

## India

# Abridged Draft of Political Theses of the C.C. of C.P. of India

\* It gives us great pleasure to publish in the "Inprecorr" the draft of the political theses sent to us by the **Provisional C.C. of the C.P. of India**. The publication of these theses is a fact of great significance; it shows serious progress of the Communist movement. In place of scattered and politically disunited groups, we see that on the arena of the world history a united Communist Party is coming. And on the basis of its platform of action, the programme and decisions of the C.I. and the open letters of the various Communist Parties, it has begun to work out its own tactical line and energetically develop practical activities.

The National Congress has entered a crisis. The cowardly and treacherous bourgeoisie, led by Gandhi, terrified at the prospects of a national revolution, is flinging itself into the arms of imperialism, and appeals to stop this mass struggle. The A.I.C.C., in its Patna decision, invites the toiling masses to have a vacation and occupy themselves with preparations for elections to the Legislative Assembly, and in such a way to adapt and subordinate themselves to the British rule. The "Left" national-reformists (the Congress Socialist Party, etc.), on the pretext of apathy of the masses, an apathy which in reality does not exist, are striving to reconcile socialism and capitalism, and under the cover of confused phrases about the socialist State, support the authority and leadership of Gandhi and his agitation of non-violence. Such a policy of the "Left" national-reformists is nothing else but a struggle against independence, against the interests of workers and peasants, against national revolution. The workers and peasants are against the treacherous policy of bourgeois Congress leaders. The determination of workers and peasants to fight the imperialists, landlords and capitalists is growing. The workers meet the attacks of the exploiters by strikes. In a number of places peasant uprisings take place. There is no apathy. On the contrary, the revolutionary hatred against imperialist and feudal exploitation is growing. The toiling masses are searching for new paths, for new leadership. This is the general situation at the present time when the Indian Communist Party comes forward on the arena of the world history. And if to-day the Party organisationally is not yet strong and shortcomings still exist, nevertheless there is no doubt that a united strong C.P.I. will be able, with the help of the C.I., to carry out a correct policy and win influence among the toiling masses and lead them to victory. The Communists must support the C.C. and, under its leadership, start to build local party organisations, and carry on among the workers and peasants in the mills, workshops, villages, in the trade unions and other mass organisations practical day to day work. The Communists must, as it is stated in the thesis, organise everyday struggles, rally the workers and peasants and, by a correct policy and practical work, win their confidence and in such a way systematically prepare and educate them for the revolutionary struggle, so as to be able in future, when the masses are prepared and necessary conditions exist, to conduct a revolutionary uprising for independence, land and bread.

Recent events in India show that the Communists are going ahead and that they have won increased influence among the workers and are successfully learning how to defend the interests of the workers.

The political thesis of the C.C. of the C.P.I. correctly emphasises that the Indian Communists must learn to participate in and organise the political struggle of the toiling masses, the struggle for independence. In order to build the Communist Party, to win the leadership in the mass movement and isolate the national-reformists, it is necessary for the Communists to organise and develop the struggle against the attacks of the employers, and at the

same time develop an active struggle for independence. It is necessary to respond actively and immediately to such issues as the "White Paper," the decision of the Congress leaders to abandon the civil disobedience campaign, etc., and respond not only in the form of articles, leaflets, etc., but by organising mass campaigns, actions, demonstrations, by strikes, and by energetically applying united front tactics. Only following such a line, the C.P., as it is correctly stated in the draft political thesis, will succeed in extending its influence, build mass Communist Party and establish the proletarian hegemony. And if some successes in the field of economic struggles can be noted, in the field of anti-imperialist struggle, only the very first steps are being taken. However, unless this is done the Communist Party will not be able, as it is mentioned in the political thesis of the Provisional Central Committee, to strengthen their influence and carry on a successful struggle for leadership. If the Communists do not develop energetic activity in the anti-imperialist movement, then the leaders of the National Congress and their "Left" agents, meeting with no resistance on the part of the Communist Party, will try to restore their influence and strengthen their shattered positions.

The draft of the political thesis correctly states that the Communists must do everything possible to expose the reformist leaders of the National Congress and show, using concrete examples, that the Congress leaders are not fighting for independence but, on the contrary, are disorganising the anti-imperialist struggle of the toiling masses. The C.C. of the C.P. of India speaks in its theses about these tasks. The job is to put them now into practice.

### (1) BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA

(Editor's Note: We omit the Introduction, which correctly deals with the international situation.)

A hundred and fifty years of British imperialist rule has reduced the millions of Indian toiling masses to unspeakable poverty and abject slavery. The entire social, political and economic structure of Indian society is subjected to the needs and the domination of the system of foreign imperialism, with the result that hundreds of crores of rupees are yearly squeezed out of India, and her natural development completely throttled. The national income per head has been reduced to such a low figure that the toiling masses are in a state of permanent famine and chronic starvation. "With all the power of the State in its hands, controlling the main branches of industry, railways, sea and river transport, banks and the credit system, the greater part of the land, forests and the irrigation system, British imperialism has retarded and still obstructs the economic development of our country in every way, supporting" and relying upon all that is backward and reactionary in our country."

For the preservation of its political ascendancy, British imperialism allies itself with the most reactionary social elements (such as princes, landlords, Taluqdars, compradors, moneylenders, etc.), and with their help hold India in social and economic backwardness. It preserves and perpetuates the obsolete and the pre-capitalist forms of exploitation and oppression (the native states, landlordism, usury, semi-slavery in the countryside and in the plantations).

The situation in India is growing ever more critical day by day. Fall of prices of the agricultural commodities has brought the peasant to the verge of starvation. The growing unemployment, coupled with wage-cuts and rationalisation, has reduced the worker in the city to desperation. The growing inability of the peasants to pay rents and taxes is resulting in famines and epidemics in the countryside. To top this all, there is an intensification of political oppression and imperialist terror against the

\* The draft of the political theses of the C.C. of the C.P.I. sent to us is written in a very detailed manner. Owing to lack of space we are compelled to publish it in an abridged form. In some places the abbreviations are marked.—Editor.

people in general. The strikes of the workers are being suppressed with greater violence. The taxes and rents are collected from the peasants with brutal methods which are reminiscent of feudalism, political movements are being crushed with unheard-of terror.

On the other hand, there has been a strengthening of the revolutionary upsurge of the toiling masses during the recent years. The working-class movement has grown in strength and consciousness—and has begun to come out as an independent political force. There has been a tremendous growth in the discontent of the middle classes, which found its expression in the spread of the terrorist movement. The anti-imperialist movement of the masses assumed gigantic proportions in the years 1930-32, and, in spite of the Nationalist bourgeoisie who took over control in order to localise and sabotage it, it was marked with a series of peasant revolts. It is becoming more and more clear to the people that the mass misery of the toilers, the imperialist feudal exploitation and oppression, and the enslavement of the people of India, is due to the rule of British imperialism in India. The only way out of this situation, the only way to put an end to this oppression and exploitation and to clear the path to progress is the unconditional overthrow of British imperialism and its Indian allies in India, the raising of the banner of the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution and the winning of National independence, for the establishment of a Workers' and Peasants' Federated Soviet Republic.

### (2) THE ATTITUDE OF THE VARIOUS CLASSES TOWARDS IMPERIALISM AND THE REVOLUTION

British imperialism is able to retain its hold on India only by relying upon the vested reactionary interests (like the princes, big landlords, moneylenders) and with the assistance of the Indian merchants and capitalists.

The princes and the landlords owe the rights to their property and the right to exploit the peasants and their subjects—almost entirely to the favour of British imperialism. The very condition of their parasitic existence is bound up with the domination of British imperialist rule. These classes therefore form the most stable and reliable allies of British imperialism in India. With the assistance of these classes, imperialism seeks to preserve its own reactionary rule and perpetuate all the most backward and mediæval forms of exploitation and oppression which are current to-day. In the new Constitution which is being hatched, British imperialism is going to give a permanent and stable form to this alliance, by guaranteeing an assured majority in the Federal Assembly to the reactionary bloc of the princes and landlords. This alliance will serve British imperialism not only against the revolutionary masses of India but also as a counterpoise against the bourgeois class which is pressing imperialism for an "equal partnership" in the right to exploit the Indian toilers.

### (3) THE ROLE OF THE BOURGEOISIE IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM

The birth and the development of the Indian bourgeoisie are more or less interlaced with those of British imperialism. The modern bourgeoisie in India has emerged from the Indian mercantile capitalists who grew rich by participating in the trade with the British merchants in the early decades of the 19th century. The accumulation of capital in the hands of this class was the basis of the formation of Indian industries and the growth of the Indian industrial capitalists. The aspirations of the young industrial bourgeoisie of India met with a firm resistance at the hands of the British imperialists from the very outset. The general policy of British imperialism has been to prevent the growth of large-scale industry in India, with a view to keeping India as an agrarian appendix and retain its monopolist hold on the Indian market.

Although it is true that the Indian bourgeois class in general would like to see an independent industrial development of India, it proved its inability to play a progressive role in the realisation of that demand against imperialism.

The desire of the Indian bourgeoisie to obtain a substantial share in the exploitation of the country is the basis of its oppositional role against imperialism. On the other hand, its role as capitalists and its intimate relations with the big landowning and moneylending interests is the basis of its role of a counter-revolutionary force disorganising and sabotaging the revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle for independence.

The boycott movement of 1907-08 was under the leadership of the industrial bourgeoisie (which was then relatively small) and voiced the demand for an independent industrial development of India. They showed a tendency to favour revolutionary methods of struggle in achieving this demand, as against the liberal reformists of the old Congress school. Even in the first phase of the National Congress movement, when the inherent dangers of a revolutionary movement of the masses were not fully realised by the Nationalist bourgeoisie, this tendency did not go beyond a moral support to the terrorist actions.

In the post-war revolutionary upsurge of the toiling masses of India, which grew up under the stress of the post-war crisis and under the influence of the successful proletarian revolution in Russia, the Nationalist bourgeoisie and its political organ, the Indian National Congress, took over the leadership of the movement, with the reactionary slogans of Khaddar and non-violence. The Nationalist bourgeoisie through its organ, the Indian National Congress was pursuing a dual policy. On the one hand, it was coming out as a champion of the people and as the leader of a mass movement, with the object of exerting pressure on imperialism to win for itself some concessions and to strike a favourable bargain with imperialism. On the other hand, it was using its leadership of the movement to disorganise the revolutionary struggle of the masses, to localise it and to sidetrack it into fruitless channels. As soon as it found that the movement was going out of the limits which it had set to it, it betrayed the movement—disorganised it, which helped the military and the police force of imperialism to crush the resistance of the masses.

In the present period of intense industrial and agrarian crisis the Nationalist bourgeoisie, in order to preserve control over the masses, again came forward with the slogan of independence and a mass civil disobedience. Here, again, the Indian National Congress pursued a dual policy. On the one hand it posed as the leader of a mass movement of the people in order to secure a favourable compromise with imperialism. On the other hand it played its counter-revolutionary role, disorganising and sabotaging the mass movement from within, and never actually organising a genuine mass civil disobedience movement. It betrayed the mass movement and concluded the Delhi pact as soon as the peasant movement, which grew under the stress of the agrarian crisis, began to assume a spontaneously revolutionary character.

The influence of the bourgeoisie over the masses is based on illusions which the Indian National Congress systematically tried to spread among the masses: firstly, the illusion that the bourgeoisie is fighting for independence and that a "united national front against imperialism" should be kept; and, secondly, the illusion about the possibility of a peaceful compromise with imperialism and the illusion that the National Congress is a national organisation which leads a revolutionary fight against imperialism.

While estimating the Nationalist bourgeoisie and the I.N. Congress in its relation to the revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle, it is necessary to guard against some errors. The error of mechanically placing now the bourgeoisie completely in the counter-revolutionary camp of imperialism. This error arises from the refusal to see the economic conflict between the Nationalist bourgeoisie and British imperialism. From this point of view it becomes difficult to explain the character of the leadership and the present dominating ideology of the Nationalist movement. It leads to the under-estimation of the Nationalist bourgeoisie influence on the masses, which was able to fool its petty bourgeois following by phrases about "a joint national struggle," about "complete independence," etc., and to disorganise and sabotage the movement from within.

This under-estimation of the role of the Nationalist bourgeoisie leads to a wrong thesis about the leadership of the I.N. Congress. It is wrong to say that the leadership of the I.N. Congress is petty bourgeois or even that it passed into the hands of the petty bourgeoisie during the period of 1930-31. These wrong conceptions lead to "Left" reformism of the Royist type or to an opportunist toning down of the criticism of the Congress and the Royists.

Gandhism is not a petty bourgeois philosophy. It is an anti-revolutionary ideology of the nationalist bourgeoisie and forms the basis of its programme and tactics. It serves a double purpose. By its vague phrases about love, meekness, modesty and hard-working existence, the lightening of the burden of the peasantry, the national unity and the special mission of Hinduism, etc., it mobilises the support of the petty bourgeois masses, trying

to utilise their nationalist ideas and reactionary religious prejudices. By its doctrine of "non-violence" and "truth," etc., it creates a technique of diverting the revolutionary struggle of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal masses into fruitless channels—of actually disorganising and sabotaging the struggle (disorganising the struggles in 1922 and 1931, suppressing mass Civil Disobedience Movement, etc.). It is for this reason that "Gandhism" is bolstered up and financed by the industrial and a section of the commercial bourgeoisie and by a section of landlords.

**"Left" Reformism!** If Gandhism can be considered the right-wing of the Congress bourgeois camp, "Left" reformism must be considered the left-wing of the same. The role of this aspect of Congress ideology and tactics is to retain within the fold of bourgeois leadership those sections of the petty bourgeoisie and peasantry who have begun to rebel against it. This it does by allowing its agents (Jawaharlal Nehru and others) to shout revolutionary phrases about socialism, Workers' and Peasants' Raj, to give equivocal support to the doctrine of class struggle, and so on. These phrases are used by the "Left" reformist agents of the Congress as a cloak to mask their real objective, which is to keep the rebellious petty bourgeois and peasant masses under the influence of the Congress and to assist actively the same in its task of disorganising and sabotaging the anti-imperialist struggle. This is proved by the words and deeds of **Jawaharlal Nehru**, who can be taken as an excellent exponent of Left reformism. While talking of socialism, abolition of landlordism, class struggle and of the Workers' and Peasants' Raj, he in the same breath declares his allegiances to "Gandhism." Recently he has declared that "as far as the methods are concerned, I have agreed in the past, and I agree now, wholly with the fundamental basis of Gandhi's methods of carrying on the struggle. Personally I would like to develop the economic programme in greater detail so that people may have a clear vision." (Actually to cloud their vision.) This gives a clear idea of the role of the "Left" reformists as agents of the Congress, whose special task is to prevent the breaking away of a section of the Congress following.

Finally, we have the latest and the most dangerous variety of "Left" reformism, viz., the **Royists**. This can be considered as the outpost of the Nationalist bourgeoisie inside the revolutionary anti-imperialist and workers' movement. The role of the Royists is to disorganise the advance-guard of the genuine anti-imperialist revolutionary movement from within. For this purpose, they pose as Communists and pay lip homage to the Communist International. They try to spread disorganisation inside the ranks of the anti-imperialist elements, outside the Congress by propounding the theory that "the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie has left the Congress and that the 'petty bourgeoisie has captured the leadership of the Congress'" (the Task Before Us, p. 62) and thus trying to bring these elements back into the fold of the Congress. They ally themselves with the recognised agents of Congress like **Jawaharlal Nehru**, by advancing slogans like "Constituent Assembly." In the working-class movement they shout the slogans of militant class struggle, independent leadership of the working class, but in practice they fight against the revolutionary elements of the working class and ally with rabid economists and Liberal reformists, who reject the political struggle and invite the workers to submit to the open agents of the National Congress, like **Bose** and **Ruikar**. In this manner they perform the task of disrupting and disorganising the formation of an independent revolutionary anti-imperialist bloc under the leadership of the working class. During the C.D. movement of 1930-31, this variety of "Left" reformism, carried on the most disastrous work of disrupting the independent labour movement and bringing it under the influence of the Congress (Bombay).

#### (4) THE ROLE OF THE CITY PETTY BOURGEOISIE AND THE PEASANTRY

The petty bourgeoisie—as a class—is not a homogeneous one. It consists in the city of intellectuals, students, lawyers, doctors, technical employees, clerks, small shopkeepers, etc. In the countryside we have peasants, artisans, etc. The petty bourgeoisie, in a colonial country like India, plays an important role, inasmuch as it forms, generally speaking, a class which is subject to the exploitation and oppression of imperialism and suffering from the effects of the same. At the same time, it consists of various strata bearing different relations with the exploiting class in the town and countryside. A section of the petty bourgeoisie is definitely connected with the capitalists in the city and with the landlord

and moneylenders' interests in the countryside. This section has its face turned towards the exploiting classes and nurses the ambition to become one of them. While there are other sections which, owing to the exploitation of imperialism and capitalism, are daily falling lower and lower and are being reduced to the level of poverty-stricken proletarians. During the present crisis, the condition of this section is becoming very acute (increasing unemployment among middle class intellectuals, etc.).

This intermediate position of the petty-bourgeoisie, between the exploiting classes, capitalists and landlords, on the one hand, and the exploited toiling masses on the other, also determines its political role in the anti-imperialist struggle. Thus the petty-bourgeoisie in general cannot play an independent role. Either it falls under the influence of Gandhism, "Left" national-reformism and Royism, and thus gets transformed into an appendage of the national bourgeoisie, or joins the revolutionary anti-imperialist front, under influence of the revolutionary working class.

**Peasantry.** The overwhelming majority of the population in India, i.e., about 80 per cent., consists of peasants, living on agriculture. The peasantry cannot, however, be considered as a homogeneous class. The upper strata of the peasantry, consisting of well-to-do peasants and rich peasants, have landowning and moneylending interests and are also to some extent employers of agricultural labour. The overwhelming majority of the peasantry, however, consists of poor and middle peasantry, who employ no labour. The interests of this lower strata are diametrically opposed to those of the big landlords, moneylenders, traders, etc. It is this section of the peasantry which is the gigantic reservoir of revolutionary energy. In fact, as has been said about the Indian national revolution, it can succeed only as an anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution. But the peasantry, not being an homogeneous class, being scattered and generally backward, is unable to assume an independent leadership in the anti-imperialist struggle. The history of the peasant struggles in the world have shown that the peasantry either falls under the influence of the bourgeoisie or that of the revolutionary proletariat. In the first case, it suffers defeat. In the latter case, the peasantry becomes the powerful ally of the revolutionary proletariat—a tremendous reserve force of the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution.

The peasant population forms to-day a live volcano of seething discontent and rebellion. Imperialism is well aware of this danger, and is trying to stem the tide of peasant unrest by brutal police oppression (which is mediaeval in character), on the one hand, and by means of petty remissions and reforms, on the other. These reforms (co-operatives, village uplift, etc.), insignificant as they are, are being carried out by imperialism, with the assistance of the exploiting sections themselves. The Nationalist bourgeoisie tries to spread its influence among the peasantry and tries to pose as the champion of the peasant masses, mainly with the aid of the rural well-to-do peasants. On the one hand, it seeks to control the peasant masses under the slogans regarding "the fight against the satanic government" and of "non-payment of taxes." On the other hand, with the help of the upper strata of the village, it seeks to restrict and localise the peasant struggles, to keep them on strictly reformist lines, and, whenever they outgrow these limits, to disorganise and sabotage the struggle. This mechanism by which the Nationalist bourgeoisie utilises the peasant masses for its own purposes, betraying their interests at the same time, was clearly demonstrated in the N.C.O. movement of 1919-21, and more clearly in the more recent struggles of 1930-32.

The treacherous role of the Indian National Congress was clearly demonstrated when in March, 1931, under the stress of growing peasant unrest and rebellions, it hastened to conclude a pact with imperialism and assisted imperialism in the task of suppressing the peasant unrest. In the period after the truce Mr. Gandhi openly came out as the rent and tax collector of imperialism and of zamindars. He exhorted zamindars to trust the Congressmen themselves and "realise that the Congress is a bridge between the people and the government." He assured them that the Congressmen will on their part see to it that **kisans** fulfil their obligations to the zamindars. He warned the peasants to "reject the doctrine that their holdings are absolutely theirs to the exclusion of the zamindars." During 1931, i.e., after the truce, there was a strong rise in the peasant unrest, and in some places peasants started no-tax, no-rent movements over the heads of the Congress leaders (U.P.). The Indian National Congress sabotaged it, and after the no-tax ordinance was issued by the government (in U.P. and N.W.F.P.) it again nominally re-started the civil dis-

obedience movement in January, 1932, under the effect of the rebuff it received at the second round table conference, but actually did its best to disorganise and sabotage it wherever it was going on.

As a result of these experiences of the C.D. movement, discontent is accumulating among the peasantry against the leadership of the I.N. Congress. Congress itself is aware of it and is allowing its "Left" exponent to speak in equivocal terms about class struggle and shout vague phrases of the liquidation of landlordism. (Jawaharlal Nehru's recent utterances.) However, the consciousness of the peasantry is growing. But this process of isolation of the counter-revolutionary bourgeois leadership can never be complete unless and until the alternative proletarian leadership is demonstrated in the actual struggle.

The struggle against the bourgeoisie and bourgeois Congress leadership must be carried on consistently. It is necessary to expose the policy of Bose, Nehru, Roy, etc., who are trying to keep the rank and file with a slogan to revolutionise the Congress and convert it into revolutionary party. But while exposing this the Communists will not refuse through some of the mass organisations of the toilers to use the Congress platform and systematically combat the Congress reformism and its "Left" varieties. This tactical proposal of the Communist Party, which remains an independent party of the proletariat outside the I.N.C. and consistently combats the Congress policy and at the same time organises the toiling masses in the trade unions, peasant committees, youth organisations, anti-imperialist organisations, etc., has nothing in common with the treacherous policy of Royists and other "Left" national reformists.

#### (5) WORKING CLASS

The working class of India, although it forms a minority of the exploited toilers, occupies the key positions in the modern economic structure of India. It is the most revolutionary and the most determined opponent of every form of oppression, exploitation and slavery.

"The working class in India is subject to the most merciless exploitation by native as well as foreign capital; in certain industries the conditions of life and work amount to semi-slavery (mines, plantations). There is a complete absence of any working class political rights. The existing labour code is most unsatisfactory and even as it is, it is not uniformly applied by the capitalists and millowners. The level of the class-consciousness and the organisation of the Indian working class has developed tremendously.

This is proved by the history of the development of the working-class movement in India during the last two decades. Although the rise of trade unionism in India did not begin until 1919, still there were a number of economic and even political strikes before that period, especially in the advanced industrial centres. In the period of post-war crisis, i.e., during 1919-22, there was a further maturing of the Indian proletariat. During the period there were a great number of big strikes in Bombay, Ahmedabad and other towns, which brought forward the working class as an active political force. It was during this period that a systematic effort was made by the agents of the bourgeoisie and imperialism to take over the leadership of the working class movement by laying the foundations of the trade union movement on the lines of the reformist British trade union movement (first T.U. Congress, Trade Union Act, etc.).

The second phase of the working-class movement began in 1924. During this period a tremendous development of the strike struggle throughout India took place, and there was a rapid growth of class-consciousness and organisation, resulting in the complete ousting of the Liberal reformists from the leadership of the movement in a number of important places. In 1927-28, the workers, especially in Bombay and Calcutta, came out under the red flag, cleared out the reactionary leadership of the Liberal reformists and began building up their own gigantic organisations under their own militant leadership (Bombay textile strikes). During this period, the Communists, working through the workers' and peasants' parties, achieved the first success in rousing the workers to come out and participate in political demonstrations, etc., on their own slogans and under their own platform (boycott of Simon and Whitley Commissions—demonstrations in Bombay and Calcutta, etc.). The workers' and peasants' party movement which grew up on the basis of the slogans: "Independence through mass revolution

of workers and peasants"—"Workers' and Peasants' Republic," etc., took the first step towards its consolidation as an independent movement under the leadership of the working class and distinct from the national reformist congress movement (the first All-Indian Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference). It was the effect of all these events that caused the imperialist government to launch the Meerut Trial, in order to crush the rising working-class movement which threatened to make a bid as an independent political force, to become the leader and the organiser of the revolutionary mass movement of the workers and peasants against the treachery of the nationalist bourgeoisie and for the overthrow of British imperialism.

The advance of the working-class movement all over India resulted in rising discontent amongst the urban petty bourgeoisie. There was a growing radicalisation in this class, insistence on the demand for national independence, and a rapid spread and popularisation of the Marxist ideology among this class. These events, together with the growing resistance on the part of the British imperialists to grant any concessions to the Indian bourgeoisie (because of the world crisis in 1929-32), forced the Indian National Congress to adopt in words the slogan of "complete independence" (Lahore Congress, 1929) and to launch upon a reformist campaign in order to keep control over the masses, to retain its leadership over the masses and thus disorganise and sabotage the revolutionary struggle of the masses from within.

The period which succeeded the Meerut arrests was characterised not only by a severe and continued attack against the young revolutionary movement of the working class, but also by an attempt on the part of the national bourgeoisie and its "Left" agents to enter into the working-class movement and to split and disorganise it from within (G.I.P. railway strike, formation of Congress Labour offices in Bombay workers' area, split in G.K.U., national reformist activities of Khandalkar, Roy and others—split in the Calcutta Trade Union Congress—subsequent activities of the Left agents of the Congress, etc.). Because of this combined attack, the organisation of the working class suffered to a considerable extent during the past two or three years (G.K.U. and the G.I. Railway Unions). On the other hand, during this very period, great working-class actions took place, such as the further extension of the strike struggle to other working-class centres (Sholapur, Bangalore, Baroda, and so on); participation of the workers in spontaneous uprising against the imperialist police (Sholapur); clear demarcation of the revolutionary working-class movement from the national bourgeois movement (struggle of the Bombay workers against the Congress in 1930); and finally independent demonstrations by the working class under the leadership of the Communists against Gandhi and the Congress (demonstration in Bombay against Gandhi, etc.). These events show that in spite of heavy odds, the revolutionary working class is steadily growing in consciousness and liberating itself from the influence of the nationalist bourgeoisie and preparing itself to come forward as the leader and organiser of the revolutionary anti-imperialist and agrarian movement of the Indian toiling masses.

The conclusion at which we arrive is, therefore, that the working class is the most consistently revolutionary class. The rapid growth of the class-consciousness and the organisation of the working class during the last decades, its coming forward into the political arena as an active and independent force, proves that it is destined to establish its hegemony in the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. **This destiny of the working class will not be realised spontaneously or automatically. It requires conscious efforts on the part of the most advanced and class-conscious elements of the proletariat.** For realising its destiny as the leader of the Indian Revolution, and for performing its historic task of organising the scattered masses of the peasantry and town poor for the struggle against British domination and landlordism, the working class must organise its own political party, the **Communist Party**—consisting of the most courageous, resolute, disciplined and of the most conscious and advanced elements. The struggle for the formation of a united centralised and a mass underground Communist Party is the first essential pre-requisite for the realisation of the historic mission of the working class of India.

There has been a tendency among some Communists in India to interpret the temporary setback suffered by the organisations of the working class in the year 1930 as a general spread of "reaction" among the proletariat. Further, it has been held that the working class came into movement under the influence of the dissatisfied petty



bourgeoisie and fell under its leadership. This interpretation is wrong. We have already shown above that the petty bourgeoisie "came into movement" under the influence of the independent political activity of the working class in 1928-29 (strikes, demonstrations against the Simon and Whitley Commissions and the revolutionary position of the working class at Nagpur T.U.C., etc.).

To accept the theory of "reaction" and to hold that the working class came into movement under the influence of the petty bourgeoisie in 1930, is to deny the independent role of the working class in the national revolutionary struggle—to deny the possibility and the need for fight at the present time for its hegemony in the anti-imperialist struggle of the exploited masses—and therefore to underestimate the need for the formation of the revolutionary party of the working class—the Communist Party of India. It must be clearly understood that there is a "growing revolutionary movement in India and growing independent political activity of the working class." To-day the advanced sections of the working class are liberating themselves more and more from the treacherous influence of the nationalist bourgeoisie and the Congress. This is proved by the fact that the very same reformist leaders who in 190-31 swore by the Congress, are to-day speaking in a different tone before the masses. Realising that the Congress has lost its influence on the working class masses, they are to-day advising the workers to remain aloof from politics, to restrict themselves merely to economic struggle. This is to-day the only way in which they (Ruikar, Kandalkar, Roy) hope to isolate the workers from the influence of the revolutionary leadership. The formation of independent "labour" parties in the various provinces to-day is an indication of the same process. The national-reformist labour leaders can no more come forward before the workers with the slogans "support the Congress" or that the "workers and peasants are the hands and feet of the Congress." (Congress Labour Week in Bombay, 1930.)

In a booklet entitled "Our Task in India," M. N. Roy declares: "the backward Indian masses, brutally oppressed and mercilessly exploited by foreign imperialism and its native allies, are not yet politically conscious. They are not able to grasp big political issues. National freedom remains an abstract conception for them."

This view, that the Indian toiling masses, including the workers, are not yet ripe for the struggle for independence, is a flat denial of the hegemony of the proletariat in the national revolutionary struggle. Mr. Roy tries now to deceive the middle-class youths into the belief that he stands for the revolution by repeating phrases about the "hegemony of the proletariat in the struggle for independence" and about the "Communist Party" in his English leaflets (Our Task in India), but the actual course followed by the Royists is the merging with the "Left" Nationalists and national reformists (support of Bose, Giri and others), the limiting of the struggle of the working class to purely economic struggle (identification with Alve, Jhabhwala and Col); and the direct participation in the struggle against the Communists in the labour movement and in strike-breaking activities (events in Bombay in August and September). Thus in spite of the verbal support given by Roy in his eclectic writings to the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat, his theoretical statements and his whole practice consists of a bitter struggle against it and against the C.P. of India, against the interests of workers and peasants and against anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution.

#### (6) THE CHARACTER OF THE NATIONAL REVOLUTION IN INDIA

As laid down in the colonial thesis of the Sixth World Congress of the C.I., the revolution in India will have to perform the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, which opens the way to proletarian dictatorship and socialist revolution. The imperialist domination in India bears the character of an absolutist State, under which there are no democratic rights, such as freedom of press, speech and association, and which is an open expression of the fact of the national enslavement of the Indian people as a whole. Finally, the imperialist government relies in its political and economic subjugation in the main on the support of the princes, landlords and zamindars, and therefore upholds the entire system of pre-capitalist exploitation in the countryside (landlordism, usury, semi-serfdom, feudalism, etc.).

The Indian revolution in its present state will have to carry out the following tasks laid down in the draft platform of the C.P.I.:

(1) The complete independence of India by the overthrow of British rule. The cancellation of all debts. The confiscation and nationalisation of all factories, banks, railways, sea and river transport and plantations.

(2) The establishment of a Soviet government. The right of nations to self-determination, including separation. Abolition of the native states. The creation of an Indian Federal Workers' and Peasants' Soviet Republic.

(3) The confiscation without compensation of all the lands, forests and other property of the landlords, ruling princes, churches, the British government, officials and moneylenders and handing them over for use to the toiling peasantry. Cancellation of slave agreements and all the indebtedness of the peasantry to moneylenders and banks.

(4) The eight-hour working day and the radical improvement of conditions of labour. Increase in wages and state maintenance for the unemployed, etc.

When we say that the revolution in India will have to carry out these democratic tasks, we do not mean either that it will be a revolution under the leadership of the bourgeoisie or that it will aim at establishing the rule of "bourgeois democracy," i.e., rule of the bourgeoisie. In the class analysis of the Indian society which we have given above we have conclusively shown that the Nationalist bourgeoisie actively disorganises and sabotages the revolutionary anti-imperialist movement from within, and, further, that with the growing strength of this movement it goes over to more open forms of anti-revolutionary activity.

The experience of the class struggle shows that the success of the revolution will be guaranteed by a revolutionary alliance of the workers, peasants and the town poor, under the leadership of the working class and its vanguard, the C.P. of India, and therefore the state which will emerge out of the revolution will necessarily be a Workers' and Peasants' Soviet Government. In the words of the draft platform: "The Communist Party of India is the Party of the working class, the final aim of which is the achievement of Socialism and ultimately of Communism. The programme of the C.P.I. is totally different in principle from the programmes and ideas of the other parties and groups which are parties of the capitalist class and petty-bourgeoisie, not excepting national revolutionary parties. While the latter strive for the development of capitalism in India, the C.P.I. consistently and firmly fights for a socialist path of development. While the national revolutionary groups are fighting for bourgeois rule and a bourgeois form of government, the C.P. of India is fighting for the democratic dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry, a Workers' and Peasants' Soviet Government in India."

The structure of the state is built on the councils of representatives (Soviets) elected in every area, on the basis of the units of production. This ensures the drawing in of all the toilers in the task of governing as toilers, workers, peasants, artisans, and so on. This ensures a real democracy of the toilers, as it has already been preceded by a successful revolution, involving (1) the overthrow of the British rule; (2) confiscation and nationalisation of all factories, banks, railways, etc.; and (3) the confiscation without compensation of all the lands, forests, and other property of the landlords, ruling princes, etc. The Workers' and Peasants' Soviet Government of India will ensure the fullest democracy to the toilers and be an organ of dictatorship against the exploiting classes, and thus be a guarantee against the counter-revolutionary efforts of the imperialists and dispossessed exploiters.

In view of certain misconceptions which are current in India, with reference to the character of the revolution, it is necessary to stress that the task of the immediate stage of the revolution in India is not the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The tasks of creating the conditions for a proletarian dictatorship involves the overthrow of imperialism, abolition of landlordism, and the strengthening of the organisation of the proletariat in relation to other exploited classes. The creation of these pre-requisites can be achieved by the working class only in the closest alliance with the toiling peasantry, which thus forms the principal and the most important reserve force of the revolution. The Communist Party of India, being the Party of the proletariat, undoubtedly strives as its ultimate aim for the dictatorship of the proletariat and through it for the establishment of Socialism and complete Communism. But, basing itself on a correct Marxist analysis of the relation of class forces in India, it realises that first it is necessary to mobilise the widest possible masses for the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution.

But the process of the revolution does not stop there. The C.P.I. visualises the process of the Indian revolution as follows:—

“The successful solution of the problems facing the revolution against feudalism and for emancipation—will open up the possibility, with the help of the international proletariat and the class offensive of the exploited masses of our country, of the revolution developing through a number of stages into the proletarian revolution, thereby creating the requisite conditions for the development of our country on socialist lines, avoiding the further stage of domination of the capitalist system.”

But this development will be determined “by struggle and struggle alone,” i.e., by the revolutionary struggle of the colonial peoples and the world proletariat for the overthrow of imperialism, and of the exploiting classes who stand behind it.

#### Revolution in India a Soviet Revolution, and the Present Tasks

The character of the revolution as a workers' and peasants' revolution also determines the form of the organisation of the struggle. It is clear that the overthrow of the rule of British imperialism and the princes and landlords can only be achieved by the workers, peasants, and soldiers, under the leadership of the working class and its Party, the C.P.I. **In order, however, to arrive at this stage, and to ensure the leadership of the working class, it is necessary to develop now the struggle for partial demands and organise and prepare the toiling masses.** In the course of developing the struggle of the workers and peasants, combined with the formation of the mass trade unions, and especially the local organisations of the Communist Party, it is necessary to extend the struggles of the toiling masses. In the present conditions the general perspective of the struggle of the toiling masses is correctly expressed in the slogan of the general political strike. It is necessary to develop the strike struggles into a general strike and convert it into a general political strike. The draft platform of the C.P.I. lays down this task in the following words:—

**“The C.P. of India calls upon all class-conscious workers and revolutionaries to assist in transforming individual strikes of the workers into a general political strike, as a resolute step in organising the revolutionary struggle of the masses of the people for independence, land and a workers' and peasants' government under the guidance of the working class.**

To develop the spontaneous peasant movement for the non-payment of rent, debts, and taxes into an All-India movement and direct it into the channels of an agrarian revolution. To develop a nation-wide movement against the Constitution, attracting the petty-bourgeoisie to the side of the workers and peasants and isolating the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois National Congress. . . . The organs of struggle will develop out of these steps and in such a manner that the leadership of the working class in the revolutionary struggle is progressively achieved. (This question is dealt with in the thesis in a more detailed manner.—Editor.)

It is of the utmost importance in every strike struggle, however limited and local, always to urge the workers to conduct their own struggles through the medium of their strike committees, elected from the entire mass of workers participating in any particular conflict. It will thus be possible to develop the initiative and fighting capacity of the working class and prepare and train an advance-guard from the working class, which will not only lead the workers but also the peasants and the other exploited sections. The workers who have thus learned to conduct their struggles through strike committees and other working-class organisations will be able to show the peasants the way to the organisation of the peasant struggle, in which the leadership is not in the hands of the treacherous bourgeoisie, but the local peasant committees elected by the toiling peasants. This will enable the peasants to seek their path towards the creation of revolutionary peasant committees, which will lead and carry out the tasks of the agrarian revolution. The anti-imperialist petty-bourgeoisie can be won, during the process of the development of the struggle, on the basis of general democratic demands and the specific demands of this class (clerks, technicians, etc.), to support the revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses. (This question is dealt with in the thesis in a more detailed manner.—Editor.)

Thus we conclude that the revolution of the Indian people against British imperialism can be successful only as an anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution, carried through by the exploited masses—viz., workers and peasants and the town poor— attracting the broad strata of urban petty-bourgeoisie to fight for

independence under the leadership of the working class and its vanguard, the C.P.I. It is necessary to develop the initiative and the fighting cadres mainly from the working class and also from the toiling peasants. This can be done only during the process of struggle, in developing mass actions and formation of various working-class organisations: trade unions, mill committees, committees of action and strike committees, and revolutionary peasant committees.

#### “Constituent Assembly”—A Reformist Slogan

The slogan of “Constituent Assembly” has been put forward by the renegade M. N. Roy against the slogan of the “Workers' and Peasants' Soviet Republic” put forward by the Communist Party of India. It has been pointed out above all that M. N. Roy and his group, masking themselves with revolutionary and pseudo-Communist phraseology, came forward during the civil disobedience movement of 1930-31, and called upon the working class to follow the Congress leadership and policy, and thereby spread disruption inside the ranks of the revolutionary workers (Bombay, splitting G.K.U.). Roy's policy emerges logically out of the imperialist policy of “decolonisation,” according to which British imperialism is playing a progressive role, and thus a way for a peaceful victory is secured. The leadership of the Congress and the C.D. movement, according to him, was in the hands of the petty-bourgeoisie (“Our Tasks in India,” page 46), and under this pretext he called upon the workers and peasants to follow the Congress leadership (workers and peasants are the hands and feet of the Congress—Royist slogan in 1930), i.e., to support the bourgeoisie. In 1930 Roy and his followers (in the declaration of June 8, 1930, published in Berlin and republished in India in the appeal of Sheik, Kabadi and Brojesh Singh in the magazine “Vanguard,” Bombay) maintained that:—

“The central political slogan of the Indian revolution should be the election of a Constituent Assembly, as against the Round Table Conference on the one hand and the Utopia of a Soviet Republic on the other. . . .”

He further went on to describe how the idea of the Constituent Assembly can be realised:—

“The local Congress Committees broadened through the inclusion of the delegates from the workers' and peasants' and small traders' organisations should become the units for the election of the Constituent Assembly.”

It is well known that the slogan of “Constituent Assembly” was a revolutionary slogan of the bourgeoisie at a time when this class played a revolutionary role. But it must be remembered that at that time while putting this slogan the bourgeoisie and some petty-bourgeois parties connected it with a slogan of a revolutionary insurrection. But Roy advanced this slogan without saying anything about the revolution while this is the central issue. Roy and his followers proposed to create under the protection of the British army “an organ of democratic power,” maintaining that the British would be unable to do anything “for the sovereign authority of the Constituent Assembly cannot be doubted.” (“Vanguard,” page 12; “People,” Jan. 21, 1931.) And now when the Indian bourgeoisie is reformist—this slogan was put forward as part of a reformist policy and served one purpose, and that is to fool a section of the petty-bourgeoisie following the Congress, who are showing radical tendencies and keep them under the Congress leadership. By proposing to make the Congress Committees, “broadened by the inclusion of the delegates of the workers' and peasants' and small traders' organisations,” Mr. Roy wished to perpetuate the illusion that the Indian National Congress is the organisation of the masses, with the object of bringing the workers' and peasants' organisations under the treacherous leadership of the bourgeoisie.

In his latest booklet, “Our Tasks in India,” which purports to be the programme adopted by the “Revolutionary Party of the Indian Working Class” which he styles “The Communist Party of India,” the Roy group has given a new formulation of the slogan. In view of the collapse of the C.D. movement in 1931-32 and the general leftward trend of the masses of the petty-bourgeoisie, the Roy group was forced to change for a time its slogan of a peaceful victory through a Constituent Assembly.

But a careful perusal of this book reveals that beneath the layer of Communist revolutionary phrases is hidden a denial of Communist revolutionary practice. In this whole book, where he protects the bourgeois Congress, there is no mention whatsoever of such important steps as “the development of a general strike

and its development into a political strike." His policy, as it is described in the book, and especially all his activities are directed against the hegemony of the proletariat. Similarly, Roy writes about the nationalisation of land, etc., but at the same time he is against developing now the non-payment of rent, taxes, and debt movement. Roy speaks about the hegemony of the proletariat, but proposes to build a "party of radicals" to lead the masses and forms a reformist All-India Socialist Party, etc. This policy amounts to disorganisation of the struggle for independence and consists in the denial of the leading role of the working class in the revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses of India against British imperialism, it leads to the consolidation of the influence and the leadership of the treacherous bourgeoisie over the toiling masses and the betrayal of socialism.

Roy's "Constituent Assembly" is the same National Congress with the same bourgeois programme and substance. And now when the masses become dissatisfied with the Congress and its reformist policy, when the masses protest against its policy of abandoning and disorganising the mass struggle for independence, the bourgeoisie and its Right wing (including Swarajists, etc.) accept the slogan of Constituent Assembly and are trying under cover of the slogan of the Constituent Assembly, to carry out the old reformist policy, to mobilise support of the masses for compromise and Legislative Assembly. The facts of the last months proved clearly that the slogan of Constituent Assembly becomes the main weapon in the hands of reformists to fool the masses. The Communists are prepared to co-operate and to support any real revolutionary struggle for independence against British imperialism, in spite of any differences as to the main slogans which may exist. But the Communist Party will always fight reformism whatever forms or slogans it may adopt.

That is why the "Left" Nehru, Bose and Co. immediately came out in support of the Constituent Assembly. This also explains why the bourgeoisie, including Roy and his friends, are so bitterly opposed to the slogan of the Indian Federative Soviet Workers' and Peasants' Republic advanced by the Communist Party of India. For this revolutionary slogan of the Communist Party, which in the present period signifies the democratic dictatorship of the working class and peasantry, is wholly directed against imperialism, feudalism, and also against the treacherous reformist policy of the bourgeoisie, which is doing its best to draw the masses away from revolutionary mass struggle into the channels of support of reformist, parliamentary manoeuvres of the capitalists.

#### (7) STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF THE C.P. IN THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

The principal objective of the C.P. to-day must be to come out as the conscious vanguard of the working class—and to move forward towards the demonstration of the independent leadership of the working class in opposition to the nationalist bourgeoisie in the struggle of the masses to overthrow imperialism and landlordism. We have shown that a revolutionary wave is rising in India. There is growing discontent among the workers against the Congress and its policy. The "Left" agents of the Congress dare not call upon the workers to support the Congress, but they call upon them to confine their struggle to pure economic struggle, or to organise themselves into an "Independent Political Party"—with a strictly reformist and legal programme of getting redressed their grievances through representation in Councils, etc. (Jhabwalla, Alew, Ruikar's speeches formulating the policies of Labour Parties in the various provinces). Similarly there is growing dissatisfaction among the peasantry and the middle-class youths with the Congress. In the present situation the application of correct tactics and strategy will to a great extent determine, "Whether the treacherous national bourgeoisie will continue for long to maintain their influence over the toiling masses, or whether the working class, headed by the C.P., having isolated the national reformists, will lead the toiling masses of town and village to a victorious struggle for independence, and the workers' and peasants' power (Open Letter).

#### Tactics in Relation to the National Bourgeoisie and Its Political Organ

As pointed out in previous sections, it is necessary to understand two things—that the national bourgeoisie has not as yet completely merged itself into the counter-revolutionary bloc of imperialism and feudal princes and landlords, and (2) that it is

carrying out a liberal opposition, whose main purpose is to disorganise and sabotage the revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle of the masses from within; it is dead against anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution of the toiling masses and is afraid of the working class. An incorrect appreciation of these two points may lead to incorrect tactics—as was shown by our experience during the C.D. movement. On the one hand there was a tendency to regard the anti-imperialist movement of 1930-31 as a movement of the petty-bourgeoisie. This interpretation involves a denial of the fact that the leadership of the C.D. movement never passed out of the hands of the national bourgeoisie. Further, it involves the denial of the proletariat and peasantry as the driving forces of the revolution. It was natural, therefore, that such a tendency should give rise to the "Theory of Reaction," to the practical withdrawal of the slogan of "General Strike" and to the efforts at securing unity with Khandalkar in such a manner that the differences between reformism and the class point of view disappear. These deviations, which have been discussed at considerable length in the "Open Letter," must be combated.

On the other hand, there was a tendency to regard the whole anti-imperialist movement of 1930-31 as a purely Congress movement and to remain aloof from it. It is a fact that during the C.D. movement of 1930-31 Communists did not realise the full significance of the movement and objectively isolated themselves from the struggle of the masses. This sectarian deviation, too, must be corrected.

It is necessary to realise that the national bourgeoisie and its organ, the National Congress, still wield considerable influence over the masses. The secret of its influence is not its positive political programme, but the assurances of its loyalty to the independence movement, the skilful use it makes of the hatred of the people towards bloodthirsty robber imperialism and of the still existing illusions of a "United national front." The Colonial Theses of the C.I. have put the position in the following words: "The masses see the chief immediate enemy of national emancipation in the form of the imperialist feudal bloc, which in itself is correct at this stage of the movement in India, Egypt, and Indonesia (as far as one side of the matter is concerned). It is in the struggle against this ruling counter-revolutionary force that the Indian, Egyptian, and Indonesian Communists must proceed in advance of all. They must fight more determinedly, more consistently and more resolutely than any petty-bourgeois section of the national revolutionary group."

But this fight cannot be carried on in a manner unrelated to the exposure of the bourgeoisie and the "Left" agents. In fact, a determined and resolute struggle against imperialism by the Communists necessarily involves the struggle for the leadership of the toiling masses—the ruthless struggle against national reformist leadership. In the words of the Open Letter:—

"In order to isolate the National Congress and all the 'Left' national reformists from the toiling masses, in order to help the separation of the forces of revolution and counter-revolution and to establish the hegemony of the proletariat in the struggle of the people, the Indian Communists must take the most energetic part in the anti-imperialist movement and must be in the forefront of all activities, demonstrations and clashes of the toiling masses with the imperialists, coming forward as the organisers of the mass struggle everywhere and all times exposing openly and by concrete examples the treachery of the bourgeois National Congress and its "Left" wing. It is necessary to participate in all mass demonstrations organised by the Congress, coming forward with our own Communist slogans and agitation; support all the revolutionary student demonstrations, be at the forefront of the clashes with the police, protesting against all political arrests, etc., constantly criticising the Congress leaders, especially the 'Left,' and calling on the masses for higher forms of struggle, setting before the toiling masses ever more concrete and ever more revolutionary tasks." (Here the theses describe in a detailed way how to expose the boycott slogan.—Editor.)

The slogan of civil disobedience was never actually carried into effect. The Congress promised to do this, but every time when the movement for the non-payment of rent, taxes and debt began to develop, the Congress leaders came out and disorganised it.

### Harijan Movement

Similarly, while exposing the stunt of the Harijan movement as a means of side-tracking the attention of the masses from the political movement, we must also show to the untouchable toilers that their emancipation cannot be achieved by their being taken into the fold of Hinduism. The problem of the untouchables, who are for the most part landless labourers and semi-serfs, cannot be radically solved until imperialism and landlordism and all remnants of feudalism are overthrown. We must expose the "Harijan movement" of Gandhi before the untouchable workers and peasants by showing to them that "Gandhi and the other Congress leaders call for the maintenance of the caste system (Hinduism), which is the basis and justification for the existence of the socially outcast pariahs." We must point out to the untouchables that "only the ruthless abolition of the caste system in its reformed Gandhist variety, only the agrarian revolution and the overthrow of the British rule will lead to the complete emancipation of the working pariahs and slaves."

### United Anti-Imperialist Front under Proletarian Leadership

In order to isolate the nationalist bourgeoisie and its political organs, the Indian National Congress, from the masses, in order to develop the anti-imperialist struggle, the Communist Party must win the leadership in the anti-imperialist movement of the masses. Only a strong C.P. with its roots in the proletarian masses will be able to come forward as the leader and organiser of the toiling masses in their struggle against British imperialism, to build a united anti-imperialist front under proletarian leadership—to liberate the masses of the peasantry and town petty-bourgeoisie from bourgeois influence and convert the peasantry into its ally in the revolutionary struggle.

The C.P. of India must develop a broad anti-imperialist movement, taking now as one of the starting points a campaign against the Constitution. One of the forms of broad anti-imperialist movement can be the **Anti-imperialist League**. The League must come out as an organisation opposing the policy of the Congress. It must constantly criticise the national reformist leaders and organisations, and participate under its own banner and slogans in the mass demonstrations, etc., organised by the Congress.

The isolation of the national reformist organisation and leadership from the toiling masses can be achieved only when the Communists prove able to demonstrate **in action** their leadership in the anti-imperialist struggle and in the struggles of the peasants and workers. To do this the C.P. must come openly before the toiling masses, and, besides carrying work direct in its name, in the leaflets, etc., signed by the C.P., meetings, etc., should also utilise every open mass organisation as well, as, for instance, trade unions, the Anti-imperialist League, etc., working there as the most consistent defender of the interests and demands of all the exploited classes against British imperialism, as the most resolute and determined fighter for national independence, land, and a workers' and peasants' government.

The struggle for the realisation of the hegemony of the proletariat must necessarily be a struggle against Royism as well. This struggle against Roy must be carried out on the basis of concrete material and examples, comparing their pseudo Communist phrases with their anti-revolutionary practice. It is necessary to multiply hundredfold our activity among the working class and demonstrate the treachery of Roy and his followers in the struggle. It also means that it is permissible and advisable to propose a united front on concrete issues to those mass organisations (trade unions, etc.), which are led by the reformists, including those of Roy-Karnik-Kara variety.

Another petty-bourgeois group, which the C.P. has to deal with, is the terrorist. As stated above, the phenomenal growth of **terrorism** is due to the rising discontent among the impoverished middle class of the villages and towns. Further, after 1928, and under the influence of the revolutionary movement of the workers, socialist and Communist phraseology began to find currency in these groups. It is quite likely that the terrorists may develop social revolutionary tendencies, i.e., they may take up mass work among the peasantry on the basis of a bourgeois peasant programme. Although some of these groups repeat Marxist-Communist phrases, and oppose Gandhism in their leaflets, they do not recognise the class struggle in practice and are still labouring under the "illusions of a united national front." In this way they are under bourgeois influence and believe in the possibility of an independent bourgeois capitalist development in India, under the

rule of the Indian bourgeoisie. With the development of class struggle in India, i.e., with the development of the struggle of the workers and peasants against imperialism and landlordism and millowners, the process of differentiation will take place among them. It is the duty of the C.P.I. to win over the rank and file of the terrorist groups, and especially of those groups who are showing inclinations towards Marxism and Communism, to the standpoint of consistent Marxism and of the draft platform of the C.P.I. While recognising the heroism and the self-sacrifice of individual terrorists, it is essential to point out the futility and harmfulness of the method of individual terrorism, showing at the same time that Communists believe that it is only the mass action of the revolutionary workers and peasants and the town poor which will overthrow the rule of British imperialism. Individual terrorist acts create obstacles to the work of the revolutionary organisations of the toiling masses by over-emphasising the role of individual action as against mass action. Even actions like the Chittagong Raid, while demonstrating the possibility of a successful attack upon certain sectors of the imperialist power by relatively small armed groups of revolutionaries, remain but isolated events totally unconnected with the masses. It is necessary, therefore, to carry on agitation among the rank and file of those terrorist groups and win them to the side of Communism.

### Tactics of the Agrarian Revolution

The Colonial Theses of the C.I. have correctly pointed out that the agrarian revolution is the axis of the national revolution in India and the colonies. The C.P.I. will be able to establish its leadership in the revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses against imperialism only when it unfolds the banner of the agrarian revolution. In India, the national bourgeoisie, through the upper layer of the village, still wields certain influence on the peasant masses. But because of the experience of the struggles of the past three to four years this influence is waning. Because of the continued agrarian crisis, which has increased the burdens on the shoulders of the already impoverished peasantry, there has been a tremendous growth of a spontaneous peasant movement. In certain parts (Burma) it assumed the character of a guerilla warfare. In U.P., C.P., and Bengal there have been a series of peasant uprisings. The national bourgeoisie and its organ, the National Congress, while putting forward the slogans of a "no-tax" campaign, in reality did everything actively to sabotage it. Under the pressure of the spontaneous rising of the peasants, the I.N.C. called off the movement and, after the Gandhi-Irwin pact, it actively helped the British imperialists to collect taxes and rents from the peasants. In U.P., at the end of 1931, the no-tax-rent campaign was started by the peasants in spite of the I.N. Congress, and the Congress hastened to participate in it, again to localise and disorganise it. To-day the Congress has retreated still further: it has called off the mass civil disobedience movement and dropped the item of no-tax campaign even from its programme. Jawaharlal Nehru, who talks of destroying landlordism, etc., has reaffirmed his complete agreement with Gandhi's latest moves and methods. It is the duty of the C.P.I. to expose these treacherous activities of the National Congress and its "Left" leaders before the peasantry and point out to them, on the basis of concrete instances, that the Congress is an organisation supported by the bourgeoisie and liberal landlords and moneylenders, and that it will never really fight for the interests of the workers and peasants. The C.P.I. must point out to the peasantry and show in actual practice that it is the working class alone which can consistently support all its demands and help to organise its fight for them.

The general demands which the C.P.I. must put before the peasantry are enumerated in the Draft Platform under the Peasant Demands. They are as follows:—

(1) The C.P. of India stands for the confiscation without compensation of all the lands and estates, forests and pastures of the native princes, landlords, moneylenders, and the British government and their transfer to the use of the toiling masses of the peasants through peasant committees. The C.P. of India stands for the complete destruction of mediæval landownership, and the cleansing of the whole country from all mediæval rubbish.

(2) The C.P. of India struggles for the immediate nationalisation of all plantations and for putting them at the disposal of revolutionary committees, elected by the plantation workers, to be used in the interests of the entire Indian people.



(3) The C.P. of India struggles for the immediate nationalisation of the entire irrigation system, the complete annulment of all debts and taxes, and the handing over of the direction and control over its work to revolutionary peasant committees, elected by the toiling peasants.

(4) The C.P. of India calls on the peasants and the village proletariat to carry out all kinds of political demonstrations, to make collective refusals to pay exactions and taxes.

(5) The C.P. of India calls for a refusal to pay rent, the cost of irrigation, contributions, and to refuse to carry out any work whatever (begar) for the landlords, native princes, and their agents.

(6) The C.P. of India calls for a refusal to pay debts and obligations to the government, landlords, and moneylenders in any form whatever.

(7) As a practical slogan of agitation among the peasants and as a means of giving the greatest consciousness to the peasant movement, the C.P. of India calls for the immediate organisation of the revolutionary peasant committees, with the aim of carrying on a struggle for the revolutionary-democratic changes to free the peasants from the oppression of Anglo-Indian imperialism and its feudal allies.

(8) The C.P. of India calls for the independent organisation of the village proletariat, especially the plantation workers, for fusing it with the proletariat of the towns, under the banner of the Communist Party, and for electing representatives of it to the peasant committees.

**The C.P. of India is firmly convinced that the complete, consistent and firm carrying out of the above-mentioned political and social changes can only be achieved by overthrowing British rule and forming an Indian Federated Workers' and Peasants' Soviet Government.**

In order to popularise these demands amongst the peasantry and to carry out the tasks outlined therein, it is necessary to send class-conscious workers from the industrial areas and tried revolutionary students to the countryside and utilise their contacts with the peasantry to form **peasant groups**. These groups will be the nuclei for spreading revolutionary propaganda and literature in the countryside, and with their help it will be possible to participate and take initiative in the local peasant struggle for day-to-day economic demands of the peasantry. With the help of these groups it is necessary to participate in the local peasant conferences, etc., held under the auspices of reformists and nationalists and put forward our programme before the peasants. Wherever possible, attempts should be made to form local peasant unions, rallying large masses of poor and middle peasantry. With the help of all these organisations it will be possible to organise mass resistance to the oppression of local exploiters (landlords and moneylenders) and the imperialist government. These committees and local unions will be the instruments for spreading the class struggle in the countryside. In every individual conflict of the peasant masses against the government, landlords, and moneylenders, it is necessary to organise a peasant committee, which will be elected by the peasants themselves, and which will be the leading organ of the struggle. In the day-to-day propaganda it is essential to acquaint the peasantry with the struggle of the working class against the capitalists in the city, and to explain to them how the workers' organisations and workers' strike committees are run. It is necessary to organise independent political demonstrations of the peasants, and workers' and peasants' conferences, in which the main political slogans of the draft platform and the general and special workers' and peasants' demands must be put forward.

The revolutionary alliance of the workers and peasants has to be shown, and will be achieved in struggle.

Wherever a dispute with the government on taxes or rent, or debt dispute with the landlords or moneylenders arises, it is necessary to organise mass resistance, conducted by a peasant committee elected by the peasants participating in the same. In such conflicts it is essential to form "**peasant guards**" in order to defend the peasants against the attacks of the exploiter and his agents. Effort must be made to widen the resistance of the peasantry over ever-larger areas and give this resistance a political character.

The perspective to be placed before the peasantry must be that of an All-Indian no-tax, no-rent, no-debt struggle. (Here the political theses describe the problem in a more detailed manner.—Editor.)

### Tactics with Reference to the Working Class

The formation and consolidation of a united, centralised, underground mass Communist Party on an All-Indian basis must form the fulcrum of all Communist strategy and tactics in its work among the working class and the toiling masses generally. This task was first formulated by the Second Congress of the Comintern as the foremost task. Later on, at the Sixth World Congress, in the Colonial Theses, the C.I. laid down, on the basis of the tremendous development of the working-class movement in India during 1926-28, and its growing independent role and of the springing up of strike leaders from among the workers themselves, that:—

"In India the conditions for the creation of a mass Communist Party have matured. The union of all Communist groups and individual Communists scattered throughout the country into a single independent centralised Party represents the first task of the Indian Communists."

The period of 1926-28 resulted in the formation of a basis for the organisation of a mass underground C.P.I., and this task was put on the agenda, when the process was temporarily interrupted by the Meerut arrests. In the period that followed, working-class activity increased in depth and breadth; there was an intensification of the class struggle and the growth of class differentiation between the national reformist and the working-class movement. (Here the Political Thesis deals with the question in a more detailed manner.—Editor.) The C.P. has lagged far behind. The C.P. continued to remain a bunch of Communist groups, not united organisationally and in some cases not even politically and to a certain extent isolated from the working masses. This tendency of localism and provincialism must be firmly rejected. To-day it is absolutely necessary not only to strengthen the provincial organisations by basing them on local and factory groups of conscious and trained workers, drawn from the day-to-day class struggle, but at the same time it is necessary to weld all the true Communist groups who take their stand upon the Draft Platform of the C.P.I. into a centralised, underground mass Party. In the words of the "Open Letter to the Indian Communists," which was issued by the C.C.s of the Communist Parties of China, Great Britain, and Germany:—

"It is necessary to come out decisively for an All-Indian C.P. While increasing local work (especially in Calcutta, etc.) in every possible way, it is necessary at the same time to move the centre of gravity of Party work to the All-Indian activity and begin to build the Party, carrying on the struggle for a common political line, creating a net of local party organisations, developing the sense of responsibility, Party feeling and discipline, encouraging local initiative and courageously drawing into our ranks workers and those intellectuals who are true to the working-class cause. The basic principle of the organisational policy of the C.P. must be the formation of factory nuclei. The strength of the C.P. is determined by the **degree of its contact with the broad toiling masses; above all, with the proletariat**. The only correct form of organisation able to secure this contact and the fighting ability of the Party is the system of **factory nuclei**. Particularly in India, under conditions of terror and comparatively high concentration of the proletariat, the formation of factory nuclei is an **absolutely essential, obligatory, and highly important task of the Party**. It is necessary to get in touch with and draw in all active industrial workers, because that is the chief guarantee for the building of an underground Communist Party, able to withstand the terror and lead the struggle of the working class." ("Open Letter.")

The non-existence of such **factory nuclei** and the irregular functioning of the existing basic units of the provincial organisation forms one of the principal weaknesses of the C.P.I. to-day. It must be remedied immediately.

Another weakness of the Communist movement to-day is the inability to develop and extend underground forms of movement, struggle and organisation. The Communist cadres have considerable experience of open mass work, but they have still to learn to devise methods to **combine "legal" and underground activity**. Without this it is impossible to organise and lead the toiling masses to revolutionary struggles. Without this it is impossible (under present conditions) to create a mass Communist Party. To neglect **underground forms of the movement means a refusal to create the C.P.**, a refusal to conduct the revolutionary struggle

to organise the masses under the banner of the C.P. The refusal to use both legal and semi-underground forms of the movement leads again to sectarianism, to self-isolation from the masses, leads to refusal to create a mass underground Communist Party. The refusal to carry on work in the trade unions, in the reformist as well as national reformist trade unions, leads to isolation and sectarianism.

"It must be thoroughly realised (and this will determine how seriously and consistently the Communists stand by the underground Party and the revolutionary struggle) that the leading organs of the Party organisations must be in an **underground position**, and that mixing the underground and open apparatus of the Party is fatal and plays into the hands of the police and government provocation. While developing the underground organisation in every way, measures must be taken for preserving and strengthening the backbone of the Party organisation. For the purpose of all kinds of open activity (in the press, meetings, leagues, trade union, etc.) special groups and commissions, etc., should be formed which, working under the leadership of the Party, should under no circumstance injure the existence of underground nuclei." ("Open Letter.")

For the purpose of consolidating and cementing the ideological unity inside the united C.P.I. and for the purpose of widely explaining and discussing the current questions and the principles of the Communist movement it is necessary in the **shortest possible time** to create an underground printed organ of the Central Committee and legal newspapers. The underground organ will serve the purpose of co-ordinating and guiding the activities of the provincial organisations and knitting them closely together. Through this underground organ it will be possible to lead and influence the local legal organs of the Party organisation. This will ensure the working out of a united Communist line and the establishment of unity of views and methods of struggle. This paper must become, in the sense of Lenin's teachings on the role of the Central Party organ, the agitator and organiser of the toiling masses and of the Party. While conducting underground Party organs, it is necessary to exhaust all legal possibilities of popularising the teachings of Marx and Lenin, and of creating Marxist literature on Indian problems, through the help of the legal papers and press.

#### Trade Union Movement

The main task of the C.P.I., as the Party of the proletariat, is to win over the majority of the working class to the platform and policy of the C.P.I., to win them over to Communism. This can only be achieved on the basis of open mass work among the workers, both in the political as well as in the trade union field. Trade unions form the elementary mass organisations of the workers, including workers of all kinds of opinions and degrees of development and traditions. It is the most important general task of the C.P.I. to utilise this channel of contact between the vanguard and the broad masses of the proletariat. It is the duty of every Communist to join a trade union and to fight from within for the class programme of revolutionary leadership and policies. It is necessary to participate in the day-to-day struggle of the workers, because it is the every-day experience of the class struggle which will help the workers, **with the aid of the Communists**, to accept revolutionary policy and Communist leadership. It is necessary, where there is a need, to build mass Red trade unions, and also to work in the reformist unions. It would be wrong to regard the work in the reformist unions as something different and in opposition to the work in the Red trade unions, or the creating of new unions. On the contrary, these tasks are interconnected, and their **combination** will speed up the liberation of the proletariat from the influence of national reformism. For building up mass trade unions it is necessary to carry out energetic everyday work in the mills and workshops, carry out a persistent struggle for the everyday needs of the workers, build mill committees, organise mass trade unions with properly elected management committees, which would be composed mainly, and where it is possible exclusively, out of workers from the mills. The management committees should function regularly, and the president or secretary should not replace the management committee or the trade union membership. The membership meeting should be called regularly to discuss the affairs of the union, of the mills and various questions concerning the conditions in the whole industry and all questions concerning the working class and the country, both economic and political. Trade unions cannot re-

main aloof from the political life and still more from the struggle for independence.

The Communist Party, while pursuing this policy in the trade union movement, will simultaneously constantly explain to the workers the difference between the class policy of the Communists and the harmful bourgeois policy of the national reformists, the "Left" national reformists, etc., who are doing their best to convert into and to keep the working class as the obedient appendix to the nationalist bourgeoisie. At the same time the Communists stand for the application of the united front tactic and are even prepared to amalgamate parallel trade unions, providing a platform of class struggle is accepted, the right of the Communists to put forward and defend before the workers their suggestions is preserved, and the management committees are thoroughly working class in composition and are properly elected, i.e., by the workers. This tactic of united front or amalgamation of parallel trade unions does not signify peace or armistice with national reformism, does not signify that the Communists should cease to explain to the workers the difference between the Communist policy and the reformist policy, or should cease to convince the workers to choose militant, class-conscious workers in the leadership of the trade unions.

It is necessary to distinguish **between** the trade union organisations led by the national reformists or liberal reformists and the reformists or national reformist leaders. United front with the trade unions (if they have masses or have influence among the masses) or even amalgamation with them does not mean unity with the leaders, and this should be clearly understood. On the contrary, it might create, providing a correct policy and energetic everyday work of the Communists is carried out, the best conditions for winning over the misled or confused workers to the banner of militant working-class policy. This should be clearly understood by every class-conscious worker. Any other interpretation of the united front or amalgamation of some parallel trade union as a peace or armistice with the reformist leaders is wrong and opportunistic. During the years 1926-28 there was a growing differentiation between the liberal reformists, who are the open agents of imperialism, and the militant section of the trade union movement. This process of differentiation consisted in the rapid isolation of the liberal reformists from the masses of workers during the strike struggles in Bombay and Calcutta in 1927-28 (the elimination of N.M. Joshi from the textile workers' movement in Bombay—building up of the G.K.U.—strengthening of the militant fraction in G.I.P.). The liberal reformists tried to stop this process by engineering a split of the A.I.T.U.C. at Nagpur (1929). In the later period (1930-31) there was further clarification in the "militant" front which consisted in the differentiation between the national reformists and the Communists. In the C.D. movement the national reformist agents of the Congress made a strenuous effort in **Bombay** to isolate the revolutionary working-class leadership from the trade union movement, so as to prevent the exposure of the treacherous role of the Congress in the eyes of the toiling masses. The I.N. Congress, with the aid of the "Left" reformist agents in the trade union movement, effected a split in the G.K.U. by demanding support of the Congress policy in the leadership and began a ruthless struggle against the revolutionary workers with the financial help of the Congress. A similar struggle began also in the G.I.P. union. The Indian capitalists, with the assistance of the Royists, succeeded in effecting a further split in the All-Indian T.U. Congress at **Calcutta**.

The split had a political basis. It was engineered by those who wanted to isolate the Communists and join hands with the liberal reformists for the betrayal of the working-class masses. Immediately after the split M. N. Roy wrote an article in "Independent India" (August 21, 1931), in which he made an offer to Joshi, Giri, and others for Trade Union Unity. The basis for unity here offered is "Pure Trade Unionism," i.e., economism. In concluding his article he expressed his joy at the fact that the Communists, whom he called "ultra leftist disturbers of trade union unity" "are now out of the way." Since then they have been carrying out strike-breaking tactics with the help of and in the interests of the Congress millowners. They have been carrying out a systematic struggle against the Communists and expelled them from the union (G.I.P.). In view of the growing discontent among the working masses about the Congress, some "Left" national reformists have ceased now for a time to support openly the Congress and even mildly criticise it, so as to prevent

the masses from being influenced by revolutionary politics, and retain the influence of the Congress bourgeoisie, preaching that the workers should remain aloof from revolutionary struggles and limit themselves to everyday economic problems only. To-day a further Leftward trend of the masses is forcing them to form an "Indian Working Class Political Party," with the reformist programme of improving the lot of the workers by constitutional methods and council entry. The revolutionary trade union movement has carried on a consistent struggle against "Left" national reformism, although it did not succeed sufficiently in explaining the bourgeois essence of the splitting policy of the reformists and proved unable to mobilise the ranks of the workers against the splitters for the unity of the working class. There cannot be unity, peace with the national reformist leaders, but it is possible and advisable to offer a united front to the trade unions led by them. We must help the workers to understand in the course of the practice of the class struggle, in the course of the mass actions the difference between the Communists and the reformists. It is clear that united front must be proposed for mass actions on definite concrete issues and should not become merely negotiations between the leaders. It is wrong to look at the past splits as if they were the results of personal "intrigues" and not the results of the process of class differentiation. It is totally wrong to maintain that these "Left" national reformist leaders were once "good revolutionaries" and that they have been driven into the camp of counter-revolution by the lack of "tact," etc., on the part of individual comrades. Such theories prevent the Party from seeing the national reformist danger and unmasking it politically in time. It leads to the tendency not to criticise the reformist and national reformist leaders owing to the fear that this might lead to the isolation of the Communists. The refusal to criticise the reformist leaders would spell the doom of the Communist movement, as it would consolidate the positions of the bourgeoisie among the working class. To-day the organisational strength of the revolutionary trade union movement is not considerable. At the same time there is a growing revolutionary trend in the working-class masses (as is displayed by the growing strike struggles of the workers against wage cuts in Calcutta, Bombay, Ahmedabad, etc.). This disparity in the weakness of the revolutionary organisation on the one hand and the growing militancy of the workers on the other cannot be remedied by a peace with the national reformist leaders. It is necessary to understand correctly the causes of our partial isolation from the working masses. It has been caused by the neglect on our part to do sufficient day-to-day trade union work, and to explain our differences in the trade union congress to the masses on the basis of concrete struggles. It would be a serious error to interpret the struggle against the national reformists in such a way that it is necessary to withdraw from the reformist unions and refrain from working among the masses who follow them.

These errors must be corrected. The revolutionary wing of the trade union movement must work to strengthen the Red Trade Union Congress. It must formulate its demands and policy and clearly show, both in words and in action, that it fights for the interests of the workers. The Communists must influence the Red Trade Union Congress and carry on agitation among its members to accept the following policy, viz.: (1) the formation of Red trade unions based on factory committees, whose leadership should be elected directly by the workers and consist of advanced revolutionary workers; (2) strenuous struggle against the reformist and national reformist leaders who form a reactionary bloc with the imperialists and the Congress; (3) closest association with and leadership of the daily struggle of the workers for their partial demands, organising participation in all individual and general strikes, the formation of strike committees elected by the rank and file workers, where the Communists must work hard to gain leadership; (4) closest co-ordination between the economic and the political struggle of the working class; (5) co-operation and support of the militant international trade union movement; (6) the constant propagation of the slogan of general political strike among the workers, "calling upon them to transform individual strikes into a general political strike, as a resolute step in organising the revolutionary struggle of the mass of the people for independence, land, and workers' and peasants' government under the guidance of the working class"; (7) on the basis of all the workers' demands laid down in the draft platform of the C.P.I. the Communists must influence the Red Trade Union

Congress and help it to become a functioning body, they must forthwith begin reorganising and strengthening the class unions affiliated to it, place them on a functioning basis—begin setting up unions in industries where the workers are still unorganised—organise regular fraction work in the reformist trade unions and in the Red trade unions, as well as carry out the exposure of the national reformists in the actual struggle and energetically apply the tactics of united front.

While carrying out energetic trade union activity, it is useful at the same time to form open mass local political organisations of the working class. Such open local political organisations represent one of the forms of open activity and can help to spread political education among the working class. It is necessary to form open political organisations for the working youth to spread the revolutionary political education of the young workers into the ranks of the Party. Such working-class youth organisations must be formed in each industrial centre, must recruit working-class youths and also draw in the best elements amongst the revolutionary students tried in the field. They must carry on a fight for the redress of grievances of young workers, must generally assist in the work of the revolutionary trade union movement, conduct study classes, etc., for the Marxist-Leninist training of the young workers, must assist and participate in political activities on the basis of the main political slogans of the draft platform. Besides organising such open working-class youth organisations, it is necessary to take steps to build a **Young Communist League of India**. It is advisable to work in the workers' leagues and workers' parties in the provinces. The Communists must understand that these are a temporary and subsidiary form of mass activities. These organisations can be used to draw wide masses of the workers and toilers, to develop mass struggles and be utilised as open platform for political demonstrations, processions, meetings, etc., for the popularisation of the main slogans of our anti-imperialist programme providing the Communist Party is established. These organisations must be controlled by well-trained and class-conscious Communist workers, organised in Communist fractions. It must be remembered that these organisations must not become rival organisations to the C.P.I. It must be clearly understood that such organisations will be of a temporary character, because British imperialism will not allow the existence of any organisation opposed to British imperialism and developing mass resistance; if in any place such organisation is formed, it can be of use only as an auxiliary organisation from which to recruit workers for the C.P. The formation of such organisations must not lead to a position when the Communist Party does not speak openly in its name on every incident and every expression of class struggle; on the contrary, the C.P. and its local organisations must issue their leaflets, must build nuclei in the mills, must recruit workers for the C.P., must everywhere be heard by the workers and lead their struggles. Another task which will devolve upon such organisations, especially at the present juncture, is the struggle against the reformists who are forming political parties in the provinces. This will have to be done on the basis of the exposure of their activities, explaining that they do not defend the interests of the workers, and are only spreading legalist and constitutional illusions.

## Comrade Johann Kovacs—Victim of Hunger Strike for the Release of Comrade Rakosi

As is known, six weeks ago the political prisoners in Hungary entered on a hunger strike in order to support the struggle of the Hungarian proletariat for the release of Comrade Rakosi. The Hungarian authorities proceeded with the greatest brutality against the political prisoners in order to smash the hunger strike by means of forcible feeding.

A young comrade, Johann Kovacs, 23 years of age, who had been sentenced to two years' hard labour on account of his Communist activity, continued the hunger strike in spite of it. He died on June 22, as a result of the hunger strike. His relatives were informed of his death only on June 27, after his burial which took place in secret.

It has further transpired that the other comrades, who after two weeks' torture abandoned the struggle, were condemned to five days' solitary confinement in dark cells and deprived of all privileges for a period of six months.