from collapsing’ – meaning thereby, to protect the ruling classes of the aid receiving countries from the growing revolutionary forces. As a former senior economist of the US Agency for International Development has admitted, – ‘economic assistance is one of the instruments of foreign policy that is used to prevent political and economic conditions from deteriorating in countries where we value the preservation of the present government’.

In June 1920, Lenin had expressed that – ‘It is essential constantly to expose and to explain to the widest masses of the working people everywhere and particularly in backward countries, the deception practiced by the imperialist power with the help of privileged classes in the oppressed countries in certain ostensibly politically independent states, which are in reality completely dependent on them economically, financially and militarily’. (Thesis on National Colonial Question, adopted by the Second Congress of Communist International, reproduced in ‘Documents of the History of the Communist Party of India’. page – 204).

Therefore, it is no wonder that President Nixon, proclaimed that – “Foreign assistance is quite clearly in our interest as a nation’, asking the American Congress for a massive overhaul of the United States’ foreign aid program and a step-up in its military and economic assistance abroad.” (‘INDIA MORTGAGED’, page – 110, 111, 112 & 116).

We will now see in detail who is the mainstay and what is the actual form and volume of this economic aggression in India as well as throughout the world.

“USA – The Biggest International Exploiter :

The United States is the biggest international exploiter and is the mainstay of colonialism today. It is the chief bulwark of world reaction. It is extremely important that we understand the purpose of the foreign aid that the U.S.A is distributing all over the world.

Long ago, Theodore Roosevelt, ex-President of the USA, had exclaimed that ‘Americanisation of the world is our destiny’. To that end, invisible dollar imperialism has been spreading its tentacles all over the world, even before World War-II. In the post-Second World War period, with the collapse of the fascist countries and with the weakening of Britain and France – America became the most powerful country. Foreign aid constitutes the main lever of US neo-colonialism. There is a lot of talk that American aid is for development of the under developed countries. But, as D.A. Fitzgerald, a former high official in-charge of foreign aid, has clearly stated: ‘this was not the objective of all’. In one of the reports of the foreign affairs committee of the USA, it is admitted that: ‘The most important reason for economic aid is that nations are determined to develop. Only by participation in that process, we will have an opportunity to direct their development along lines that will best serve our interests’.

To put it concretely, in an article – ‘The Domestic Dividends of Foreign Aid’, in Colombia Journal of World Business, 1965, Mr. E.R.Black says :

‘Our foreign aid programs constitute a distinct benefit to American Business. The three major benefits are (1) Foreign aid provides a substantial and immediate market for US goods and services., (2) Foreign aid stimulates the development of new overseas markets for US companies, (3) Foreign aid orients national economies towards a free enterprise system in which US firms can prosper’.

Thus the USA encourages the development of new local capitalist forces – whether in industry, trade, or agriculture – provided they continue to depend upon American aid. The US Government has always encouraged US monopolies to establish themselves in those countries which guarantee their involvement and super-profits.

US (private) involvements abroad, between 1950 and 1968, rose in Latin America from \$ 4,576 million to \$ 12,989 million, in Asia from \$ 998 million to \$ 3,645 million, and in Africa from \$ 147 million to \$ 1,961 million. According to certain calculations made, the profit rate of US direct private investments in the developing countries in 1951 reached 23.1% as against 14.3% in its own country. In 1963 the percentage obtained were 15.7% and 9.9% respectively, and in 1968, 20% and 8.3% respectively. One can now understand why, according to Senator Church, the foreign aid program – ‘has become a spreading monetary tree under which the biggest American business finds shelter when they invest abroad’. The aid program

provides about \$ 1,000 million of sales annually for American manufacturers and gives US shipping companies about one-fourth of their total revenue from outward-bound cargo. With dollar aid, India can buy goods only in the most expensive US market and the commodities must be transported in US ships. How the American ships fleece India can be seen from the following news item that appeared in Economic Times on May 25, 1969 —

‘The US insistence on shipping fertilizers in US bottoms, in terms of the decision that 50% of American Fertilizer export financed out by US aid should be carried under US flag’, ... is likely to add to a substantial increase in freight costs on fertilisers to be shipped from the U.S to India’.

We can now understand how costly US aid is. We not only pay high prices for the goods purchased in the US, under the aid programs, but also pay extremely high transport charges with other concomitant service charges added, and of course, we pay interest on the loan. As Lenin said, aid is a double-edged weapon in the hands of finance capitalists to bleed the country to which aid is given.

World Bank — American Aid in Disguise

Besides the economic levers which America uses directly, it has increasingly resorted to international financial organizations to probe and penetrate the third world, to hide the face of the ugly American whose image is becoming very much tarnished all over the world. Such international financial organizations as the World Bank, International Finance Corporation, International Monetary Fund, Asian Development Bank, etc. are nothing but semi-official American organizations, even though several other countries too are members of these financial bodies. In these bodies, the USA plays a dominant role on account of its economic power.

Let us now examine the conditions of the World Bank for getting loans and credit. The World Bank, before granting a loan, is authorized to make thorough investigations of the general economic situation of the country which applies for a loan, even though the loan may be only for a specific project. A special committee is sent to that country, not only for inquiry on the spot concerning the project for which a loan has been applied but also for economic espionage. After the loan has been granted, the World Bank continues to follow closely not only the economic but also the political evolution of the debtor country, by periodically sending an investigation committee to the country.

“For example, the World Bank has been preparing a report on the economic and political conditions of our country, year after year, from 1957; and a committee of the World Bank is in permanent session with the economic department of the Central Government before the budget is presented to the Parliament. In our own country, there is a permanent mission in existence, to advise on various economic problems and to co-ordinate various economic problems, and coordinate aid from various Western countries and international financial organizations. Thus the World Bank constantly and consistently intervenes in the internal affairs of the aid-receiving country.” (Ibid - page - 120, 121, 122, 123, 124).

In the present period, the export of finance capital throughout the world has acquired a much bigger volume and being operated in a very organized and effective manner. No need to say that, in India too, the volume of foreign loan has reached such a high level that,

to maintain financial balance, the requirement of further loan is keeping on increasing year after year and gradually, our economy is getting increasingly worse and a never-ending financial crisis has already developed. We will look into the details of the same at a later stage. For now, it is established that imperialist exploitation of finance capital throughout the world is on its way in full swing, and underdeveloped – backward countries have already got under their complete grip.

Analysis of Feature - 2) – In Semi-Colonial countries, imperialism, instead of their direct rule, consigns the reigns of power into the hands of their trained and loyal agents :

Before coming into the main point, it is necessary for us to know about the real history of our independence struggle, because within that history, remained hidden the various examples of betrayal of our big bourgeoisie – big landlord classes and the political party that represents them, the Indian National Congress. The facts behind the so-called independence of our country are still not known to most of the people. Therefore, we have to look into that particular chapter of the history first.

We all know that there has been a massive and active involvement of the common masses of our country in the independence struggle. We know about many revolutionary struggles such as the Great Revolt, Sepoi Mutiny, Naval Mutiny, etc, and innumerable economic and political struggles of the workers and peasants throughout the country, various democratic movements of the common masses, the fierce street fight of workers, peasants and middle-class people with the British army and so many other forms of struggle against the British Imperialists. As the National Congress Party, the political entity of the big bourgeoisie and big landlord classes of our country, was in the leadership of this national independence struggle, they nullified all these movements of the people of India, and keeping aside all the revolutionary aspirations of the common masses, they embezzled the state power through a peace-treaty with the British Government in 1947. In this transfer of power, what kind of secret treaty was reached into and under what kind of terms and conditions the matter was settled, is unknown to most of the people of our country. But we all know that, as a result of this treaty, on the one hand, the big bourgeoisie and the big landlord class of our country as well as world imperialism has continuously kept on increasing their wealth year after year, and on the other hand, the common hard-working people of our country kept on getting suppressed, exploited and squished and thereby gradually falling down towards a stage below the poverty line, because of the repression and exploitation of the said big bourgeoisie – big landlord classes as well as imperialism.

Therefore, without a detailed review of the role and character of the Indian big bourgeoisie class during the previous and post-independence periods, one can not understand why our country is not progressing in the right direction and why the economy of our country is worsening day by day. Let us, therefore, proceed towards a detailed analysis of the role of our big bourgeoisie classes as well as of their political representatives, the Indian National Congress Party.

Com. T.Nagi Reddy has given a detailed description and analysis of the basic characteristics of the big bourgeoisie class, in his book, based on various lessons as given by Lenin in this regard. Let us now have a look at the same –

“The Bourgeoisie and the Bourgeoisie Democratic Revolution :

For any Marxist, such a betrayal by the bourgeoisie is no surprise. As early as 1905, Lenin had pointed out that, the bourgeoisie in this epoch of Imperialism and Proletarian Revolution, cannot and will not fulfill the tasks of the completion of the Democratic Revolution.

He said: ‘the Bourgeoisie 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 a greater advantage to the bourgeoisie for the necessary changes in the direction of Bourgeoisie Democracy to take place more slowly, more gradually, less resolutely, by means of reforms and not by means of Revolution’. (Two Tactics of Social Democracy, Page -77).

Why is the Bourgeoisie afraid of Bourgeoisie Revolution? Why is it against clearing the ground of the survival 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 bourgeoisie 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 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 toward 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 Bourgeoisie 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 friend of imperialism, feudalism and the big bourgeoisie. It is no wonder that Gunner 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 masses? These are some of the questions that will have to be gone into by us to understand the actual essence of our independence.

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 on 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 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, casts, and communities; the open rumblings of the revolt of 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 was 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 among the armed forces.

The British authorities were unnerved, and the Indian bourgeoisie leadership was flabbergasted. The twins met to disrupt and destroy the unity of mass of the people and the armed forces, which was developing into an explosive force to sweep away the hundred-year away 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 force at the disposal of the Government will be used to the utmost,.... even if it means the 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 the 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 and expressing 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 he held 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 position 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 declared 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 interest to compromise with the Indian bourgeoisie. In summer of 1945, an official Industrial Mission, headed by the top persons of Indian Industry, Mr. G.D. Birla and J.R.D Tata, visited the UK and the USA 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 Indian 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 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 Bonapart'.)

"Thus 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." (INDIA MORTGAGED, Page - 34 to 39).

Nation Building by the New Government :

"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 ICS (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 provide 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 bourgeoisie 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 and S Parliamentary procedures to the secret files on the lower stuff of the administration, introduced and evolved by the colonial administration to preserve law and order, – 'continue to rule even to this day'. (Ibid- Page - 41)

Such kind of betrayal against the united struggle of the fellow countryman was never seen before.

"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 rights. 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 'battered 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 democratic 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 importance of thought as well as of action. After two years of debates and deliberations, which were not 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 the 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 condition 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 construction other than the one that was already in existence. The mass of the people were deceived by the ruling class and its agents in to believing that this Constitution is sacrosanct. But the bourgeoisie knows what it is adopting as the Constitution of India.

Thus the Constitution was nothing but a superstructure built on the readymade foundation carefully and laboriously laid by imperialism. The Constitution was meant to legalise the existing legal and administrative network 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 power in India to rule without serious prejudice to its structural integrity, constituted as it was at that time.

Ambedkar, who piloted the Constitution as Chairman of the Drafting Committee was a little more excited in his reply to the debate in the third reading of the 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 be recognizing 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 one value'..... We must remove this contradiction at the earliest possible moment or else those who suffer from inequality will blow up the structure of political democracy which this Assembly has so laboriously built up." (Ibid, page- 34 to 47).

So, this was the actual essence of our Constitution.

"Economic Policy of the

New Government :

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, railway, electricity, and atomic energy, 'the rest of the industrial field will normally be open to private enterprises' – that is in favor 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 'socialist' Nehru – 'the jewel of India.'" (Ibid, page - 43, 44).

"Compromise with the Princely States :

In the face of 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 legalized 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. Considerate treatment of these relics of feudal power and privilege in the interest of maintaining stability and status-quo is the fundamental synthesis of compromise with imperialism and accession to power." (Ibid - page 42)

"Compromise with Feudal System :

The abolition of the zamindari system was another farce played on the people of India. With millions of acres of land left as the 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 estimate 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 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." (Ibid - page 43).

"Nefarious Deal with Foreign Capital :

The Government, in the course of its decision in the Constituent Assembly, decided to remain within the 'Commonwealth', thereby giving a go-by to the famous resolution 'PURNA SWARAJ' 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 nationalization 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 is prepared to collaborate with them in the exploitation of the Indian people for super-profits." (Ibid, page - 43).

"Reorganising the Indian Army :

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 fulfill an imperial role..... Officers were carefully screened for their loyalty..... some of course were beneficiaries under British rule and 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 interest 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 Lontaign, strode into the main lecture hall, interrupting the lecture, 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 Officials to the top-most Secretary in the Government of India almost intact." (INDIA MORTGAGED, page - 40, 41).

Lastly on the whole, it can be summed up that, during the last episode of the liberation struggle of the people of India, the British Imperialists entered in to a compromise with the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlord classes and handed over the state power to them through a secret treaty, with an understanding that interests of the British Imperialists will be fully preserved.

Therefore, it is clear that, the British Imperialists handed over the ruling power of India into the hands of their loyal and obedient big-bourgeoisie and big-landlord classes.

Conclusion :

The various important points, those emerged out of this whole chapter are as follows :

1. As an impact of the long lasting and heroic revolutionary independence struggle of the people of India, as well as because of the huge losses incurred by the British Imperialists in the second World war period, the unnerved British Imperialists had to come to a compromise and hand over the reigns of power into the hands of their most loyal and obedient Indian bourgeoisie classes, represented by the Indian National Congress in 1947 through a secret treaty of transfer of power.
2. The Indian National Congress Party, being the representative of the big bourgeoisie and big landlord classes of our country, had embezzled the state power through a compromising and peaceful treaty with the British Imperialists, by nullifying all the heroic revolutionary struggle and aspirations of the people of India.
3. The newly formed Indian Government adopted the same Constitution, as was prepared and adopted by the British Imperialists, and also adopted the same administrative norms and practices as developed by the British rulers.
4. As regards the economic policy of the newly formed Indian Government, the socio-economic interest of the Indian big bourgeoisie - big landlord classes has been made fully secured by bringing in various new laws and regulations. The same initiative has been taken for securing the interests of the Imperialists.

Thus, all the above activities of the Congress-led Indian bourgeoisie classes and the subsequent steps taken by the newly formed Indian Government clearly establishes the teachings of Lenin that, in the case of semi-colonies, the Imperialists' hands over the state power into hands of their trained and loyal agents. And therefore, Feature - 2 of India being a Semi-Colonial country, has been proved to be quite correct.