

# THE TREACHERY OF THE NATIONAL CONGRESS AND THE REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE IN INDIA

By G. SAFAROV.

*In the Footsteps of Simon.*

**T**HE agreement between Lord Irwin and Mahatma Gandhi has been signed. This agreement means nothing less than a counter-revolutionary bargain between the Indian National Congress and British imperialism. Even the staid *Times* cannot disguise its satisfaction.

"The advantages of the settlement can hardly be exaggerated. Civil disobedience is abandoned; the Congress Party agree to co-operate, in a critical spirit it may be, but nevertheless to co-operate, with the Government; law and order are upheld by the maintenance of the penalties imposed on political violence and the withdrawal of the proposals for an inquiry substantially vindicates the police." (*Times*, March 6, 1931.)

British imperialism is jubilant at the treacherous step taken by the Indian bourgeoisie. It is enough to acquaint oneself superficially with the Irwin-Gandhi agreement in order to be convinced that they have a basis for their jubilation. What are the basic points of this agreement? The agreement says:

"As regards constitutional questions, the limits of future discussions, in agreement with His Majesty's Government, will be limited to a review of the future scheme of constitutional Government for India as discussed at the Round Table Conference. In the above mentioned scheme, federation is the most important thing; the matter is exactly the same with the responsibility of India and the reservations or guarantees on the part of India in such questions as, for example, defence, foreign affairs, the position of minorities, the financial obligations of India and the fulfilment of these obligations.

British imperialism has not taken the slightest essential step towards giving India even the smallest rights of a dominion. It promises Indian capitalists and landlords to continue the aimless conversation on the Constitution, stipulating for itself the unchangeable and irreducible right of domination. British imperialism displays, indeed, a grim humour, when it declares in the agreement with Gandhi, that the main point of the future Indian Constitution is the "federal" organisation of India. It would hardly be possible to give a more correct and exact interpretation to this point than that given by the quarterly entitled "*The Round Table*." This magazine represents business Conservatism. Here, in its pages, the Conservatives feel at home and do not think it necessary to hide their real intentions behind a mass of words. Speaking of the federal organisation of India, *The Round Table* remarks:

"It has been shown that the chief consideration in favour of this decision was the desire of Great Britain to consolidate and strengthen the central legislative and executive power by the presence of a conservative element

in the person of the native princes, at the same time preventing the transfer of any significant power of decision without the essential control of the central power. It is undoubtedly correct that the representatives of the Indian States represent a force which may be counted on in the sense of resistance to revolution and separation from the Empire; in such a quality they will be an element enabling constitutional stability to be maintained. However, the decisive consideration in favour of working out a constitution on the basis of the federation of all parts of India was the conviction accepted in common both by the native princes and the representatives of British India as well as the British representatives, that it was impossible to put British India on the path of responsible government without including native India in the limits of the constitution, without which forces would have been set in motion which, in the last resort, would inevitably have disrupted India into fragments. The delimitation of the relations between the autocratic States and native India and democratic British India cannot be an easy matter and no one can say in advance whether the traditional system of native India is more powerful than contemporary Western methods of British India, whether the latter would be more adapted to Indian conditions or whether it would be possible to create a compromise between both these systems."

The Conservatives give a completely frank and unequivocal evaluation of the bargain made. British imperialism has, in its time, not without cause, broken up India into a number of small sections and, including the provinces of British India, cut out almost 560 native States. The Middle Ages rule is almost untouched in these native States. There the feudal-landlord rule has been preserved in all its inviolability. There feudal lords serve as the direct basis of British sovereignty. These feudal dregs understand perfectly that they retain their autocratic rule only because they support British imperialism. An independent India would be the inevitable and irrevocable end of their own rule. The revolutionary wave which developed with particular force in 1930 forced them to bind themselves even more closely and more directly to British rule. The "Round Table" Conference could probably not have taken place, had the gilded satraps of the native States, who were looked upon in London not only as a circus curiosity, but as the most faithful and devoted assistants, not been attracted to it.

The "Round Table" Conference was begun with the definite calculation of pushing into the foreground this vanguard of the wholly corrupted and degenerated feudal dynasties. Although there was much ado on the question of Simon's participation in the "Round Table" Conference, although MacDonald tried in every way to avoid the suspicion that the Simon Commission report would be the basis of the dis-

cussion at this Conference, nevertheless, this report actually became the core of the future Indian "Constitution," one-tenth promised and nine-tenths already butchered.

It was the Simon Commission which, refusing to discuss the question of giving dominion rights to India, suggested a federal reorganisation of India on the basis of a bloc between British imperialism, the feudal princes, and the landlords. The time-honoured English tradition consists in not stinting verbal promises when some trickery of particularly wide scope has to be carried out. The policy of British imperialism was built up on this basis in the course of many decades. Formally, the Simon Commission report was not accepted as the basis for discussion at the "Round Table" Conference. In essence, however, it was precisely within the framework of this report that the representatives of British imperialism and the moderate envoys of the National Congress coming to London incognito as representatives of Indian moderate policy, sought a "common language," repudiating even passive resistance to British despotism.

The core of the agreement between Lord Irwin and Gandhi was the Simon Commission report. The Indian National Congress on its knees declared its own bankruptcy, its own inability "even in its baseness to preserve a shade of nobility." Is it so long since the members of the Congress boasted that they were on the streets when the Indian people shouted indignantly at Simon: "Simon, go back!"? Is it so long since that the Indian bourgeois-landlord press declared with satisfaction that passive resistance had already converted to ashes the fruit of Simon's and his colleagues' bureaucratic perseverance? Actually Simon emerged as conqueror, that is, the die-hards of British imperialism, who never change their slaughterhouse principles of administration although they also never refuse to take advantage of liberal garrulity. Baldwin emphasised this with sheer Conservative clumsiness. He said:

"The idea that the ("Round Table") Conference would be something that in its basis contradicted the Simon Commission, that the Conference would not be completely in accord with the conclusion of this Commission, represents the greatest foolishness."

Baldwin pointed out—and undoubtedly correctly—that the basis of the Simon report was the idea of a reorganisation of India on a federal basis. Of course, when they speak of "federation" it is to be understood as more or less a caricature and distortion of the term. In his time, the great Russian satirist, Schedrin, said that the Russian feudal-landlords, who could scald the peasants to death, complained that all they lacked for complete power was "self-government." Under "self-government" they understood the granting to

them of the rights of a State power within the limits of their estates.

It is approximately such a "free" order that the lords of British imperialism are ready to dispense to India. They interpret "federation" in such a way as to mean that every feudal prince will, as formerly, rule despotically over the life and property of his subjects. The inclusion of these feudal princes within the federation means that they will decide the affairs of British India with their own satrap yardstick. The Conservative quarterly magazine, *The Round Table*, is absolutely correct when it affirms that the essence of the Irwin-Gandhi bargain is the special organisation of "free" competition between feudal-landlord despotism and liberal complaining under the high protection of the British Crown. The new Viceroy of India, Lord Willingdon, with that lightness of thought which is inherent in the majority of English lords, declared, not so long ago, that coming to the administration of India he is firmly convinced that "it will continue to remain not only the greatest bulwark of the British Empire, but the finest diamond in the imperial crown." The stupidity of English Viceroys of India reflects not only their subjective qualities, but the objective-servile position of India as an "ornament" of the British Crown.

The base treachery of Gandhi and the Indian National Congress involuntarily forces us to recall the betrayal of 1921-1922. As is well known, the prophet of the bourgeoisie and landlords of India and the National Congress then also tripped up on the rights of the feudal-landlords. When the peasants in Bardoli refused to pay rent to the feudal exploiters, Gandhi and the Congress made a bargain with British imperialism and put a stop even to passive resistance.

Now, once again, Gandhi and the National Congress, on the very same point, but on an incomparably greater scale, carry out their counter-revolutionary betrayal. They conclude a bargain with British imperialism not only on the basis of an acknowledgment of its rule, but also on the basis of the acknowledgment of the sovereign position of the feudal satraps and feudal-landlords within the framework of a "constitution" which is promised "after the lapse of a number of years." The barest nod of the head from London sufficed to set these fighters for national independence racking their brains and vying with each other in putting forward the best and most certain recipes for crushing the popular mass revolutionary movement.

Simon has conquered! Such is the first deduction from which there is no escape. The Indian National Congress, with Gandhi at its head, did not carry on a struggle against British imperialism. It only speculated with the mass revolutionary struggle trying to haggle at least a slight concession for itself, at least a bit of the bear's ear. However, even within

the limits of this counter-revolutionary trade with the imperialists, they could not secure a minimum concession for themselves. They could not gain even an externally visible success. Simon has conquered—this denotes that the clash between British imperialism and the mass revolutionary movement threw the Indian National Congress into the arms of British imperialism.

The sly son of an even more sly father, now deceased, Jawaharlal Nehru, still tries to play the clown and loudly affirms that "this is only a truce." This can serve as a warning. Not only actually, but formally as well, the Indian National Congress has gone over to the side of imperialism and counter-revolution and is continuing its policy of openly mocking and betraying the struggling masses. More than that, it strains all its forces in order, having struck from behind, to break and scatter the army of fighters.

*"Purna Swaraj" or the Chameleon in the Service of Imperialism.*

Base treachery and compliance is conducive to talkativeness. Mr. Gandhi, once having concluded the bargain, comes obligingly to the assistance of the English correspondents and explains to them both the peculiarities of Indian pronunciation and the strangeness of his conduct :

"It is not possible in the English language accurately to explain the meaning of the word 'Swaraj.' Literally, its translation is—disciplined self-government and self-control. 'Purna Swaraj' does not exclude association with any nation, least of all Britain. But this association must be free and based on mutual advantage. 'Purna Swaraj' only puts forward complete independence in order that popular imagination in our country will not in any way be able to reconcile itself with the idea that the British governing class will honestly propose something different. I look at it differently. The British people is a practical race, loving its freedom. It is only necessary to go one step further in order to love the freedom of another nation."

These arguments are the most disgusting hypocrisy, and Mr. MacDonald, having only recently hung four textile workers of Sholapur for rebelling against the British yoke, must applaud Gandhi. The British Labour Party can boast that through the medium of a "Labour" Government a shameful bargain has been concluded between British imperialism and bourgeois landlord India. Gandhi's manner is in complete conformity with that of MacDonald and Co. In order to push through the plan of the Simon Commission, British imperialism found it necessary to stage the "Round Table" Conference. In order to find a common language with Gandhi, it could not get along without bringing in MacDonald as mediator. British social-imperialism, adopting Fascist outlines more and more in its struggle against the British working-class—is an irreplaceable weapon where it is

necessary to demonstrate the "unity of the whole British nation" in the struggle for the suppression of colonial revolution. On the other hand, it is as irreplaceable as the lackey who transmits a letter from the lord to his agent with whom the lord himself does not deign to talk.

The chameleonlike transformations of "Swaraj" are no new thing.

The constitution of the elder Nehru, which saw the light in 1928, already exposed the general line of the counter-revolutionary betrayal and its subservience to imperialism, the real line of conduct of the Indian National Congress. The Congress removed the slogan for national independence. However, by the end of 1929 there had to be more subtle hypocrisy in their betrayal in Lahore. The waves of the revolutionary movement were too strong to permit of plain speaking. The working-class of India, having passed through the heroic strikes of the Bombay textile workers of 1928-1929, proved that it was fast becoming an independent revolutionary force, that it was maturing not daily, but hourly.

Already, by the end of 1929, amidst the revolutionary petty-bourgeois masses of the cities, particularly among the students, cries resounded which portended no good : "We do not want to fight for the 'Swaraj' of Sassoon and Birla." "Independent India must be a republic of workers and peasants ! " It is true that in these demonstrations of the revolutionary youth, there was much of the aimlessness and spinelessness of the "beautiful soul" of the petty-bourgeoisie. It is true, young Nehru and his partner, Subhas Bose, took advantage of the growing revolutionary unrest with extraordinary skill, trying through roundabout paths and "left" manoeuvres to secure the support of the masses for the Congress.

None the less, these "left" manoeuvres would have been quickly cancelled had not the session of the Congress in Lahore adopted the decision on "the struggle for independence" under the flag of non-violence. The period of the Lahore session up to the wide mass anti-imperialist movement of the spring of 1930, was the period of vanguard skirmishes and battles between the Indian National Congress and its agents on the one side, and the proletarian vanguard which had begun its independent political struggle with the considerable sympathy of the revolutionary youth on the other.

In the spring of 1930, the mass anti-imperialist movement suddenly, seemingly unexpectedly, acquired the force of a spontaneous revolutionary torrent and aroused many millions to the struggle who had until then been sleeping the sleep of eternity. In the cities and in the villages, tens, hundreds of thousands and millions felt a burning, insistent demand to bring to an end the rule of British imperialism at once, with a *single*, powerful eruption. But they were drawn into the struggle together with

all their prejudices and backwardness, with patriarchal trustfulness frequently not only toward the bourgeoisie, but to the landlords as well.

The powerful outbreak of anti-imperialist unrest united millions of workers, petty artisans, the city petty bourgeoisie and the toiling peasants. *Many millions of the masses felt the strength of their union for the first time.* But they were drawn into the movement as a solid mass not having been stratified according to class relations. Its official signboard, not covering it by one-tenth, was the "struggle" of the Congress. They did not participate in the campaign of passive resistance because they believed in the all-saving efficacy of non-violence. *Millions rose to the struggle and grasped at the first occasion which arose in order to give battle to British imperialism.*

Only on this basis could the movement of the Afridis develop, only such a setting could give rise to the uprisings in Sholapur and Peshawar and the number of terrorist acts against the predatory English. The mass anti-imperialist movement was such under the Congress leadership only in a very conditional and limited sense. As the movement of many millions of the toiling masses, it could not remain within the limits of passive resistance. The very thought of the possibility of restraining revolutionary elements within this framework is equivalent to a complete ignoring of the very essence of mass struggle. However, the Congress succeeded in disorganising the movement in the sense that all the heroism and all the self-sacrifice of millions of masses could not lead to a decisive conflict with the oppressors.

Further, the Congress succeeded to a certain extent in warding off the revolutionary criticism of the proletarian vanguard owing to the national character of the movement. The Indian National Congress, which had always been contemptuous of the workers' quarters, penetrated their territory by preaching the "union of the whole nation" in the struggle with British imperialism. The wave of petty-bourgeois trust in the bourgeoisie and landlords enveloped considerable strata of the workers. Wide masses who felt the strength of their union in the anti-imperialist struggle, were, at first, suspicious and on their guard against the attempt of a general class survey.

They could not believe the Communists, who were few in numbers, who declared that the National Congress was a gathering of the bourgeoisie and landlords who steadfastly shun struggle, who disorganise and make it impotent and are preparing a base treachery. They could not all at once believe that the Congress was only interested in seeing that the Bombay manufacturers had a good market, that the landlords were not threatened with a peasant revolution, that the moneylenders got their interest punctually. The fact that millions were drawn

spontaneously into the struggle gave unexpected support to the Congress since, in a situation of intense struggle of the masses, there was not set up in opposition to the leadership of the Congress on a sufficiently wide mass scale, *a political leadership about which the millions of workers and peasants would have known.* In the course of the movement—the more the movement developed so the gap widened between the words and deeds of the Congress and the mass practical struggle.

None the less, even the shutting down of factories and mills, the dismissal of tens of thousands of workers, the industrial crisis and unemployment, the agrarian crisis and the beginning of peasant unrest to a heretofore unknown degree did not completely expose the National Congress in the eyes of the masses. The Congress succeeded in bringing about a split in the textile workers' union, the Girmi Kamgar Union. The Bombay manufacturers made extensive use of the boycott of foreign cloth for setting their enterprises into motion again and were able to make political capital out of this also.

The Congress made use of the fact, in its entirety, that the Indian proletariat, in a setting of a mass revolutionary upsurge, did not have its political and organised Communist Party. The Congress could not set aside the spontaneously developing struggle of the working-class for its class self-determination and for its political leading rôle. But it succeeded, for a short time, to a certain extent, in isolating the vanguard of the working-class, who were even more definitely starting on the path of independent Communist policy.

The spontaneous outbreaks of peasant revolt from end to end of the country deprived the Congress of the further possibility of manœuvring in order to haggle for some slight concession from British imperialism as well as to fool the masses under the blind of a "struggle" with it. The peasant masses came out, not against the National Congress, but against the landlords and the moneylenders. Seized by the throat in the deadly grip of the agrarian crisis, the peasantry were compelled to rise against taxes, against rent to the landlords, against usurious interest rates. This was a blow to the National Congress because it always tried to set the "struggle" for national liberation against the struggle for the everyday interests of the workers and peasants.

*The growth of the peasant movement forced Gandhi and company to hurry with the working out of the conditions of a bargain with British imperialism.* When the Mohammedan peasants of Kishoriganj rose against the Indian moneylenders and began to take away from them their debt accounts and to threaten them, the local National Congress Committee hurried to the British Governor with the abject request not to delay sending of detachments to suppress the rebels. This precedent could not remain without a sequel.

When the National Congress saw that *an animated workers' and growing peasants' movement* threatened to upset all its calculations, it sent Gandhi to the Viceroy. Gandhi and Irwin together decided to cease:

- (a) organised disobedience to any laws ;
- (b) refusal to pay land taxes and other legal dues ;
- (c) publication of appeals for support of civil disobedience ;
- (d) attempts to influence civil and military servants or village officials for agitation against the Government or to instigate them to desert the service.

The British Conservatives, seeing the Indian counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie crawling at their feet, could not resist a contemptuous kick as an advance for the future. Baldwin declared that he refused to participate in a continuation of the Conference of the "Round Table" in India. At the present stage, the promise even of the feudal-imperialist constitution has been transformed into a kick in "advance." Such is "Purna Swaraj."

#### *Demarcation of Class Forces and the Revolutionary Upsurge.*

"The overthrow of the democratic regime in Russia by the Bolsheviks and the destruction of parliamentism in China due to the militarists and the party quarrels can repeat itself in India,"

so declares *The Round Table*.

Due to the intensification of the industrial and agricultural crisis on the one hand, and the mastering of certain lessons of the struggle on the other hand, the masses of workers and peasants, as well as wide strata of the urban petty-bourgeoisie, are becoming more and more conscious of the necessity of *independent* revolutionary struggle. The peasant movement took on a wide scope during the second half of 1930. It is enough to point to the uprisings in Bengal and Sind, in Berar and Burma, and to a number of isolated peasant revolts in all parts of India. While in the first half of 1930 the peasant masses joined the campaign of passive resistance, *refusing to pay taxes and cutting trees illegally in State forests*, during the next period the struggle took on a much more definite form. The uprising in Kishoriganj was the turning point in this. The peasant movement broke out with greatest force precisely in those regions where special cultures predominated, in the cotton and jute regions, and in the region which grew crops for export. The mechanism of these movements cannot be a source of any doubt whatever. To take at least the last uprising in Buldan of December, 1930, and January, 1931:

"The revolt was directed against the Brahmins and Marwaris. The primary cause was that for a number of years the Brahmins and Marwaris have held in their hands economic domination over the peasantry of Berar. Thanks to their actions the dissatisfaction against them accumulated more and more . . . Another cause of the

revolt was the system in virtue of which the agricultural workers in Berar always receive a portion of their wage in kind. Recently, taking into account the fall in prices, the Marwaris and Brahmins attempted to transfer their losses to the workers by causing the latter to accept their whole wage in kind." (*Times of India*.)

Thus *The Times of India* writes. This was a peasant movement and a movement of agricultural workers against the landlords and moneylenders. It was conditioned by the fact that the *agrarian crisis, entailing a catastrophic fall in prices for colonial raw materials brought into the movement—against the workers and pauperised peasants—the whole machine of the Middle Ages, of feudal-moneylending exploitation*. This crisis displayed the real core of Indian economy and showed how the feudal-landlord order still retains its sovereign position, serving as a support and conductor for imperialist exploitation.

Even in Punjab, which one is accustomed to regard as the district of petty-peasant holdings, 16½ million acres of the 29.7 millions of land under cultivation was leased for rent or rent in kind. In Agra, out of 28½ millions of acres, 21.9 were rented out. In Oudh, of 10 million, 8.4 millions were leased. Approximately three-fourths of all the land under cultivation in Bengal was rented under semi-feudal conditions. In Mysore, according to a most modest calculation, 51 per cent. of all the loans were made in order to absorb debts contracted earlier.

From December 31, 1928, the price of rice from Burma on the London market fell almost by one-fourth, the price of cotton decreased by more than one-half. A ton of jute, which cost at the end of 1928 £32 5s., by December 31, 1930, cost only £15 12s. Oil seeds fell from £145 a ton at the end of 1929 to £22 at the end of 1930. The Madras Association of Producers of Oil Seeds wrote in its memorandum of January, 1931:

"Southern India exports yearly to Europe ground nuts to a maximum amount of 10,000,000 sacks. The foreign price for this product has been £20-£25 per ton during the course of the last ten years. But prices have now fallen terribly and reached £12. This catastrophic fall signifies terrible losses for the cultivators. In the Madras Presidency, ground nuts represent the most important product of dry soil cultivation—about 3,000,000 acres. The fall in prices for agricultural production has increased more than two-fold the indebtedness of the ryots."

Indian papers are filled with reports like the following:

"Abnormal fall in prices for grain, it is stated, has brought about much dissatisfaction among the peasants of the Allahabad region and the tenants almost daily in large masses come from their villages to Allahabad with petitions demanding a change or a reduction of rent."

A telegram of December 22 says:

"A strong movement in the form of the robbing of harvests which have not been removed from the fields belonging to the Marwaris and other moneylenders and to large landlords, has arisen in the Buldan region."

"According to the information from the Aligahr police, on Thursday, December 18, a large crowd of textile workers from Budge-Budge declared to the vegetable merchants that they must sell their products at decreased prices. A refusal followed. Then the textile workers looted the shops and cleared out."

The movement in Burma is still continuing and the British have not been able to crush it. The peasants have organised according to separate villages, elected their leaders and organised detachments. They rose at the call of the "king of the dragons." *The Times* (January 9, 1931) lamented over the failure :

"It is quite improbable that this 'king' could receive such widespread support if it had not been for the heavy crisis in the rice trade on which almost the whole well-being of Burma depends. This unfortunate situation was strengthened by the almost general conviction that the united European mill-owners were to blame for it. This conviction evoked a specially sharp outbreak of hostility on the part of the rebels in the Tharavaddy region against Europeans. Another cause of the revolt was the unwillingness of the Government to postpone the collection of taxes and make it possible for the peasants to wait for more favourable prices. In so far as this delay was refused, the peasants were compelled to sell at whatever prices they could get in order to pay the taxes."

MacDonald carried through the separation of Burma from India at the "Round Table" Conference following the traditional maxim : "Divide and rule."

*A real civil war on a small scale is going on in the Indian villages with the English tax collectors, landlords and moneylenders.* Here is an eloquent communication from Madras of February 4 :

"The local police organised an expedition against the villages which refused to pay arrears. . . . The police did not find anything of the slightest value since the Honds had hidden all valuables beyond the confines of the village. The police arrested the village elder."

On the following day, the peasants attacked the police. The police opened fire. The entire district of the rebels, including 350 villages, has been occupied by the police. "*Communications between villages have ceased, no one from one village can go into another until he has paid up the arrears.*" Such is the "free" régime which is now reigning in India.

The peasants in Ahmedabad who have not paid their land taxes are prohibited from gathering their harvest. Toward the end of January, four villages decided to collect their crop from the fields. As a result, there was a clash with the imperialist hirelings.

*The slow-moving Indian peasants, the heavy reserves of the Indian revolution in the upsurge, are being set into motion.* The agrarian crisis had to reveal the class springs of the poverty of the masses and the rule of English despotism. The Indian National Congress now tries to strike a blow in the back of the struggling masses because their further awakening threatens the interests of the Indian landlords and moneylenders, and, at the same time, the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie who are to a considerable degree united with the feudal-moneylending exploitation.

*The growth of the class-consciousness of the workers after the events of Peshawar and Sholapur was irrepressible.* The members of the Congress tried to split and to disorganise the foremost ranks of the working-class. They tried to terrorise the workers in the name of a "united action." The Indian capitalists, throwing the workers out of the factories and mills and depriving them of every relief, at the same time, jeeringly declared that "the workers remain too far behind the national movement." The anti-imperialist struggle of the masses, to the extent that it was under the control of the Congress temporarily drove back the strike movement. Only with November, 1930, did the strikes begin anew, first in Bombay, embracing from 3,000 to 5,000 workers. In 1931 the most significant event on the strike front was the demonstration of the jute workers of Calcutta. Forty thousand workers were threatened with dismissal due to the shutting down of the jute mills as the result of the crisis. Twenty thousand workers struck, half of them striking for almost two months.

An even more significant sign of the working-class being aroused is shown by its increased political activity. *Mass meetings and demonstrations* take place almost every week. The workers fight for their rights on the streets. The working mass begins more and more to realise that only the independent struggle of the working-class in a union with the basic masses of peasantry, with the revolutionary youth and petty-bourgeois elements of the town, can bring essential revolutionary successes.

Before the betrayal of the Congress was effected, the activity of its "left" agents was significantly increased. Petty-bourgeois politics seized with joy the slogan of the "democratisation of the Congress from below" which had been hatched by the renegade Roy and other people of his sort. The "left" agents of the Indian bourgeoisie and the landlords spread that treachery in order to draw the workers away from the struggle for its hegemony against the bourgeoisie. There was no point in destroying the Congress which enjoyed "authority" in the country. It was necessary to correct its leadership, avoiding a sharp clash of class interests. "Manifesto 100" led some astray and this hesitation undoubtedly helped Gandhi and the National Congress, imperceptibly, surrounded by figures of speech, to make its way to a treacherous bargain with English imperialism.

This aim also characterised the manoeuvres of Kandalkar, who everlastingly plays himself up as an "independent" leader and actually is but a marionette in the hands of the Congress. Kandalkar, when he cannot hide behind the back of the Congress, announces his "opposition" to it and . . . hides behind the back of the Yellow Amsterdam International and the Geneva Bureau of Labour under the League of Nations. This counter-revolutionary centipede has in reserve hundreds of manoeuvres for

dissipating the force of the proletariat. It is a pity that the vanguard fighters of the Indian working-class do not expose such chameleons with sufficient firmness and consistency.

*The treachery of the Congress and Gandhi is the heaviest blow to the petty-bourgeois illusions of millions of masses who could not, until now, orient themselves in the struggle of class forces in the Indian revolution. These masses have, until now, not understood the inseparable bond between anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. The British joke of a "Constitution" will teach them now how to orient themselves in the basic questions of the class struggle.* The British attempt to stifle the struggle of India for its independence through the mobilisation of the forces of the feudal Middle Ages and the attracting of the bourgeois-landlord bloc, in the form of the National Congress, to its side, will force the workers to come to the defence of their own interests and unite the struggle against the landlord, the moneylender and the predatory police with the struggle against imperialism.

At the same time, the task of organising the mass struggle in the city and the village, stands forth particularly vividly. "Non-violence" has been exposed as it had never been heretofore. "Non-violence" means crawling on one's knees before imperialism, feudal-princes, and landlords. *We must answer the treachery of the Congress with a general counter-attack against the counter-revolutionary bloc of the bourgeoisie and the landlords, which supports imperialism and is being supported by imperialism.*

More than ever before, the time is now ripe for a demonstration by the weak, and still insufficiently formed Communist vanguard, as the pioneers and

organisers of the revolutionary counter-attack against imperialism and its aids. *Not a minute must be lost in exposing the Congress and its "left" wing which will now, more than ever, creep out of its skin in order to screen its black treachery and help English imperialism to avenge itself on the mass revolutionary movement.* A blow from behind must be answered with a direct blow at the enemies of the Indian revolution. The objective grounds for the struggle to bring the mass revolutionary movement on to a higher level is present. The workers' movement again moves uphill, drawing new strata of the working-class into the struggle. When the base traitor Gandhi dared to appear before the Bombay workers, he was driven away by them. At this meeting the workers tore down the Congress banner and set up its own red flag. The peasant revolution comes ever closer and becomes more and more an obvious fact. The petty bourgeois youth and wide masses of the small city traders cannot follow the National Congress. The path of "conciliation" with British imperialism is not for them. The preaching of preparation of mass political struggle, of preparation and organisation of general strikes has now become particularly important and urgent.

Down with the feudal "constitution" of Simon !

Down with British imperialism in India !

Down with the base bargain between the National Congress and the oppressors of India !

These slogans must mobilise the national masses under the leadership of the Indian proletariat who have already undergone no little experience, have accumulated revolutionary experience and cannot make peace with the bourgeois-landlord betrayal of the Indian revolution.