

What the Congress Socialists Want

By Ben Bradley

(1) WHAT THE CONGRESS SOCIALISTS PROMISE

The disappointment felt by the national masses of India in the policy of the National Congress is, indeed, great. The workers openly express their hostility towards the leadership of the National Congress, which always has cared so much about negotiations and bargains with British imperialism, which always did take such great interest in the well-being of the Indian bourgeoisie and always has been so deaf to the protests of the workers. The peasant masses, reduced to abject want and pauperisation, are no longer inclined to have faith in Gandhi and his followers. The broad strata of the urban petty bourgeoisie, who most keenly feel the blows of the imperialists, openly begin to turn aside, and it is precisely at this time that part of the Congress leaders organised the All-Indian Congress Socialist Party! At the conference in Patna, held in May, 1934, it was decided to create such a party, and there also its programme was drawn up.

The National Congress up till now did everything in its power to defend the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie and landowners, connected with Indian capital. To-day, in the camp of the National Congress, they begin to speak loudly about socialism. People who for years at a stretch had dragged along in the tail-end of Gandhi, of the textile manufacturers and merchants, suddenly flame up with great love for the workers and peasants. The Congress Socialist Party promises to the workers and peasants of India to turn India from a British colony into an independent socialist State.

But what is Socialism? Socialism is such an order whereby all instruments of production are in the hands of the workers, organised, united and led by the Socialist State. The dictatorship of the working class is the basic and positive condition for winning socialism and for building up socialism. Socialism means the destruction of classes. And the destruction of classes and all sources breeding the division of society into classes and exploitation of one class by the other, is impossible without the most advanced and revolutionary class, the proletariat, coming to head the whole of the social reconstruction, without it uniting the majority of the toilers of town and village under the banner of the struggle against capital.

In our days it is impossible to speak about socialism and simultaneously ignore the great Land of the Soviets, where socialism has been established, where the national freedom and independence of peoples, formerly oppressed by the Russian bourgeoisie and landowners, to-day lean for support on the Soviet Power and socialist construction.

India suffers under the heel of British imperialism, which sucks all it can out of it. India is exploited not only by the foreign capitalist-conquerors, but also by the native despots, by the landowners and usurers; and side by side with British capital bending the workers' backs there is Indian capital, somewhat weaker, but no less rapacious and fierce.

It is quite natural, then, that the toilers of India, and first and foremost the Indian proletarians, anxiously and hopefully look to every bit of news about the victories of the Soviet Union. It is quite plain why the workers and peasants of India desire to learn all they can about the lessons of the victorious struggle of the working masses of the Soviet Union.

The Congress Socialists, however, prefer to gloss over the victories of the Soviet Union. Neither do they say anything about the fact that their task is to hamper the working class and broad toiling masses from rallying to the side of the Communist Party and its fighting programme. By means of sweet phrases they call on the workers, peasants, students and urban poor to join their ranks. They promise quite a lot. Let us see what they promise.

- (1) To transfer all power to the producing masses.
- (2) Development of economic life of the country to be planned and controlled by the State.
- (3) Socialisation of key and principle industries, for example,

steel, cotton, jute, railways, shipping, mines, banks and public utilities with a view to progressive socialisation of all instruments of production, of distribution and exchange.

- (4) State monopoly of foreign trade.
- (5) Organisation of co-operative societies for production, distribution and credit in un-socialised sections of economic life.
- (6) Removal of princes and landowners as well as all other classes of exploiters.
- (7) Redistribution of land to peasants.
- (8) State to encourage and promote co-operation and collective farming with a view to ultimate collectivisation of all agriculture in country.
- (9) Liquidation of debts of the workers and peasants.
- (10) There shall be adult franchise which shall be on functional basis.

The programme is extensive, it is full of good intentions and promises. The Congress Socialists even promise to persuade the National Congress, i.e., its leaders who so eagerly guard the interests of Indian capital against the claims of the workers and peasants, to endorse this programme. But is this a programme of promises or is it a fighting programme? It is one thing to speak about socialism and independence, and quite another thing really to fight for these.

The newly-appeared Congress Socialists call themselves Congress Socialists. They, evidently, suppose that socialism can be attained only with the aid of the National Congress.

The Indian worker is inclined to be mistrustful of everything that comes from the camp of the Indian National Congress.

Dozens of times the National Congress called for action, only in order afterwards to seek for side-tracks in order to conclude the basest and most treacherous bargains with imperialism, with the landowners and usurers. The National Congress boasts that it represents the whole of the Indian nation, but it did nothing whatever to help the heroic struggle of the Indian textile workers. It helped to disrupt this struggle in the interests of the capitalists. The leaders of the Congress never begrudged promises. Promises always remained unkept, while instead of the old forgotten promises, new ones were made. The Indian worker is incredulous, and he wants to know what is this new programme of the Congress Socialist Party—is it a programme of fresh promises or is it a real fighting programme?

What does the first point of the programme of the Congress Socialists say? "Transfer all power to producing masses"! The Congress Socialists cunningly say nothing about the means for gaining power in the country, which is pressed under the iron fist of British imperialism. They speak about transferring the power to the "producing masses." Well, who are these "producing masses" in the opinion of the Congress Socialists? It is no secret to anyone that there were socialist-utopians in the history of the labour movement and Socialism, who ranked also industrial employers who exploited the workers among the producing classes. They wanted to gain socialism, not with the aid of the class struggle, but with the aid of class conciliation.

In all countries of Asia the young nationalist bourgeoisie, competing with the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries and fighting for independence in the name of the prosperity of national capital and exploitation of the workers, shouts that it is the "salt of the earth," that no independence is possible without its own strong industrial capital. In India the Indian bourgeoisie has already shown its claws to the workers. It brutally exploits the workers of the textile and other enterprises, it sweats them to death and lowers their as-it-is starvation earnings. In order to struggle against the workers, it has nothing against the aid of the imperialist ravishers.

The Congress Socialists fear to declare openly in their programme that they rank also this plundering bourgeoisie among the producing masses. However, all of their conduct and speeches

at meetings show that they propose to the workers and peasants fraternally to divide power with the capitalists, so that the capitalists could, of course, get the lion's share of it.

The Congress Socialists vaguely promise to "remove all princes and landowners as well as all other classes of exploiters" and to "re-distribute the land to the peasants," but they say nothing about how it will be done and whether all land, all pastures and forests will really be handed over to the disposal of the peasantry. They will say nothing about which power could guarantee this transfer and render harmless the ravishers and exploiters from the camp of the imperialists, the native despots, landowners and usurers. The general promises of the Congress Socialists to lead India directly to Socialism screen the desire, by means of loud phrases, to evade the real revolutionary struggle.

In China, the workers and peasants, under the leadership of their Communist Party, established in a number of extensive regions their Soviet Power. This Soviet Power has raised as its immediate and direct task the national liberation of China from the yoke of imperialism, the expropriation of the landowners and usurers and the distribution of all land to the toiling peasants. Soviet China successfully copes with this task, and millions of oppressed workers, coolies and peasants render every possible aid to the gallant struggle of the Chinese Soviets and Chinese Red Army. There is no room for exploiters in the Chinese Soviets; the Chinese Soviets realise the power of the workers and peasants. The Chinese Soviets have still not raised the question of their agenda of collectivising agriculture, inasmuch as economic conditions and the consciousness of the peasant masses are still not prepared for this.

The Congress Socialists say nothing about the revolutionary seizure of power, about the establishment of a revolutionary dictatorship. They say nothing about Soviets. It is quite easy to understand why the Congress Socialists avoid replying frankly to the most urgent and vital questions. They desire to utilise socialist slogans for keeping the masses from going over to the side of the revolution.

Compare their programme with the programme of action of the Communist Party of India. The latter is a programme without any evasions, without any conciliatory lies and bourgeois deceit. This programme indicates the path of struggle.

But the Congress Socialists do not desire to fight. They want to hamper the mass revolutionary struggle, and this is why they fight against the Communists. The Congress Socialists are akin to the British Socialists, are akin to the British Labour Party. Both the first and second British Labour government obediently, upon the order of capital, carried through pacification in India, in China, in Egypt, everywhere where the power of imperialism was threatened. The British Socialists, just as all social democrats, are against violence with regard to imperialism and the capitalist ravishers. But instead, they are for violence with regard to the oppressed and exploited.

(2) PURNA SWARAJ AND SOCIALISM

The Working Committee of the National Congress, after having familiarised itself with the programme of the Congress Socialists, began to rage about it. No programme of class war is compatible with membership in the National Congress; and, of course, the Congress Socialists made haste to remove all misunderstandings in this connection. Their leaders published a statement:—

"The Working Committee supposes that confiscation and class war contradict the faith of the Congress in non-violence. This is a most unexpected statement which will hardly be adopted by the majority of the Congressites. The symbol of faith of the Congress is the achievement of Purna Swaraj, with the aid of legal and peaceful means. There is nothing in our programme adopted in Patna which would in the least contradict this. We also want to win independence, and the very fact of our being in the ranks of the Congress proves the *peaceful and legal means which we apply.*"

Again, the Secretariat of the Bombay Congress Socialist Party found it necessary to emphasise its loyalty to non-violence:—

"In view of some misunderstandings, the party considers it necessary to clear this matter up; it recognises both the aim—complete independence, as well as the method—non-violence, comprising part of the Congress symbol of faith."

It is quite known to all how false the assurances of the Congress leaders are about their being for complete independence. If

it were so, then why would they be always bargaining with the British imperialists?

Purna Swaraj—this is merely a false label needed for misleading and doping the masses. Gandhi and his agents do not seem to explain clearly just what they mean by this Purna Swaraj. Does it refer to winning real and full independence for India, or does it mean a bargain with British imperialism, that the latter should permit in India a particularly powerless parliament, preserving at the same time its former power in the country? The Gandhists are doubtlessly against the forced overthrow of British rule, and this means that they, when speaking about complete independence, want that imperialism should merely give some alms to the Indian capitalists and landowners.

The Congress Socialists are wholly and indisputably for Purna Swaraj. Every sincere and honest adherent of the cause for the emancipation of India from under the yoke of British imperialism will understand that this position of the Congress Socialists is the position of the Indian conciliatory bourgeoisie. Indeed, less than a couple of weeks were needed to expose the real essence of the extensive programme mapped out by the Congress Socialists! These people swear that they do not even dare to think of rough revolutionary seizure of the land in favour of the peasants from the imperialists and landowners. They swear that they will never dare to confiscate the enterprises of the Indian capitalists or even the enterprises belonging to British imperialist capital. These people do not regard in any way seriously the struggle of classes and they have no intention whatever to fight seriously even against imperialism.

True, there are lots and lots of preachers of non-violence in the ranks of the National Congress! The preachers of non-violence close their eyes to how British imperialism suppresses and stifles downtrodden India, utilising for the purpose its armed fist, tanks, bombardments, machine-guns, rifles, police clubs. Under cover of preaching non-violence they defend the existing regime, playing into the hands of the British plunderers. Gandhi, Nehru and others have long since been bargaining for getting concessions from these British plunderers. Moreover, they help the ravishers chain the hands of the workers and peasants, condemning every single manifestation of the masses.

It is high time for the toilers of India to think this matter over carefully, to see what is behind the Congress preachings of non-violence. For hundreds of years, thousands and millions of acres of land had been seized by the imperialists, landowners and usurers from the Indian peasants. These ravishers took advantage of the pauperisation and impoverishment of the masses to oppress them and bend them down to the very ground. And Gandhi, "young" Nehru and others at this same time loudly called on the peasants not to have recourse to methods of violence!

They exposed themselves as adherents and defenders of violence of the imperialists, landowners and usurers with regard to the peasants. They do not dare to say frankly that they support the violence of the parasites and oppressors, and this is why they advise the oppressed not to resist the most brutal torture and mockery. The Congressites in their preachings of non-violence unite open support of the oppressors of the peoples of India with the worst sort of hypocrisy. The National Congress applied the tactic of civil disobedience in 1921, and gave up even this when the revolutionary masses in town and village left the framework of British "legality." Then the National Congress became frightened at the outburst of indignation among the national masses against the imperialist plunderers, and it became even still more frightened at the going over of the peasants to the struggle against the landowners. In 1922, at Bardoli, the National Congress solemnly declared that its aim was not to support the struggle of the peasantry against the landowners, but conciliation between them. After this the leaders of the Congress returned to take part in powerless legislative assemblies for petty bargaining with the British robbers. In 1930-31 the civil disobedience drive was also only a step towards betraying the liberation struggle of the masses, a step towards a bargain between Gandhi and the Viceroy. The recent campaign for civil disobedience represented a whole chain of waverings, betrayals and bargainings. Now the Congress leaders call for participation in the Provincial Legislative Councils and the Assembly for carrying on negotiations and concluding bargains with the British bourgeoisie.

These preachers of non-violence have always paved the way

for their negotiations and bargains with the agents of British imperialism through the medium of mass movements. Paltry dwarfs and miserable cowards, they have always been in need of the struggling masses for the purpose of getting on to their backs and utilising them as a pedestal from which to start negotiations with the bosses of the British exchange.

During the recent years of the desperate offensive of capital against the workers, these preachers of non-violence always declared all attempts at resistance to the plunderers to be violence with regard to the capitalists. Workers' strikes, the refusal of peasants to pay taxes to the imperialists and rent to the landlords, resentment of the small artisan worker and storekeeper against the force used by the policemen who smash them in the face—all of this is "violence" and is condemned.

The Congress Socialists have gone through the school of Congress conciliation. They solemnly declare that they are always for "peaceful and lawful means." They do not tell the oppressed and exploited what kind of peaceful and lawful means could be applied in a country where there is absolutely no inviolability of personal freedom, where freedom of the press, assembly, unions and strikes are mere empty phrases, where the arbitrariness of the British sahibs, feudal princes, parasite landowners and the boss's truncheons reign supreme. These fake socialists dare to call on the masses to fight by "lawful means." Lawful—from the viewpoint of what law? The law that consists of the lawlessness of the parasites and oppressors?

The Congress Socialists mock at the enslaved and downtrodden masses. They use the same fake means which have been used by the Congress in the struggle against the national-liberation movement for many years at a stretch.

The Congress Socialists promise to establish socialism in India and do not wish to mention even one word about the forced overthrow of the basest slaveholders and plunderers.

Experiences acquired in the struggle of all nations for their national liberation indisputably prove that under the domination of imperialism only a real national revolution, a revolution of scores and hundreds of millions can liberate the oppressed masses from the chains of colonial slavery. The example set by China is particularly instructive for India. Plundering Japanese imperialism seized Manchuria from China, spread its greedy paws over North China and hopes to turn China, with its four hundred million population, into one of its colonies. Simultaneously it is feverishly preparing for war against the Soviet Union, which it fears owing to the latter's creative power and the force of the example it sets. The British, French and American imperialists also rend the national territory of the Chinese people to pieces. All imperialists desperately attack the Chinese Soviets, considering that Soviet China serves as the chief prop of the struggle for the national liberation of the Chinese masses.

The national masses of China have been waging a struggle for national liberation since the first Chinese Revolution, since the year 1911. The bourgeoisie and landowners in China have long since become the hangmen's agency of imperialism in the country. Only throughout the territory of Soviet China is the imperialist bayonet powerless, because there the freedom of the workers and peasants, national freedom of the Chinese nations, are being defended by the *Red Army*.

In India the British robbers have for scores of years endeavoured to imbue the national masses with the idea of passive subordination to their plundering domination. The force of the armed fist is the basis of their domination, and quite naturally, by means of shooting and torture, they try to show this force everywhere. Let the colonial slaves convince themselves of the invincibility and irresistibility of the British fist! This is necessary even from the viewpoint of economy. British imperialism subjugates and enslaves the three-hundred-and-fifty-million population of India with the aid of its 150,000 army. To imbue the slaves with slavish habits so that they would not dare to think even of an uprising against the slaveholders—is this not the basis of the whole of British policy? For this same end British imperialism spreads the tale about the unfitness of most of the peoples of India for war, and for this same end it invents the legend to the effect that the British fist in India is the only power able to prevent the mutual destructive struggle among the peoples of India.

In India no movement of the peasants refusing to pay taxes to the imperialists and rent to the landlords, no one strike, no mass demonstration, ever occurs without the toilers being shot

However, the Gandhist prophets continue to convince the toilers of village and town that the best means for gaining freedom is to beg for it on their knees.

To-day India can be congratulated with a new achievement. The Congress Socialists suddenly discovered that it is possible to impetrate not only freedom and independence, but even socialism also, remaining on their knees before British imperialism. The Congress Socialists are of the opinion that India can become an independent socialist State with the aid of Purna Swaraj, with the aid of non-violence. This would be comic if it were not tragic!

Only yesterday, striking textile workers were shot down on the streets of Bombay. The whole of India, especially during recent years, is soaked with the blood of thousands of the finest sons of city and village. For years hundreds of Indian villages have been suffering from compulsory military orders and mockery of the British imperialist soldiers. Scores of thousands languish in British prisons, prisons which can very well compete with the bloody torture-chambers of German fascism and the prisons of Japanese imperialism. The prison-bars cast a terrible shadow over the whole of India, for India to-day represents one huge prison for the enslaved and enchained masses. You must not dare to break the chains which hurt your hands and feet, shouts Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Bose and their like. You must not dare to break the chains, for this would mean violence!

Then Jawaharlal Nehru and his adherents move one step away from Gandhi in order to make it easier to mislead, and *promise to introduce socialism in India, which is bound in chains, by peaceful and lawful means!* The British jailers could not find any better assistants for themselves than these falsifiers, masquerading under the cloak of socialism!

However, the fakers are fakers precisely because they defend the interests of the class of exploiters which fears most lest the destruction of the British prison in India might lead to a Soviet regime. The Congress Socialists cannot give even one example from the history of humanity when radical changes in the whole of the State and social order have occurred without a violent struggle, without bitter resistance having been put up by the classes being overthrown, without the latter waging an armed struggle against the majority of the oppressed peoples.

The programme of the Congress Socialists promises to introduce a planned economy in India, but where is this economy going to be planned—in London or in India? With the permission of the MacDonaldis, Baldwins and Churchills, or without their sanction? What guarantee can the Congress Socialists give that London, this world financial leviathan, this monster octopus, will suddenly turn into a peaceful lamb and renounce milliards of super-profits for the sake of—Purna Swaraj? Only during the crisis years, British capital pumped over two milliard gold rupees out of India, not counting the tremendous quantities of depreciated peasant raw material. Due to this open robbery, hundreds of thousands and millions of Indian peasants have been compelled to leave their last strips of land and hand them over to the plundering landlords, usurers and urban speculators.

Indian raw materials are pumped out in tremendous quantities by England through the medium of a complicated system based on the domination of the British fist and rich landowners. The Indian peasant is forced to sell the fruit of his labour for a mere trifle and then hopelessly starve, only because he is obliged to pay taxes in favour of British imperialism, only because he has to pay usurious high rent to the landlords, only because he can never rid himself of his debts to the moneylenders.

The Congress Socialists promise to "remove all princes and landowners as well as all other classes of exploiters." These pseudo Socialists who so loudly rave about their Congress Socialism did not dare to call the bourgeoisie by its right name! However, they do not say how and by what means they intend to remove at least the princes and landowners. As far back as 1931, Jawaharlal Nehru solemnly declared that he had never aimed at forced expropriation of the Indian landowners, while when he referred to the raj of the workers and peasants, he meant merely rule by the panchayats.

The Congress Socialists promised to the bosses of the Congress to fight against confiscation and forced expropriation. What does this mean? Obviously this should mean that not only the socialisation of key industries and banks, but also the transfer of the land of the landowners to the peasants in India must be carried through *with the aid of ransom*. Then permit us to ask how

many dozens of generations of Indian toilers will, in the way of Purna Swaraj, have to pay tribute to the London banks and joint stock companies, to the Indian Rajahs and Marajahs, to the land-owners and usurers?

Socialism through Purna Swaraj represents not only charlatan jugglery, but it is a plan for robbing the masses, which might be to the liking of many parasites. Is it not for this reason the Congress Socialists express such certainty that their plan for establishing socialism in India would be endorsed by the Congress, i.e., by its bosses, who always and everywhere are so loyal to the interests of Indian capital, to the interests of the parasite-land-owners and urban and village usurers?

(3) NON-VIOLENCE AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

The Congress Socialists adopted a resolution of sympathy with the textile workers' general strike, when this struggle had reached its highest pitch.

The general strike of 130,000 textile workers continued for over two months, it being the greatest event in the history of the Indian labour movement. Textile capital, national Indian capital, fiercely attacked the standards of living of the Indian working class. Wage cuts, new methods of exploitation, fresh intensification of the speed-up system—all of these were had recourse to.

The Congressites did everything in their power during the period of the strike to disrupt the ranks of the working class. Outwardly they made believe that they wanted to interfere in the conflict between labour and capital. However, it proved to be only for the purpose of discouraging the workers from fighting for their vital demands and interests. The Congress Socialists merely marched to the left of the Congress camp.

The textile workers' general strike immediately showed up the degree to which the relations of the different classes with imperialism were interlaced. British imperialism, by means of volleys, cleared the streets of the workers; it persecuted the leaders of the workers and loudly called for the struggle against Communist instigators. The textile blood-suckers, the Indian textile manufacturers, breathed more freely and declared they would have been prepared to negotiate with the workers, but why do so if it is of no use, if only out-and-out Communist-Bolsheviks get the benefit, who always urge the workers to strike? The Congress leaders called for conciliation and they also shouted at and cursed the irreconcilable elements. This rendered it possible to break the strike in the third month, splitting the ranks of the weaker and more backward strata. This untied the hands of the British imperialists. They immediately introduced their "Conciliation Bill," enforcing compulsory arbitration by a representative of the British administration, and the right for the latter to refuse to deal with all undesirable representatives of the workers. According to this Bill the workers are actually *deprived of the right to strike*. The strike is declared to be unlawful. The workers must appeal first to British arbitration bodies.

And what is the opinion on this very vital question of the Congress Socialists? Let us give the floor to *Jhabwala*, one of their leaders—

"I was against the last textile strike, not that the workers had no complaint, but because we were not prepared in the true sense of it to fight a strike. The socialist party may help a great way in eradicating the irreconcilables from the ranks of labour. Then the Congress must revive its relations with the millowners and other industrial companies by giving them a guarantee of consumption of manufactured goods on the strength of proper Swadeshi propaganda on the owners' acceptance of a gradual socialisation of all the industries."

It is, indeed, hard to imagine that *Jhabwala* comes from the ranks of the Meerut prisoners, who inscribed one of the principal pages in the history of the proletarian revolutionary movement of India. He can unceremoniously speculate with his Meerut past as much as he pleases, but one thing is certain, that his way and the way of the workers part.

Jhabwala is for conciliation between labour and capital. Moreover, he believes that a true labour movement consists precisely of the fact that the workers should move . . . towards conciliation with capital.

However, *Jhabwala* does not dare to say openly that he had been against the textile workers' strike due to reasons of principle. No! The strike had not been practically prepared. Practical

reasons—this is precisely what any misleader of the workers is apt to say when pressed for an explanation.

In spite of this, the Congress Socialist principally is for conciliation between labour and capital. As a matter of fact, Congress Socialism was born for driving out all that is impure, in other words, all irreconcilables from the workers' ranks. Congress Socialism strews the path leading towards conciliation between labour and capital with socialist phrases.

The Congress Socialist in his clumsy endeavours to help Gandhi and his followers out of the difficulty of explanations with the workers, at once blabs out things which throw a surprisingly vivid light on the very essence of the Congress Socialist party. He proposes Swadeshi propaganda, propaganda in favour of buying Indian-made fabrics, as a means for moderating the appetites of Indian capital. The Congress Socialists play the role of commercial travellers and promise the Indian manufacturers, attacking the workers, to advertise their goods as best they can. Buy Indian cloth, buy in the name of the prosperity of Indian national capital! This is what was preached by the National Congress for many years and, true, the Indian capitalists reaped in some good profits from this propaganda! But to-day the situation is different and more complicated. The contrast of class interests comes clearly to the fore. The resentment of the working masses grows and so does their will to struggle and the stubbornness of their resistance to the capitalist robbers. And the Congress Socialists draw the natural conclusion; it is essential to cover the commercial advertisements of Indian capital with socialist forms. Let the capitalists, bossing the Congress, superficially and with a thousand reservations, endorse the non-committal phrase about the "progressive socialisation of all industries." There will always be time enough to say that they mean first of all the industry belonging to British imperialism.

It is necessary to reorganise the commercial advertisements of Indian capital on a socialist footing. Let the workers become travelling salesmen and petty salesmen of their manufacturers, who brutally lower their wages and throw them out of their jobs. Let them, in the role of lackeys of their manufacturers, console themselves with the idea that in this way they will finally reach the distant harbour where all power will be transferred to the "productive masses," when industry and agriculture will be "socialised."

But the Congress Socialists have one argument covering all against the damned Bolsheviks—non-violence. The Congress policy of non-violence has indisputably been refuted by the whole course of the political struggle not only in all countries of the world, but also in India proper. Beginning with 1929 India witnessed revolutionary mass movements the like of which it never knew before. A new revolutionary force is being born in India, a new revolutionary India is coming into being.

The bankruptcy of the Congress policy of non-violence and its continuous evasion and dodging of the struggle for the sake of conciliation with imperialism stands out boldly before all. However, this bankrupt policy has its deep class roots. The Indian bourgeoisie and its agents fear most of all a real national revolution. They are bound in a thousand ways with the rich land-owners and usurers—economically, politically and by ties of blood. Indian capital would not have been able to wage such a fierce attack if the Indian peasants had not been enslaved by the land-owners and usurers.

In the scope and swing of the labour movement the Indian bourgeoisie clearly saw the face of the impending danger. It saw real signs of class awakening and self-organisation of the Indian proletariat. In the powerful peasant uprisings against imperialism, against the feudal despots and parasite landowners and usurers, the Indian bourgeoisie saw the danger of an agrarian-peasant revolution, the danger of revolutionary victories for the peasants, the danger of the latter winning their land. Precisely this is why the bourgeoisie has been so anxious to welcome the Congress Socialist Party, looking upon it as a new weapon for deceiving the masses.

All experiences acquired in the international revolutionary struggle teach us that only under the leadership of the working class consolidated by its struggle and its political line can the toilers of town and village counterpose bourgeois lies and victoriously fight for emancipation. This is what developing events in India lead to, where a Communist Party has already crystallised, which, in spite of all its shortcomings and mistakes of the

early period of its existence, has the only real and practical programme of revolutionary struggle for the liberation of the country.

Everywhere, beginning with the City of London and on to the trading offices in Bombay, then to meetings of trade union lawyers from the camp of the Congress, everywhere the cry can be heard: bullets for the Communists!

The enemy scents the growth of revolutionary activity, the awakening of consciousness and organisation of the masses. And precisely for this reason, capital, while depriving the worker of his last penny, makes kind gestures and sends its faithful wolves, in sheep's clothing, into the ranks of the proletariat. It is quite easy to recognise these wolves in sheep's clothing, these lawyers with their babbling tongues and generous promises. They can easily be recognised wherever they go.

They are for the class struggle, but against strikes; they are for socialism, but by means of non-violence; they are for independence, but within the framework of Purna Swaraj. They are . . . Congress Socialists!

(4) CONCILIATORY GAME IN PARLIAMENTARISM OR AN IRRECONCILABLE STRUGGLE AND ORGANISATION OF THE MASSES ?

The national masses of India doubtlessly crave for complete independence and for full emancipation. However, they are hampered in their struggle by the conciliation of the bourgeoisie going under cover of the National Congress. The Congress pseudo-socialists do not represent these sections of the honest petty-bourgeois democracy to which many millions and tens of millions in town and village belong. The rank and file representatives of the petty-bourgeois population of the cities, of the intelligentsia, of the peasant masses, honestly and sincerely want to fight for the liberation of India from the imperialist yoke. They are anxious to bring about a full and final victory of the national revolution. In this regard their interests coincide with the interests of the working class. However, the Indian bourgeoisie does not want the national revolution. It fears the leading role of the working class in the impending revolution. It fears the prospect of the working class organising and consolidating its ranks under the leadership of the Communist Party. It fears the Soviet anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution, which would really serve as a preliminary stage along the path of creating an Independent Socialist India.

The Indian bourgeoisie hopes to enfeeble the working class, to divide the ranks of the workers and peasants, to put obstacles in the way of spreading proletarian revolutionary influence in the midst of the village and urban toilers.

The bourgeoisie mostly shouts about the necessity of the united front and constantly drives a wedge in the ranks of the struggling masses, disrupting the struggle against imperialism, disorganising the peasant rebellions and stifling the workers' strike action.

The Congress Socialists are its tamed agency. They appeal to the will of the majority, they always refer to this will of the majority of the people, but only for the purpose of preventing the destructive blows of the revolution from reaching imperialism and its chief props—the feudal despots, the landowners and usurers.

In the camp of the Indian bourgeoisie to-day there is quite a lot of confusion and serious differences. One section of the Indian bourgeoisie openly marches with unfurled Swaraj banners towards collaboration with British imperialism. Another section of this bourgeoisie makes out it is inclined to continue the struggle and simultaneously tries to get into the hybrid "legislative assembly" for further bargaining and gaining concessions from British imperialism. In the midst of this bourgeoisie there are also differences on the question of municipal curias, etc. Finally, there are some bourgeois groups who fear to sell too cheaply the premature concessions and, considering the approach of fresh military clashes in the camp of imperialism, parade before the masses with phrases about independence, without, however, undertaking any practical steps for the struggle of independence.

The National Congress leadership does its best to liquidate these contradictions in its midst, simultaneously endeavouring to get the support of the masses for carrying through its bourgeois conciliation policy.

The National Congress has announced its intention to participate again in the legislative assemblies. This will not rouse sympathy in the ranks of the national masses. The broad strata of adherents of the National Congress are dissatisfied with its conciliation policy.

The framework of the Congress has come to be too narrow for them, and they spontaneously, half-consciously, aspire for an independent political organisation for the struggle against imperialism, without the protection of the bourgeoisie and landowners, who support the Congress.

Attempting to distract attention from the fact that the Congress evades the struggle against the slave fake-constitution, the Congress leaders developed a mass drive for the "democratic revival" of the Congress, for the purpose of further preparing a "constituent assembly."

A constituent assembly—such is the latest prescription of the Congressites. The constituent assembly will have to draft a constitution which would reflect the interests of "all" strata in India. The constituent assembly will have to submit a promissory note to British imperialism; instead of a "white paper," India must be given a "real constitution"!

The Congressites pretend that they believe that from the thunder of this revolution all citadels of British imperialism will tumble down. Here the base speculation with the will of the majority of the people screens a rather crafty class policy: to pave the way for more extensive trade with the slave-holders. Precisely for this the slogan has been issued: a constituent assembly!

The National Congress talks about the convocation of a constituent assembly at the time when India is being severely attacked by imperialism, when British imperialism, utilising the whole of its hangmen-repressive apparatus, mercilessly suppresses all manifestations of struggle against its domination, all action of the peasantry against the plundering landlords, all strikes of workers against attacking capital!

The national masses are craving to fight, but the National Congress, with inimitable grace and cynicism, tells them to sit at the table and begin to write a "correct" constitution.

The Congress Socialists by no means play last fiddle in this campaign for destroying imperialism with the aid of a well-drafted constitution, for beating it by means of much-promising resolutions. They give their socialist blessings. They promise, by means of resolutions, without strikes, and—God forbid!—without any revolutionary struggle, without an armed overthrow of the oppressors, to establish socialism, which would be to the taste even of the sharks of Indian textile capital.

It is impossible to stage this comedy without the masses, for it is precisely for the purpose of demoralising and disorganising them that this game in constitution has been undertaken. Then let Congress Socialism serve for these rebelling masses as an allurement, as a bait!

In India there is no constitution, there is a bloody and executionist imperialist dictatorship, leaning for support on semi-feudal satraps and landlords, supporting them, utilising for misleading the masses, different manoeuvres, bargaining with the Indian bourgeoisie on the question of a constitution.

Many of the Indian bourgeoisie cherish the hope that they will be able to get into the slit created in the camp of the British die-hard imperialists, considering that Baldwin is for giving some insignificant concessions to the Indian bourgeoisie under cover of a fake-constitution, while Churchill does not want to hear even of convening the most powerless conference of representatives of the native princes, Indian landowners and bourgeoisie, under the label of a parliament.

These hopes and illusions of the Indian bourgeoisie best of all show them up as the most hopeless bankrupts.

The struggling national masses have nothing in common with these bankrupts, neither can they have anything in common with the bankrupts of Congress fake-socialism.

In India the united front of the fighting masses grows from below in strikes and revolutionary demonstrations, in manifestations of the peasantry against the imperialist ravishers and landowners, in the struggle of the masses. The Indian working class is awakening more and more, is crystallising into an independent class revolutionary force. The Communist Party of India, adhering to a correct Bolshevik policy, will be able to win a worthy place for itself at the head of the struggling masses, as representative and leader of the revolutionary class to the very end. The programme of action of the Communist Party of India—*this is the real fighting programme, the real liberation programme.*

Away with conciliatory forgeries, bearing the brand of bourgeois treachery and the socialist label!