

A Few Facts of History

(CONCLUSION)

One of the most important problems of the Indian revolutionary movement, demanding a clear answer, is that of the class nature of Gandhism and its evolution. The solution of this problem is directly linked up with the correct Bolshevik policy on the question of the hegemony of the proletariat and the struggle against national-reformism.

A number of Indian comrades gave the following answer in their speeches of 1931-1932: Gandhism is now a bourgeois theory, but "by origin" it is clearly a petty bourgeois philosophy directed against the machine.

Such an estimation of Gandhism is wrong and it complicates the working out of a correct strategic and tactical policy of the Communist Party of India.

It is not true that the petty bourgeoisie was at the head of the movement in 1919-1922; and that in 1919-1922 the bourgeoisie was not able to retain control of the popular movement in its hands. It is not true that the working class "stood aside" from the mass independence movement. The slogan of "non-violence," as a matter of fact, represented the interests of the coalition of the bourgeoisie and the liberal landlords who feared an anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution. Even Gandhi himself and other leaders of the National Congress admitted this repeatedly, although they succeeded in utilising the backwardness and submissive psychology of considerable stratas of the toiling masses.

It is not true that the essence of Gandhism was the struggle for "the spinning wheel" and agitation against the machine. To prove this it is enough to cite an extract from the resolution of the Calcutta Session of the "National Congress," 1920 (not to speak about the entire practice of Gandhism) wherein it is said:

"The Session of the National Congress advises that swadeshi be adopted on a large scale (the movement in support of national industry.—Ed.) as far as cotton goods are concerned and, since the existing mills of India with national capital and control do not produce enough yarn and material to satisfy the needs of the nation and can hardly satisfy them for still a long time to come, the Session of the National Congress advises that hand-spinning in every house, hand-weaving by millions of weavers who stopped work because of lack of support, be immediately stimulated on a large scale."

A study of all the decisions of the National Congress for this period, including also the resolution (Bardoli) on calling off the non-co-operation campaign of 1920-22, adopted in answer to the revolutionary activities of the workers and the peasants show that the National Congress, like Gandhism, represented the interests of the bourgeoisie and the liberal landlords. Moreover, Gandhism put the defence of the interests of industry, interests of capital above all, advocating at the same time liberal and reformist methods of "fighting." "The ideal of the Indian National Congress is the establishment of Swaraj by legal and peaceful means." (Calcutta Session of the National Congress, 1920.) And this remained the policy of I.N.C. till now.

The following statement of Comrade Stalin can serve as the correct point of departure for the definition of the class essence of Gandhism:—

"As to assistance (of imperialism—Ed.) such as Gandhi, tsarism had a whole flock of them in the form of liberals of all kinds which, however, resulted in nothing but confusion." (Report at the Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.)

The same point of view is expressed by the Platform of Action of the Communist Party of India which says:

"The policy of Gandhism on which the programme of the Congress is founded, uses the cloak of vague phrases about love, meekness, modest and hardworking existence, lightening the burden of the peasantry, the national unity, the special historic mission of Hinduism, etc. But behind this cloak it preaches and defends the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie. . . preaches the interests of capitalist development of India on the bones and sweat of the toiling masses of people, oppression in alliance with world imperialism."

Several circumstances helped Gandhism to draw to its side the masses in 1919-1922 and at the later period. The fact is that Gandhism entered the arena during the breakdown of social relations, growth of native capital (during the war and after), in the period of the World War which tore millions of peasants out of the village, in the years of the awakening of the peasantry and the proletariat, of the tremendous flood of hatred for British domination. Gandhism was able to use the influence of religion, of patriarchal-caste traditions, the naive, "non-resistance to evil," submissiveness characteristic of the more oppressed peasant masses, it was able to exploit the temper and the demands of the petty bourgeois masses, the ruined handicraftsmen and artisans, the unemployed elements, the office workers, etc.—all this was utilised and reflected in the early agitation and the slogans of Gandhism. Gandhism was able to exploit the growing protest of the masses, their awakening to active struggle, stimulated in part by the World War, influenced by the October Revolution. Gandhism, in putting forward its slogans, was able to utilise the vague desires of the toiling masses to change the existing conditions, it was able because the proletariat lacked the consciousness that it represented a revolutionary force, the interests of which were in a direct opposition to the interests of the reformist bourgeoisie.

It is wrong to say that the proletariat in 1919-1922 was asleep and stood aside from the mass movement. Facts contradict this. It is wrong to assert that in 1919-1922 and after the conditions for the existence of a Communist Party, for a struggle for the conquest of the hegemony in the emancipatory movement by the proletariat, did not exist. We must not lump everything together in one pile, we must not lose sight of the differences between the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, we must not regard them as one and the same thing and thus weaken our struggle against the influence of the bourgeoisie, which lead the National Congress.

Such wrong views lead to the glossing over of the fact that the basic condition for the victory of the Indian revolution is the isolation of national reformism, the establishment of the hegemony of the proletariat, able to draw democratic allies (chiefly peasantry) over to its side. In order to carry out this condition the process of the transformation of the proletariat into an independent class force, must be clearly understood; we must see that it is the condition for the organisation of a mass Communist Party. Only being clear on this point and having complete confidence in the proletariat, we will be able actively and consciously to lead the struggle for proletarian hegemony and draw over to the side of the proletariat all the allies, use all the democratic movements for the development and the preparation of the popular revolution.

The end of 1929 and 1930 was the turning point in the organisation of the Communist Party. Local committees of an illegal Communist Party began to be organised; leaflets began to be published in the name of the Party; the Platform of Action was published. An organisational and ideological rupture of the Communist groups from "left" national-reformism took place. The Communists carried on in the open a struggle against "left" national-reformism, considering it as the chief obstacle on the path of the formation of the Communist Party and the mobilisation of the toiling masses for the revolution.

The rupture between the Marxists and the "left" national-reformists was historically an absolutely necessary action long overdue. Without this rupture, the transformation of the proletariat into an independent class force, into the leader of the toiling masses, would have been inconceivable. As long as the illusions of united all-national front, and the super-class nature of the National Congress were widespread, it was, especially in view of the manoeuvres of the "left" national-reformists, not easy to carry through this rupture. It was connected with temporary "sacrifices." However, only the fact that the cadres of the Indian Communist movement were so young, inexperienced; only the fact

that they were not sufficiently trained in Marxist-Leninist sense, explains why this rupture with "left" national reformism temporarily severed to a no small extent, the Communists from the mass independence movement in 1930-1931. Having broken with national-reformism, the Communists proved by themselves unable to establish wide contacts with the mass anti-imperialist movement of 1930. The illusions of all-United national front with the bourgeoisie swept all over the country, and the Communists did not succeed in carrying through simultaneously two tasks of taking the most energetic part in the anti-imperialist movement and expose, fight and isolate the national-reformists. And this weakened the growth and even isolated somewhat the Communists from the toiling masses.

The Indian proletariat is confronted with the need to organise a party entrenched in the mass movement, to organise through the most active participation in it.

The weakness of the Indian Communists lies in the fact that they have not mastered yet the most important Bolshevik principle and that is that the fight for the transformation of the proletariat into an independent class force and the consolidation of the positions of the Communists in the working class, the winning of the decisive strata of the proletariat, and transformation of the proletariat into the leader of the toiling masses, can take place only on the basis of most active participation of the Communists in the mass movement, of the working class and peasantry and toiling masses in general. The Communists must come forward at the head of all democratic movements, use all democratic issues to develop and extend the mass movement, to isolate the reformist elements, to raise the class consciousness of the proletariat, to organise and teach the toiling masses, to draw them to the side of the Communists and prove in deeds that the only leader of the revolutionary people is the proletariat headed by the Communist Party, that the only path to free the country and destroy the landlord-moneylending system of exploitation is the path indicated by the Communist Party. The Communists must be able to win the confidence of the worker and peasant masses.

The mistakes of the Indian Communists are various. Some of the Communists saw only the need to convert the proletariat into an independent class force and organise an illegal Communist Party; others saw only the need of taking part and utilising the mass democratic movements. Both of them approached the question *onesidedly*. In fact it signified certain distrust in the proletariat, it meant that the task of fighting for the proletarian hegemony in the people's movement was not clearly understood. These deviations have not yet fully disappeared and represent the chief obstacle on the path of formation of a mass Communist Party of India.

These wrong views led also to a number of other mistakes such as the refusal to work among the mass organisation led by the national-reformist leaders whose rank and file supporters were misled, to lumping into one heap the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, to a legalistic deviation on one side and to the actual refusal to build up an underground party on the other side. These views brought in their train the inability to manoeuvre and to use the temporary, vacillating, even unstable, allies in the fight against imperialism, it led to attempts to slow down the struggle against national-reformism, etc.

The various Communist groups made different mistakes, but behind these mistakes there was the lack of understanding of the fact that the organisation of an underground Communist Party not only does not contradict but, on the contrary, presupposes a struggle for its hegemony, presupposes participation in the revolutionary-democratic movements, and its fight for leadership and the attraction of all democratic allies, even though for only a certain part of the way, over to its side.

Only in this way can a powerful Communist Party be organised, only in this way can the development and the preparation of the Indian revolution progress.

How wrong the approach of some of the Indian Communists is can be illustrated by their idea of the relations between the working class and the peasantry. In one of the documents (1932), it is true, of a legal organisation, it is said:

"We do not propose to take any steps now in regard to the peasantry. This is not because we do not sympathise with the peasant movement or because we do not recognise its importance. But we think that our immediate task is to improve our position in regard to our own class (i.e., the pro-

letariat—Ed.). Each of these classes must be united, strongly organised and must realise its interests and aims."

The most important task is that of consolidating the position of the Communists in the working class. However, now when the agrarian and anti-imperialist movement is growing this task can be solved not only through day-by-day economic and trade union activity. The position of the Communists can be consolidated in their class only providing that they participate both in the daily economic struggles as well as in the anti-imperialist and agrarian movements. There is no other way. All other paths consolidate the position of national-reformism, will introduce confusion in the ranks of the revolutionary movement, limit its role to a position of an appendage to the bourgeoisie and, strengthening the position of the reformists (such as the economists, etc.), weaken the Communist ranks.

The formation of Communist groups was preceded by the organisation of reformist trade unions and it had effect on the development of the Communist movement. The first groups of revolutionary intellectuals, having discarded the ideology of the National Congress, joined the trade unions. It is here (and not in the field of the independence movement) that they clashed with reformism, clashed chiefly on questions of the strike struggles. The trade unions began to replace the Party. The Gani Kamgar (the Bombay Textile Trade Union "Red Flag") led political demonstrations of the workers. This substitution of the Party by the trade unions led to a position where the Communists allowed themselves to be provoked by the reformists to accept without strong resistance, splits of the trade unions. In a number of cases, both unnecessary and untimely. In a number of places where Communist groups were formed, their appearance in the political field was followed by some splits in the trade unions. Thus it appeared that some Communists did not understand the differences between the Party and the trade union, which was utilised by the "left" national-reformists who carried the split into the trade unions. And this led on the part of some comrades to an increased tendency towards sectarianism, toward isolation, it led to the refusal to fight for the masses, to the inability to isolate the national-reformist leaders and draw the rank and file over to the Communists' side. The Communist groups, therefore, did not succeed to carry through the tactics of a united front and take a lead in a true fight for the unity of the working class. Many Communists did not understand the fact that a fight against national-reformism, which should be led consistently and constantly, does not mean at all that Communists should not work in the national-reformist trade unions, does not mean at all that we should object even to amalgamation of the red trade unions with some mass national-reformist trade unions when it is in the interests of the working class. But such an amalgamation not only does not mean a retreat from Communist positions; but on the contrary, it means increased efforts to propagate our ideas and if the Communists maintain a correct policy, it will only help to isolate the national-reformists and to develop the proletarian movement.

The substitution of the Party by the trade unions has increased the tendency to reject the anti-imperialist struggle, to reject the organisation of an underground Communist Party; has increased the danger of a peculiar form of economism, has increased the danger of harmful ideas that a Communist Party can be organised only through the trade union activities, that all attention must be turned only towards "one's own class," i.e., only towards the proletariat. Actually this led to the rejection of the struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat and helped to consolidate the position of national-reformism and imperialism.

The origin of the main weaknesses of the Indian Communist Movement was indicated above. They are connected with the history of the movement. One of the biggest is the underestimation of the organisational problems, the lack of understanding that the movement cannot develop, that the Indian revolution cannot be victorious unless a strong, centralised party organisation is built.

The Indian Communists have increased their ranks through the trade unions, by organising Communist groups within the trade unions. Consequently the Communist groups have become the organisations of a few active members of the trade union movement. The organised formation of these groups did not go beyond loose trade union fractions. Such a situation is clearly abnormal. Every Communist must clearly understand that if a strong Communist Party is to be organised in India, city, district committees, factory nuclei must be organised; i.e., a Party organisation must

be organised which would carry on work in the trade unions and in the mills, among the peasantry and among the revolutionary youth, an organisation which would not only build trade unions, but other organisations as well, which would publish beside the trade union papers an official organ of the Party as well, which would publish leaflets not only in the name of the trade unions, but also in the name of the Party itself and of the Party organisations.

Only such an underground Party organisation can develop legal and underground work, can use the legal forms of the movement, not falling in the trap of economism and not adapting itself to legalism, i.e., to a refusal to defend revolutionary positions.

Without this we cannot build up a party, we cannot win the proletarian hegemony in the all-national movement, we cannot develop proletarian methods of fighting, we cannot set ourselves more and more revolutionary tasks.

The organisational question is of first rank political significance for the Indian Communists. We must resolutely put a stop to the petty bourgeois inheritance of the past, with the influence of the Congress organisational principles, with the lack of confidence in the working class.

These tasks are tremendous and extremely difficult. The Indian Communists are yet extremely weak. But it would be wrong, none the less, if somebody would claim that a preliminary period of local circles is necessary, who would recommend to concentrate all attention of the Communists on local tasks and to shift the centre of gravity of all the work exclusively to the trade union organisation. This would lead to Khvostism (tailism), to Menshevism, to the loss of initiative, to isolation. We must remember that the masses have accumulated tremendous experience of the class struggle. Not only the workers, but the revolutionary intellectuals and considerable strata of the peasantry have also accumulated this experience. And the process of the realisation of this experience, of transforming it into deeds can go on with exceeding speed; this will depend on the practical work, the energy, and the correct policy of the Communists. The rapidity with which a mass Communist Party will be organised depends entirely on them. The Roy group try to utilise the mistakes of the Communists to justify their anti-proletarian, anti-revolutionary policy. This will bring the Roy group no success. It will not fool the revolutionists. The latter will soon understand that the mistakes of the Communists are exactly the result of the remnants of Roy's ideology in the ranks of the Communist movement, and the sooner they will get rid of them, the sooner the Communist movement will develop.

The picture of the development of the labour and anti-imperialist movement and the changes that took place will be far from complete if we do not explain the general role of the "left" national-reformists. It would be wrong to assert that Gandhism was the only obstacle on the path of the revolutionary awakening of the toiling masses that prevented the exposure and isolation of the reformist bourgeoisie. From 1928, "left" national-reformism began to play a particularly harmful role in the general mass movement. It crystallised more or less like a definite stream of reformism in 1927-1928. With the growth of class differentiation, and the revival of the fighting spirit of the masses, the difficulty to maintain the influence of the bourgeoisie began to grow, and the "left" national reformists, as agents of the bourgeoisie, assumed a considerable significance. In 1928-1929 the "League of Independence" of young Nehru and Bose was formed and played an important role. It tried to retain control over the petty bourgeois and toiling masses who were dissatisfied with the Nehru constitution and pressed the fight for freedom. In 1930-32 they were joined by a new variety—of Kandalkar-Roy-Karnik and Co. The "left" national-reformists developed recently frenzied activity and succeeded for a time to disorganise to a considerable extent the ranks of the proletariat, split the trade union movement, etc.

And now when a general disillusionment with Gandhism among the toiling masses and revolutionary intelligentsia is taking place, it naturally found its expression among the followers of "left" national-reformism as well. The "left" Congressists feel this and correspondingly try to change their tactics, adopting new "left" slogans, and some of them sometimes even openly criticising the leadership of the National Congress, etc. That explains the new programme of Nehru, Bose, Kandalkar, etc.

The bourgeoisie is turning more and more to the right and trying to divert the attention and the energy of the wide masses

to isolated reform activities (Harijan campaign, etc.). It is explained by its fear of the growing disillusionment of the masses and the ripening of the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution. The toiling masses are dissatisfied with the old forms of the movement. They look for new paths, new leadership, new programme, new methods of fight. The anti-imperialist movement is not waning. As a matter of fact a new wave of the revolutionary movement is approaching.

The newspaper "Advance" wrote in its March 1 issue that in Allahabad an illegal terrorist organisation called upon the population to come out with a hartal in memory of Chandrashekhar Azad, the revolutionary-terrorist killed by the police in 1932.

"In the evening—writes the paper—a crowd gathered; the police dispersed it. The police were set on guard all through the night. There was a hartal in the city although a few Moslim shops were open."

This communication is a typical sign of the temper of the broad strata of the town petty bourgeoisie and of the toiling masses in general. The newspapers are every day full of news of the arrest of individuals, of groups, that carry out illegal revolutionary activity, making weapons and explosives, etc. And these are not a few isolated acts; they begin to assume a mass character.

Gandhism has again demonstrated now its liberal, anti-revolutionary nature. The working class and the peasantry are going to the left; new battles are maturing.

British imperialism is doing its best to consolidate its landlord-princes support, it gives some slight concessions to the Indian bourgeoisie (so far as the textile, sugar, cotton, and some other industries are concerned), permits them to take part in the distribution of 20 per cent. of the State budget, forms a sham reserve bank, i.e., throws some crumbs at the expense of the increased exploitation of the masses. While making some constitutional concessions, British imperialism at the same time adopts all possible measures to consolidate its yoke. At the same time it, together with the bourgeoisie, prepares to crush the revolutionary people, and prepares the country for the impending world war, for the war against the U.S.S.R. It tries to secure the loyal support of the Indian bourgeoisie for the coming war.

British imperialism is faced with a number of difficult tasks; the growing revolutionary movement in India, the growing instability within England itself and the coming armed struggle for the redivision of the world. This determines its Indian plans to strengthen its coalition with the feudal-landlord groups (drawing the princes in, federation scheme, etc.) and thus introduce an Indian element of "stability" into the apparatus of domination and proceeding from this, putting feudal groups against the bourgeoisie, give some small concessions to the Indian bourgeoisie. The anti-revolutionary bourgeoisie in its turn, being mortally afraid of an agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution, has adopted in general the policy of adaptation to the feudal-imperialist federation. It hopes to draw the feudal lords and the semi-feudal lords to its side, and press for further concessions from British imperialism. The bourgeoisie hopes to create and to consolidate a bourgeois-landlord coalition. The Indian bourgeoisie grudgingly agrees to make a compromise with British imperialism. It is afraid of a revolution and is afraid of foreign invasion (by Japan, etc.).

British imperialism agreed to give some economic concessions at the expense of foreign competition (Japan, Belgium, Dutch, etc.) that began to undermine British positions. At the same time it is putting through preferential tariffs, that is, consolidates its own position and places a number of additional obstacles on the path of development of productive forces of India. The Indian bourgeoisie accepts the compromise with British imperialism to fight the people's revolution and foreign competition and is seeking to make a coalition with the feudal and semi-feudal groups to carry on a further parliamentary struggle against British government.

That is why, while criticising the new draft in every way and pressing for a number of changes, the bourgeoisie demands to stop the mass movement, and reorientate the masses for the "elections" and new legislative assemblies and harijan campaign.

The most prominent leaders of the Indian bourgeoisie, Buri, Tsakurdas, Hiragand, Shriram—the biggest capitalists and Gandhi's closest advisors—declared in a statement to the press the need of a most rapid introduction of the federation and indicated the demands of the bourgeoisie: (a) That the share of the budget which the representatives of the Indian bourgeoisie have a right

to distribute, be increased. This should be achieved by decreasing military expenses and by shifting part of the expenses to the British treasury; (b) that the export of gold from the country be prohibited and gold be used to establish reserve bank (c) that the administration of the railways be handed over to the Indian Legislature; (d) that the forced subordination of the rupee to the pound be done away with; (e) that legislature be given the right to pass laws against foreign competition.

The bourgeoisie proposes to fight for these proposals within the framework of the constitution, through negotiations, through economic pressure, etc. To characterise the loyalty of the Indian bourgeoisie it is enough to point out that even in 1930-1932 it actively (to the extent of 800 million rupees) supported the internal loans of the Anglo-Indian government which were used to suppress and enslave the country.

The Congress newspaper *Mahratta* wrote on January 15, 1933:

"We must note the fact that to-day the leaders of the Congress are directing the attention of the people to the problem of the liquidation of untouchability (i.e., the pariahs—Eb.) and thus are withdrawing the attention of the people from questions that are of direct political significance.

It is not difficult to understand that the concentration of the attention of the people on the question of untouchability, of the right to enter temples is equivalent to a renunciation of the movement for which the Congress leaders and their supporters are now sitting in prison." And this is what actually has happened.

The Congress, covering up with the "struggle" against the pariah system, is helping, as a matter of fact, to put through the Constitution drafted by British imperialism. National-reformism is adapting itself to the new form of the domination of British imperialism. The National Congress is trying, while adapting itself to the new situation, to repeat the manœuvre carried out in 1922. But this time the bourgeoisie will find it more difficult, because, unlike in 1922, the economic crisis is now growing more acute, the revolutionary movement is growing and the working class has appeared on the scene.

The reformist policy of the bourgeoisie and the formal rejection of the "non-co-operation" movement will undoubtedly increase the class differentiation in the national movement. It is possible that the National Congress will still talk for some time about the boycott of the legislative assemblies. It is even possible that there will be splits and secessions in the National Congress. It is possible that a party such as the former swarajist party, as well as parties "from the left" like those of the former "League of Independence" of young Nehru, will be created outside or inside the National Congress. The results of the Round Table Conference undoubtedly do not satisfy the Indian bourgeoisie. However, its chief groups, headed by Gandhi, have retained their loyalty to the old British orientation. Some bourgeois groups might begin to flirt with the American bourgeoisie. It is also possible that some elements of the bourgeois national movement, linked up with the petty-bourgeois movement, will begin "to make advances" to the international proletarian movement, thinking about the might of the Soviet proletariat. All this is linked up, chiefly, with the class differentiation and upheavals that are taking place in the country.

In short, the bourgeoisie is doing its utmost to retain its influence, advancing its "left" detachments to the forefront. It is also possible that a number of individual national-revolutionary groups, etc., will appear.

The Communists of India must foresee all this so that, while co-operating with, and attracting all elements and organisations that are ready to fight against the imperialists, isolate the national-reformists and develop a revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses for independence, land and power.

The present period of development of the independence movement in India is characterised by a tremendous upsurge of the peasant movement, particularly marked in the native States. In some places this movement took the form of an agrarian uprising, that contained some signs of a national-revolutionary war. The activity of the peasants in Burma, Kashmir and Alwar have not ceased; the peasantry who rose in the Alwar State have forced the royal army to retreat; the British military came to the rescue.

In some provinces the spontaneous movement of refusal to pay debts, taxes, rent, is very widespread. In a number of places the government was forced to lower taxes temporarily, but at the

same time it adopts its own measures; everywhere, particularly in Bengal, garrisons have been stationed, the number of police has been increased, fines imposed, land property, cattle sold at auction. The peasants' activities, the clashes with the police and the landlords, have become typical and this shows the popular nature of the movement. Millions of peasants have been roused out of their "slumber." With the further development of the crisis it will be more and more difficult to pacify, by significant tax concessions, the unrest of the village. The Index of prices for cotton in 1932 fell from 97 to 87; for grain products, from 108 to 87; jute, from 58 to 39. The yield of wheat for the last decade fell from 760 to 600 per acre (Makerdji, "Bombay Chronicle," January 10, 1933), the rice yield decreased in 1932 from 877 to 837 an acre. The area under cotton continues to decrease; in 1929 it was 10,480,000 acres, in 1932 it was 8,409,000 acres; the area under wheat decreased for 1932-33 by 4 per cent., while in Punjab, the chief wheat district, by 15 per cent. ("Capital," February 16, 1933.) The following document of the government of the United Provinces testifies eloquently to the ruin of the peasantry during the crisis:

"The tenants preferred to give away their land and renounce their rights rather than to pay the rent which under present conditions has become excessively high. Consequently the number of deserted holdings for the year (1931) grew from 20,860 to 71,430, while the number of forced collections of the land tax amounted to 256,284." (Bombay Chronicle, January 26, 1933.)

In 1933 this process assumed still greater proportions. The production of iron has fallen from 804,000 tons in 1931 to 650,000 in 1932; coal, from 1,752,000 metric tons in 1931 to 1,580,000 in 1932, etc. Some increases can be noted in the sugar industry due to the prohibitive tariffs.

At the same time taxes and indebtedness have increased. The scissors in the prices has increased, the decay and degradation of the social economic system of colonial India went on at a greater pace.

The peasantry is being ruined in greater numbers; it is being expropriated. Gold, "distress gold," a name which describes the true nature of the plunder, is being pumped out of the country. From September, 1931, to December, 1932, 11½ crore rupees of gold were squeezed out of the country. ("Capital," February 9, 1933.) British capital covers the decline in the export of goods with this gold. The trade balance of India is characterised by the fact that exports usually exceeded imports. Imperialism used to maintain the whole colonial apparatus of oppression and receive super profits by pumping out raw materials and semi-manufactured goods. The acuteness of the present crisis, of the crisis of the whole social-economic structure of India manifests itself in the trade balance. The import of gold has become passive.

In 1930-31, exports exceeded imports by	57.54 lak rupees.
In 1931-32	29.29 " "
In 1932-33	" were lower than .. 1.71 " "

Only the forced pumping of gold made it possible for British imperialism to retain its economic position. It testifies to the ruin of the peasantry and toiling strata of the city. Even the British economic journal *Capital* (Calcutta, February 2) was forced to admit that

"the inflow of gold came from the largest districts of the United Provinces where the agrarian crisis was most acute. We must remember here that the influx of gold began long before the gold standard had been abolished and the price of gold was not too high."

The increased ruin and disillusionment with the reformist policy of the National Congress leads to the growth of a spontaneous revolutionary peasant movement. It will assume greater and greater scope.

The National Congress sabotaged the peasant movement, demands it should be suppressed. When it takes the form of an uprising, the I.N.C. falsely represents it as a Hindu-Muslim conflict. The Congress organ, *Mahratta* (in the January 8, 1933, issue) qualified the agrarian uprising of the Alwar peasantry in the following way:—

"It is praiseworthy on the part of the British government not to interfere with the affairs of the State, but at the same time it is its duty to prevent provocateurs from without from creating disorders within the State. The Pan-Islam agitator

have achieved their goal in Kashmir and it is evident that they have now chosen a new victim, the Alwar State."

That is how they propose to the imperialists to put down the peasant movement.

The growing agrarian-peasant movement is beginning more and more to be connected with the anti-imperialist movement; the revolutionary consciousness of the toiling masses is growing. In its turn, the national-reformist camp is coming closer and closer to the imperialist camp for a common struggle against the impending agrarian revolution. However, the class consciousness of the working class is growing; the illusions in regard to national-reformism are rapidly fading; the Communist movement is growing (although still insufficient).

The reformists' betrayal of the railway strike on the M.S.M. railway in 1932 greatly lowered the authority of the reformists in the south of India as well, as Giri himself admitted. The workers began to join the revolutionary left wing in increasing numbers. In a number of places the left wing was partly able to isolate the reformists and consolidate its positions among the working masses. The situation now is changing considerably.

The textile workers of Bombay are again faced with the gravest attack of the capitalists. The mill owners, taking advantage of the worsening conditions in industry, have again lowered wages of the workers and increased the number of looms and spindles per worker. The mill owners of Ahmedabad have announced a 25 per cent. cut in wages. Mills are being shut down; unemployment is growing. The strike movement, to resist the attack, is spreading not only in Bombay, but in the other centres, too. The same can be observed all over the country. To-day the workers are striking in Bombay, Nagpur, Cawnpore, Viramgaon, Baroda, etc.

A new stage in the struggle is approaching. The conditions are changing. The vanguard stratum of the proletariat is ridding itself of its illusions about the Congress; the backward stratum is more and more falling in line; the revolutionary intellectuals are beginning to revise their old conceptions; the trend towards Communism is growing and *all this is taking place at the time when millions of peasants are awakening*, and the national bourgeoisie is becoming more and more anti-revolutionary. The international situation testifies to the rapid change in the correlation of class forces throughout the world, the forces of the international proletariat and the colonial peoples are coming closer. A new period of revolutions and wars is close and finds its expression in the growing revolutionary movement in the colonies. The victorious socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. points the way for the oppressed toiling masses of the colonial countries and of the whole world.

However, in spite of the favourable situation, it will give results only if the Indian Communists will be able to correct their policy and carry out energetically the formation of the Communist Party because that is the basic premise for the successful preparation and victory of the Indian revolution. Here lies the key to the victory of the Indian people.

The capitalist world is again entering a period when it increasingly will apply warlike, armed forms of fighting. War is coming. In the article "Quality Rather Than Quantity," which is of general strategical importance, *Lenin* wrote:—

"The outcome of the struggle depends upon the fact that Russia, India, China, etc., constitute the vast majority of the population. And it is this majority of the population that has been drawn into the struggle for their emancipation with unusual speed during the last years so that in this sense there can be no doubt whatsoever as to the final outcome of the world struggle. In this sense the ultimate victory of socialism is fully and absolutely guaranteed."

The Soviet Union has developed great socialist construction, consolidating itself as the basis of the world revolution. China has passed through a tremendous revolutionary school, having created a Soviet Republic and the Red Army. The Indian people are turning to the true, revolutionary path and the time is not far off when it will follow *Soviet China*. The oppressed toilers of India, under the leadership of its vanguard—the Communist Party of India—will be able not only to throw off the yoke of the British bourgeoisie but to come out on the broad path of the fight for socialism.