

most important thing at the present time in view of the threatening outbreak of war. To keep a watch over the production of war material and also to prevent its transportation, is another task confronting the masses as part of the solidarity campaign. All the staffs which we bring into contact with the staffs in Hitler Germany for the purpose of active solidarity and which take up the fight against the English bourgeoisie and against the production of war material, are shock troops in the fight against chauvinism and war.

India

Whither Nehru?

Mr. Nehru has recently published a long article "Whither India." Here, and in a number of other articles, he developed his ideas about the present situation in the country and the tasks confronting the toiling masses. Mr. Nehru developed an energetic tirade in favour of socialism and even Communism (?), and so on and so forth. One might even get a suspicion that there is a turn, a change in the policy of Mr. Nehru, a turn towards revolutionary ideas and revolutionary methods of struggle. However, Mr. Nehru repudiates such thoughts or suspicions and hastily declares: "Personally I am not conscious of any glaring inconsistencies in my ideas or activities during the last thirteen years." (*Bombay Chronicle*, 21/11/33.) Mr. Nehru is correct. He has not changed his policy. **But what kind of policy and activities? What kind of a political line has Mr. Nehru carried out?**

Mr. Nehru now says everywhere that he stands for socialism and independence. That is his credo he says, but as a matter of fact Mr. Nehru fights neither for independence, nor for socialism. The truth of the matter is that **Mr. Nehru disorganises both the struggle for independence and the efforts to build a Communist Party which would be able to organise and prepare a revolutionary camp to fight for independence, land and power and clear the way to carry out the further battle for socialism.**

Mr. Nehru's policy, as a matter of fact, is directed against the independence of the country and against socialism. This is not accidental. This is an expression of the nature of bourgeois-national-reformist camp, of which Mr. Nehru is one of the main "Left" leaders. This opinion is based on facts and we will briefly touch on some of them. Mr. Nehru says he is for independence and socialism; let us see the correct facts.

Does Mr. Nehru Fight for Independence?

One of the main principles of Gandhist treacherous policy is propagation of non-violence. The propaganda of non-violence carried out by the Congress leaders and liberals and supported by British imperialism represents the beastly fear possessing the exploiting classes before the people's revolution. It is aimed at disarming the toiling masses and preserving the slavish, submissive mentality among those sections of the down-trodden masses who were brought up and live under the terror of feudal landlords, caste regulations, police terror, etc., who were brought up in the spirit of subjugation, poverty, submissiveness, passive acceptance of their fate (which religion teaches them, too), lack of understanding of their own class interests, etc., etc., who suffer from imperialist and feudal-moneylending exploitation. The bourgeoisie, headed by Gandhism is doing its best to exploit such slavish mentality and covering it up with phrases about ideals of humanity, etc., demands of the toiling masses that they give up the idea of revolutionary struggle for independence, give up the idea and preparations for agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution.

This is the strategy of the bourgeoisie, and it was not an accident that the "*Bombay Chronicle*" published everyday on its front page (beginning from 1930) in big letters: "Non-violence is our sheet anchor."

The bourgeoisie made frantic efforts to instil into the minds of the toiling masses this spirit of defeat and submissiveness, especially because, as a result of growing revolutionary movement, the experiences gained during the last decades and the examples of Soviet Union and China, the slave psychology and submissiveness were fast disappearing and the influence of Congress bourgeoisie weakening. It is sufficient to cast a glance at all the peasant risings of the last few years (Kashmir, Burma, Alwar, etc.).

Propaganda of non-violence, coupled with an appeal to preserve the united national front and submit to the leadership of the Congress bourgeoisie, remained as the chief anti-revolutionary weapon

of Indian reformism and served the interests of British imperialism as well.

Mr. Nehru strongly recommends support of non-violence and passive resistance as the main dynamic forms of struggle. "Personally," says he, "I accepted the non-violent method because not only did it appeal to me in theory but it seemed to be peculiarly suited to present conditions in India. . . . I believe that for a long time to come our most effective methods must be non-violent." (*"Bombay Chronicle,"* 21/11/33.)

Mr. Nehru accepts non-violence in theory and in practice. **This is sufficient for us to state that Mr. Nehru is a reformist and does not stand for independence.** It will be of no use for Mr. Nehru to shift the blame onto the toiling masses and justify himself by referring to peculiar conditions. Peculiar conditions in India demand exactly the opposite, they demand sharpest struggle against the theory of non-violence so that everybody in the country should know that it represents the interests of exploiting classes and is directed against the independence of the country.

There is another theory of Mr. Nehru which shows that he is against the independence of the country. And it is the following: Mr. Nehru continues to claim that Gandhism represents a revolutionary force. In spite of the fact that many Congressmen, and even such as Mr. Bose, have been compelled to admit the bankruptcy of Gandhism and the treacherous role it played, **Mr. Nehru defends Gandhi and Gandhism.** This is one of the fundamental questions that divides a revolutionary camp from a reformist one. In a letter published in the "*Manchester Guardian*" (11/12/33), Mr. Nehru declares: "But the awakening that Gandhi brought about was definitely a political awakening of the masses . . . **the programme of open and defiant action that Gandhi put forward worked an amazing change in the masses.**"

According to Mr. Nehru, Gandhi is a revolutionary leader who has awakened the masses from their slumber to a political life by putting forward a programme of direct actions. This statement of Mr. Nehru does not correspond to the facts. The true position was totally different. The toiling masses, because of their sufferings from feudalists, moneylenders, imperialists, and under the influence of Russian October Revolution and the experiences gained during the war and shattering of the capitalist system—under the influence of all that, the toiling masses woke from their slumber and a revolutionary mass movement developed. The masses became active and demanded relief, demanded struggle against oppressors. At the same time, the Indian bourgeoisie, which demanded from British imperialism some reforms and economic concessions, came forward in the role of opposition, took the leadership over the toiling masses and did its best to press the imperialists for a compromise and to stop and disorganise the mass movement for independence, which, as the Mopla rebellion and the Bombay disturbances show, assumed a revolutionary character and has been developing new, higher forms of struggle.

This was the essence of the situation in 1919-22. **The Congress leadership, headed by Gandhi, did its best to disorganise the revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses.** This fact Mr. Gandhi admits himself. Let us take the letter addressed by Gandhi to the Viceroy regarding the inauguration of non-co-operation:—

"I venture to claim that I have succeeded by patient reasoning in winning the party of violence from its ways. . . . I hold that no repression could have prevented a violent eruption if the people had not had presented to them a **form of direct action**, involving considerable sacrifice. . . . Non-co-operation was the only dignified and constitutional form of such direct action. . . . At the same time I admit that non-co-operation practised by the mass of people is attended with grave risks. . . . Not to run some risks now will be to court much greater risks if **not virtual destruction of law and order.** . . . I hope that your Excellency will give those who have accepted my advice and myself the credit for being actuated by nothing less than a stern sense of duty." (Speeches and writing of Gandhi, "*Young India*," 1919-1922, page 200.)

This statement of Gandhi very clearly shows that he tried to find a form of direct action to prevent a revolution directed against imperialist law and order. Mr. Gandhi begs the Viceroy to recognise his service to British imperialism. This is the essence of Gandhism, which represents the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie and the liberal landlords. This treacherous statement of Gandhi must be widely circulated. It must be explained to the toiling masses that from the beginning till now, including participation in the Round

Table Conference, assistance to collect taxes in U.P., etc., etc.—Gandhism carried on a struggle against the independence and agrarian movement and did his best to keep the present system of imperialist and feudalist exploitation intact.

Mr. Nehru supports and defends Gandhism, his past and present. He does it because he is not a socialist, not a Communist; he was and remains a "Left" Gandhist; he does not fight for independence. On the contrary, Nehru and his ideas represent one of the most harmful obstacles on the road to independence.

To expose his ideas, to annihilate the influence of "Left" Gandhi-ites will help very much to strengthen the revolutionary camp, to put an end to the existing confusion among the toiling masses and revolutionary elements of the petty bourgeoisie, will make it possible to attract them to the side of the revolutionary camp.

The anti-revolutionary character of the policy of "Left" Gandhi-ites, who falsely describe themselves as socialists and Communists, can be seen from their activities as well. Mr. Nehru supported Gandhism during 1921-1922. He participated in the preparation of the Nehru Constitution, although he did not sign it. There was a division of labour between son and father. Motilal Nehru prepared and signed the draft of the slave constitution, which accepted limited dominion status as its goal and preserved all titles, property, i.e., preservation of landlordism, etc. Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru participated in the preparation of the constitution and agreed to preserve all titles of property, agreed to vote for the communal electoral system. He disagreed with dominion status and together with Bose, who signed the constitution, formed the League of Independence. He declared himself a socialist, etc. However, the League has done nothing, and in 1929-30 was quietly buried and Mr. Nehru was elected to a high position in the leadership of the National Congress. He started, together with Gandhi, with the Lahore Independence resolution and soon after supported Gandhi's eleven points of surrender, eleven points which represented the interests of capitalists and landlords. When the British imperialists refused to accept them, Mr. Nehru supported Gandhi's salt march, the purpose of which was again to provide an outlet for mass energy and disorganise the mass revolutionary struggle (Gandhi stated himself: If we don't start, the forces of violence will get the upper hand and it will be too late), Mr. Nehru refused the offer of the Bombay Workers' and Peasants' Party to give support to the G.I.P. railway strike and help to convert it into a general strike, which would have immensely developed the revolutionary offensive of the toiling masses. Instead of that, he endorsed Gandhi's trip to London, to the Round Table Conference, etc., and he now covers up the bankruptcy of Gandhism with phrases about socialism and does his best to preserve bourgeois Congress leadership over the toiling masses. Mr. Nehru becomes indignant when Communists begin to criticise the Congress policy and the Congress leadership. "The Congress," declares Nehru, "has been far the most militant organisation in India during recent years. It seems to me perfectly ridiculous for people who do nothing effective themselves to accuse the Congress of lack of militancy." (The "Indian Labour Journal," 12/11/1933.)

Mr. Nehru confuses the bourgeois Congress leadership and the wide masses who followed it. The toiling masses are militant. The National Congress, headed by Gandhi, Nehru, etc., did their best to disorganise the struggle of the toiling masses. Even Bose admitted this in his recent address to the Indian political conference in London. Will Mr. Nehru, who claims to be a socialist, kindly explain how the masses could influence the National Congress with its system of appointed Congress dictators, with no functioning rank and file membership, etc.?

Mr. Nehru continually calls for the cessation of criticism of the Congress. But this is in vain, because the very interests of the struggle for independence depend upon the clear exposure of the treacherous essence of the Congress policy. The victory of the struggle for independence demands the formation of the Communist Party, clear-cut demarcation between the forces of revolution (i.e., working class and peasantry and town poor) and reformism (bourgeoisie, liberal landlordism, upper strata of petty bourgeoisie), annihilation of the Congress reformist influence among the toiling masses. Mr. Nehru is afraid of this. He is afraid because he represents the interests of the reformist camp and does not fight for independence.

That is Mr. Nehru's actual position regarding independence. Let us now consider his views on socialism.

Does Mr. Nehru Stand for Socialism?

Mr. Nehru does not stand for socialism, and it is easy to prove this. In addition to his reformist, bourgeois policy on the question of independence, non-violence, etc., Mr. Nehru himself states that his Communism has nothing in common with proletarian Marxian Communism. "I do not approve," says Nehru, "of many things that have taken place in Russia, nor am I a Communist in the accepted sense of the word. . . . I have a weakness for Oxford and what it stands, if something like it, only with a broader base, could be retained, well and good." ("Manchester Guardian," December 11, 1933). It is clear that **Nehru's Communism is nothing else but Oxford liberalism.**

Nobody needs to take Mr. Nehru's declarations about socialism seriously and no one demands it from Nehru. However, it would be interesting to know what exactly Nehru disapproves of in Russia and China. Mr. Nehru declares he disapproves of the Communist methods applied in Russia and China. It is clear, therefore, that Mr. Nehru wants socialism and independence **without** a revolution. He is ready to swear for workers and peasants, etc., etc. But no revolution. One of the defenders of capitalism wrote in the "People" (Lahore, October 23, 1933) about the Communist creed of Nehru: "This reflects a peculiar mass-psychology, demonstrating that the method more than the creed is often the cause of strife. If the creed is a good creed and the method adopted innocent, even those who have to suffer not only sympathise with it but often work hand in hand to achieve the object. . . . Gandhi, therefore, rightly stressed in his letter to Panditji the importance of methods."

The landlords and capitalists tell Nehru: please speak as much as you want (but please vaguely) about socialism, **but** do recommend innocent methods, i.e., be against anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution, stand for non-violence and prevent the formation of the Communist Party. And Mr. Nehru carried these instructions out faithfully.

To prove that Nehru is not a socialist is not a difficult job, it is sufficient to know some elementary things about socialism. Revolutionary socialism, based on the class struggle, represents the theory of the working class and includes as one of its main points the acceptance of the hegemony of the working class, not only in the struggle for socialism but for independence and destruction of landlordism as well. According to it the leadership of the working class, expressed through the Communist Party, is able to organise the scattered masses of the peasantry and destroy the imperialist-feudalist yoke. The working class, according to the socialist theory, will then carry the fight further to destroy the capitalist system and replace it by a socialist system. For that purpose the Communists must fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat as a necessary prerequisite for establishing the socialist society. Now this theory and the methods advanced have been tried in the Soviet Union and in China, and proved successful. In China the Kuomintang carried out the policy propagated by Nehru, with what results are known; the counter-revolutionary betrayal of the people and the dismemberment of China.

The only force which proved capable of defending the country was the Chinese Red Army and the Soviets. Now Mr. Nehru is against socialism as preached by the working class throughout the world, he is against the Communist methods, he is in favour of **innocent** methods preached by Gandhi. What has Mr. Nehru's pseudo-socialism in common with the proletarian socialism of the Communists? Nothing at all. That is why we are justified in saying that Mr. Nehru's socialism is reformist Gandhism, covered up with some "socialist" phrases to fool and demoralise the toiling masses. The Communists do not demand of Nehru that he be a socialist. Mr. Nehru admits that the imperialist yoke is the basic reason of poverty of the people, he admits that landlordism, feudals (princes, etc.) are parasites, who blocked the development of the productive forces. Mr. Nehru speaks against Communalism, emphasising that it is abused and represents the interests of the reactionary feudal groups, etc., etc. If he admits all that, let him fight to destroy it, this is what one would expect from a representative of a true nationalism, but instead of this Mr. Nehru betrays the struggle for these tasks. He has proved unable to carry out the revolutionary struggle for bourgeois tasks, the tasks which are essential even for capitalist development. **Mr. Nehru stands by Gandhism and betrays the struggle for independence.** It is not accidental, it is the result of the whole position and role of the Indian bourgeoisie. It is incapable of carrying on a revolutionary

struggle against the imperialists, it is a reformist force, it strives for compromise with imperialism, because it is afraid of the people's revolution. The dangerous and harmful role played by the "Left" congressites is that they cover up this treachery of bourgeois nationalism by "revolutionary" phrases and they still succeed to fool considerable sections of the toiling masses.

In the present epoch, when socialist ideas are winning everywhere, when the bankrupt bourgeoisie is trying to find salvation in fascism, every national reformist group in India tries to cover itself with a socialist garb.

Everybody—Mehta, Gandhi, Giri, Ruikar, Kandalkar, etc.—every reformist, uses socialist phrases. It is the garb which they are putting on to fool the masses.

Mr. Nehru has explained himself clear enough. "Nationalism," says he, "to an ever-increasing extent, and everywhere, is appearing in a socialist garb. . . ." Explaining further the growing class conflicts in the country, Mr. Nehru continues: "We cannot escape having to answer the question, **now or later**, for the freedom of which class or classes in India are we specially striving?"

For a time, he says, we tried to avoid giving an answer "on the ground that the national issue must be settled first," but now we, "as men of action," must "fashion our idea of freedom accordingly." ("Whither India," "**Bombay Chronicle**.") The reasoning is clear. At first we came forward with an appeal for a united national front and kept socialism, i.e., class struggle out; we appealed to capitalists and workers, landlords and peasants, princes and subjects, etc., to stand together and live peacefully. We did for a time. But now a change is taking place. People have followed our instructions for many years and now they see there is no such a thing as this united national front, that in practice the landlords and princes and also capitalists do not fight for independence. Workers and peasants began now to revolt. They said you fight neither for independence nor for the workers' and peasants' interests. They also said: We must destroy landlordism because it not only exploits us but even supports the imperialists.

The people began to see the game of the exploiters and congress leaders who represent them and **the illusions of the united national front** began to evaporate. Mr. Nehru sees that, and that is why he says, as a practical politician, he must "fashion the idea accordingly"—and hence his strenuous efforts to don a socialist garb. Mr. Nehru is ready to give concessions to the peasantry, even part of the land of the landlords, and so on. But he is against the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution. Although he sees the changes in the relationship of the class forces, he hopes to preserve the leadership of the bourgeoisie, he does his best to preserve the influence of the bourgeois national congress. That is the origin of his socialist garb. But now it is too late. The workers have learnt a lot. Nobody will fool them with a "socialist garb" only, the workers will form the Communist Party to fight for independence and for true socialism, as it is built in the Soviet Union, as well.

Mr. Nehru represents the interests of the most far-sighted sections of the industrial bourgeoisie, who understand that the home market cannot be developed unless the feudal system is abolished. They also understand that petty concessions will not help much, but at the same time they see that the only force capable of changing the present conditions is the toiling masses, and that the revolution is the only way. But they are still more afraid of the people's revolution. They do their best to avert the revolution and preserve the leadership over the toiling masses. That is why they try their best to prevent formation of the Communist Party. Without it they believe it will be possible to avoid a revolution and sometime later achieve some more tangible results.

Mr. Nehru represents the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie and those upper strata of the petty bourgeois and bourgeois intelligentsia which are connected with the bourgeoisie. It is here that the understanding between Nehru and the Roy-Karnik group comes to the front. The peculiar task of the Karnik-Roy-Kandalkar group is to preserve the influence of the bourgeoisie among the workers and prevent the formation of the Communist Party which would be able to fight for the leadership of the toiling masses, and prepare and lead them for anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution.

How, According to Mr. Nehru, the Working Class Should Behave Itself

According to Mr. Nehru's idea, the struggle for independence is separate from the struggle against landlordism and the unbearable exploitation of the workers. Mr. Nehru further divides the func-

tions, the bourgeoisie (or, as he says, nationalism) will carry on political struggles, while the working class should limit itself to economic struggles, "should organise itself in the trade unions and the like quite separately," and should follow the leadership of the Congress bourgeoisie or, as he puts it, "have co-operation in militant activity."

These ideas of Nehru have as their aim to disarm the revolutionary movement and keep the leadership of the reformist bourgeoisie over the masses.

First of all, is it correct to say that the struggle for independence is represented by the bourgeoisie and that bourgeois nationalism represents a revolutionary force? Is it correct to say that "the National Congress is, as its name implies, a national organisation, whose purpose is national freedom for India," that "it includes many classes and groups which have really conflicting social interests, but that the common national platform keeps them together" (Nehru)? No, it is not correct to say that.

There are two kinds of nationalisms. There is bourgeois nationalism, represented by the Congress leadership, which expresses the reformism, the cowardness, the reactionary character of the bourgeoisie and liberal landlords. But there is a revolutionary nationalism of the peasantry and considerable sections of the petty bourgeoisie which is ready to carry on revolutionary struggle for independence. The working class is ready to support the revolutionary nationalism and lead the forces of it towards the anti-imperialist revolution. The revolutionary peasantry is ready to carry on the struggle not only for independence, but for destruction of feudal-money-lending exploitation as well.

Mr. Nehru confuses bourgeois nationalism with revolutionary nationalism. He mixes various conflicting classes and conflicting programmes. Mr. Nehru is sadly mistaken if he believes that it will be possible to unite reformists and revolutionaries on a "common national platform." It is true the Congress bourgeoisie succeeded for many years in fooling the people and disorganising the revolutionary struggle under the banner of a common, united national front and common platform of all classes. It meant that it succeeded in subordinating the working class and peasantry to its control. **But now the situation is changing.** The working class understands that this common platform meant reformism and subjugation to bourgeois leadership. The illusions of the united front with bourgeois nationalism are fast disappearing. The working class evolves as a separate class force, as an independent class force. Conditions have been created for rapid formation of the Communist Party and successful fight of the working class for the hegemony in the mass movement.

Mr. Nehru will not be able to prevent this process of class differentiation by his agitation for a common united front with the bourgeoisie. It was tried for many years and it proved its anti-revolutionary character, it proved its bankruptcy.

But that is not all. The history of the revolutionary movement in India has proved that the working class is the most consistent anti-imperialist force. The brunt of the street battles in the cities of India was borne by the working class. The British imperialists directed its heaviest blows against the proletariat. The Meerut trial is a classic example of this. The history of the revolutionary movement in India clearly shows that the independence of India will be attained only when the working class, headed by a Communist Party, takes the lead, organises the scattered masses of the peasantry, exposes the national-reformists and thus delivers a mighty blow to imperialist oppression. This is what happened in former Russia, it is taking place in China. In China the "Left" Kuomintang talked about socialism, democracy, etc., it agitated for a common national front with the bourgeoisie when it became anti-revolutionary, etc., etc., and it betrayed the struggle for independence. Wang Chin-Wei, the former leader of the "Left" Kuomintang, is the chief helper of the bloody watch-dog of imperialism, Chiang-Kai-shek.

The working class of India will never accept the counter-revolutionary theory of Nehru that the working class should subordinate itself to the National Congress and limit its work and organisations to trade unions only, nor will it accept the counter-revolutionary theory of Roy-Karnik-Kandalkar group that the working class cannot grasp big political issues such as independence, and therefore should limit itself to partial struggles only and follow the National Congress or a new party of radicals which the Karnik group proposes to build.

Both of these theories of Nehru and Karnik are practically the

same, and aim at keeping the proletariat as a submissive appendage of bourgeois nationalism, an appendage which should be a Left-wing of the bourgeois camp and exert pressure through "Left" congressites. It is very clear why Mr. Nehru, in the same article (published in "The Indian Labour Journal," November 12, 1933), declares:—

"I am not in theory against a Labour Political Party apart from the Congress, but I fear that any attempt to make such a party to-day will be utilised against the workers," i.e., Mr. Nehru is not in favour of the formation of a political party of the working class. He goes still further and gives advice to the Congress to take the initiative in forming trade unions, etc., to develop a militant programme "even in advance of Congress programme," etc., i.e., to promise everything but keep control of the labour movement in the hands of the Congress bourgeoisie.

That is how the Communism of Mr. Nehru looks in practice. He is ready to vote for a limited Communism (!), but he is dead against the Communist Party.

The bourgeois class nature of the "Left" congressites is made clear. The bourgeoisie and the imperialists understand very well that nothing comes by itself.

The Bolshevik Marxian theory makes it clear that Communists do not believe in sheer spontaneity. Marx in his time said the former philosophers tried to explain the world, but it is time to change the world. The essential point of Bolshevism is that there cannot be a true Communist policy if it does not include organisational measures to put this policy into effect. The working class has only one weapon, and this weapon is the organisation. The working class can take the leadership of the masses and mobilise them for the revolution if its vanguard is organised, if a Communist Party is built. The Communists when they see and decide on strike action, or non-payment campaign, a general strike, etc., must immediately take steps to organise it. **This is an essential part of Bolshevism.** And the most important part of this organisation, the most important prerequisite to materialise the Communist policy, to carry out everyday struggle, to prepare and lead the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution is the formation of the Communist Party.

Without it any talk about socialism, independence, etc., becomes sheer deception of the toiling masses. And therefore it is not an accident that all the anti-revolutionary forces, from the imperialists up to the "Left" congressites and Karnik and Co., direct their fight against the formation of a strong mass Communist Party.

Karnik-Kandalkar, who are better connected with the workers and see their dissatisfaction, are carrying out their work more skilfully. They stand for a leadership of a "Left" (!) nationalist party which, according to them, should lead the masses, but at the same time they formed a workers' party to give outlet to the workers' desire to have their own political party. The workers' party created by Karnik-Kandalkar will play a subordinate role and put pressure on the "Left" congressites. That is to say, the purpose of creating such a party is to deceive the workers and keep them as a submissive appendage of bourgeois nationalism.

Karnik-Shastri, etc., declare that the Congress is fighting for independence, and what is necessary is that I.N.C. should adopt a different programme of demands, because, they say, if the I.N.C. gets freedom, it may be used against the toiling masses. The Karnik-Shastri group are deceiving the workers on the main question. Because the essential point is that the Congress leadership and its "Left" variety, Nehru, etc., **are not capable of fighting for and achieving the independence of the country.** They are against the revolutionary struggle for independence. That is the essence of the criticism of the Communists. The Communists are ready to make temporary agreements with any revolutionary group which is prepared **in deeds** to fight, be it only for independence.

But experience has proved clear enough that the Congress bourgeoisie is an anti-revolutionary force and does not fight for independence. Therefore the ideas of Shastri-Karnik to put pressure on it through Nehru and other "Left" congressites only help the bourgeoisie to disorganise the revolutionary mass movement.

The central task of the Indian revolution still remains the formation of the Communist Party, which will consolidate the working class, organise the scattered millions of the peasantry, and build a broad anti-imperialist front to carry on the battle for independence, land, bread and workers' and peasants' power.