

Between Passive Resistance and Revolution

By G. SAFAROV.

A STUPID journalist who was present at the Indian National Congress records his impressions as follows in *The World To-morrow* :—“On the whole, my impressions are that Mahatma Gandhi absolutely excels all other political leaders in India, that those Nationalists convinced of the necessity of resorting to violence are capable of getting the upper hand and ousting Gandhi, if the fight continues; that the political rule of Great Britain in India is probably radically undermined, that India is faced with a decade of fighting and disorder before a stable and firm national government is formed, that the underlying motive of the nationalist leaders' conduct is the love of liberty that urged

George Washington and Thomas Jefferson to the heroic acts of 1776.”

One cannot, of course, expect such persons to understand the complicated mechanism of historical development. As merely casual spectators, hailing from a country where patriotic conceit is so easily substituted for mental effort, these journalists confuse political factors, situations and classes, and, naturally allow their inquisitive vision to be distracted by the most sensational figures, names which can be published in the papers the next day in large-sized heavy type. Gandhi, in general, attracts the sympathy of the international bourgeois for the simple reason that he is a representative of bourgeois moderation and a crafty class outlook. The American bourgeois, now energetically besieging the domains of British imperialism with the object of capturing them economically, display a considerably wider vision than their British competitors, as they may be able to “clean up” something from the national-liberation movement in India. The American bourgeois, nevertheless, observe proper moderation in their opinions in so far as the real victory of a peasant revolution in India, a revolution growing broader and stronger under proletarian leadership, does not inspire them with joyful hopes. The scepticism of the dollar is also justified by the American economic crisis.

But no matter where it happens, a fact remains a fact. Even a casual American journalist ought to have recognised that in India such historic forces have arisen as could not be driven underground for whole decades, even if world capitalism were able to remain master of the situation over the whole world for these decades.

Those whom *The World To-morrow* calls Nationalists really represent the great mass of the Indian working-class, peasantry and lower sections of the urban petty bourgeoisie. They were not represented, of course, at the Lahore Congress. One cannot consider as their representatives various delegates of the revolutionary students, who a couple of weeks after Lahore almost knelt before Gandhi and Co. These masses stood beyond the walls of the Congress; the demonstrating Sikhs were merely a chance fragment of these masses.

At Lahore, if not at the Congress, at least in the Congress Hall, it was Gandhi and Nehru who ruled with their grimacing. During the Congress, Mahatma conceived the bright idea of offering prayers to the “All-Highest,” at four o’clock in the morning and at half-past seven at night. This produced a particularly great impression on the American yellow-pressman. But despite the fact that the Lahore Congress outwardly ran smoothly for Gandhi and Nehru, it was affected by the reverberation of the revolutionary struggle. All speakers at the Congress had their eye on the streets, with a badly concealed fear of the intervention of the masses. After the Congress, there commenced a long series of attempts by Gandhi and the rest to distract the attention of the agitated masses from the struggle, to delay the struggle for so long that it would become impossible, and so forth. Gandhi vowed to the Viceroy that he is ready to pack-up the whole fight for Indian independence if only the Viceroy agrees to the most moderate demands of the Indian bourgeoisie. The “passive resistance” of Gandhi, Patel, Nehru and the others is reduced to mere conversations.

GANDHI SPEAKS “FIRMLY”

This treacherous behaviour is coming to an end, thanks to the revolutionising of the masses. Much firmer notes are to be perceived in the voices of Gandhi and the rest. In an interview with the *Matin* correspondent Gandhi declares with obvious despair that: “Red ruin, revolution and a complete break with legality would be better than the present state of affairs, as all these afflictions are showered on us every day in the name of government and social order.”

It would be a grave mistake, however, to conclude from this that Gandhi has thrown himself into the struggle. That is not so, could not be and will not be. He was and remains a willing tool of the Indian bourgeoisie, seeking compromise with British imperialism at the cost of suppressing the Indian revolution. Gandhi has carried out, and still carries out, the counter-revolutionary policy of the Indian bourgeoisie. In announcing the beginning of passive resistance, he is trying to replace the revolutionary indignation of the

masses by foolish gesture, by disjointed outbursts of mass discontent in no way dangerous for the British, and by "passive resistance," which is as like as two peas to complete conciliation with British imperialism. However, the Indian National Congress and its leaders will have to adapt themselves to the *mass* sentiments. They are bound to take these feelings into consideration, they are bound to adapt the *forms* of their activities, the *tone* of their speeches and various gestures, to the sharpening mass struggles which, with sweeping effect, are now embracing the railways, the Calcutta jute factories and the villages of the Punjab. The waves of the developing world crisis, are in turn, undermining the peaceful trend of life and compelling the Indian capitalists to feign revolutionary indignation, in their demands to British imperialism.

One need only listen to a certain Mr. Walchand of the Makharasta Chamber of Commerce: "Do we require further proofs of unity, when political leaders and practical business-men equally recognise as many as seven points out of the eleven demands put forward by Mahatma Gandhi, while not a single practical business man will object to the remainder?" (*Bombay Chronicle*, February 10th, 1930.)

Although Gandhi does try to give himself the appearance of a semi-mystic, the evenness and the co-ordinated nature of his "spiritual movements" show that he will not diverge one iota from the behests of his capitalist masters. He does not utter a *single word more* than is dictated to him by the Chambers of Commerce. And the Chambers of Commerce transform their indignation at the high rates of bank interest into "truly revolutionary" passion. Here, for instance, are the actual words of Wadia, a big-wig, to the correspondent of the *Bombay Chronicle*: "The textile manufacturers have lost all credit. Banks grant them loans very unwillingly; and I know a number of cases where factories have paid 7 per cent. for a loan on working capital, although providing the creditors with absolutely reliable securities, whereas usually the banks have advanced for 1 or 2 per cent. This percentage has ruined the Bombay industry and also had a destructive effect on Ahmed-

abad. The Ahmedabad factories are already working short time. I had occasion to examine the balances of Ahmedabad factories and was convinced that whereas in 1925 they showed a profit of 400,00, in 1928 they only earned 200,000. It is indisputable that Bombay has earned nothing and has suffered terribly from strikes. Bombay began to lose from the year 1925. We import annually up to 20 per cent. foreign goods as a result of the high parity, and India has to use this extra 20 per cent. of goods or else decrease her production by 20 per cent., for the benefit of foreign goods." (February 11th.)

We hear the same speeches from Meta, secretary of the Chamber of Indian Merchants, which did considerable work in recruiting strike-breakers during the great Bombay textile strike. Meta states: "The epidemic of strikes throughout the whole country and other working-class disturbances cannot be explained away by the mere assertion that communism is their cause. The cause lies in the economic disparity caused by the compulsory introduction of the new rates, which has led to acute economic depression, and to labour disturbances which represent merely the outward display of this depression. . . Silver has now fallen, it would appear, to the very lowest price, and its fall during the last three years from 70 rupees to 46 rupees means depriving the Indian peasantry of a very large part of their wealth — approximately one-third." (February 13th.)

The British double book-keeping keeps the Indian money-market constantly in tension, and renders the changing of rupees into gold a money-lending operation.

The fall of prices on cotton and other colonial products hits Indian national economy very severely. British imperialism is shifting on to the shoulders of India the consequences of economic depression, and this is felt all the more, as the symptoms of the approaching world economic crisis become clearer.

II.

The growth of mass discontent and revolutionary feeling accentuate the struggle for hegemony proceeding between the working class vanguard and the bourgeoisie. The centre of attention is now the strike on the

G.I.P. railway which employs 125,000 workers. The sifting out which took place in the very first days of the strike, between the official leadership of the Railwaymen's Union and the supporters of a consistent revolutionary policy, goes to show that the All-India Trade Union Congress was only a first step in the establishment of political and organisational unity of the Indian working class. In November last at this Congress the Indian national-reformists, led by Bose, supported the representatives of Girni Kamgar.* In other words, they could not bring themselves to hinder the advanced workers in dissociating themselves from direct agents of British imperialism like Joshi and Chaman Lal. Ruikar, now heading the reformist leadership of the railway strike, made "left" speeches at the T.U. Congress, and advocated the proletarian method of the general strike, as against bourgeois-compromise methods of passive resistance; although it is true that at the same time he beat all records in kow-towing to Jawaharlal Nehru. As a result of the Congress, Bose became president of the All-India T.U. Confederation, and Deshpandhi its secretary. This outward alliance of the national reformists with the best elements of the Indian labour movement could deceive no one, in so far as bourgeois national reformism, under the conditions then prevailing, when the heroic fight of the Bombay textile-workers was still fresh in everybody's memory, *dared not* openly and directly oppose the Girni Kamgar. Now the picture has completely changed. As was to be expected, the servants of Nehru and Gandhi, the Ruikars and similar gentlemen, at once emerged in their true light as soon as they had to act instead of talk. Ruikar commenced his betrayal of the revolutionary struggle of the Indian workers by sending a telegram to the MacDonald imperialist government with the request that the fascist law on compulsory arbitration be immediately applied to the conflict on the G.I.P. Railway. The strike commenced in February and continues to this day, despite the fact that the administration is paying double wages to the blacklegs and utilising every means of terror to break the resistance of the masses. But it should be remem-

bered that the strike is proceeding in spite of the reformist leadership, which from the very start did everything possible to cut it short, to make it "acceptable" both to MacDonald and to the Indian bourgeoisie. The leaders of the Congress, knowing full well that the extension and intensification of the class struggle will finally undermine their rule over the masses, are trying to use this strike on the one hand as a means of politically advertising the decaying National Congress, and on the other hand as an example to oppose to the strike of Bombay textile workers. The struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat for hegemony can be discerned very clearly in every mass movement, in every street demonstration, in every strike. The Indian bourgeoisie is utilising the Ruikar leadership to counterpose the railwaymen's strike to the revolutionary strike of Bombay textile workers, which has raised the struggle of the Indian people for emancipation to a new historic level.

THE "LEFTISM" OF YOUNG NEHRU

This is clearly apparent, if only in the appeal of the young Nehru to the bourgeois public. "He asked the public to show patience and sympathy in the present situation. It was not enough to sympathise with the strikers; the demands of the workers should be actively supported in every way, financial assistance be rendered and meetings and demonstrations held. The merchant classes, who must now suffer particularly big losses in trade, should assert every pressure on the Indian Government and the railroad administration so as to bring the conflict to an end as soon as possible." (*Bombay Chronicle*, February 8.)

The young Nehru thus quite openly gives away the secret of bourgeois policy in relation to the strikers. The *Bombay Chronicle* hints with emphasis, that "the Railwaymen's Union is generally recognised as being a responsible organ, working on sound trade union lines, under the direction of responsible leaders." (February 8.)

The bourgeois Congress leaders, in the usual way, "accuse" British imperialism of destroying "sound" trade unionism.

A leaflet was issued on behalf of the "Workers' and Peasants' Party" which

* Red Flag: the revolutionary textile workers' union, Bombay.

stated: "Railway workers should see that Ruikar supports the strike, and does not go back. Ruikar has already sent a telegram to Ramsay MacDonald. It is an error on his part to appeal to the imperialist premier with the request to put into action the law on compulsory arbitration, which is a strike-breaking machine. Railwaymen should link up with the railwaymen of the other lines and call for a general struggle. Workers of the Bombay-Baroda Railways and of the Central India line! Your position is just as intolerable as your comrades of the Peninsula Line. Your complaints are the same. Join in the fight!"

Ruikar immediately hastened to reply to this appeal by sharp attacks on "Deshpandhi and Co.," earning the applause of the whole bourgeois public.

Whereas the Bombay textile strike took place under the leadership of tested proletarians and was an open struggle against the national bourgeoisie, against whom the strike was directly aimed, one can say without the slightest exaggeration that the present railway strike is an arena of struggle, wherein the bourgeoisie is trying to turn the workers into obedient tools. The whole authority of the Indian National Congress, all the noise of public opinion, all the vacillations of the petty-bourgeois careerists have been thrown into the scales. Nehru and Co. create their own atmosphere of "sympathy" around the strike, having already sold it in advance, with the aid of Ruikar. The same old story! The counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and its agents take the leadership of the movement in order to deprive it of a real leadership. But they did not succeed very well. Despite the fact that Ruikar, in collaboration with Joshi and Co., the direct agents of British imperialism, negotiated with the railway administration for the termination of the strike, his "compromise" was, nevertheless, nullified by the workers. The workers refused to recognise Ruikar's deal, and are continuing the fight with still greater determination. The entire preceding trend of events has brought India to that juncture where proletarian means of struggle have acquired indisputable authority among the masses.

BOURGEOISIE "GOES TO THE PEOPLE."

The bourgeoisie is trying to make use of the closing of a number of Bombay textile mills, the pressure of the economic crisis on the working class, and the weak organisation of the workers, in order to get the political initiative in their own hands. They "go to the people," to the ranks of the working class, as it is that class which has boldly entered the path of the revolutionary liberation of India. Only under proletarian leadership can the national-colonial revolution in India be victorious; only proletarian leadership can guarantee to it the firm support of the peasant masses, that decisive force without whose aid no emancipation is conceivable. The bourgeoisie goes to the people in order to disorganise and disarm the working class it hates so much. One need only glance at the Indian newspapers to be easily convinced as to what a powerful weapon of deception and betrayal the press is in the hands of the bourgeoisie, and the Indian National Congress. The monopoly of legality enjoyed by the bourgeois politicians with the permission of the British, and in opposition to the working class, allows them to exaggerate to Herculean magnitudes any trite liberal gesture, any patronising nod of the Viceroy to Gandhi, and to represent as an insignificant factor the Indian proletariat, which is the real basis and the main driving force of the present-day revolutionary wave. The Bombay textile strike was conducted as a struggle against all the forces of imperialism and bourgeois society. The very same press which now, in innumerable articles, praises Ruikar and indicts the Girni Kamgar leaders as evil shepherds, published at the time of the Bombay strike huge advertisements for the hire of blackleg labour at high rates. Strike-breaking was then almost proclaimed as a national mission. At that time, however, the bourgeoisie were endeavouring to eject the working class from their positions by a direct frontal attack. But they used mistaken tactics. They had not learnt that on the crest of the revolutionary rise, the working class can only be attacked from the rear, the weakest links in their organisation being selected for the blow. Now they are waging a struggle on behalf of their counter-revolutionary deal with British imperialism—on the broad arena

of the labour movement. They are conducting this fight through the actions of Ruikars, rendering financial aid to the strikers and at the same time drawing them beneath the arbitration guillotine, beneath the bludgeons of the British police. They are trying to suffocate the workers in "national-social" embraces. Merchants and mill-owners, students and money-lenders, small shopkeepers and backward workers, smooth-tongued lawyers and professional politicians — all these are to embody national unity, the "sacred unity of all classes." The railway strike is disclosing the true political meaning of passive resistance under present conditions: it consists in reducing the aims of the strike to compulsory arbitration, *i.e.*, suicide in the interests of peace between the British and Indian bourgeoisie.

REVOLUTIONARY IMPLICATIONS OF GENERAL RAILWAY STRIKE

The masses, of course, are fighting, and fighting seriously, but what is going on below is in glaring contradiction with the schemes of the leaders, with what is being enacted on the legal surface. The extension and deepening of the movement would perforce flood the dams raised by the traitors and reveal the true revolutionary physiognomy of the working class. The Indian revolution cannot proceed without embracing the transport system. *A general railway strike under present-day conditions, given a genuine proletarian leadership, would be the beginning of a catastrophe for British rule in India.* This is realised by the enemies of the working class. Gandhi, Nehru and the rest are doing all they can to warn the British bourgeoisie that they are marching on the edge of a precipice. The thick mist of mysticism and pacifist fanaticism, the ineffaceable features of Gandhi's entire masquerade, can of themselves no longer deceive anybody. It is no exaggeration to say that a couple of months back Gandhi was still in the background, merely feeling the pulse of the revolutionary upward surge, in alliance with British imperialism. At the front of the stage was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who made "Left" gestures towards the Soviet Union, the Communist International and the Indian working class. True, even then, at the Trade Union Congress, he made it clear that Chiang-Kai-

Shek was much "nearer and dearer" to him than the October Revolution. The wily Ruikars, however, stretching like india-rubber gloves, tried, by clapping to the right and to the left, to conceal the growing gap between the "Left" wing of the National Congress and the revolutionary labour movement.

Since then the position has changed. Gandhi has once more come into the limelight as the symbol and personification of a single national front, uniting all classes of the population. For tactical reasons a new rôle has been given him. Instead of the rôle of super-diplomat in negotiations with British imperialism, he is given that of a prophet on the eve of a national miracle, who is to "render superfluous" or, rather, ward off the National Revolution. Gandhi is no longer hiding behind the scenes. He has now come right down to the footlights. The British bourgeoisie is no longer clasping hands affectionately with Mahatma Gandhi, but has sent him a farewell blessing, saying that they will always be able to appreciate his counter-revolutionary rôle, even if he pretends to stand on the other side of the barricades.

"A TEST OF STATESMANSHIP"

The Indian National Congress, the Indian bourgeoisie and their petty-bourgeois hangers-on, are now treading on difficult ground. And British capitalism is not unaware of this. The *Daily Herald*, that extremely dull and untalented organ of British social-fascism, remarks knowingly: "The campaign of civil disobedience in India sets the Labour Government a great test of statesmanship." The *Daily Herald* speaks, of course, on behalf of its master, MacDonald. Why did we not hear such statements when there was a discussion in the House of Commons on the promise of dominion status to India? On that occasion the *Daily Herald* appealed solely and exclusively to the good sense of the police! The change of position is explained by the realignment of class-forces in India. The Indian working class with its new methods of struggle, its influence over wide strata of non-proletarian toilers and petty-bourgeoisie, has come to the fore as a spontaneous force. But it is lacking in a central political leadership — an organised and political vanguard. That

vanguard does exist, inasmuch as the preceding struggle has already produced, moulded, and to an extent consolidated, advanced proletarian cadres. This vanguard, however, which is best represented in the ranks of the Girni Kamgar Union, has not yet completely appreciated the significance of a proletarian political party, has not yet succeeded in forming this party, although there already exist all the pre-requisites not only for its formation, but also for the decisive spreading of its influence over the entire mass of the Indian working class.

III.

“If we look at the history of the last decade we become convinced that the liberals have collaborated with the government, declaring that they were practical politicians in spite of the wishes of the people. What are the fruits of this collaboration with the government? Our ruin and the ruin of the country’s industry and trade, prison for those who really take the interests of the fatherland to heart, titles for the liberals, and high salaries for the members of the legislative councils.”

Do not imagine these lines are borrowed from a proclamation by immature students. They are from the declaration of the chairman of the Union of Bombay Bankers, Desai. They can sniff revolution in the air. As the sound of the class struggle increases, so the footsteps of the approaching revolutionary upheavals can be heard more distinctly. It was not for nothing that they were heard even by an American correspondent on the spot. When bankers made subversive speeches, factory owners give financial aid to strikers and counter-revolutionary politicians suddenly appear as revolutionaries, this means that revolution is knocking at the door and demands either to be let in or abandoned. The Indian National Congress has but one desire—to abandon and suppress the revolution. But it is not yet strong enough to do this; and in the meantime plays for time, for room to manoeuvre in and to struggle against the revolution. That is why it is engaged in “going to the people”—not only to the railway strikers, but also to the peasants of the Punjab, Oudh, etc. “The conditions of the Oudh peasants are intolerable; the crop

failures of the past three years have made the position disastrous. In spite of this the talukdars have tried to impose new burdens on them and have now increased rents considerably. Illegal attacks and evictions from the land are a common occurrence. The cup of the rent-payer is full, and an end must be put to this state of affairs. Let the peasants adhere to the Congress, form groups and prepare for action. If Congress summons them they should stop paying taxes, but this should only be done in an organised manner, and *should on no account be done individually or without the permission of Congress representatives.*” (February 7.)

PLAYING WITH FIRE

Such was the debut of the young Nehru before the peasants of Oudh. The peasants are a force with which the bourgeois politicians have to reckon, the more because they are much easier to deceive than the urban workers, and can even, on occasion, be set against the latter. For the time being the peasant discontent is only breaking through in little isolated bursts, which, however, are becoming more and more alarming and threatening. The approach of a peasant wave and a peasant war is felt by all. It is characteristic that in trying to justify and defend the well-known betrayer of the Bardoli peasant movement and close colleague of Gandhi, Patel, the marionettes of the Legislative Assembly made special reference to the fact that “the appeal to millions of peasants to refuse to pay their land levies is a punishable revolutionary act.” (*Times*, March 11th.) It must not be thought that the National Congress has adopted the policy of preaching a peasant revolution. It is merely trying to get a hold on peasant discontent, in order to paralyse the fight and direct it against separate groups of Moslem landowners and particularly savage Indian feudalists. They have to *play* with fire, as there is no other means of putting it out.

A turn in the peasant movement has now definitely been reached. The peasant conference in the Punjab, which made a worthy estimate of Congress policy, was a very important event. But the peasant masses have not yet come openly to the surface, and therefore we

come up against zig-zag vacillations among the urban revolutionary petty-bourgeoisie, particularly the students. The lack of self-assurance of these elements causes them at every sharp turn in the situation either to seek sympathy with the proletariat or else to lean helplessly on the bourgeoisie. Is it long since the *Young Liberator* vehemently rebelled against the Swaraj of Sassoon and Birl? Is it so long since it called Gandhi a servant of imperialism and threatened the young Nehru with a complete break if he went to the Right at the Lahore session of the Congress? Now this journal of petty-bourgeois student youth has forgotten much, and in spite of the urgency of the situation, lets fall words of moth-eaten sagacity: "Although the left wing, the representatives of the Youth, were unable to carry through their programme and views at the Congress this year, nevertheless, there can be no doubt that they will win at Karachi, and if the cause of independence be not won now, with the aid of the present programme, a more radical programme will most certainly be adopted by the Congress with the object of the final overthrow of British imperialism and its allies and the establishment of complete independence." (*Young Liberator*, January, 1930.)

These young people are evidently not yet aware that a revolution is not made by prescriptions—one tablespoonful twice a day; and that the path from one resolution of an impotent and treacherous Congress to another resolution of the same institution, which has become still more rotten, is a path of continuous falls and defects without end. Those who drag the mass movement on to this course are playing an objectively counter-revolutionary rôle. After all, in the Russian Revolution there were also numerous examples of the petty-bourgeois Socialist-revolutionary elements drawing nearer and nearer to the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie in the process of the struggle against Tsardom and the landowners.

VACILLATIONS SYMPTOMATIC

The sugary statements of the student-youth organ should not, of course, be interpreted as the capitulation of the mass student move-

ment to the National Congress. The heads of any petty-bourgeois movement are always worse than the rank and file, are always more undermined by faint-hearted hesitations and doubts, always more inclined to capitulate to the bourgeoisie. However, in the present crucial period, these vacillations of the *Young Liberator* are highly symptomatic. They are symptomatic because they show that only by its own forces will the proletariat be able to conduct and complete its struggle against the bourgeoisie for hegemony. The petty-bourgeoisie, headed by the peasantry, is the essential ally of the proletariat in the national-democratic revolution. But the proletariat can only establish its hegemony by becoming clearly class-conscious and self-reliant—by acting as an *independent revolutionary vanguard*. There is nothing surprising in the fact that in the epoch of the national-democratic revolution, bourgeois-democratic aspirations and aims in India as in other countries are painted in socialistic shades. There is nothing astonishing or accidental in the fact that bourgeois democracy willingly combines the idea of the fight for independence with that of the fight for socialism, thus reinforcing their historically restricted aims with the grandeur and inspiration of the proletarian class struggle. There is nothing strange or unnatural in the fact that bourgeois democracy confuses the interests of the working class and petty-bourgeoisie, and identifies the working class with the entire peasantry. All that is the direct consequence of the intermediary position of the petty-bourgeoisie, its economic and political instability. But it is not enough to supply an explanation for various phenomena; the practical conclusions must also be drawn from the explanations given. The proletariat can only assure its hegemony of the national-peasant movement in India on condition that it places its own class-education and unification on the right lines. Pseudonyms, such as "Workers' and Peasants' Party" have long since become obsolete, and the Indian proletariat now, more than at any other time, needs to realise the necessity for the definite formation of its own Communist vanguard.

COMMUNIST PARTY A FUNDAMENTAL NECESSITY

The matter of forming a Communist Party of India has become a fundamental problem of the Indian Revolution. The Indian proletariat has reached the struggle for political hegemony in the emancipation movement by other means than the Russian working class. In the infancy of the Russian labour movement there was formed the party which afterwards became the Bolshevik Party. In the Revolution of 1905 the working class followed its banner. During the Revolution, the Party grew by the masses rallying around it; it grew up with the mass of the working class. We find a different position in India. There the spontaneous development of the class struggle brought the masses to a struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie for hegemony in the liberation movement. Only in the process of the fight against imperialism, inside the nationalist ranks, was the proletariat able to emerge as an independent class force. Only by passing through a long series of detours in the national-emancipatory struggle was the Indian proletariat able to grow up into an independent class force. Manabendra Nath Roy, one of the has-beens, now vehemently attacks the Communist International for its ill-disposed attitude towards Gandhi, Nehru and the Ruikars, at the same time trying to belie the revolutionary history of the Indian working class, in which he has been unable to find a place for himself. With the shamelessness of a renegade, to whom principle is much cheaper than wounded conceit, he writes: "When Lenin wrote the resolution of the Second Congress, he only had very incomplete conceptions on the position in the colonial countries." (*Gegen den Strom*, March 1st.) Mr. Roy, imitating Trotsky and other incarnations of unrecognised genius, tries to turn the history of the development of the Indian labour movement into a kind of small-talk history of how he, the great Roy, taught Lenin. At such rubbish one merely snaps one's fingers, of course. Of the same worth are the accusations of another careerist,

a Max Schachtman, in the *Militant*, who accuses the Communist International of "resisting the formation of a Communist Party in India." (*Militant*, February 8th.) Both the Right and the "Left" renegades ignore the real facts, for the birth of the revolutionary working class in India in 1928-1929 is an indisputable fact. That did not and could not take place until the development of the class struggle had aroused the masses, until the slogans of the Comintern had been turned into class reality. They could only be embodied in the real life of India thanks to the self-development of the working class, in the process of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. Roy and the other knights for an hour (and renegades for life) can console themselves as much as they like with statements that "Moscow is not a geographical conception." (As a matter of fact this individual wants a *Kuomintang* for India!) They are already, be it noted, not far from declaring that the defence of the "geographical frontiers" of the Soviet Union is one thing, but the "political defence of Moscow" is another! In the rotten bog in which they are stranded all revolutionary conceptions are turned into their own antithesis—into the marked cards of a counter-revolutionary game.

The Indian labour movement is ascending with difficulty to the height of a revolutionary wave, by means of the railway strike, by means of the strike of 30,000 jute workers, by means of innumerable actions of separate sections of the working class. The achievement of working class political and organisational unity is the order of the day. The formation of a Communist Party of India, drawing its forces from the broad trade union organisation, and the manifold contacts with the peasantry, is the order of the day. The Gordian knot of contradictions in the present changing period will be cut by the further development of the Indian working class struggle, by the preparation of decisive battles, the path to which lies through the revolutionary general strike, led by the genuine proletarian vanguard.

The ENGLISH EDITION of the *COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL* is published twice monthly.

Subscription Rates 8/- per annum in England, \$2 per annum in U.S.A. post free through any bookseller.