Appendix III

What do we want?

M. N. Roy

1. Political Independence

We want, first of all and as soon as possible, political independence, because it is the first step towards our goal. But we must know that merely the overthrow of foreign rule will not bring us all we lack today and all that is indispensable in order that the masses of the Indian people shall live like human beings. Why are we determined to overthrow the British Government? Because, it is based on the principle against which everyone who lives by honest labour must rebel. It is based upon the right of the possessing class to exploit the expropriated toiler.

The task of a government is to administer the affairs of the country. If the government is not a part of the country, it can not execute its task in accordance with the interests of the inhabitants. In order to safeguard the people's interests, the government should be controlled by them; it should represent the people. In other words, the people of a country administer their own affairs through the medium of a government which is constituted by means of elected representatives; any government not so constituted, not based on the principle of elected representation, cannot take care of the interests of the community.

The British Government, which has been ruling India for more than a hundred and fifty years, is not a part of the country; it does not represent the Indian people whose affairs it administers. It is not constituted of representatives of the people. The British Government rules over India not for the
sole purpose of administering the affairs of the Indian people but with the object of exploiting them. The present government of India is not elected by the people of India; it is appointed by the capitalist class of England, which makes profit by exploiting the labour of the Indian and English working class. We are rebelling against the present government because it lets the British capitalist rob the Indian people. A government which does not administer the affairs of the country in the welfare of the people of that country has no right to exist, and must therefore be overthrown. Foreign domination must be replaced by a national government. India must be governed by her own people, who will elect their own representatives to look after their interests and welfare.

The concern of British Government is to see that the British merchants and manufacturers, who rule England today, get the greatest amount of profit by robbing the Indian people. The fact that the Viceory is an Englishman and all the high government officials are also Englishmen does not mean that India is ruled by the English people as a whole. No, India is ruled by a very small section of the English nation—the small section which makes profit by exploiting the Indian people and natural resources of our country, and which is called the capitalist ruling-class. It is this capitalist class which carries on trade, owns railways, mines, and plantations, and makes money by robbing the Indian worker and peasant of the fruits of his labour. It is this class which rules not only India, but England and the whole British Empire today. The British Government is composed of the representatives of this powerful class of exploiters, who control the affairs of the Empire in their own interests.

The same thing may happen when India will be governed by the Indians. The fact that an Indian gentleman may sit where Lord Reading sits today; that Indian officials administer the affairs of the country instead of English ones; that all the governors of the provinces will be Indians; that all the magistrates, collectors and judges will also be Indians, does
not necessarily mean that the country will be governed in the interests of the entire people of India.

Why is this so? It is because the interests of all the people in any given country are not identical. The Zamindars of Bengal, the Taluqdar of Oudh, the Patwaris of the Punjab, the millowners of Bombay and the Brahmins of Madras are all inhabitants of India; they are all a part of the Indian nation and belong to the same nationality. So also are the tenants of the Zamindars, Taluqdar and Patwaris in the various Indian provinces; the factory-hands of Bombay the Pariahs of Madras—all are a part of the Indian people, belonging to the same nationality. But can we believe that simply because they belong to the same country, they have the same interests? No, of course not. It cannot be so. The Zamindars and Taluqdar cannot continue to occupy their present position of rich and idle parasites unless there exists a class of people to cultivate the soil and pay them rents and tributes. The mill-owners cannot exist unless they have tens of thousands of workers to run their factories. The Brahmins cannot maintain their superior religious and social position unless a certain section of the population is held in intellectual darkness and social slavery. All these people, the Zamindars, Taluqdar, merchants, manufacturers and parasitic priests, belong to the same class of exploiters whose interest it is to live at the expense of another and larger section of the population—the Indian workers and peasants.

It is clear then that the interests of all the people belonging to the same country are not identical. The interests of the rich are opposed to those of the poor; those of the landlord are not the same as those of his tenants; the interests of the mill-owner are contrary to those of his factory-hands. Why? Because one class thrives on the exploitation of the other.

The present government represents the British capitalist class, whose interest it is to exploit the labour of the Indian working-class, on whose wealth it fattens. When the British Government is overthrown, and a government of the Indian landlords, merchants and manufacturers is established in its
place, will that change the present miserable condition of the Indian workers and peasants? No, for the interests of these two classes are not the same. A government composed of the upper and middle classes of the Indian people, in spite of being a national government, will protect only the interests of those classes, and not of the exploited majority. The power of the Zamindar will increase; more profits will swell the purse of the mill-owner; the Indian middle-class intellectuals will fall heir to the fat government jobs today reserved for Civil Service men imported from Great Britain. How can this in any way alter the existing economic condition of the majority of the Indian people? In what way will this change of English rulers for Indians improve the lot of the toiling peasant and starving wage-slave?

Outlines of Swaraj
Thus it is necessary for us to enquire what kind of national government will be established in the country after the foreign domination is overthrown. We cannot remain satisfied with the vague formula of Swaraj as our goal. It is necessary to define Swaraj; to know what definite provisions will be made by the national government to improve the condition of the Indian masses.

The national government must represent the interests of the majority of the Indian people in order to protect the national interests. Who are the majority of the people of India? Who constitute the backbone of the nation? Is it the idle landlords and rich capitalists or the industrious workers and peasants? Ninety out of every hundred people in India belong either to the poor peasantry or the exploited city workers. These are the people who produce everything necessary to the life and comfort of the nation; they till the soil, weave the cloth, build the houses, construct roads and railways, dig mines, run the trains and ships. It is they who conduce to the daily activity and progress of society, therefore the welfare of her peasantry and working class constitutes the national welfare of India.
This being the case, the national government of India will not be really representative unless it is controlled in the interests of and by the majority of the Indian people, the Indian workers and peasants. A government which represents the productive element of the society is the only truly national government which will foster and defend the interests of the majority. The capitalist employer and parasitic landlord cannot protect the interests of the productive classes, since the former thrives on the exploitation of the latter. Government power in the hands of the exploiting class will be wielded for the benefit of that class alone. The condition of the masses will be very little improved unless such improvement is guaranteed beforehand by a clear statement of national reconstruction put forward as a political programme to be fulfilled after the overthrow of foreign rule.

We demand the formation of such a programme of national reconstruction, which shall contain the following measures:

1. That our National State (Swaraj) will be based on the principle of Universal Suffrage.

2. That the principal means of production, distribution and exchange (land, mines, factories, railways, waterways, etc.) will be owned by the Democratic State and operated under the control of Workers’ Committees, elected by and from among the workers employed therein.

3. That Landlordism be abolished, and the ownership of land be vested in the State, which will distribute it among those who cultivate it.

We demand these things in order that those who work shall enjoy the fruits of their labour, in order to bring the exploitation of man by man to an end.

The workers and peasants of India want to conquer Swaraj because it will open to them those avenues of progress now closed by the foreign ruler. The national government which replaces foreign rule must not administer the country in the sole interests of the Zamindars, factory-owners and other rich people. It must be the champion of the toiling masses, who have been exploited for so long by foreign imperialism. We
will not overthrow one exploiter to put a new one in his place, simply because the latter happens to be born in the same country as ourselves, belongs to the same race and speaks the same tongue. It hurts just as much to be kicked by my own brother as by an Englishman in the street.

The British Government is the rule of the rich propertied class over the workers who live by their honest toil. That is the reason we are against. It exploits our people, therefore we are determined to overthrow it. It is not only because it is foreign that we are rebelling against it; we are struggling to end it because it represents the class which grows rich by exploiting the toiling masses, by robbing them, by depriving them of the fruits of their labour. The British Government in India is a part of the capitalist system, which makes the workers live like animals while the idle roll in luxury.

The masses of our people are striving for something human; there is nothing spiritual or sublime in it. They produce everything, but live in misery and die of starvation. It is this state of affairs we are out to fight. Every human being requires something to live on. He has to struggle for his existence if he does not wish to die. The Indian people are no exception and if they are to live a human life, they must struggle to conquer that fight. This is the true nature of the struggle we are involved in—to conquer the right to live as human beings. This is the motive force of the movement for national liberation. Before we talk about the spiritual uplift of the Indian people, we must look at their material existence. Do the majority of our people live a human life? No. Look at the places they call their homes. They are nothing but dirty dens, unfit even for animals to live in! Pet dogs, horses and other domestic animals belonging to the capitalist class, British as well as Indian, are kept in rooms which are heaven compared to what the Indian workers and peasants live in. Just imagine their food! The pet dogs of the master class get fresh meat every day, and what do they eat? It may be said that their rooms, their food, their clothing are so miserable because they cannot earn more. But why do they
earn so little? Because somebody deprives them of the greater part of what they produce, of what rightfully belongs to them, because it is created by their honest labour. The wages of the worker are so low because his employer grows rich on profits. The peasant lives in hunger, borrows money to buy food and pay his rent and taxes; often he sells his plough and cattle to liquidate his debt, and eventually he is driven off his land. Why is this so? Why should he who makes the earth yield heaps of food grains live in hunger? Because the greater part of what his labour produces is taken away from him in the shape of rent, taxes, interest and other tributes to the landlord, and government and money-lender, who do no productive work.

It is this system of exploitation and expropriation which is responsible for the present miserable condition of the majority of the Indian people. True freedom of the human being cannot be realized so long as society is based upon the right of man to exploit his fellowmen. The British Government upholds this system; therefore we want to overthrow it. We are fighting not for political independence and self-government alone, but a Swaraj that will enable the Indian people to advance on the road to greater freedom in every field, social, economic and political. Foreign rule must be ended, and national self-government put in its place. But the administration of independent India must not be allowed to fall completely into the hands of the native exploiting class. The government must be controlled by those who form the majority of the nation, and on whom the economic life of society depends, without whose labour no progress can be made. India should be liberated from foreign rule, not only to secure a greater scope for native capital and a more comfortable life for the upper classes, but in order to conquer a new life for the toiling masses as well. We are determined to free the Indian masses not from foreign exploitation alone but from all sorts of exploitation. The Indian people have begun a struggle which will not end with the attainment of political freedom alone.
2. Economic Emancipation

We will win political freedom as a step towards economic emancipation. Everybody, rich or poor, educated or ignorant, fights for his own interests. But the interests of every man are not the same. The interest of the rich cannot be the same as that of the poor; that of the employer cannot be identical with the interest of his workers, nor that of the Zamindar with his tenant. If the poor worker fights to improve his miserable condition, he comes immediately into conflict with the rich because the poverty of the one can be cured only by limiting the power of the other to rob and exploit him. The wages and living conditions of the city worker cannot be improved without reducing the profit of the employer; the lot of the agricultural classes can be lightened only at the expense of the landlord.

A nation struggles for its independence, but since every nation is divided into two classes, viz, the property-owning and the propertyless, the employer and the employee, the landowner and the cultivator, the capitalist and the worker—the object of this struggle for national independence cannot be the same for both these classes into which the people of every country are divided. The rich man wants Swaraj because under it he expects to grow richer. The factory-owner will build more factories and employ more workers to produce more goods and make more profit under the protection of the national government. The British Government does not let him build as many factories as he would like, because the English merchants and manufacturers want to sell to the Indian people the cloth, shoes, and other articles made in English factories. Therefore the Indian factory-owners want Swaraj. When India has a government controlled by the native proprietied classes, the Indian capitalists will be helped instead of hindered in building more factories, employing more workers, producing more goods and making more profit.

The present government is foreign. The huge amount of money that it collects as revenue from land is sent to England. When the country will be free, this money will go to the Indian
Zamindars. The profit that the English capitalist class makes by ruling India will be inherited by the Indian landlords, merchants and manufacturers when the foreign domination will be overthrown, when the English will no longer rule the country. But what will the common people get from this Swaraj? What will be their share in this freedom for which we are fighting, and to win which the blood of the Indian masses must be shed in torrents?

Theory of National Wealth Wrong

We are told that the industrial and commercial development of India will increase the national wealth, and that consequently, the economic conditions of all classes will be improved. But is it so? Let us examine some facts. Today India has to pay an enormous sum of money to buy the cloth imported from England. Thus it is argued that if the cloth we need is manufactured in this country, the money that today goes to England will stay in the country. Very good. But who pays this money? The people who buy the cloth, that is the common people, the workers and peasants, contribute a very large portion of this huge sum that goes out to England in payment for the cloth imported into India. Now when the cloth will be manufactured in the country, it surely will not be given free to the people who now buy it, they will have to buy it just as they always did. In other words, when the Indian masses buy country-made cloth instead of the imported commodity, their money will go into the pockets of the native merchant and manufacturer instead of to the British capitalist. How will this fact make any appreciable difference in the economic condition of the common people? The same argument holds good for other industries. Some people say that the foreign cloth can be driven out of India by the revival of the Charkha and handloom. These people are visionaries. Their economics are wrong and they are socially reactionary. First of all, machine-made commodities cannot be ousted from the market by handmade stuff, which can always be undersold by the former, on account of lower cost of pro-
duction and increased output. So those are mistaken who argue that the Charkha and handloom will drive away foreign cloth and the money thus saved will be evenly distributed among all the people. Then, supposing that handicraft production will be able to supply the demands of the country in sufficient quantities and at a low enough price so as to throw the machine-made imported commodities off the market, even this will not mean an equal distribution of the national wealth. The Charkha and looms will be owned by private individuals; cotton will be produced by people interested in selling it at the highest possible price; the land on which cotton will be grown will carry rent. Thus all the elements of trade are latent in this primitive means of production, a return to which is held by many of our leaders to be the panacea for all the present troubles and miseries of the Indian people. And as long as all the economic elements giving impetus to trade are there, trade will develop and expand, changing the primitive individualistic character of industry into manufacture, machinefacture and large-scale production concentrated in the hands of a few who possess capital to purchase raw materials, machinery and hire labour just as it happened in Europe during the Industrial Revolution. The result will be the same in India as it was in Europe—capitalist industry will expropriate the worker whose labour produces commodities and the profits of production wrung from the unpaid labour of the worker will go to enrich the idle employer. So under no conditions can the theory of an equal distribution of national wealth be put into practice.

The increase of national wealth means the enrichment of the native propertied class, and the enrichment of this class means the expropriation and pauperization of the producing class.

The industrial development of India under a national government will mean more extensive and intensive exploitation of the labour power of the working-class. The building of more factories will require the employment of more labourers.
Increased profit can be made only by paying lower wages. If the textile production of the country is increased, raw material must also become more plentiful and cheaper. This necessity will affect the economic position of the peasants who grow cotton. Methods of large-scale production will have to be introduced into agriculture to improve the quality and increase the quantity of the produce. This will mean the concentration of land in the hands of capitalist farmers, producing raw materials not for the use of the village weaver as in the olden days, but for exchange on the capitalist market. Concentration of land takes place only by ousting the poor peasantry, who are driven to the industrial centres to live the life of wage-slaves in the great factories.

Extensive industrialization of a country—the process by which national wealth is increased—means the liberation of the peasantry from feudal bondage, the expropriation of the free cultivator, the gradual elimination of individual production and the transformation of the pauperized peasants and artisans into proletarian wage-slaves.

This is exactly what is going to happen in India. National freedom will open up avenues for the aggrandizement of the propertied upper classes. But will that satisfy the requirements of the common people? Are we to call upon the peasants to join us in the struggle for Swaraj in order that they may be driven off their land or continue to live as now, completely at the mercy of the landlord, on the morrow of the establishment of Swaraj? Are we to call upon the working masses to follow us in the fight against foreign rule, only to see them exploited by the native instead of the foreign capitalists? This is surely not what we want. This is not a revolutionary ideal. If this is our goal, if this is the Swaraj we are fighting for, then we can abandon the stormy path of non-cooperation and follow after the co-operating Moderates, who are also striving for the same thing and who lead us there in a much more orderly and peaceful manner. But we do not want to follow the Moderates. Why? Because there is a different between their ideal and ours. The Swaraj that
we strive for then must be something more than a national government, under which the Indian propertied classes will thrive at the expense of the toiling masses.

It becomes necessary, therefore, to define what are the interests of the common people. It is necessary to know clearly for what we are fighting. It is necessary to put before the Indian workers and peasants a programme of action. Above all, it is necessary for us to know that what we want is not the same thing that the rich and propertied classes of India want.

We are fighting for the economic interests of the Indian masses, which are distinct from those of the classes that thrive by robbing them.

It has already been seen that we want to overthrow British rule because under it, the masses of our people are ground down in chronic poverty. We are convinced that unless the chains of capitalist imperialism are broken, there is no chance of improving the economic condition of the Indian people. But the Swaraj that will put the native exploiting class in the place of the foreigner will not secure what we strive for. The Swaraj needed for the welfare of the Indian masses—of those labouring in the factories and toiling on the fields is not the Swaraj that will satisfy the aspirations of the propertied upper-class and prosperous intellectuals.

In order that Swaraj may bring about such radical economic changes as will improve the life of the working class, it must be something more than a political makeshift or a spiritual formula. It must signify certain principles of economic reconstruction and social readjustment of the entire nation. The progressive upper classes of India are also oppressed by foreign rule in so far as free progress is not permitted to them. These classes have also a part to play in the general scheme of our social revolution. Their free development will break down all the old bondages of social conservatism and religious prejudice, bonds which can only be broken by the free development of economic forces by the rise of higher means of production. Therefore, we must lead the masses of our people to support the progressive upper and middle classes in their
struggle against imperialistic domination. But we must never for a moment confuse our goal with theirs. They want to go a certain distance and stop. As soon as they have conquered political power, as soon as they have become the rulers of the country in place of the overthrown foreigner, or as soon as the latter makes them sufficient concessions of power, they will stop all revolutionary agitation. It is our part to push them forward by strengthening their demands with the support of revolutionary masses. But this support must not be given unconditionally, since we must always remember that their goal and ours is not the same. We must support their demands on condition that certain demands of our own are included in their programme. We must make them declare that Swaraj will guarantee the substantial economic improvement of the working-class.

Our demands should be so formulated as to secure as much as possible for the masses in return for their support of the nationalist cause. Our slogans should be such as will appeal to the imagination and desires of the exploited masses. We must put forward demands which can be easily understood by the most ignorant worker, and which will help him to see that such a Swaraj means something more for him than the Paradise of the propertied classes or the Utopia of the Social reactionaries. Our programme must interpret Swaraj according to the needs and desires of the wide masses of the population, it must advocate concrete improvement in the economic condition of the working masses. We must define Swaraj to mean a state of national independence which will guarantee to the Indian workers and peasants a higher standard of living and the opportunity for further progress, free from the exploitation of capitalism. Such a Swaraj will open up a new vision of life to the Indian people, and such a Swaraj is alone worth fighting for.

Abolition of Landlordism

We demand the expropriation of all big estates belonging to the Zamindars, Taluqdars, Jagirdars and other aristocrats and
feudal lords. The land is to bear fruit for all who labour, but none of these idle rich men do anything to make the land yield harvests. It is the poor peasants who do all the work. Why then should these idle aristocrats own the land and make the cultivator pay them rent? There are lakhs of peasant families living on two or three bighas of land, whereas almost one-half of the whole country belongs to a small number of the idle and corrupt landlords. Swaraj must put an end to this inequitable distribution of land—a distribution that is based on the principle of exploitation. The land should be given to those who cultivate it. The peasants must organize village councils to enforce the expropriation of large estates, and these village councils, composed of all the poor and landless peasants, should take charge of the redistribution of the land. The expropriated landlords, village traders, money-lenders and all others owning capital or large properties should be excluded from these village councils. The reason for such exclusion is plain. It is to protect the interests of the poor peasantry, freed from the age-long exploitation of landlordism, and to make the confiscation real. If legislative and executive power is not vested in the poor peasantry, they will be cheated by the cunning trader and money-lender, and a new class of land speculators will replace the old landlords.

The confiscation must be complete and unconditional. No compensation should be made, because in that case the confiscation will have no economic value. Who would pay this compensation? The Government? Where could the Government get the money? It would have to be raised by taxation. The expropriated landlords would hold heavy bonds and through these, control the Government. This would mean the same state of affairs as now prevails. We are against compensation because it nullifies the act of confiscation. You talk about 'justice' to the landlords. Where is your sense of 'justice' now towards the expropriated peasants? There can be no talk of justice in what is an economic question, pure and simple. If we want the welfare of the peasant masses, the rights of landlordism must be unconditionally challenged and abrogated. A Swaraj
which does not put the welfare of the exploited masses above
that of the privileged upper classes cannot be of any interest
or concern to a revolutionary who strives for the political
freedom of India, not for the sake of political freedom in itself,
but as a necessary step towards the happiness of the majority
of the Indian people, now sunk in an abyss of misery.

Our Agrarian Programme is *Unconditional Abolition of
Landlordism, the national ownership of land and its distrib-
ution among the poor peasantry*. Our slogan is *confiscation
without compensation*.

Our Agrarian Programme can only be executed by the
expropriated peasantry itself. Thus we must popularize our
programme in the villages and organize the poor peasantry
into militant class-organisations which will carry on a con-
tinuous struggle against the landlords, the usurers and spec-
ulating traders.

Futility of Village Reform

The attempts of some of our nationalists to revive the old
Panchayats are reactionary. These attempts are not inspired
by any revolutionary ideal, but by the desire to blunt the edge
of the class-conflict, which is growing sharper every day.
Neither will the reformist activists of the social workers do.
To try to teach the pauperized peasantry self-help before they
learn self-assertion is useless. It is like advising a man to
cook his food tastefully to make up for deficiency in quantity.
*The village cannot be reformed, because its economic basis
is rotten*. Excessive and multifarious exploitation is the cause
of the chronic poverty of the peasantry which requires a
radical remedy. No patchwork will do. How can you save
the peasant from pestilence by sinking a well or starting a
charitable dispensary, when he falls so easily victim to any
epidemic disease because of his undermined vitality, which
in turn is produced by life-long malnutrition? How can you
teach the peasant co-operation when the villages are infested
with money-lenders and traders, with their thousand and one
cunning schemes of exploitation, which they carry on with
the support of the local officials? In addition, so long as the peasants will be submerged in debt as they are today, they will not be in a position to dispose of their products in a fair market. Excessive rents and taxes imposed alike by the Government and the landlord, force him into the clutches of the usurer and land-spectulator; the only release is found in the slums of the large industrial cities. Burdened with heavy debts, which always increase, the majority of the peasants are forced to mortgage their own crops even before they are sown. How can you save them from this situation so long as the law sanctions even the worst forms of exploitation? While his crops are liable to be auctioned off by the court bailiff, or seized by the creditor before they are harvested, it is idle to preach to the peasant the magic charm of co-operative stores. Such movements will be encouraged by the landlords as well as by the Government because they are instrumental in pacifying the discontent of the peasantry. It is necessary to go deep into the root cause if we are sincerely fighting for the welfare of the peasantry, which constitute more than eighty per cent of our nation. The peasants are poor because a large part of what they produce is taken away from them in the form of rent, taxes, interests and contributions. Their poverty cannot be cured unless the system which sanctions and protects all these innumerable forms of robbery is changed. Reformist activities only help to perpetuate the system by teaching the peasant to make the best of the situation and to accept it as inevitable. Thus reformism, besides being futile, is reactionary and counter-revolutionary.

**Militant Village Councils**

We are against the revival of the old Panchayats because they do not suit the present requirements. In former days, they were a politico-economic institution corresponding to a certain stage of economic development of the people. The Panchayat is a form of organization suitable to a community just emerging from a state of tribal communism. But this cannot be
said of the Indian village today, where private ownership prevails. When the village land was still held in common, the Panchayat functioned as the government of the community. The evolution of private property long ago destroyed the economic significance of this institution, and with the disappearance of its economic significance its political importance becomes nil. Today the Panchayat can have no juridical, legislative or administrative authority, because all these functions are vested in a government whose foundations do not rest on the Panchayat. The line that divides our present society into two great classes—viz., exploiter and exploited—runs also through every village community. The Panchayat cannot eliminate this division, which is based upon private ownership. If the Panchayat be elected by all the adult population of the village, it becomes nothing more nor less than a little Parliament, with all the limitations and abuses of parliamentary democracy latent within its organism. It is proven by experience in countries where this form of government prevails that parliamentary democracies do not by their very nature protect the interests of the working class, which is only able to wrest some rights for itself by the use of militant class-action. Therefore, the Panchayat will not solve the agrarian problem of the villages. It may possibly act as an arbitration court, but such courts have no possibility of changing the economic status of the peasantry.

The village councils which we propose to organize will be militant class-organizations which will represent, not the interests of the whole village population but those of the poor peasantry. Just as the nation is not a homogeneous whole with identical interests among all classes, so neither is the village community. A governing body composed of the landlord or his representative, the rich peasant proprietor, the money-lender, trader, artisan, poor peasant landless proletariat will surely not protect the interests of the last three named. Therefore, our organization will include only those expropriated elements that are constantly engaged in a struggle with the exploiting upper classes and their partisans.
A programme which expresses their immediate interests will be easily understood by the ignorant rural masses, and through this programme their struggle will be guided towards the wider channels of national liberation and complete social and economic emancipation. It is in the process of struggle itself that their revolutionary consciousness will be aroused. The fight against the money-lenders will bring them up against the government, personified in the law courts that protect the rights of the usurer to exact interest. The conflict with the landlords will draw the government into the field to protect the rights of the latter. Thus the necessity of overthrowing the foreign domination that upholds the present system which oppresses him will become forced upon the understanding of the peasantry.

It is thus we should organize the peasantry. Not by giving them "constructive programmes", not to teach them "self-help", not to tell them to spin after the hard day’s labour in order to earn a few pice more, not to set up dummy arbitration courts without any authority to enforce their own decisions—but to demand the reduction of rents and taxes, to back up such demands by refusing payment and resisting arbitrary collections, to organize mass demonstrations to protest against the imposition of indirect taxation such as the salt tax, against high prices, low wages and the payment of usury. We must learn to direct the organized energy of the rural masses towards the redress of those innumerable immediate grievances which make their lives a burden.

Mass action thus begun will develop into organized agrarian strikes, into food riots, the plunder of corn-stocks and assaults upon large estates with the idea of confiscation. The down-trodden peasantry must be made conscious of their right to live like human beings and our propaganda should be aimed at making them understand that they should conquer this right by militant action. Such action, properly organized on a large scale, will arouse them from their age-long mental and spiritual slavery, and make them conscious of their own might. Reactionary pacifism must be
repudiated. What burst out spontaneously at Gorakhpur, Rae Barelly, Chauri Chaura, Malabar, Central India, and what is going on in the Punjab must be developed by every possible means. Peasant revolts should spread like wildfire from one end of the country to the other. We must formulate our programme to correspond to the economic interests of the masses, then go forward boldly with the programme till we reach our goal.

The Government of the people—a government which represents the interests of the majority—should not allow the backbone of our country, the peasantry, to be ground down in abject poverty. We want to see the life of the peasant improved. Why should those who produce food for the entire country remain eternally in the miserable condition they live in today? Science has shown how abundant harvests can be yielded from the land with little labour if modern methods are introduced into agriculture. A hundred years ago, people had to walk from one end of the country to the other. Merchandise was carried from province to province by horses, mules or camels. Today it is otherwise. Railway trains take people from Calcutta to Lahore in three days. Lakhs of maunds of merchandise are carried hundreds of miles without effort in a few hours. How much trouble has been saved! The work that formerly needed the labour of hundreds of men is done by one steam engine.

The same can be done in agriculture. With the aid of modern implements the peasant can cultivate his soil with much less labour. A plough driven by steam can take the place of at least a hundred of those we use now. Thus a steam-plough will free the peasant from an enormous amount of labour. On the other hand, it tills the land much better and faster, and makes it yield more crops. Instead of toiling from sunrise to sunset, the peasant need work but a few hours a day to secure a larger harvest. The rest of the time he can spend in play, amusement, rest and study, in developing the higher side of his nature which today he has no time for. Those pleasant aspects of life, enjoyed at present only by the idle rich, will then be within
the reach of all. Life will become an enjoyment and a blessing instead of a burden and a drudgery.

Thus we want the method of agriculture to be improved under Swaraj. But one may ask, "a steam plough, even a modern steel plough, costs so much that the ordinary peasant cannot buy it". Well, we are fighting for Swaraj, for our own government which will administer the country not in the interests of the foreign merchants and manufacturers, but for the benefit of the Indian people. The present government does not help the peasant to improve his condition, it extracts rent and taxes and leaves him to starve. This must not be the case under Swaraj. Our own government must care for the welfare of the people. Now the peasant cannot buy modern implements because he is poor. It is not his fault that he is poor; he is made so by the exploitation of the foreign government and native Zamindar. We must set up such a government which will help the poor peasants buy modern agricultural machinery and improve their primitive agriculture. We will set up village councils. Not the old Panchayat over which the village bully ruled. Our councils will be elected by the poor peasants from among themselves and will administer the affairs of the village. The national government will buy modern agricultural implements and place them at the disposal of these village communities, which in their turn will rent these out to the peasants at a very moderate charge. As the village councils will be controlled by the peasants themselves, the rent will naturally be fixed according to their own capacity to pay. Thus the poverty of the peasant will no longer prevent him from obtaining the help of modern science and invention to free himself from his present misery.

Small plots of land cultivated independently by individual owners are not suitable for the use of modern agricultural machinery, which can be used to advantage only on large tracts of land. It is also true that the productivity of the soil cannot be very much increased under the primitive system of agriculture that prevails among our peasantry. Individual cultivation should be replaced by large-scale farming in order to raise the
productivity of the soil and utilize modern farm implements. Only thus can the maximum production be secured by the minimum labour. Large-scale farms, however, become vehicles of intensive exploitation if owned by private capitalists for their own profit. In order that the mass of the peasants should derive advantage from them, these large-scale farms should be owned by the state and everybody who works on them should share equally in the produce.

Individualism is the main trait of the peasant’s character. Under the evolution of the system of private ownership, the old primitive tribal communism breaks down and the sense of private ownership of property becomes very strong in the peasant. Today, oppressed by the government and landlord, by the usurer and trader, this land-hunger is intensified. He hugs to his bosom the small plot of land which he possesses or imagines he possesses, and which is all that stands between him and starvation. His first instinct is to own the land which he tills. This psychology is bred by the economic law of his environment, and cannot be killed in a day. To work against it would be disastrous. We must therefore slowly proceed and by steps to train him to the idea of large-scale farming on the basis of social or community ownership. The first act of the revolution must be to put him in possession of the land which he cultivates, whose final ownership should be declared vested in the state.

In order to show the peasant the advantages of community ownership, communal agricultural farms should be started to serve as models under the direct supervision of government experts. Great estates now under a modern system of agriculture and tracts of waste land can be utilized for such communal farms, which will be controlled by the council of peasants who work on them.

Nationalization of Public Utilities

Besides land, there are other institutions and properties used by everybody and which are indispensable to the life and progress of the nation. Such are the railways, canals, tele-
graphs, mines etc., which are known as public utilities. These public utilities should cease to be owned by private individuals for their own profit, but should be owned by the whole society. They have not been specially created by anyone. The workers have brought them into existence by dint of hard labour. Gold, copper, iron, coal and other minerals are dug out of the earth by the toil of the miners, who work like beasts of burden, while the rich owners make profit by selling the minerals. The worker who digs the coal out of the bowels of the earth has to pay for it if he wants a bucketful to cook his own food. This is nothing but robbery, and we are not going to let it continue under Swaraj. The railways, telegraphs, mines and canals should belong to the nation. No private individual should be allowed to make profit out of these public utilities. At present many railways, the canals and telegraphs do not belong to private persons, but neither do they belong to the nation. They are the property of the British Government which is controlled by the rich English bankers, merchants and manufacturers. This is no national ownership. If Swaraj means simply the transfer of the administration of country to the native capitalist class, the workers will not be benefited very much. In that case the railways, telegraphs, canals and mines will be given over to private owners who will operate them for their own profit. Our capitalist class has already registered its opinion against the state ownership of public utilities. They want to inherit the position occupied today by imperialist capital. Such a change of hands will swell the profits of those who are already rich, but what benefit will the workers get out of it? We are against private ownership of public utilities. We demand their nationalization under Swaraj.

Handicrafts versus the Machine

We are told that it is a shame to put on foreign cloth, to use any article made in another country. Our leaders say that we must weave all the cloth we wear here in India; we must manufacture ourselves everything the nation needs. Very well.
We also agree that all foreign goods should be thrown out of the country. What follows this resolution? Big industries must be built in India to produce the goods formerly imported from outside. Hardly one-half the cloth needed by the people is manufactured inside the country; it is produced in the large factories as well as by the weavers in the village. Boycott of foreign cloth cannot be successful unless twice as much cloth is manufactured in the country. How can this be done? Our leaders find the solution in the Charkha. With this solution we cannot agree. First of all, as seen previously, we cannot compete successfully against machine-made products by primitive handicrafts. Then the progress of science has made the life of man more comfortable than in the ancient days. Modern machinery saves human labour. Why should a hundred people bend their backs before the loom when the same work can be done by one person with the help of a machine, which is also the creation of man? When men knew of no other way, they made the women spin with the primitive Charkha. Now the work of several hundred Charkhas can be done in the course of one hour by the use of machinery. Why should we condemn our womanhood to the ancient drudgery, which is no longer necessary?

Cloth produced in the factories by the use of machines is cheaper than that made on the handlooms. Machine-made articles are always cheaper than hand-made ones because of large-scale production, which increases the output and lowers the cost of each article. Machine-made cloth is also more comfortable to wear than khaddar, and why should we not be comfortable? We are human beings after all. If Swaraj wants to take us back to barbarism, we don’t want it. Why should we suffer sacrifice and die for something which will not improve our material condition? We are fighting not for mere abstract freedom alone, but for material prosperity. We want Swaraj because foreign domination has sucked the blood of our nation. It has obstructed the national progress. We are fighting for a Swaraj which will carry us forward with the rest of mankind. We have been kept back
too long already; why should we go further backward into primitive savagery?

The Charkha will not help us. It is a step backward, not forward. Why should our women spin all day when a good piece of machine-made cloth can be bought more cheaply in the market? We don’t want sixty crores of rupees to be taken from our country by the British merchants who sell us their cloth, but if we have to pay more for a piece of cloth made in India how can we buy country-made goods?

More factories must be built in the country so that everything the people need can be supplied by articles manufactured in India. This is the only way by which foreign goods can be thrown off our home market. But if thousands of factories are built in the country, who is going to prosper thereby? Those people who own them. This prosperity will not be for the workers who form the majority of the nation. If the mill-owners of Bombay grow richer, does that make our hunger less biting? Therefore we declare that ample provision should be made so that the Indian workers can share in the national prosperity that will come with political and economic independence.

This prosperity will be created by the workers. Factories will be built and operated by them, just as the existing ones are built and operated. The labour of the workers has enabled the factory-owners to make profits but have the workers gained anything except a bare existence? No. nothing. The fact that the factory was owned by a foreigner or an Indian has made no difference to the Indian working class. The capitalist pro-prietor is interested in making profits. He pays the workers the smallest possible wages, just sufficient to keep them alive and working. In the last four years, the profits from the cotton mills of Bombay and Ahmedabad have increased six to seven times, while the wages have hardly doubled.

We want all this to be changed. Swaraj must help India to build more industries, to build more factories, to employ more workers. But we are not fighting for a Swaraj that will
increase the means of exploiting the working class. The latter must derive some benefit if they are asked to fight for it. And it must not be forgotten that there can be no Swaraj unless the Indian workers and peasants join in the struggle for it. If Swaraj is to be won through the combined strength of the workers and peasants, they must be convinced that they are fighting for something which will benefit them, whose fruits they will reap and enjoy.

A Minimum Wages And on Eight-hour Day for Labour

We demand that every worker shall receive a minimum wage which will secure for him and for his family a decent standard of living which will guarantee him an improvement in his present miserable condition. Out of the profits derived from the factories, houses should be built for the workers. If the National Congress desires to lead the masses in the struggle for liberation, it must endorse these demands of the working class.

The workers are human beings and are entitled to lead a human life. Why should they spend their whole time in working for the profit of the employer? They need time to enjoy themselves, to educate themselves, to develop the finer aspects of life, and to rest. This they can never do so long as they must spend ten, eleven, twelve and fourteen hours a day in mines, factories and workshops, earning a miserable pittance insufficient for themselves and their families to exist upon. We want the industrialization of the country because with the help of modern machinery, all requirements of society can be secured by the minimum amount of human labour and in the shortest possible time. But this will not mean the betterment of the condition of the working class, so long as the means of production remain the property of private individuals, whose object is not to produce commodities for the use and benefit of the community but to produce them for exchange in order to make profit. This is demonstrated by the condition of the working class in highly industrialized countries like England, Germany and France and the United States. Indus-
trialization is a curse so long as it is conducted on the basis of capitalist production for profit, of private ownership.

Eight hours a day for five and a half days a week should be the maximum amount of compulsory labour performed by anybody. In that space of time, a factory worker produces much more value than the amount he receives in wages for a ten or eleven hours day. Why are the Indian workers forced to work such long hours? Because the employers, both native and foreign, make more profit by exploiting him (them) thus. Eight hours labour in a modern factory produces more than sufficient value to pay for three full meals a day, clean clothes and a decent place to live in, besides leaving a good margin for profit. In few Western countries, where there is an eight-hour law, do the workers work longer; yet their wages are higher and standard of living far superior to that of the Indian workers. This is not due to the fact that Western capitalists are any more charitable than our own, but to the organized strength of the working class, which has been able to enforce a minimum wage and eight-hour day by means of direct action. If the masses contribute their forces towards the winning of Swaraj, their demand for a fair standard of living must not be ignored. The national freedom that leaves the majority of the people in their present condition of wage-slavery will not mean anything to them, and will prove a hollow mockery.

The Indian working class is becoming articulate after being dumb for centuries. It is developing a consciousness of its economic interests. It will fight for national liberation because such liberation will be more helpful to its economic progress, or not at all. The days of docile slavery are gone for ever. The Indian masses are learning self-assertion. Swaraj will cease to have any charm for them if it does not promise at least some modification of their present economic servitude. They will not build the nation only to become the servants of native masters. They will not fight to free the country only to return meekly to their chains after the establishment of Swaraj.
Our goal is not to secure political power and economic aggrandizement for the native landholders, financiers, merchants and manufacturers, but to put an end to the economic slavery of the masses of the population. So our programme of national liberation must include provisions for the economic emancipation of the working class.

Our programme must be put into action at once. We must demonstrate by deeds that it is not the aggrandizement of the upper classes but the emancipation of the masses under Swaraj that we strive for. To rally the working class under the banner of Swaraj, we must make this economic struggle a part of the political struggle. The redress of the immediate grievances of the Indian workers and peasants should be our object. In case of conflict between the interests of the native capitalist and the worker, we must boldly take the side of the latter if we are sincerely fighting for the welfare of the majority of the Indian people. Such demands of the workers as the right of organization, the right of strike, the recognition of the unions, the eight hour day, minimum wage, proper housing facilities, etc. should be included in the Action Programme of the Indian National Congress, or failing this, a Party of the Masses would be organized setting forth the demands of the Indian workers and peasants. Every local strike should be developed into a general strike with combined political and economic demands at every available opportunity. Labour unions should be organized, not to reconcile the interests of the employers and the employees but to act as militant organs of the working class struggle.

Workers' Control of Industry

In the industrial field we must go farther if our goal is the complete economic emancipation of the masses. Industrial development will release the working class from the drudgery of primitive production. Machinery enables man to procure his necessities with the least amount of labour. This process of saving human labour and releasing human effort for higher pursuits will continue with the development and application
of science. Every blessing conquered by the genius and efforts of men should be brought within the reach of our people. But this cannot be done unless the present social system, the system of private property, is radically changed. We advocate this change. Considering the industrial backwardness of our country, it may be necessary to advance gradually towards this goal. But in order to counteract the abuses and miseries of capitalist industrialism, we propose state supervision and workers' control of industry.

All heavy industries should be placed under the supervision of the National State based upon universal suffrage. But experience in the Western countries has shown that political democracy alone does not restrict the exploitation of the working class by capitalism. On the contrary, it protects the most flagrant and intensive forms. Therefore we demand that Swaraj shall be based not only upon political, but upon industrial democracy as well. Those who control the means of production monopolize the political state power. If the industries of the country are left entirely as the property of and under the control of the individual capitalist, political freedom even under a democratic government will be only a myth. The protection and welfare of the working class therefore demands a certain degree of supervision and restraint over capitalist ownership of industries. This supervision and restraint will be exercised by the workers' council, elected from among and by the workers in the factory. These councils will see that the laws regarding the protection of the workers are enforced and that the profit accruing to the owner does not exceed a certain limit set by the democratic government. In this way the national wealth, increased by the development of industries, will be as evenly distributed as is possible within the limits of capitalist ownership. Excessive exploitation of the workers will be prohibited and the industries of the country will be run no longer in the exclusive interests of a few individuals who contribute nothing themselves to the actual process of production, but whose pockets are swelled by
the unpaid labour of the workers. State Supervision and Workers’ Control of Industry will enable the people in general to benefit at least in part by the process of modern machine production, and will hold somewhat in check the abuses of capitalistic exploitation.

Our ultimate object, however, is a complete social revolution, which means the abolition of private ownership in the means of production, distribution and exchange. Only thus will the real freedom of the Indian people be achieved. The realization of our goal depends upon the development of the working class.

The political independence of the nation must be followed by the economic emancipation of the masses, because without economic freedom the labouring classes, which constitute the overwhelming majority of every community, cannot attain an all-round elevation on every plane, physical, intellectual and spiritual.

3. Social Emancipation
The real and lasting freedom of a people demands their complete and unconditional social emancipation. From time immemorial, the working class has lived in a state of social slavery. Why is this so? Why is the class which produces everything condemned to slavery? Is it because it is by nature inferior to the other classes? Is there any reason to believe that those who maintain society by their toil are in any way inferior to those who live in idle luxury? No, we cannot believe that some have been specially ordained to live in comfort and happiness, while the great majority exist in want and misery. Two hundred workers build a house. In this house, a few people live comfortably. Who decides that these few, and not the many whose labour has built the house, shall live in it? The law of private property decides. The people who have paid for the house are said to own it, though they have done nothing to bring it into existence. They have not laid one brick; they have not moved a piece of stone; they
have not carried one pitcher of water. Yet we are told: "the owners have paid the workers wages for their labour." Where did the owners get this money with which they paid wages to the workers? They did not coin it, neither did it drop from heaven. This money with which the workers are paid their wages does not belong to the owners, because it has been gained by exploitation, by robbing other workers of the fruits of their labour. The money has been gained from profits made on land or industry or trade and all profits, as we have seen, are made from the unpaid labour of the working class. Thus the wealth of the rich does not rightfully belong to them, but to those who have worked to produce it.

*Just so long as everything that is produced by the labour of the many remains the property of the few, just so long will the working class continue to be the slave of the capitalist class, of those who own private property.* Until this system based upon private ownership, which leads to the exploitation of human labour, is changed there cannot be real freedom. Since everything of value is created by human labour, these should belong to all those who work. And in order to earn the right to live in human society, productive labour should be made compulsory to all.

Some argue thus: "Well, the people of the upper classes are more educated and more intelligent than the workers, that is why they are able to earn more money." This is a foolish argument. If the children of the workers and peasants were sent to the same schools and colleges as the children of the rich, would they be any less educated than the latter? Of course not. It is not lack of ability, but lack of opportunity, that creates a difference in education and culture. It is not natural inferiority but economic disability that creates such a wide gulf between the rich privileged classes and the poor and down-trodden masses. The wages they receive are not sufficient to feed their children; how then can they send them to school, especially in a country where education is neither free nor compulsory? No, it is not natural inferiority; they are maintained in poverty so that the few may live in luxury.
Against this system, we must rebel. We declare war on it, and we demand its overthrow. This is what we want. National freedom, a small increase in wages, some improvements in our miserable way of living will not, after all, change our life very much for the better. The cost of living will keep step with the increase in wages. As long as capitalism exists, so long as society is based upon private ownership, the working class will continue to be exploited by the possessing class. \textit{We demand the liberation of the industrious classes. We are struggling for that state of society in which everyone shall work, and each will enjoy the full fruits of his labour.} We fight for national independence because we know that it is the first step forward towards our ultimate goal. What we really strive for, what we really want, is for the Indian nation to become a free community of those who labour productively for the good of society. In such a community the idle rich can have no place. It is the task of the workers to establish such a society. We propose to educate, organize and lead the working class in this struggle for Social Emancipation, which will be hard and prolonged. The goal cannot be reached at once, we must progress by stages. In order to free the toiling masses from social slavery, we have to fight every inch of the way. The privileged class is seated very firmly in the saddle. It cannot be overthrown at once. When the foreign ruler is driven out, our native master class will take its place. Age-long economic enslavement has obstructed our moral and intellectual progress. For this reason, in spite of the unbearable misery in which the majority of us live, many are still resigned to their lot. They believe fate has ordained them to be poor and to suffer. This ignorance and passivity of the masses has always been fomented by the upper classes and maintained by every means within their power, chief among which has been the preaching of religions that teach resignation to our earthly lot as to the will of God. The first thing we have to fight and overcome is this spirit of resignation and submission engendered by superstition and ignorance. This task is aided by objective economic forces, which have shaken the
traditional passivity of the Indian masses and have set them on the warpath. It is our task to direct this awakening in the channels that will lead to real freedom.

We must educate the ignorant workers. We must show them how they are robbed and exploited. Many do not know what slaves they are; they think it a virtue to be poor. We must teach them that those who preach the virtues of poverty are not true spiritual guides, but the protectors of the interests of the master class. The masses must be freed from their moral slavery in order to realize fully the misery of their material life. Throughout the ages they have been taught that they will be rewarded in the afterlife if they suffer patiently in this. This is all very well to say, but we know that the hope of future bliss does not lessen the sufferings of our everyday life, which is the only actuality we know of. No, we must fight to win freedom in this life, to improve our present economic condition in order to release other and higher faculties, born of leisure and enjoyment. We must teach the masses that the philosophy of poverty is conducive to the interests of the idle, because it keeps the people docile and harmless. This spirit of docility and resignation does not make for freedom: so long as the Indian people remain victims of this pernicious doctrine, even the political liberation of our country cannot be realized.

Therefore we want to organize the workers in their own class organizations with the object of fighting for the interests of their class. If they do not wish to be deceived and betrayed, let them not trust the leadership of the upper classes, whose interests are fundamentally opposed to their own. The exploited masses can be educated and organized effectively only in the school of revolutionary mass action.

Revolutionary Mass Action
The working class must be organized first of all to defend its own interests. We have seen how the interests of the entire people in any country cannot be the same, because they are divided into two antagonistic classes, namely, the
propertied and the propertyless, the owner and the producer, the employer and the employee, the capitalist and the worker. The former thrives on the exploitation of the latter, therefore the interest of the one cannot be the interest of the other. Both may unite temporarily to fight together against a common enemy, but this union can never be permanent, because each is struggling for a different goal—neither is actuated by the same motives; each wants liberty, but the liberty of their respective class.

The Indian people as a whole are exploited by the foreign ruler, and therefore the British Government is their common enemy irrespective of class distinction. Rich and poor, capitalist and worker, bourgeoisie and proletariat, are fighting and must continue to fight in a united front against the foreign domination. This fight is called the struggle for national freedom. The Indian people are fighting for their political independence, for the right to rule themselves. The Indian propertied class want to be free of foreign rule because under it, freedom of development and the unrestricted right of exploitation is denied to this class. If all the wealth produced by the workers and peasants of India remained in the hands of the rich native capitalists the British would cease to rule India, because there would be no profit in their rule. As long as a foreign government rules the country, the native capitalist class must lose a portion of the proceeds of exploitation, which are appropriated by the foreign ruler and which the native consider their legitimate due. Such being the case, the native upper classes must fight the foreign exploiter. They say they are struggling against foreign domination to make the country free, but what they are really fighting for is their own interest. They are fighting for the freedom to exploit the Indian workers and peasants and the natural resources of the country; in order to secure this they must become the rulers of India. This is the national freedom they are striving for; this is what they want.

But is this what we want? Will the condition of the toiling
masses, who constitute the great majority of the Indian people, be any better off after gaining such national freedom? No, surely not. The Indian workers and peasants are poor, they are starving, they die by thousands from famine and pestilence, because the exploitation of the propertied class deprives them of the fruit of their labour. The British, being the rulers of the nation, are able to rob the people more than the native capitalists do. Therefore we must fight to overthrow them. But the overthrow of British rule will not be enough to free the entire people from economic exploitation and social slavery. The fundamental motive of our struggle is to abolish the source of human exploitation, which lies in the system of private property, of production for profit, in a word, Capitalism. Since the entire Indian people are exploited by a foreign power, the entire people must rebel against it, must unite their forces to fight against and overthrow it. But this does not alter the fact that the people are divided into two antagonistic classes, with mutually opposing interests.

The Indian workers and peasants will join the struggle against foreign rule, impelled by the interests of their class, because it exploits them, keeps them economically backward and obstructs their social progress. Our fight is of a different nature from that of the rich Zamindars, capitalists and intellectuals. We are fighting for the interests of the common people and our goal must be always clear before us. We want to end foreign exploitation of the Indian masses in order to better their economic condition. This is our immediate goal. Our ultimate goal is the end of all exploitation. We want to break the age-long social slavery of all those who live by labour, who create all wealth.

How to achieve this ultimate goal? How to proceed? A hard struggle lies before us. Our fight will be a long one. Intelligent leadership is necessary, but we must ultimately learn to depend on the irresistible strength of mass action, impelled ever forward by relentless economic forces, which in the end always triumph. Our task is to develop in the minds of the masses this consciousness of their own power, to awaken their
interest and develop their indomitable will to conquer freedom. They will do the rest.

By agitation, we can educate the workers to understand the interests of their class. We can teach them how to organize themselves for concerted action on the economic and political field. We can help to root out of them the spirit of resignation, of submission to fate, which robs them of all initiative and desire to improve their material existence by active struggle. We must teach them their right to live as human beings, and help them to formulate the demands which must be backed by determined mass action, which under perfect organization and leadership can be developed into a country-wide general strike.

Our task will be aided by external forces, ever at work. Starvation and age-long suffering have already shaken the traditional resignation of the Indian working class. They are in a rebellious mood, ready to fight. They demand a change in their condition but because of their centuries of moral and material slavery, the majority of them do not know exactly what to fight for. It is our task to infuse consciousness in these toiling masses — to develop the spontaneous awakening and intensify their rebellious spirit of leading their struggle for the redress of their immediate grievances. Our object should be to create discontent everywhere against the present system of exploitation, and to intensify it wherever it exists. Thus will the ideal of Swaraj be brought within the understanding of the workers and peasants of India. Let us lead them forward under the slogans: "Down with Foreign Rule"; "Down with all Exploitation"; "Land to the Peasant and Bread to the Worker".