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

India

Whither Nehru?

Mr. Nehru has recently published a long article “Whither India.” Here, and in a number of other articles, he developed his ideas about the present situation in the country and the tasks confronting the toiling masses. Mr. Nehru developed an energetic tirade in favour of socialism and even Communism (?), and so on and so forth. One might even get a suspicion that there is a turn, a change in the policy of Mr. Nehru, a turn towards revolutionary ideas and revolutionary methods of struggle. However, Mr. Nehru redundates such thoughts or suspicions and hastily declares: "Personally I am not conscious of any glaring inconsistencies in my ideas or ideas of my party during the last thirteen years." (Bombay Chronicle, 21/11/33.) Mr. Nehru is correct. He has not changed his policy. But what kind of policy and activities? What kind of a politician has Mr. Nehru carried out? Mr. Nehru himself explains everything that he stands for socialism and independence. That is his credo he says, but as a matter of fact Mr. Nehru fights neither for independence, nor for socialism.

The truth of the matter is that Mr. Nehru disorganises both the struggle for independence and the efforts to build a Communist Party which would be able to organise and prepare a revolutionary camp to fight for independence, land and power and clear the way to democracy. Mr. Nehru is seeking to disorganise the genuine battle for socialism and independence against the imperialist and rentier capitalism. That is his credo he says, but as a matter of fact Mr. Nehru disorganises both the struggle for independence and the efforts to build a Communist Party which would be able to organise and prepare a revolutionary camp to fight for independence, land and power and clear the way to democracy.

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

Does Mr. Nehru Fight for Independence?

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

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

The bourgeoisie made frantic efforts to instil into the minds of the toiling masses this spirit of defeat and submission, especially because, as a result of growing revolutionary movement, the experiences gained during the last decades and the examples of Soviet Union and China, the slave psychology and submissiveness were fast disappearing and the influence of Congress bourgeoisie decreased. Mr. Nehru is doing his best to reverse this situation and thus to represent the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie and the liberal landlords. This treacherous statement of Gandhi must be widely circulated. It must be explained to the toiling masses that from the beginning till now, including participation in the Round
Table Conference, assistance to collect taxes in U.P., etc., etc.—Gandhism carried on a struggle against the independent and agrarian movement and did his best to keep the present system of imperialist and feudalist exploitation intact.

Mr. Nehru supports and defends Gandhism, his past and present. He does it because he is not a socialist, nor a Communist; he was and remains a "Left" Gandhist; he does not fight for independence. On the contrary, Nehru and his ideas represent one of the most harmful obstacles on the road to independence.

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

The anti-revolutionary character of the policy of "Left" Gandhites, who falsely describe themselves as socialists and Communists, can be seen from their activities as well. Mr. Nehru supported Gandhism during 1921-1922. He participated in the preparation of the Nehru Constitution, although he did not sign it. There was a division of labour between son and father. Motilal Nehru's son said: "I declare that I am a socialist, and Gandhian domination is destroyed and our mass energy and disorganise the mass revolutionary struggle (Gandhi stated himself: If we don't start, the forces of violence will get the upper hand and it will be too late), Mr. Nehru refused the offer of the Bombay Workers' and Peasants' Party to give support to the G.I.P. railway strike and help to convert it into a general strike, which would have immensely developed the revolutionary struggle. He declared himself a socialist, etc. endorsed Gandhi's trip to London, to the Round Table Conference, etc., and he now covers up the bankruptcy of Gandhism with phrases about socialism and does his best to preserve bourgeois Congress leadership over the toiling masses. Mr. Nehru becomes indignant when Communists begin to criticise the Congress policy and the Congress leadership. "The Congress," declares Nehru, "has been the bulwark of Indian nationalism. During recent years. It seems to me perfectly ridiculous for people who do nothing effective themselves to accuse the Congress of lack of militancy." (The "Indian Labour Journal," 12/11/1933.)

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

Mr. Nehru continually calls for the cessation of criticism of the Congress. But this is in vain, because the very interests of the struggle for independence depend upon the clear exposure of the treachery of the so-called "socialists" in Congress. I may perhaps be accused of inconsistency: I am a Communist in the accepted sense of the word... I have a weakness for Oxford and what it stands, if something like it, only with a broader base, can be retained, well and good." ("Manchester Guardian," December 11, 1933). It is clear that Nehru's Communism is nothing else but Oxford liberalism.

Nobodies need to take Mr. Nehru's declarations about socialism seriously and no one demands it from Nehru. However, it would be interesting to know whether Nehru's "Communism in Russia and China. Mr. Nehru declares he disapproves of the Communist methods applied in Russia and China. It is clear, therefore, that Mr. Nehru wants socialism and independence without a revolution. He is ready to swear for workers and peasants, etc., etc. But no revolution. One of the defenders of capitalism wrote in the "People" (Lahore, October 23, 1933) about the Communist creed of Nehru: "This reflects a peculiar mass-psychology, demonstrating that the method more than the creed is often the cause of strife. If the creed is a good creed and the method adopted innocent, even those who have to suffer not only sympathise with it but often work hand in hand to achieve the object... Gandhi, therefore, rightly stressed in his letter to Panditji the importance of methods."

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

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

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

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

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

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

For a time, he says, we tried to avoid giving an answer "on the ground that the national issue must be settled first," but now we, "as men of action," must "fashion our idea of freedom accordingly." ("Which India—Bomani or Bombay?")

To this reasoning, the intellect is clear. At first we came forward with an appeal for a united national front and kept socialism, i.e., class struggle out; we appealed to capitalists and workers, landlords and peasants, princes and subjects, etc., to stand together and live peacefully. We did it for a time. But now a change is taking place. People have followed our instructions for many years and now they see there is no such a thing as this united national front, that he does his best to preserve the landlords and princes and also capitalists do not fight for independence. Workers and peasants began to revolt. They said you fight neither for independence nor for the workers' and peasants' interests. They also said: We must destroy landlordism because it not only exploits us but even supports the imperialists.

The people began to see the game of the exploiters and congress leaders who represent them and to observe the illusions of the bourgeois, who understand that the national front was a great protection. Mr. Nehru sees that, and that is why he says, as a practical politician, he must "fashion the idea accordingly"—and hence his strenuous efforts to don a socialist garb.

Mr. Nehru is ready to give concessions to the peasantry, even part of the land of the landlords, and so on. But he is against the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution. Although he sees the changes in the relationship of the class forces, he hopes to preserve the leadership of the bourgeoisie, who he thinks is the influence of the bourgeois national congress. That is the origin of his socialist garb. But now it is too late. The workers have learnt a lot. Nobody will fool them with a "socialist garb" only, the workers will form the Communist Party to fight for independence and for true socialism, as it is built in the Soviet Union, as well.

Mr. Nehru represents the interests of the most far-sighted sections of the Indian bourgeoisie, he represents the interests of the most consistent anti-imperialist force. The brunt of the street battles in the cities of India was borne by the working class. The British imperialists directed its heaviest blows against the proletariat. The Meerut trial is a classic example of this. The history of the revolutionary movement in India clearly shows that the independence of India will be attained only when the working class, headed by a Communist Party, takes the lead, organises the scattered masses of the peasantry, exposes the national-reformists and thus delivers a mighty blow to imperialist oppression. This is what happened in former Russia, it is taking place in China. In China the "Left" Kuomintang talked about socialism, democracy, etc., it agitated for a common national front with the bourgeoisie when it became anti-revolutionary, etc., etc., and it betrayed the struggle for independence. Chi-Chiau-Wel, Kuomintang, is the chief helper of the bloody watch-dog of imperialism, Chiang-Kai-shek.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No experience has proved clear enough that the Congress bourgeoisie is an anti-revolutionary force and does not fight for independence. Therefore the ideas of Shastri-Karnik to put pressure on it through Nehru and other "Left" congresses only help the bourgeoisie to disorganise the revolutionary mass movement.

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

**Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union**

The 17th Party Congress and the International Proletariat

By L. F. Boross

The following article is the second of a series of three by our Moscow Correspondent on the Seventeenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U., the first of which appeared in our issue No. 14 of March 2—En.

II. Unity and “Unity”

In all the reports on the Seventeenth Party Congress—in the press as well as in innumerable meetings—the fact that the Party Congress revealed the unity of the entire Party, unity which is even unparalleled in the Bolshevist Party itself, was underscored with particular enthusiasm.

In what was this unity expressed at the Party Congress itself? Even externally, so to speak, according to the order of business, this unity was expressed in the fact that almost all the reporters were able to forego detailed concluding remarks, that the discussion at the Party Congress lasting fifteen days did not disclose any opinion which in any way deviated from the standpoint of the reporters. It was the first Party Congress at which there was no opposition at all. Not only was there no opposition, but the representatives of all the currents of opposition which had manifested themselves during the past decade had themselves to acknowledge the complete bankruptcy of their standpoint at the Party Congress.

Leading representatives of the former Trotzkyist opposition (Radek, Preobrazhenski) came forward and said:—

"The declarations which various comrades (from former oppositions—L. F. B.) made here are not simply the result of their political bankruptcy, not only the result of the bankruptcy of the opposition, but the result of a much more important process—the result of the great positive victory of our Party. Every one who unintentionally expressed the influence of other classes, who fought against the Party in the belief that he serves the working class, now has to ask himself the question: You either stand on this side or on that side of the barricades; there can be no middle course." (Radek.)

Leaders of the former united Zinoviev-Trotzkyist opposition (Zinoviev, Kamenev) spoke and made the following declarations:—

"I had the presumption to force my particular conception of Leninism, my particular conception on the 'philosophy of the epoch' and, of course, I openly recognise (of course late enough), that conception was a chain of mistaken conclusions. And if the Party had not repudiated these mistakes, then we would now discuss everything possible at the Party Congress here, but not the Second Five-Year Plan of socialist construction." (Zinoviev.)

The leaders of the former Right opposition (Bucharin, Tomsky, Rykov) came and confessed:—

"In the light of events it is now clear that any victory of our false line ... would have exceedingly weakened the positions of the working class. It would have led to premature intervention ... and in consequence to the restoration of capitalism." (Bucharin.)

The former leaders of the so-called "Right-Left" bloc were also not missing:—

"We did not see the perspectives which Comrade Stalin had outlined, we looked for a way out not in overcoming the difficulties, not in an advance but in a retreat. We did not understand that retreat is the prelude to the difficulties new difficulties, that retreat means the destruction of all our plans, all our goals" (Lomonadze.)

Thus the former opponents of the Bolshevist general line themselves came forward as its crown witnesses.

But the mightiest symbol of complete unity was the storm of enthusiastic acclaim for the organiser of the victory of socialism—Comrade Stalin—the storm of applause which began in the Kremlin Hall, continued in the socialist factories and on the collective farms of the vast country, and found a million echoes in the