The crisis inherent in capitalism set in as soon as the war began in Europe in 1914. Previously there had been occasional signs of disbalance in the international economic system, but outbreak of war jeopardised the whole system. Capital "tied up in international trade and foreign enterprises became temporarily at least, irrecoverable, and some of the most useful channels of short-term investment were closed or made unattractive by commercial uncertainty. The international gold standard was abandoned, and international financial dealings became a less stabilizing influence than they had been." This situation in the international market caused budget deficit in all the countries and ushered in a reign of inflation throughout the world. Even after the end of the war the economic situation, instead of improving, worsened for war repayments and extraction of large sums as reparations from the defeated power. "The reparation question was an important element in the background of European economic affairs just after the war, when the major problems were those of transfer from a war to peace economy and restoration of a sound financial system." However, the situation started improving because of political stabilisation and the restoration of business confidence that followed. The business men felt assured that their programme of expansion would not be interfered with by violent political changes. Full credit for the change in situation should go to two continental powers namely France and Germany under the statesmen Aristide Briand and Gustav Stresemann respectively.
relaxation of international tension and political stabilisation particularly since the signing of Locarno Pact in 1925 "was accompanied by stabilisation of internal conditions in all the major countries and marked a spectacular economic recovery. By 1927 every major country returned to the gold standard." The gold standard "brought about a rapid development in the economies of the most advanced industrial countries, a vast increase in world trade and huge investment of capital in underdeveloped countries in the world."

But the expected restoration by the revival of gold standard could not save the economy from recurrent cycles of boom and slump. Profit-oriented nature of competitive society inevitably involved considerable unemployment. Thus John Strachy observes that the simultaneous appearance of masses of unemployed capital and masses of unemployed labour is a characteristic feature of capitalist economy. This may be described as an inherent contradiction of capitalism leading to periodic crisis. Temporarily, however, idle capital might find avenues of investment; the rate of profit might also be pushed up by taking measures such as "price raising and/or wage cutting". Yet the recurrence of crisis was inevitable. Capitalism "never pretended to be a system for the direct satisfaction of human needs" and the object of production here is the maximisation of profit. Hence, the restoration of the international economic system during the period of 1925-29 was more apparent than real. Prosperity was real so far as the growth of trade, production and income were concerned, but it
was purely a 'hand to mouth' arrangement abandoning thought of the morrow. The size of unemployment was very high. Because the labour force engaged in primary production for the market was increasing at a faster rate than the population of the major consuming areas. The introduction of better technicalities to raise the rate of production added fuel to the fire. "Another disturbing symptom was the failure to adjust the output of a number of the basic commodities of international trade to the level of demand prevailing at acceptable prices."

Moreover, the terrible legacy of violence inherited from the war had been endemic in the political life of Europe, and it lurked round the corner biding for the opportune moment. Particularly in Germany, the nationalist right force under the leadership of Hugenburg started vigorous campaign against Stresmann in 1928 and this allowed Hitler to emerge for the first time from provincial obscurity and become a national political figure as an ally of Hugenberg. This was a bad augury for the future. Economic stability was also taking a precarious turn. In the pre-war period the Bank of England would work as the world's Central Bank, but after the war America emerged as the strongest industrial and financial country of the world. London also remained great and that created the difficulty. The two countries started operating mutually contradictory credit policies. The international economy was further strained by the Anglo-French policy of choosing "parities which were out of balance with each other."
There was another very important factor to contribute to the onset of the depression. The recovery was purely the result of industrial and manufacturing boom. Throughout the world agriculture started declining in relation to industry. "The relative decline of agriculture created a disequilibrium both between the industrial and the rural areas of the world, and between the industrial and rural areas within the developed countries, and this contributed a marked element of instability to the economic system as a whole." And above all pursuing of the policy of economic nationalism along with political nationalism by different countries greatly disturbed the economy. The Great Depression set in.

The depression of 1929 became so severe and devastating because Britain could not and U.S.A. did not assume responsibility for stabilising the economy "in three particulars: (a) maintaining a relatively open market for distress goods; (b) providing counter-cyclical long-term lending; and (c) discounting in crisis." But Joseph Schumpeter observes that, depression of such severity is also a regular feature of capitalist economy and this has "repeatedly occurred — roughly once in fifty-five years .....".

Capitalism suffers from these defects because it is a lopsided ideal. It fails to recognise that man is a solitary being as much as a social being. As a solitary being he attempts to protect his own existence and that of those who
are very close to him, to satisfy his desires and to develop his innate capacities. The capitalist system is a perfect expression of the desires of a solitary being. But a man is unable to think, feel and work by himself; he depends so much upon society for his physical, intellectual and emotional existence that we cannot think of a man outside the framework of society. "It is 'society' which provides men with food, clothing, a home, the tools of work, language, the forms of thought, and most of the content of thought; his life is made possible through the labour and the accomplishments of the many millions past and present who are all hidden behind the small word 'society'." As capitalism does not conceive society this way, it is quite natural for it to develop crisis from time to time.

The attention of man is, therefore, naturally turned towards socialism. Socialism is not, however, a suddenly discovered hand-made model. "The idea of a new and better form of human society beyond capitalism is as old as capitalism itself. Moreover, the history of capitalism has been marked by a series of revolts against the conditions of life which capitalism has produced for the greater part of the population. . . . . The idea of a socialist or communist form of society was born at the very moment of the birth of capitalism, and of capitalism's shadow, or property-less working class." The description of a property-less working class was given in Sir Thomas More's Utopia. But the misfortune of the utopian
socialists was that they failed to recognise the role of the working class as the chief agent of social change. As socialism does not mean piecemeal or patchwork reform of capitalist social structure but revolutionary reconstruction of entire social system introducing socialisation of production and social ownership over the means of production and distribution, the work can be undertaken by the working class alone. "For no other class or group has ever shown either the desire or the capacity to lead the community in the task of abolishing capitalism and building up socialism. Socialism must be established under the leadership of the working class, or it will not be established at all." The catastrophe of capitalism might be averted only by the establishment of real workers' control over the production and distribution of goods.

It should, however, be noted that, it was not merely the world-wide depression and crisis in capitalism that inspired a considerable portion of world population to socialism. The tide of socialist movement was already there — somewhere it was an ebb tide and somewhere it was a flow tide. The tide was high in Soviet Russia. The Soviet leaders were trying hard to build up a system of planned production for community consumption. It is not that they were successful in every attempt, but with much pain they were evolving through observation, experiment and verification. They had one thing "what most government lack — a fixed purpose of social
change, to be persistently pursued and relentlessly fulfilled, at whatever cost and sacrifice. This purpose they themselves described as the creation of a new social order, the class-less state, "by which they meant a society in which no one would be able to use the labour of others in order to enrich himself or even in order to live without producing." 23 The term also had a constructive meaning. "It implied . . . . the establishment of a community in which every able-bodied person, without exception, would be expected to repay to the community the cost of his upbringing, as well as to contribute to the common well-being, in whatever way his faculties permitted; whilst being secured his own share in the common product, in a form and to an amount appropriate to his particular needs." 24 The post-revolutionary zeal of social reconstruction had, therefore, a natural impact on world-mind, particularly on the colonial populace. "This not only opens out a new perspective for the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, constituting the majority of the human race, to advance from the passive to the active instruments of history; but this in its turn reacts upon and undermine the basis of imperialism in the remaining countries and the consequent social-political structure built upon that basis." 25

The Russian revolution and the subsequent efforts to build up a new society in Russia undoubtedly influenced the development of socialist movement in India; but it will be an over simplification of facts to state that the Indian socialist
movement was a mere reflection of the Soviet zeal. Many other happenings within the Indian National Congress as also outside it contributed to the emergence of an integrated party of socialists. Gandhi, the central sun of the Congress ever since the year 1920, had indeed sought to direct the freedom movement along moral and spiritual line. Satyagraha, the method used by him, was "purely a spiritual weapon .... It is the complete substitute for violence or war. It is designed, therefore, to reach the hearts both of the so-called Terrorists and of the rulers who seek to root out the terro-

This observation was made by Gandhi while suspending the Mass Civil Disobedience Movement and restricting it to himself. His plea was that the movement, which was out and out a non-violent one, had been vitiated by the incident at Chauri Chaura. In Gandhi's opinion had it been true non-violence it would have been self-evident. Because a true soldier of non-violence is not a mechanical adherent of truth and ahimsa. He must have a living faith in truth whose other name is God and he must not break down at the critical moment. But with other leaders of the Congress as well as with the Congress as a whole non-violence was not a creed as it was with Gandhi. Non-violence was to them a policy. The objective of the Congress was "the attainment of Poorna Swaraj by all legitimate and peace-

Being sandwitched between the creed of non-violence of the prime leader on the one hand and the objective of legitimate and peaceful means of struggle by the Congress
on the other, leaders of the Congress evolved certain political and economic objectives which were very limited in scope. The politico-economic objectives of the Congress had been laid down in a resolution of the Congress Working Committee on January 2, 1930. It reads: "We believe that it is the inalienable right of the Indian people, as of any other people, to have freedom and to enjoy the fruits of their toil and have the necessities of life, so that they may have full opportunities of growth. We believe also that if any government deprives a people of these rights and oppresses them, the people have a further right to alter it or to abolish it. The British Government in India has not only deprived the Indian people of their freedom but has based itself on the exploitation of the masses, and has ruined India economically. We believe, therefore, that India must sever the British connection and attain Purna Swaraj or complete independence."

31 Purna Swaraj has been explained by Rajendra Prasad in his Presidential address to the 48th session of the Indian National Congress in 1934 as: "... the end of exploitation of one country by another and of one part of the population of the same country by another part. It contemplates a free and friendly association with other nations for the mutual benefit of all. It forebodes evil to none, not even to those exploiting us in so far as they rely upon exploitation rather than good will. The sanction behind this Independence movement is non-violence which in its positive and dynamic aspect is good will of and for all." This
formulation raised the problem of Swaraj to a mystic height revealing the failure of the leaders to understand its real nature. Their formulation of economic objectives had no relevance to the contemporary living conditions of the people. The living conditions of the Indian peasantry at that time were extremely miserable being an effect of low farm productivity and backward techniques of cultivation. This situation was further aggravated by the rapid growth of population. From 0.9 percent increase in 1921 Indian population jumped to a 10.6 percent increase in 1931. The growing pressure of population in village demanded development of rural industries. Men were thrown from the frying pan into the fire by the Great Depression. The depression cast its shadow more or less over all the fields of Indian economic life, but its effect on agriculture was disastrous. "Practically all agriculturists have suffered, but the extent of suffering has been greatly affected by the degree of self-sufficiency and the extent of dependence upon particular crops. The more commercialized agricultural areas and classes have suffered more than those which are self-sufficing, whilst Bengal, Bihar and Orissa have been most severely hit by the fall in value of their principal crops." The total value of marketable crops in Bengal had fallen from an annual average of Rs.72.4 crores for the years 1920-21 to 1929-30 to Rs.32.7 crores in 1932-33 whereas the monetary liability rose merely from Rs.27.9 to Rs.28.3 crores. Consequently the free "purchasing power" of agriculturists fell from Rs.44.5 to Rs.4.4 crores.
This situation could have been challenged in two ways, namely, by demanding faster development of rural industries in order to reduce the increasing pressure of population on land; and secondly, by demanding to create agricultural surplus in order to repair the loss in the purchasing power in villages owing to the depression as also to enhance it, for that surplus might support the consumer industries in villages. But Gandhi though insisted upon village self-sufficiency, was against using machine tools in rural production. He was also hostile to the use of contraceptives for family planning.

The industrial policy of the British Government, on the other hand, not only led the workers to starvation but also frustrated the industrialists. They, therefore, started rallying round the Indian National Congress. What was natural for the Congress then was to demand a faster pace of industrial development and nationalisation of key industries. But it raised no such demand; on the contrary, it adopted an ambiguous policy and Gandhi tried to fight the political and economic battles by invoking change of heart after the Bhagavad Gita.

It was an age when forces were to be consolidated against imperialism and exploitation. Imperialism is the final stage of capitalistic development; so exploitation, which is the life-blood of capitalism, also forms the blood and bones of imperialism. Imperialism which means "an immense accumulation of money capital in a few countries," develops
an extraordinary class called "rentiers, i.e., people who livey "clipping coupons", who take no part in any enterprise
whatever, whose profession is idleness. The export of capital,
one of the most essential economic bases of imperialism, still
more completely isolates the rentiers from production and sets
the seal of parasitism on a whole country that lives by
exploiting the labour of several overseas countries and
colonies." Moreover, fluctuation of trade cycle, which is
a characteristic mark of capitalism, creates crisis at intervals
in the capitalist countries and in their colonies. The world
in the beginning of nineteen thirties was being swayed by such
periodic crisis. The socialists rightly understood that the
economic difficulties caused by the world-wide depression
were not peculiar to India but were shared by the Britishers
also. "Prices declined sharply, money incomes fell catastro-
phically and every capitalist country was faced by a rising
tide of unemployment. In three short years the volume of
world unemployment had reached a staggering total — estimated
to have exceeded thirty millions persons. . . . . The economic
hurricane that blew itself out in those three disasterous years
left behind it a devastating Europe to force a dreary political
dawn, heavy with pressing and bitter problems of social
reconstruction." Imperialists would naturally try to adopt
some recovery measures for their survival and that would entail
thousand-fold exploitation of colonies. The foundation of
imperialist economy having cracked, the socialists thought it
was an opportune moment to discredit the capitalist system.
The theories of economic liberalism which strengthens the imperialist domination must be thrown out because therein would lie the real freedom of the masses. But this interpretation of the situation had no appeal to the Congress leadership. Since Gandhi was the supreme leader of the Congress it was but natural that any suggestion of rapid action would be rejected. Gandhi had an unparalleled faith in human nature. He would believe in basic goodness of a human being, and therefore he considered none to be beyond redemption. The wrong doer was to him a victim of circumstances; hence he might be brought to the right path not merely by verbal persuasion, but also, if necessary, by non-violent non-co-operation, which was an effective remedy. Gandhi firmly believed that it was only through non-violence and by harnessing the forces of love as against hatred that exploitation could be stopped and economic equality could be established. His trusteeship theory was the non-violent way of ensuring economic equality in society. Trusteeship "is a concession one has to make to those who earn money but who would not voluntarily use their earnings for the benefit of mankind." He observed that, as wealth is socially produced and labour is socially owned the possessor of wealth "will use what he reasonably requires for his personal needs and will act as a trustee for the reminder to be used for society. In this argument honesty on the part of the trustee is assumed." If the rich refused to act as the trustee, non-violent non-co-operation should be the
Infallible remedy. Because wealth could not be produced without the co-operation of the worker. So it was quite natural for Gandhi to believe that the weapon of non-violence would work on the foreigners and exploiters. And it was in pursuance of this conviction that he suspended even the individual civil disobedience (The Mass Civil Disobedience Movement was called off on July 23, 1933) at the Patna session of AICC on May 18, 1934 and restricted to himself. He said, the "decision of suspension is not the outcome of despair. I am an optimist and never give way to despair. My decision is born of an unmistakable faith in non-violent resistance." Gandhi suspended the movement because he felt "that the masses have not received the full message of Satyagraha owing to adulteration in the process of transmission." The tragedy was that Gandhi wanted to fight with a weapon in whose potency his fellow-soldiers had little confidence. J.B. Kripalani has written on this issue: "He came to know that one of the important members of his Ashram had not performed the task assigned to him by the jail authorities. He, therefore, suspended even individual satyagraha and, as stated before, confined it to himself. He ought to have known that some of the best of satyagrahis did not perform in jail the tasks assigned to them."

But the suspension of the Civil Disobedience Movement made room for some who had so long kept themselves away from the movement. Since 1922 a force developed within the Congress
which favoured fighting the British by entering into legislatures. This force was represented by no less persons than C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru. They organised themselves into the Swarajya Party within the Congress and had a resounding victory in the Council election. This, however, could not change Gandhi's faith in boycotting the legislatures. Gandhi "met Motilal and Das towards the end of May 1924. Neither party could convince the other. They issued two separate statements. Gandhi reiterated his old stand that Council entry and non-co-operation were not compatible with each other and that he believed that Das and Motilal would, after some time, through experience, come to the same conclusion." Because of the hectic political events in the following years the Council entry programme lost its utility. But when Gandhi suspended even individual satyagraha and said "... I have no other programme, save untouchability, Hindu-Muslim unity, total prohibition, Khadi, Swadeshi and the revival of village industries," the demand for Council entry became strong. As a matter of fact, ever since the Patna Conference of July, 1933 when the Mass Civil Disobedience Movement was suspended, an increasing number of Congressmen felt that the then stalemate might be overcome by adopting a programme of entry into the legislatures. Entry into the legislatures might help them to force the government to repeal the repressive laws. In order to give shape to this idea they met at a conference on March 31, 1933 at Delhi,
under the Chairmanship of M.A. Ansari. This conference reiterated the programme of the Swarajya Party and resolved to send a deputation to Gandhi, consisting of M.A. Ansari, Bhulabhai Desai and B.C. Roy to get his blessings. Gandhi welcomed the decision for he "felt that it would be good for some politicians to engage themselves with work in Councils." He wrote to M.A. Ansari on April 5, 1934 - "... I feel it is not only the right but it is the duty of every Congressman who for some reason or other does not want to or cannot take part in Civil resistance and who has faith in entry into the Legislature, to seek entry and form combination in order to prosecute the programme which he or they believe to be in the interests of the country. Consistently with my view ... I shall be at the disposal of the party at all times and render such assistance as it is in my power to give." Gandhi had another reason to support the revival of the Swarajya Party. C. Rajagopalachari, who had a strong following in the Congress favoured the Council entry programme. Under these circumstances Gandhi felt that his opposition to the programme might cause disruption in the Congress. So, it was with the blessings of Gandhi the AICC resolved on May 18 and 19, 1934: "In as much as there exists in the Congress a vast body of members who believe in the necessity of entry into Legislatures as a step in the country's progress towards its goal, the All India Congress Committee hereby appoints Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and M.A. Ansari to form a board, with M.A. Ansari,
as President, called the Parliamentary Board consisting of not more than 25 Congressmen." The resolution however did not get a smooth passage; it was the intervention of Gandhi which helped it to be carried. Taking part in the deliberation he emphasised that the no changers should neither change their views nor feel affected by the new programme. All this he said to the socialists in particular; because they were very much opposed to the Council entry programme. The socialists held that unlike the original Swarajya Party the regenerated Swarajya Party was a pucoa constitutionalist body to "develop a mentality which will run counter to the revolutionary policy of the Congress" pursued since 1920. Jawaharlal Nehru was very much opposed to this new body. During his eleven days' leave from prison owing to Kamala Nehru's serious illness in August, 1934, Jawaharlal Nehru wrote a passionate letter to Gandhi with caustic remarks about the character of the persons forming the Swarajya Party. He did not consider legislative activities to be contrary to the pursuance of revolutionary ideas, but he lamended: "The leading figures of the Congress suddenly became those people who had obstructed us, held us back, kept aloof from the struggle and even co-operated with the opposite party in the time of our direct need. They became the high priests in our temple of freedom and many a brave soldiers who had shouldered the burden in the heat and dust of the fray was not even allowed inside the temple precincts."
The socialists thus could not agree with Gandhi. They were apprehensive and quite rightly, of the constitutionalists or the leaders of the Council entry programme. The constitutionalists were chiefly landlords, businessmen and men of legal profession, and this social composition of theirs prevented them from joining the Civil Disobedience Movement. Hence, they availed of the first opportunity they got to channelise the freedom movement in the direction of petty constitutionalism. This would benefit them both ways — as members of the Congress as also as the cooperators of the government. In order to strengthen their move the constitutionalists even referred to the advice of Sir Samuel Hoare, Secretary of States, to the Indian delegates to the Third Round Table Conference as far back as December, 1932 that there was ample scope for Indian participation in British administration and the Britisher would welcome it. As already stated, Gandhi had no respect for this type of movement, yet he agreed to this for some other considerations. He believed in mass movement and he had the confidence that people could be roused to movement whenever required. But subsequent events proved that at times the leaders could overshadow people. Gandhi could not check many undesirable things, not even the partition of the country despite having the whole country fall in line with him. It has been proved that constitutionalism is a trap, and once entered into, it is difficult to come out.Suspicion of the socialists was already confirmed when M.R. Masani was
not allowed to move an amendment demanding socialistic programme to orient the original resolution at the First Conference of the revived Swarajya Party on May 2, 1934 held at Ranchi. Amidst laughter M.R. Masani had to sit down when the President of the Conference, M.A. Ansari pointed out that, it was not the occasion to discuss his amendment. On the second day M.R. Masani moved another amendment to the lengthy programme of the Swarajya Party. In this amendment he urged the Swarajya Party to undertake the programme of organising peasants and workers so that they might participate in the national struggle against imperialism and its ally the vested interest. The amendment was lost by 26 to 40 votes. In the same way amendments moved by the socialists were lost at the Patna session of the AICC on May 19, 1934. The socialists could realise that the leaders of Congress were not for any radical programme, they had been using the platform of Congress to fight for a mere transfer of power from one interest to another. The programme adopted at the conference of the swarajists and that which chiefly worked as the guideline of the Congress programme of Council entry was a scattered programme of social reform. It was far from socialism. Because "Socialism . . . would have nothing to do with parliament in which all the people were not represented, and which had not the powers to give political and economic freedom to the people." The futility of parliamentarianism was realised by the social democrats in Europe when Hitler shattered the Social
Democratic Party to pieces in Germany, and in Spain, at about the same time when the social democrats failed to outvote the conservatives and the vested interests in Parliament. The socialists having the knowledge of what happened in Germany and Spain were convinced that the parliamentary institution offered by Britain was a sham. "The parliaments cannot be given by a foreign government as a gift. They are born out of the efforts of the forces of nationalism and organised working class. What India needed was such strength and unity between the organised workers and progressive nationalists. The nationalists could be progressive only if they remained with the working class, and organised themselves into a strong socialist party." The persons, who came to the leadership, had alignment of economic interests with the rulers. Hence, it was but natural for them to vote down any programme of radicalising the Congress. Had the socialistic programme been adopted the natural corollary would have been the removal of these persons from leadership causing damage to their interests.

These apart, movement launched independently of the Indian National Congress also made significant contributions to the development of socialism in India. As a matter of fact, through these movements the younger section of the Indian populace started organising themselves into radical groups chiefly on the Marxist line. The call of the leaders like
Jawaharlal Nehru - "Socialism was not a mere war cry, but it was a thing to be learned, studied and practised" - or Subhas Chandra Bose - "a socialised republic based on Indian conditions alone could provide a real solution of the problems of country" - or of Bhupen Dutta to uplift the masses and make them class-conscious by analysing to them the socio-economic views of the situation, enthused the youth and students, and youth organisations were developed in different parts of the country. The youth movement on the socialistic line got a spark when Yusuf Meherally, the 24 years old member of the Bombay Youth League, raised the slogan "Go back Simon" during the visit of the Simon Commission to India in 1928. "His impetuosity and dare-devilry, the extreme originality of his idea struck even Gandhiji." Yusuf Meherally thought that if a group of young people, intellectually well-equipped and properly trained could be inspired to dedicate themselves to the cause of the country, the freedom fight could be brought to a successful conclusion. With this idea in mind he organised the Bombay Provincial Youth League in February, 1928. A new stream was thus let open. At the instance of Bombay Youth Leagues were formed in other provinces. An All India Organisation was set up with Yusuf Meherally as the General Secretary. "By 1930, the Youth League was a formidable organisation in the provinces. It had already demanded Purna Swaraj, launched a series of demonstrations and it stood for social reforms with a definite socialist view." During the Civil Disobedience
Movement, when processions and public meetings were banned and leaders were arrested, the volunteers of the Youth League rendered historic services in keeping up the morale of the people. Yusuf Meherally was a name during this time. A group of young men called Bombay Shadow Cabinet directed the struggle along the plan sanctioned by Gandhi. Besides Yusuf Meherally, Achyut Patwardhan was another source of strength to the Shadow Cabinet.

During the time when the Youth League was acquiring strength there was a strong organisation within the Congress to work with leftist programme. It was the Independence for India League. Amongst many, Jawaharlal Nehru and Narendra Deva were very important members of the Independence for India League. The broad object of this organisation was the reconstruction of the society on a new basis, and its immediate programme was to fight communalism and organise labour and peasant unions for furthering the programme of the Congress. The Independence for India League played a very dominating role at the Calcutta Congress of 1928. At this session Subhas Chandra Bose moved and Jawaharlal Nehru seconded an amendment to the original resolution of dominion status. The Independence for India League demanded complete independence in the amendment. This might have led to a split in the Congress. However, it was by Gandhi's intervention the amendment was defeated. But the organisation could not effectively remain in the political scene for long. Because its programme of social reconstruction was not
based on clear conception of social and economic theories. It could give the people neither the basis nor the means of social reconstruction.

There were at least two other very important groups to propagate socialist ideas and work for the creation of socialist forces in the country. They were the Bihar Socialist Party and the Punjab Socialist Party. After the suspension of the Non-Cooperation Movement in 1930 the Congress leaders felt the necessity of presenting to the people the blue-print of independent India and the Karachi resolution of 1931 was the expression of that feeling. It was through the Karachi Resolution the Congress expressed for the first time the desire "to end the exploitation of the masses" by enunciating certain economic and social rights for the people in addition to political rights like freedom of thought, expression and association irrespective of caste, creed and sex and adult suffrage. As for economic rights, emphasis was given on the organisation of trade unions, living wage, old age, unemployment and sickness benefit, protection against child employment and for women workers, and settlement of labour disputes through suitable machinery. Progressive income tax and graduated inheritance tax was sought to be imposed, agricultural rent to be reduced and usuary to be controlled. As for social rights, emphasis was given on free primary education, religious neutrality and prohibition of intoxicating drinks. But this did not satisfy the advanced younger section. Because Gandhi's
resolution left the Zaminder's interests unaffected and failed to give the peasantry a footing on the soil. They stressed on the importance of building up class organisations to quicken the pace of freedom. This section of the Congress felt under the impact of Russian Revolution that unless all sections of the people including peasants and workers be involved in the freedom struggle the movement could never be an all enveloping one. For this required a socialist blueprint. With this objective in mind the Bihar Socialist Party was organised in 1931 with Gangasaran Sinha as the Secretary of the Party. Giving first priority to national independence the Bihar Socialist Party tried to propagate socialistic ideas with specific programme of the abolition of Zamindari and Princely States and the re-distribution of land. The Bihar Socialist Party was a formidable organisation within a short period of time and it was one of the reasons why Patna was chosen as the venue for the preparatory conference of the All India Congress Socialist Party.

The Punjab Socialist Party was formed during the end of 1930 with Feroz Chand as the Secretary. But it bore no impact of the Russian Revolution. It was virtually an organised expression of the broad socialistic ideas of Lala Lajpat Rai. Without being influenced by any particular socialist creed Lala Lajpat Rai was a staunch supporter of the labourer's cause. He rightly understood that, imperialist capital would always present bug bear to the labourers of every country. As the
western labourers lived under the threat of importing cheap labour from India and the Indian working class were kept in fear of western competition, the labourers could not organise themselves and were forced to lead a life of political impotence and economic helplessness. The western labourers, however, succeeded to rise against the tide by organising themselves, and it was only that way the Indian labourers might change their lot. Lala Lajpat Rai rejected every variety of European socialism for he was convinced that the ideas of socialism could never be implemented, even broadly, in Europe, where political life "is not, has never been and will never be straight," men are not free from temptation and socialism is used as a ladder to power. He emphatically said that, mere belief in socialism could not change men who are inherently frail and fallible. Belief in socialism needed to be converted into action by conduct and practice. It was for this reason, he held, the Indian rishis laid down "as a rule of life that beliefs must be subjected to discipline and test-sadhanas and tapas." Christ also cried for the safety of mankind from temptation. The hard core of socialism, as believed by Lala Lajpat Rai, was the freedom from temptation and emancipation of the down-trodden. He also hinted at the problem of Hindu-Moslem unity without which India, instead of marching towards its goal of freedom, would remain in perpetual bondage and provide a field for never-ending civil war. Being imbued by these ideas the followers of Lala Lajpat Rai organised
the Punjab Socialist Party after his death. The object of the party was "the establishment of a new economic order in which the worker will be entitled to the full reward for his labour and there will be no exploitation of one class by another. In the new economic order . . . . instruments of production as far as possible, will be owned by the people as a whole." The immediate aim of the Party was "the nationalisation of (a) land, the most valuable form of capital in an agricultural country, and (b) such large manufacturing industries as can, with advantage be transferred to the community, taking in view the existing political and economic condition of the country. When land has been nationalised, or declared to be the property of the state, the right to use it will be enjoyed only by those who actually cultivate it. The agriculturists, that is the 'tiller of the soil, will be entitled to the whole produce of his labour, less the taxes. There will be no intermediaries between the tiller of the soil and the State."

Participation in the Civil Disobedience Movement gave the opportunity to these socialist groups to come in close contact with one another. They felt that unless a strong and integrated all-India group was organised the freedom movement could never be channelised to the path of socialism. This feeling found expression in the formation of the Congress Socialist Party in 1934. With the organisation of the Congress Socialist Party all other socialist groups but the Punjab Socialist Party merged with it. A close contact was however
maintained between the two parties and many of the members of the Punjab Socialist Party joined the Congress Socialist Party. Later on, of course, the situation was such that "our Party would more or less work as a wing of the C.S.P.", said Feroz Chand.

But for obvious reasons the socialists could not associate themselves with the Communist Party of India. They could not join the C.P.I. due to the Comintern-imposed left sectarianism of the communists. The communists not only alienated themselves from the freedom movement launched by the Congress under the leadership of Gandhi, but also branded the Indian National Congress as a reactionary organisation and an ally of British Imperialism. In the Draft Platform of Action, published in the International Press Correspondence, it was observed: "The greatest threat to the victory of Indian revolution is the fact that the great masses of our people still harbour illusions about the National Congress and have not realised that it represents the class organisation of the Capitalists working against the fundamental interest of the toiling masses of our country." The left elements of the Congress had been charged with confusing and disorganising the revolutionary struggle to come to an understanding with the British. The thesis also added: "The policy of Gandhism, on which the programme of the Congress is founded, uses a cloak of vague talk about love, meekness, modest and hard-working existence, lightening the burden on the peasantry,
national unity, the special historic mission of Hindustan etc. But under the cloak it preaches and defends the interests of the Indian Capitalists, the inevitability and the wisdom of the division of society into rich and poor, eternal social inequality and exploitation."

By this thesis C.P.I. claimed to be the only party of the working class, the final aim of which was to achieve socialism, and ultimately communism. With this aim the C.P.I. had been fighting for democratic dictatorship of the peasants and workers and developing peasant and workers' soviets like those in Soviet Russia as against the fight of the Congress for capitalism in India. The thesis envisaged four objectives in the main:

"1. Complete independence of India by violent overthrow of British rule. The cancellation of all debts. The confiscation and nationalisation of British factories, banks, railways, sea and river transport and plantations.


3. The confiscation without compensation of all the lands, forests and other property of the landlords, ruling princes, churches, the British Government Officials and money-lenders and Banks."
4. The 8-hour working day and the radical improvement of conditions of labour, increase in wages and 'state-maintenance for unemployed labour.'

The C.P.I. as "a part of the organised world Communist movement, a section of the Communist International", which had its headquarter in Moscow, resolved to fight with the above-mentioned demands.

This programme of the C.P.I. "was based on the assumption that the period of capitalist stabilisation, that is, the post-war economic prosperity and political stability, had ended, that world capitalism had entered upon its last stage and that the victory of international revolution is imminent." But this analysis of the socio-economic conditions was not only bookish, but also based on incorrect information. Peasantism that the Indian communists wanted to create through the Peasant and Workers' Party - the CPI being banned the Peasant and Workers' Party was then their official platform and through which they proposed to bring the peasants under the fold of the proletariat, was not possible in India. Because till then no peasant movement, was built up - why peasant movement alone, working class organisation of any variety was yet to be born. Far from organised participation only 1 percent of Indian peasants and workers participated in the Salt Satyagraha. "The history of the trade union movement . . . is a sad story of internal clashes, sectarian
splits and personal rivalries leading to faction fights. Every power-rivalry within the AITUC was expressed in the jargon of the Communist polemic," observes Achyut Ratwardhan. So any call under these circumstances for violent mass action for immediate overall reform of the peasant and workers' condition of living was either adventurist or motivated, particularly when the nation was yet to be free from foreign domination. This was something like putting the cart before the horse. But the Indian communists ignored the objective reality and undertook the programme under the direction of Moscow to eliminate all rival parties particularly those which were speaking of socialism and winning over the people. And as a part of this programme they branded Gandhi as a reactionary and an ally of the British imperialism. The socialist parties of all countries were their bitterest enemies because the Sixth Congress of the Communist International thesis said, "International Social Democracy of all shades has become the last reserve of bourgeois society and its most reliable pillar of support." The Indian communists were faithful to the Comintern almost to the letter. This was evident when they tore off the National Flag in Bombay Chowpatty. The justification of the incident, they felt, followed from the teachings of the Comintern. The Congress, according to the Comintern, was the party of the bourgeois reformists, and according to Stalin, the left nationalists and socialist radicals were the bitterest enemies of world revolution. But this left sectarian line
did not cut any ice. They were quite right in taking Gandhi as the life blood of the Congress. They considered the socialists to be the rising generation of Indian leadership and therefore launched vehement campaign against the Congress including Gandhi and the socialists. But their miscalculation was apparent in their estimation of the capacities of Gandhi to influence the masses. They did not realise that they could not achieve anything by merely tarnishing the image of Gandhi. The people were overwhelmed by Gandhi's call for Civil Disobedience and this movement opened up channels for new trends to develop.

The rejection of the communists' line by the people as also discontent against the old leadership for their drifting to petty constitutionalism created a vacuum. This vacuum was filled in by the younger section of the Congress, later known as the socialists. The socialists organised themselves into new group called the Congress Socialist Party within the Indian National Congress. They proposed to organise mass movement by uniting the peasants and workers and by making them class-conscious, remaining all the time within the Congress. That would have broadened the base of the Congress and transformed that into an instrument for national emancipation.
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