

MR. ROY IN THE SERVICE OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM AND THE NATIONAL CONGRESS

HEADED by Gandhi, the leaders of the National Congress — Nehru, Bose and Mehta, who dissolved the “Meerut Prisoners’ Defence Committee,” who gave their consent to the imprisonment of thousands of revolutionaries in Anglo-Indian prisons, and left them to suffer a lingering death, have now launched an energetic campaign in defence of Roy. This support has a class basis.

The Indian bourgeoisie, headed by the National Congress, in its compromise with British Imperialism, is trying all it can to disorganise and to keep in check the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants. Besides direct terror on the part of British imperialism, which is called into action by the national-reformists every time the toiling masses attempt an armed uprising (Kishoreganj and so on), the Indian bourgeoisie spares no efforts to disorganise the revolutionary movement from within to keep back the growth of the revolutionary, class-consciousness of the working masses, and to hinder the formation of a Communist Party of India.

The XI. Plenum of the E.C.C.I. marked a new stage in the development of the process of differentiation in the National liberation movement of India, and indicated that in the circumstances, which had arisen after the session of the National Congress in Karachi, the emancipation of the working class from the influence of the bourgeoisie had gone forward at a more rapid rate. The fact that the broad masses of toilers

had now entered into the political struggle compelled the National Congress to increase its efforts a hundredfold in order to maintain the leadership of the national movement.

In order to achieve this task, the National Congress held its Congress in Karachi under the slogan of “defending” national interests, and passed its bourgeois “Declaration of Rights,” which it is now trying to make out as almost a Socialist document. In order to strengthen its leadership, the National Congress began to talk a lot about its chief task being to defend the interests of the peasantry (actually, of course, the landlords), and, finally, considerably developed its activities among the workers. The National Congress recently passed a resolution calling upon the factory owners to grant “concessions” to the workers; further, in several places committees for work among the workers have been formed, and Congress mediators between the workers and owners have begun to take part in several strikes who call themselves the workers’ friends, but who in actual fact are disorganisers and enemies of the working class movement. This increased activity on the part of the National Congress has become characteristic during the last few months, and represents the conscious effort of the bourgeoisie to disorganise the proletariat and to subject the workers entirely to their policy.

However, the forces of the National Congress and its programme are clearly inadequate, especially for the purpose of demoralising the more

advanced sections of the proletariat and of preventing the creation of a Communist Party. The "left" wing of the National Congress, headed by Bose, Nehru and Mehta, etc., is also an inadequate force, as the experience of the class struggle in India shows clearly.

Now, this task of the Indian bourgeoisie for the disorganisation of the proletarian vanguard, the advanced sections of the working class, has fallen to the lot of the Roy group, the agency of the Indian bourgeoisie inside the working class movement, whose activity (Roy's group) of late has taken on a serious form.

The Roy group with Sheik, Kabadi, V. N. Joshi and others, organised a split in the Girni Kamgar Union and during the "Labour Week" campaign, organised by the National Congress in Bombay during the summer of 1930, came out with the slogan: "Workers and peasants are the arms and legs of the National Congress."

During the whole course of their activities, as well as during the Calcutta session of the National Congress, Roy and Co. called upon the workers to support the National Congress and to refuse to tolerate any form of criticism against the so-called "lefts"—Bose, Nehru and others.

In the summer of 1931, Mr. Roy and Co., with Mehta and Ruikar, amalgamated with the down-right agents of British capital—Joshi, Giri, Shiva Rao — and formed a reactionary so-called unity committee to split the trade union movement. Then, fulfilling the general plan of the bourgeois National Congress, which was mentioned by Bose in his speeches during and after the Calcutta Trade Union Congress, Roy, Kandalkar, Sheik and Co., together with Bose, Ruikar and other national reformists, split the Congress in order to isolate the revolutionary vanguard and disorganise the growing class unity of the proletariat, which was entering more and more into active strikes and political warfare.

The disorganising work of the Roy-Kandalkar-Sheik group was shown in several strikes and is now particularly evident in the disorganising of the mobilisation of the railway workers for a general strike. Ruikar, in alliance with the Roy group, is energetically striving to prevent any true militant unity among the workers and once more instead of preparing for a strike, is advocating, and taking part in, an Arbitration Committee, in order to gain time, to prevent the strike and to defeat the workers section by section.

It is quite clear, therefore, why the bourgeoisie and the National Congress are offering them their most hearty support.

In the existing alignment of class forces, where

the bourgeoisie, headed by the National Congress, is doing its utmost to prevent an anti-imperialist, agrarian revolution, and the working class has begun to free itself from the influence of the bourgeoisie, to organise the Communist Party and develop the strike movement, with the widely-developed agrarian and peasant movement as its background (the Burma uprising, etc.)—the Indian bourgeoisie is using the group of Roy, who was long ago expelled from the ranks of the Communist International, as its agent in the work of disorganising the revolutionary movement of workers, peasants and revolutionary youth. In playing its part as the agent of the exploiting classes within the labour movement, the Roy group, with its "revolutionary" phrases and supported by the entire bourgeois-landlord apparatus (the press, etc.), enjoying favourable treatment at the hands of the English gaolers—carries on treacherous work to prevent the creation of a powerful Communist Party and to disorganise the coming Indian revolution.

Mr. Roy took up his treacherous position against the strict line and the decisions of the Communist International, swearing allegiance to Communism in *words*, but later appearing *openly* against it in *deeds*, and was for this reason expelled from the ranks of the International in 1929 as a traitor to the Indian liberation movement and the world proletarian revolution.

In order that the broad masses of workers and peasants should more easily understand the demagogic deceit of Mr. Roy, it would be as well to give a short estimation of Roy's position on Indian questions.

ROY'S IDEA OF THE ROLE OF THE INDIAN PROLETARIAT IN THE NATIONAL LIBERATION REVOLUTION

The estimation given by the Roy group of the class forces in India is diametrically opposed to the position of the Comintern, according to which the working class and the peasantry, together with the town poor (among whom the leading and organising rôle is beginning and will be played by the proletariat, headed by the Communist Party) are the driving forces of the Indian revolution. Moreover, the proletariat fights for this leading rôle, not in alliance with, but on the contrary in the struggle *against* the treacherous bourgeoisie and all its reformist detachments, especially the "lefts." And yet the whole policy and activity of the Roy group aims at *reducing the proletariat to the position of a feeble appendage of the bourgeoisie.*

The Roy conception and estimation of class forces and the tactic he propounds are of a

national-Menshevik character. This is most clearly shown in the fact that the proletariat is given the rôle of left flank of the *united* national-bourgeois front. The Roy group faces the proletariat with the task of merely criticising the "wavering" of the bourgeoisie and bringing pressure to bear through its "left" wing. This is obviously a treacherous position.

The Indian bourgeoisie, writes Mr. Roy in his article from the Cawnpore prison on August 23, was "urged" by British imperialism to "capitulate"; moreover, in view of the provocative actions of the Government, Roy complains: "Congress was compelled again and again to postpone the journey of Gandhi to London. The responsibility falls upon MacDonald for the fact that the Indian people, against their will, are having a sham scheme of "self-government" forced upon them. Thus, *Mr. Roy even now entirely lifts the responsibility from the shoulders of the Indian bourgeoisie and the National Congress for their betrayal of the national-revolutionary movement and is trying to convince the nation that the bourgeoisie is prepared to fight against British Imperialism.*

The proletariat, according to Roy and Co., has only to bring pressure to bear upon the bourgeoisie and remain within the framework of a united front and a united organisation, i.e., submit completely to the leadership of the treacherous bourgeoisie. Roy and Co. therefore urge the workers to follow the National Congress, to support the so-called "lefts"—Nehru, Bose and others—and "win over" the National Congress from within. Therefore, Roy and Co., for instance, have issued the slogan of a Constitutional Assembly and have declared themselves strongly against the general strike and the independent programme of the working class. The Indian bourgeoisie through its National Congress and Gandhi has entered into negotiations with British imperialism concerning the conditions upon which they can mutually exploit the Indian people. The "left" wing of the National Congress, representing an organic part of the latter and pretending to be a quasi-opposition *in words, actually* pursues the policy of the National Congress, whereas Mr. Roy and Co., in mildly criticising occasionally the fact that the Congress leaders participate in the negotiations with British imperialism, *call for support of the united front with the "Left" Wing of the National Congress—Nehru, Bose and Co.*

In this way Roy is working hand-in-hand with the bourgeoisie in fooling the people and disorganising the revolutionary struggle. In this betrayal the most dangerous rôle is played by the "left" groups, together with Roy and Co., whose real treachery is more difficult for the people to

understand, because Roy even now tries to masquerade in the name of the Communist International.

THE NATIONAL-BOURGEOIS PARTY INSTEAD OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Roy and his supporters, playing their part as the agent of the exploiting classes within the working class movement, *endeavour to gloss over the bourgeois character of the National Congress and the treacherous rôle of the "left" national reformists—Nehru, Bose and Co.*

Roy and his supporters, forced to take into account the disillusionment of the people in connection with the treacherous policy of the National Congress, and in order to strengthen the position of national-reformism, have suggested the formation of a national "revolutionary," *actually* national-bourgeois, party, and are fighting determinedly against the independent proletarian party—the Communist Party.

In his book, *Future of Indian Politics*, he proposes:—

"Convert the Swaraj Party (a bourgeois Party which was in favour of participating and collaborating in the arbitrary legislative assemblies introduced by the English after the 1919-22 movement—Editor's note) into a national revolutionary party of the people. The first event in the future of Indian politics will be the crystallisation of such a party." (Page 99.)

Thus Mr. Roy proposes the conversion of the treacherous bourgeois party of the Swarajists into a so-called National Revolutionary Party.

In 1930 Mr. Roy and his supporters in a manifesto signed by the international Right renegade Brandler group, which was expelled from the Comintern, declared:

"The National Congress was very useful in the period of agitation and propaganda. But it could not act as a political party aiming at true struggle. Consequently the task of the movement is the creation of a national-revolutionary party."

Thus, seeing that the people have begun to discover the bourgeois character of the National Congress, whose treacherous activities Mr. Roy is continually justifying—the Roy group (whose open transition to the side of national-reformism took place side by side with the growth of class consciousness among the proletariat and the deepening of class differentiation), *in order to consolidate the leading position of the bourgeoisie and to deceive the masses, once more puts forward the idea of creating a national-revolutionary party, i.e., actually* of creating a national-bourgeois party, whose task it will be

to strengthen the influence of the bourgeoisie by means of radical phrases and promises.

The group of Roy serve the purpose of spreading the counter-revolutionary influence of the bourgeoisie above all in the ranks of the town petty-bourgeoisie and partially among more backward strata of workers.

It fights for the political hegemony of the bourgeoisie against the proletarian vanguard and especially against the creation of the Communist Party, which represents a serious threat to National Reformism in the arena of the mass movement. Wholly and completely carrying out the policy of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie it operates on the basis of their immediate support and the counter-revolutionary tendencies of the town petty-bourgeois heads, enemies of the mass revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants.

Precisely because of this social and political basis it endeavours to realise its splitting reactionary national-reformist influence upon the lower petty-bourgeoisie and the workers.

ROY AND CO. AGAINST THE HEGEMONY OF THE PROLETARIAT IN THE NATIONAL MOVEMENT

The Roy-Sheik group is against the working class and its programme for the Indian revolution. According to Roy and Co. the proletariat has no right to fight for the rôle of leader of the Indian people or to make propaganda under its own fundamental slogans. *The working class, in the opinion of Roy and Co., should drag along behind, and not question the leading position of the treacherous bourgeoisie and its political organ, the National Congress.* In an open letter to the Bombay workers the Roy-Sheik-Kandalkar group proposes that they:

“Fight only for partial demands, as it is pure *romanticism* to talk about a general strike . . . and to put forward the slogan of a workers' and peasants' government.”

The Communist Party of India *in actual practice*, and not merely in words, participates in the daily strike struggles of the working class (Bombay, Sholapur, the G.I.P. railway, etc.), and in its Platform of Action it made quite clear its attitude to the question of the struggle for partial demands. The Roy-Sheik-Kandalkar group had to use this lying accusation against the Indian Communist Party about underestimating the struggle for partial demands, merely in order to hide up its own “hvoistist” Menshevist position, to deprive the workers of a programme of fundamental demands, which would express the hopes of the people of the land and, *on the basis of which the proletariat is fighting and will fight for*

hegemony in the National Movement, under the flag of which the Indian Revolution will develop. Mr. Roy and his supporters declare that questions of power, of the agrarian revolution, of independence and so on are no business of the working class, but must be left entirely to the bourgeois National Congress; Roy and Co., who are frequently ready to swear allegiance to the leading rôle of the proletariat, actually fight against all real measures to bring about proletarian leadership. That is why they are so bitterly attacking the slogan of a general strike, which has such significance for the development of the revolutionary movement, especially at the present moment. Hence the constant leit-motif of all the propaganda made by Roy and the bourgeois Congress, with its accusations against the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions: of “ultra-radicalism,” “sectarianism,” “Moscow dictatorship,” and so on. This accusation is hurled out in an equal measure because the Red trade unions and the Communist Party are fighting determinedly not only for general political demands, but also in the everyday economic struggle, leading strikes *in the spirit of the class struggle*, struggling against all reformist traitors and disorganisers of workers' strikes (for example, the betrayals of Ruikar, Joshi and so on in the railwaymen's strike on the Great Indian Peninsular Railway).

The negotiations carried on by the Roy-Sheik-V. N. Joshi group with the Bombay Committee of the National Congress, published in the “Bombay Chronicle” of September 28, are an example of the way in which they “struggle” for partial demands, trying to convert the proletariat into an appendage of the bourgeoisie. The Congress paper writes: A meeting took place between the representatives of Congress Committee, Messrs. Brelvey, Nariman and others, and the leaders of the Tramwaymen's Union, Messrs. Lalji Pendse, V. N. Joshi and others (representatives of the Tramwaymen's Union—supporters of the Roy group), at which Lalji Pendse and Joshi asked the National Congress to “fulfil its obligations before the workers” and help to secure the demands of the tramwaymen. In reply the Congress representative said that he is prepared to assist “in order to avoid a probable catastrophe,” i.e., prevent the men from striking. This is an example of the “class” policy of the Roy group, which amounts to subjecting the workers to the leadership of a bourgeois National Congress, and together with the latter demoralising and disorganising the strike struggle. The policy of the Roy-Kandalkar-Sheik-Joshi group amounts to the same thing in all the struggles of the textile workers and others. All their dis-

organising work in conjunction with Ruikar among the railwaymen amounts to this as well. Hence they make use of the support of the bourgeoisie, hence the Association of Owners recognises them and negotiates with them. For they are the lackeys and agents of the bourgeoisie within the ranks of the proletariat.

A POWERLESS CONSTITUTIONAL ASSEMBLY VERSUS THE REVOLUTION

The treacherous bourgeois character of the Roy-Sheik group is obvious further from the programme of action it has launched before the toiling masses of the land. In Roy's declaration of June 8, 1930, published in Berlin and reprinted in India, again mainly repeated in the appeal of Sheik, Kabadi and Bradjesha Sing, published in the "Vanguard" in Bombay, and in other documents as well, we read:

"The central political slogan of the Indian revolution should be the *election of a Constituent Assembly*, as against the round table conference, on the one hand, and against the utopia of a Soviet Republic, on the other . . ." and further:

"The local Congress Committee broadened through the inclusion of the delegates from the workers, peasants, small traders . . . organisations should become the units for the election of the Constituent Assembly."

Thus, supported by the British army, Roy and Co. propose the creation of an "organ of democratic power," which will bring about "independence," "for the sovereign authority of the constituent assembly cannot be doubted." (Page 12, "Vanguard" and "The People" of January 22, 1931.) It should be clear to every worker and peasant that the idea of a *constituent assembly is for the purpose of disarming the masses, preventing the agrarian revolution, consolidating the domination of British Imperialism, clearing the way for constitutional "reforms" and glossing over the simple truth that India can obtain independence, only by means of a revolutionary rising.*

The proposal of the Roy group is an attempt to consolidate the authority of the National Congress by giving it the new name of Constituent Assembly and swelling the ranks of its members by further deceitful efforts to subject the toiling masses to the leadership of the predatory bourgeoisie.

Roy's constituent assembly is the same old congress, with its same old counter-revolutionary bourgeois programme, bourgeoisie leadership, only under another name.

That is why the "lefts," Nehru, Bose and Co.,

are supporting Roy's constituent assembly. And from this it is quite obvious why the bourgeoisie, with Roy and his friends, are so violently opposed to the slogan of an Indian Federal Soviet Workers' and Peasants' Republic, put forward by the Communist Party of India and supported by demonstrations of the workers. For this slogan of the Communist Party, which means the democratic dictatorship of the working class and peasantry, is essentially directed against imperialism and the treacherous bourgeoisie whom the Roy group defends.

Roy's democratic constituent assembly actually means not only support of Indian bourgeois domination, but is meant to be a justification for the agreement *between the ruling classes of India and imperialism* as well, an agreement for the mutual exploitation of the Indian people.

The fact that the slogan for a constituent assembly is a piece of treachery is also confirmed by the general attitude taken up by Roy's group towards the question of economic relations between England and India and the present economic policy of British imperialism.

Mr. Roy in his book *Future of Indian Politics* writes:

"What are the cardinal demands of the Nationalist bourgeoisie? Impetus to the industrialisation of the country; fiscal autonomy; protection. All these have been realised incidentally by British imperialism." (Page 44.)

"In practice, protectionism is already in force. Imperialism is driven to it by its own contradictions." ("People," p. 301.)

Thus the Roy group actually asserts that imperialism has taken the road of protectionism and is assisting to develop the forces of production in India and, in consequence, the chief economic contradiction between Colonial India and imperialist England is vanishing. And once this is the case, there is serious ground for collaboration. In these circumstances, according to Roy, there is no need to hold on to the idea of revolution, but every need for playing at convening a constituent assembly, under the defence of British bayonets.

Further, it is no accident that in the programme of Roy there is no condemnation of the National Congress, and that among the seven *main* points of the programme the slogan "complete State independence of India" is not to be found. (Incidentally Vrajat Sing in his "Appeal for the collection of funds to defend Roy," published in the "People" of August 30, 1931, states that the Roy programme was passed by the Trade Union Congress (?) in Calcutta.)

This is what Roy's treacherous programme and his slogan of a constitutional assembly actually

amounts to in practice, and no oaths of allegiance to the struggle for independence or casual mild criticisms of the leaders of the National Congress, can make things better.

The programme of compromise with British Imperialism is the programme of the bourgeois National Congress which is fighting against the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution. This is the programme which Roy and Co. support.

The programme of the revolutionary proletariat and the Communist Party has nothing in common with this programme. The Communist Party of India like the whole Communist International, is determinedly fighting against British imperialism, which holds the Indian people in slavish subjection and does everything possible to hold back the development of productive forces inside the country. The only way out, which has been correctly indicated in the Platform of Action of the Communist Party of India, is the forcible overthrow of British domination and landlords' ownership of the land by means of a victorious revolution of workers and peasants. *The utterances of Roy and Co. are the words of traitors who are spreading the ideology of Imperialism in the ranks of the National Liberation Movement.*

ROY AND CO. AGAINST THE AGRARIAN REVOLUTION.

Pursuing their bourgeois policy among the proletariat, the Roy-Sheik-Bradjeshi Sing group at the same time opposes the agrarian revolution and the complete abolition of feudal survivals.

In their appeal, published in the "Vanguard" (Bombay), these bourgeois "revolutionaries" declared that:

"The abolition of the Native States and landlordism should take place by Decree of a national democratic State, empowering the peasants to confiscate land." (Page 12.).

Further:

"The abolition of peasant indebtedness only in cases where the peasant is in a state of bankruptcy."

This is the maximum programme of the Roy group, of the national-mensheviks who are trying to urge the peasants to put off their agrarian revolution until such time as the "democratic" State, i.e., landlords and capitalists, may kindly think fit to hand over some land to the peasants. The Roy group at most promises to bring about some reforms from above, through the bureaucracy, which actually differ in no respect from the programme of the "Nehru Constitution." This is at a time when, in order that the peasants

should get the land, a revolution must be made from below, which would overthrow the domination of the imperialists and landlords, and, with revolutionary actions on the part of the peasantry and working class, would put the programme of agrarian revolution into operation. However, Mr. Roy in his article of December 20, 1930, in "Gegen den Strom" wrote: "The agrarian revolution must be carried out in stages," i.e., he proposes to hold back the revolutionary fight of the peasantry and betray the struggle for independence. Realising that the peasant movement, despite the advice of the National Congress and Roy to wait a little, is continually developing, the Roy group is now trying to head, i.e., to behead, the movement in separate parts of the country, and in doing so aims at deceiving the masses with its new programme of demands, of which the most important are:

A cut of 75 per cent. in land rent for the duration of the present depression; a lowering of 50 per cent. in the land rent as soon as *normal circumstances have been restored*; conclusion of fixed rent agreements, annulment of peasant indebtedness."

(Vidyarthi letter of June 20, published in "Gegen den Strom," July number).

This programme differs very little from that of the National Congress; for the National Congress also talks about a 50 per cent. drop in land rent and the introduction of fixed rent agreements, though in *actual fact* it is helping the British Government to *collect taxes and the debts of the peasants*. But what is most characteristic of the treacherous position of the Roy group is that in their demands, they accidentally expressed their hope that the "*restoration of normal circumstances*" would soon take place.

This is the meaning of Roy's programme to "bring about the agrarian revolution in stages," i.e., it means that having *promised* the peasantry anything and everything for the time being, during the revolutionary upsurge, it is doing its utmost to *bring about "normal circumstances" for the peasantry*, i.e. to *disorganise the revolutionary struggle of the peasantry, to prevent the agrarian revolution and maintain the existing economic system*. This bourgeois agrarian programme which Roy puts forward has nothing in common with the programme of the Indian Communist Party, which, while doing its best to organise and to lead the partial struggle of the peasantry, in order to develop the agrarian movement as well as the revolutionary education and organisation of the peasantry, clearly and determinedly puts forward at the same time the programme of the agrarian revolution (confiscation of

the land without compensation and its immediate transference to the peasantry through peasant committees, annulment of all debts without compensation, etc.) and mobilises broad masses of peasants under its slogans.

ROY—THE ENEMY OF WORKING CLASS UNITY.

In defending the interests of the bourgeoisie, the Roy-Sheik-Kandalkar-Vidyarthi group is trying as far as possible to bring about a split and demoralise the working class movement, the trade unions and the proletarian vanguard.

With assistance from the leaders of the National Congress, the Roy-Sheik group split the Girni Kamgar Union and the "Trade Union Propaganda Committee" in Bombay, actually advocating affiliation to Amsterdam and Geneva, and finally split the All-Indian Trade Union Congress in Calcutta.

Mr. Vidyarthi, an active leader of the Roy group, in the "People," page 115, declared that the trade union movement has now created a "mighty middle (read reformist) group," associated with Mehta, which includes those who, fighting against the stupidities "of the orthodox Moscowites in the Indian labour movement," nevertheless support (!) "Russian methods" and are sincerely trying to get unity on the basis of true trade unionism . . . and who have worked out a platform, which has been accepted by this middle group, on which to fight *against* "both extreme wings."

The Roy group is very proud of this achievement and the whole bourgeois press is in agreement and welcomes it. What is the idea of all this "unity?" Roy and Vidyarthi themselves write sufficiently clearly on this point. In the "Revolutionary Age," published in America, Mr. Roy wrote as follows on September 5 in his correspondence on the position of the working class movement in India:

"In the course of a few months a powerful middle group has crystallised on the platform of unity" . . . "and it is not by choice that the right wing (Joshi, Giri, Shiva Rao and others . . . Editor's Note) is *moving towards unity on a platform of class struggle*. They are being forced to that position" . . . "As a matter of fact, since the conference (the "Unity" Conference in Bombay in the summer of 1931 . . . Editor's Note), the right wing leaders have modified their attitude and have even gone to the extent of showing readiness to liquidate the Federation, provided some concessions be made to them as regards attending the Geneva Conferences. We are prepared to make the concession on this minor issue for the sake of unity on a platform of clear class struggle"; and in

another place Mr. Roy adds that the split at the Nagpur Trade Union Congress took place "on secondary issues."

Thus unity, according to Roy, means unity with the Joshi group, which "supports" the platform of class struggle at the present moment. For anyone at all acquainted with Indian affairs, the falsehood and deceit attached to such a declaration is completely obvious.

The Joshi group are the agents of British Imperialism inside the working class movement, and they have demonstrated this fact during the whole course of their existence; at present they are engaged in disorganising the struggle and the general strike of the railwaymen, at whatever cost. Roy and Vidyarthi have become so insolent, counting upon the credulity of the Indian workers, that their assertion that the Joshi group is prepared to accept the platform of class struggle was not even confirmed by any statement from the latter group. And they were unable to give any such confirmation, for none exists. The Joshi group openly declares itself to be against the class war and strikes. But Mr. Roy needed this lie in order to hide up the fact from the workers that he has passed over to the agents of British imperialism and allied himself with them so as to smash the struggle of the workers and create a united reactionary bloc of all the enemies of the revolutionary proletariat. It is for this reason that the Roy group depicts the Nagpur split as the result of stupidities on the part of ultra-lefts, and declares that the split took place on "secondary issues."

Mr. Roy underestimates the growth of class consciousness among the proletarian vanguard. The workers will quickly understand that the assertions of Roy are declarations of the agents of the bourgeoisie and imperialists. The Nagpur split took place on a fundamental question connected with the interests of the whole nation; the question as to whether to wage war against imperialism and the Whitley Commission or take the road of compromise, to give up the fight for independence and take part in the work of the imperialist Whitley Commission. The struggle for independence is a fundamental, cardinal question for India. And the Roy-Vidyarthi-Sheik group declare that it is a "secondary issue." True, for bourgeois agents, for imperialist agents it is a "secondary issue," but for the workers, the peasants and the revolutionary youth, it is a question of life or death.

Thus "unity" for the Roy group means the amalgamation of all anti-revolutionary forces for the purpose of disorganising the national struggle, for the purpose of splitting the ranks of the proletariat, for the purpose of reducing the prole-

ariat to mere appendages of the treacherous bourgeoisie."

The splitting tactics of the Roy group and its anti-revolutionary nature was shown clearly during the Calcutta Trade Union Congress.

Roy and Co. are very proud of the fact that under their leadership the national-reformist section of the trade union congress broke off from the main body. Brajdesi Sing in his appeal published in "The People," August, 1931, declared that the Trade Union Congress had confirmed the programme that Roy has been advocating for several years, and in connection with which Giri has no serious differences of opinion at all. As an illustration of the position of this section of the National Reformist Congress of Trade Unions we give here the resolution of the Bose-Roy section of the textile workers in Nagpur: "Congress promises to give full support to the demands of the Nagpur Textile Workers' Union formulated on May 1, 1931, and since that date, and calls upon owners immediately to appoint conciliation boards for a friendly settlement of the dispute" . . . Roy's loyalty to the class struggle actually means conciliation boards and class collaboration, or, to be more exact, the subjection of the interests of the workers to those of the capitalists. And this is so, at a time when the Sholapur textile workers, led by the proletarian vanguard had entered into a strike. Thus the policy of Roy-Kandalkar and Co. means no more and no less than a blow at the textile workers, no more and no less than the smashing up of their united struggle in the interests of the owners.

The revolutionary trade union movement and the Communist Party of India take up the correct attitude when, *fighting for the creation of true class unity of the proletariat in the factories and workshops during strikes and mass actions*, they unmask the treacherous nature of the national reformists at one and the same time.

The Communist Party of India is absolutely right when it unmasks the Roy group and reveals it as the agents of the bourgeoisie within the working class movement. *The party must continue with its energetic campaign against the Roy group, reveal to the workers the fraudulent character of their promises, which are essentially bourgeois under their "radical" phraseology.* The most fraudulent side of the Roy affair is the oath of allegiance which he swears to Communism and the loyalty he professes for the Comintern. Mr. Roy and Co., compelled to profess their loyalty, because of the complete confidence which the working masses of India feel for the Communist International, at the same time hope to hide up the treacherous disorganising part

they are playing under these loud phrases. It is just for this reason that the Roy group are not against calling themselves Communists, at the same time assuring the national reformists that "Communists" of the Roy type are not Communist supporters of the Comintern, i.e., not supporters of international Communism, but the domestic servants of the Indian bourgeoisie. Roy and Co., by making use of the justified suspicion and indignation of the masses of workers at the foreign oppression of British imperialism, at the same time endeavour to undermine the confidence of the working class in the Soviets, the Comintern, as organisations, foreign to the Indian national interests, which do not understand Indian conditions. Mr. Vidyarthi-Roy in the same article, as also in his manifesto from prison (and in other documents) frequently writes about this. This policy of the Roy Group is nothing but veiled support of British imperialism, the aim of which is to undermine the militant international unity of the world proletariat and the oppressed nations, and to disorganise the common struggle of all toilers against Imperialism. The Communist International everywhere, and on every possible occasion, urges that consideration be taken of local conditions, including conditions in India; but it advocates in India as in other places the necessity of following the principles to be found in international, Marxist, Bolshevik experience gained in the class struggle, since this is the only guarantee of victory for the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution in India.

It is necessary to wage war upon the ideological and practical activities of the Roy group not for the purpose of entering into a discussion with these agents of the exploiting classes, but in order to win over to the Communist Party those workers, peasants and honest revolutionaries, who have fallen victims to the cunning deceit and "radical" phrases of Roy's supporters.

The only programme which represents the interests of the people and points out the road to victory for the Indian revolution is the platform of action of the Communist Party of India.

The Communist Party of India takes the correct stand when it calls upon all workers and peasants to join *the united front under the banner of the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution and to throw out all agents of the bourgeoisie and the National Congress, who try to disorganise the revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses from within.*

Roy and Co. declare that the Communist movement during the past two years has been moving along the downward grade. And yet it is just during these last two years that for the first time there has been created a true Commun-

ist movement in India, which, having made a decisive break with national reformism, came forward with the Bolshevik programme of action. In India a Communist Party is growing up which fights determinedly to win the masses and convert itself into a mass organisation, the true leader of the people. In the day to day struggle, with a tried class programme as its basis, the working class is being forged into one mighty whole, which does its utmost to smash the agents of the bourgeoisie and Imperialism. Hence, the struggle for unity among the proletariat and the fight to unmask the national reformists, and especially the "lefts"—who, according to the trend of development of the situation abroad and at home, *may yet* make use of new "left" manœuvres to consolidate their influence among the people and *disorganise* the revolutionary struggle—becomes a question of first-class importance. In reply to all the manœuvres of those who try to disorganise the revolutionary movement, who are fighting against the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution, *we must fight to obtain class unity among the proletariat, to build up and consolidate mass class-conscious*

trade unions, to create a mighty all-Indian Trade Union Congress, to launch the agrarian revolution in the Indian village, and to organise a mass Communist Party as the only leader of the workers and peasant masses.

Imperialism throughout the world is seeking to disorganise the working class, by using its agents, social-fascists, i.e., by trying to undermine the militant power of the growing proletarian movement.

In India both the native bourgeoisie and imperialism do everything in their power to weaken and disorganise the workers' and peasants' movement from within. The Communist International, for the sake of liberating the Indian people from slavery, poverty and the yoke of the imperialists and feudal landlords, calls upon the workers and peasants to drive out from their ranks all agents of the ruling, exploiting classes, interested only in maintaining the existing régime, and to march forward under the leadership of the Indian Communist Party, side by side with the world revolutionary proletariat, into the struggle for their vital interests, for independence, for land and a workers' and peasants' government.