

Dhananjayrao Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-023798

In the Court of R. L. Yorke Esqr. I. C. S., Additional Session Judge, Meerut.

In the case of King-Emperor versus Spratt & others.
Examination of R. R. Mitra

accused under section 342 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, made before me R. L. Yorke Addl. Sessions Judge at Meerut on the 18th day of March 1931.

My name is Radha Raman Mitra; my father's name is Bepin Behari Mitra; I am by caste No caste; 35 years of age; by occupation Teacher up to time of arrest; my home is at Calcutta; Police-station Sham Pokra; district Calcutta; I reside 27 Mohindra Bose Lane at time of arrest.

Q. You heard your statement in Lower Court. Exh P.2584 read out to you on 16-3-31. Did you make that statement?

A. Yes.

Q. Have you anything to say about the recovery of P. 97 Leninism and P. 111 Trade Union Movement Thesis from your possession?

A. They were both found in my possession. With regard to P. 97; it was not a proscribed book but openly on sale in bookshops in Calcutta; it was not my own copy but one I had borrowed from some library. I have nothing to say about the Thesis.

Q. There are some papers in regard to your membership of the Workers and Peasants Party of Bengal: namely P. 122, P. 105, P. 544 (3), P. 52 and P. 34. (note: nature of papers explained to accused.) Have you anything to say about these?

A. The prosecution have urged and the Magistrate has supported them that the Workers and Peasants Party was really a Communist Party or a veiled Communist Party. I don't know what is its position now. I claim that it was not a Communist party. A number of Communists might have been members of it but that does not make the party a communist party. This kind of argument will show that a Trade Union for example of which a communist was a member was a communist party of that the Indian National Congress was a communist party because several of us were members of it. The Communist Party has its own programme, the attainment of Socialism through the Revolutionary overthrow of Capitalism and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The Workers and Peasants Party had its programme, the attainment of independence, and generally the aims of the National Democratic Revolution. The 2 are not the same thing. The communists could join the workers and peasants party because they agreed with its programme

so far as it went. The Communist Party also works for the attainment of independence and the achievement of the tasks of the National Democratic Revolution since in Indian conditions these are the essential steps towards the fulfilment of its programme.

The Workers and Peasants Party did not aim immediately at the Dictatorship of the Proletariat nor did it but forward Socialism as part of its programme. The propaganda of its individual members may at times have mentioned these things as ultimately to be attained, but its programme and policy as such demands only independence and democracy, and describes only the way to get them by carrying through the national revolution. The constitution of the Workers and Peasants Party states that the aim of the party is the attainment of complete independence from British Imperialism and thorough democratisation of India based on Economic and Social emancipation and political freedom of men and women. P. 1017 which is the organisational statement of the aims and policy of the Workers and Peasants Party of Bombay clearly states that its policy is the attainment of independence, and the demands formulated in it contain no socialist item. P.1013 "What the Workers and Peasants Party stands for" says the same thing. P. 138 "The principles and policy of the workers and peasants party" states that the functions and policy in the most general terms is to achieve at least the essential preliminary step, that is the attainment of political independence for the abolition of exploitation & political oppression; and at the end of it speaks of the building up of a new independent and democratic order as the task of the revolution. These all bear out the essentially national democratic character of the workers and peasants party and its programme. The workers and peasants party was an Independence Party and not a Communist party or a veiled Communist party. I was not a member of the workers and peasants party of Bengal or of All India. In January 1929 I was elected General Secretary of the Bengal Jute Workers Union (formerly Association) which was affiliated to the workers and peasants party. This Union had been affiliated to the Party long before I joined it (the Union). The prosecution and the Magistrate have said that I was an affiliated member of the Party. I know of no such thing as an "affiliated member" at least in the sense in which the prosecution have used it. The constitution of the All India Workers and Peasants Party makes mention of no such thing. Wherever the term 'affiliated member' occurs in any publication of the workers and peasants party it always means a member of an affiliated Union or organisation, deputed to represent the organisation on the Executive Committee of the Party.

I was elected a member of the Reception Committee of the 1st All India Workers and Peasants Party Conference. The membership of the Reception Committee was not restricted to the Party

Members. It was open to all irrespective of their political opinions. I attended the 1st A. I. W. P. P. Conference as a delegate from the Bengal Jute Workers Union and not as an individual Party Member : as my delegation ticket (P. 142) and the delegation fee mentioned thereon as well as the fee paid by me for membership of the Reception Committee (P. 105) show. I also attended the Conference on behalf of the Bauria Jute workers' union which organisation had been invited by the Secretary of the Reception Committee (P. 114) to send a representative to watch the proceedings of the conference. I was astounded to read the Magistrate's remark that actually I took a very large part in the proceedings of the Conference. In fact all that I did was to second, on the 3rd day of the conference a resolution of sympathy with the Bauria strike which I was leading at the time and which had already lasted well over 5 months. There is no evidence that I was present at the Conference either on the 1st 2 days or on the 4th day. On the 3rd day I took part in the procession led by the Party to the Congress Nagar and made a speech there. P. 108 shown to me: I might have received this notice but when I don't remember: I do not know whether the meeting announced in it at all took place or not. At any rate I did not attend it.

Q. Anything to say about recovery of P. 123 Mind and Face of Bolshevism in your search?

A. This book was recovered in my search. It was not also a proscribed book. It is a book written not by a Communist or a Bolshevik but by a Bourgeois from the bourgeois point of view. Its attitude is extremely critical from beginning to end and some places denunciatory. One who goes through this book will have a repulsion for Bolshevism rather than a love for it. This book also did not belong to me. I had borrowed it from a library.

In this connection I would like to say something about my search. All the items that were recovered were not entered in the searchlist nor were they signed in my presence. Many of them were made into bundles and sealed not with my seal as has been said by P. W. 10 because I had none. They were sealed with the seal provided by Mr. Gordon the Deputy Commissioner of Police Northern District Calcutta who was supervising the search. One of the search witnesses did not sign the searchlist in my presence. As I have suggested in my cross-examination the searchlist was sent by the Sub-Inspector from the Thana to the house of the witness and got signed there.

Q. There is evidence of prosecution witnesses P.W.'s 47, 83 and 94 in regard to your activities in the Lilloqah E. I. Railway strike of 1928, and again of P. W.'s 67, 84, and 86 in regard to your activities at Oudal. In this connection speeches P. 1930 (series),

P. 1931, P. 1932, P. 2107, P. 2108 and P. 2109 are in evidence against you. There is also evidence of your activities at Asansol, in company as at Ondal with Spratt and Goswami a/cd., vide evidence of P.W. 68 also that of speeches P. 1933 and P. 1934 there, and further of a speech P. 2508 made by you at Sitarampur on 14. 6. 28. Reference may also be made to P. 41 to P. 47 and P. 121.

Do you wish to offer any explanation in regard to this evidence ?

A. I dont remember when I attended the first meeting at Lillooah. From the evidence on record it appears that the earliest date was May 14, 1928. The next date is May 17. This was after the Chengail strike had ended. In the 3rd week of May I was requested by Mr. K. C. Mitra the Secretary of the E. I. Railway Union to proceed to Ondal with a view to bring about a strike in the workshop there. At this request and not at the request of the party that is of the workers and peasants party because I have already said that I was not a member of the Party and therefore the party had no jurisdiction over me, I proceeded to Ondal. Of course I readily fell in with his suggestion because to me extending the strike along the line appeared to be the only course left open at the time. I asked the workers of Ondal Railway workshop to go on strike. I take full responsibility for bringing about this strike. I dont think I did anything wrong. It was not done out of a political motive. The circumstances at the time fully justified such a step. The Lillooah lockout had already lasted well over 2½ months without any prospect of ever coming to an end. The cause of the lockout was the dismissal of some workers of the Lillooah workshop and the protest of the remaining workers against this arbitrary action. The authorities replied by closing down the workshop. Then the lockedout men put forward certain demands such as recognition of the Union, reinstatement of the dismissed men, increase of wages, provision of free quarters or house rent in lieu thereof, medical and casual leave with full pay, pay for Sundays and holidays. There were several interviews between Mr. K. C. Mitra the Union Secretary and Mr. Colvin the E. I. Railway Agent. Every time the Agent turned down the demands and even refused to consider them before the men had gone back to work unconditionally. Under the circumstances there was no other alternative than to extend the strike along the line, to bring pressure to bear on the Agent.

Sympathetic strike in support of economic demands is a legitimate weapon in the hands of workers with which they can bend recalcitrant employers to their will and its legitimacy has been recognised both in trade Union theory and practice for a long time. The British General strike of 1926 was a sympathetic strike in support

of the lockedout miners; many of those who are now carrying on His Majesty's Government in Great Britain were leaders of the General Strike. It was only after the threat of Sir Johan Simon that they collapsed and called off the strike leaving the miners to their fate. After this incident the Conservative Government, in 1927 passed the British Trades Disputes Act declaring General strikes illegal and the Government of India, followed suit in 1929 with its own Trades Disputes Act which went a step beyond its British prototype in that it prohibited all sympathetic strikes, but at the date, I urged the Oudat workers to down tools in sympathy with their Lillooah Comrades, who were fighting not only for themselves but for all the workers on the E. I. Railway line in that their demands were of a general character, this repressive piece of class legislation was not even on the legislative anvil. Similarly I take full responsibility for the Asansol strike as well, though technically I was not responsible. At Asansol I addressed the workers for 2 consecutive days that is on 1st and 2nd June. On the 1st day there was no response. On the 2nd a handful of workers declared for a strike. According to this decision in which all did not concur only 1 shift of about 60 men absented themselves from night duty for 5 or 6 hours only. With the morning the strike collapsed. Then Mr. K. C. Mitra came to Asansol from Lillooah and made a strong appeal for strike for 2 days, 6th and 7th June.

It evoked no response from the workers. Disappointed he and I left Asansol for Lillooah on morning of 8th June. On the same night while I was at Chengail the strike at Asansol began. The strike unlike the previous one did not prove abortive and lasted till it was called off on 10th July so technically I was not responsible for this strike though morally I was. It was a spontaneous strike caused by the kicking of a Mohammedan workman at prayer; this incident greatly incensed the workers of Loco Department who were mostly Mohammedans, see P. W. 68. It was I think on 11th or 12th June that I went back from Calcutta to Asansol after the strike had already lasted there for 3 or 4 days. This incident refutes the theory that the agitators are wonder-workers and that they can bring about strikes when there is no serious discontent. I also admit that I attempted to extend the strike to Sitarampur which is the next station but I did not succeed. It is also a fact that I did not oppose the termination of the Lillooah strike on the 8th and 9th July as has been suggested by P. W. 83 S. I. K. B. Sen Gupta. In fact it was with my full concurrence that the strike was called off as we all realised that it was impossible to carry on the struggle any further with the coffers empty and the strikers exhausted. What I said on July 8th was actually with reference to what had happened, because the decision had already been taken then to call off the strike. The meaning is that they "had had" no other alternative (statement of P. W. 83 page 21). It was at the meeting of 9th July

that the strike was called off and many of the strikers were disappointed as they got nothing for their hard struggle for so many months. It was to those that I said that they should not take the defeat so much to heart as a defeat of this kind, that is after a strenuous struggle, is tantamount to victory. I have explained above the gist reports of speeches contained in evidence of witnesses.

In regard to the full reports of speeches:—

P. 1931 (vol: 1p64) and P. 2108 (vol 11. p11):—In these 2 speeches I said in short that there cannot be any justice and equality between the rich and the poor, between the exploiters and the exploited and that the law and the legal machinery are and are intended to be used by the ruling class for the purpose of suppressing the Exploited classes. In P. 1931 I mentioned Russia as the only exception because it is only Russia that does not make such a hypocritical claim and frankly admits the class character of its laws and courts, but I claim at the same time that it is not a peculiarly Communist view of law and the machinery of justice. This is what for instance Professor H. J. Laski who is by no means a communist says about the machinery of justice: "all men are equal before the Courts but they cannot enforce this equality save by the possession of wealth they do not possess. The humble tenant who seeks redress against his landlord, the servant girl who is dismissed without wages or character by her mistress, the workman injured in the course of employment and refused compensation by an employer who argues negligence on his part, all these are but instances of an inequality before the law which gives the lie to the democratic thesis of equality. The hierarchy of Courts moreover may well swallow up in the costs of appeal even the pitiful redress the worker has been able to secure. The very fact that special legal institutions have been created which seek to alter the balance the present order maintains is itself proof that the democratic claim is inadequate." And this in Britain itself which maintains a fair appearance of impartiality and fair play between the classes.

But I was not speaking under the influence of those general considerations, specially in P. 2108. There I was speaking with reference to the specific situation as it existed at the time in Asansol and Ondal. In order to appreciate this speech it is necessary for me to outline the circumstances.

The Deputy Superintendent of Police of Asansol had established a regime of terror. It was openly a Police Raj. Unlawful acts were committed in broad day light. About 300 armed Gorkhas were stationed at Asansol. The number of ordinary police was not much less. Every morning the Gorkhas used to be marched through the strikers' Bastis in order to intimidate them with a show of force. In addition a large number of police were stationed day and

night in the workers' bastis. They would not allow anybody to stir out of his dwelling after dusk even to answer a call of nature. They would not allow people to stand even on their doorsteps. Peaceful picketting, and there is no suggestion by any witness that the picketting was not peaceful at any time, was made impossible. The Deputy Superintendent of Police used to move about the town with a posse of armed constables; wherever he would come upon a group of strikers, not picketting but simply standing together or quietly chatting in the streets, he would assault them mercilessly and then arrest them on a charge of wrongful assembly or rioting and if they were severely wounded would leave them half dead in the streets without attending to their wounds or sending them to the hospital. Many skulls and ribs were fractured and limbs broken. No complaint would be entertained against the Deputy Superintendent of Police although there was overwhelming proof of his crime. On the other hand he was at perfect liberty to institute false cases of wrongful restraint or obstruction in course of public duty or criminal intimidation. On these charges more than 100 strikers were sent up for trial. Bail would invariably be refused. At first security offered by property owners was accepted in some cases. Subsequently this was stopped. None but Vakils and mukhtars could stand as sureties. Fines and sentences would be imposed on concocted or flimsiest evidence. At Ondal these things were repeated on a minor scale. 6 strike leaders were arrested at Ondal on a charge of criminal intimidation to a public servant. The Asst. Station master who was supposed to be the complainant did not turn up at the identification parade which was held in the presence of the Deputy Superintendent of Police. He was twice sent for but did not turn up. At last he was brought under arrest by order of the Deputy Superintendent of Police but he could not identify anybody. None the less the arrested men were sent up for trial.

A resolution was passed condemning the actions of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, see P. W. 68 That had no effect upon that officer; then a telegram was sent on behalf of the E. I. R. union to the Governor of Bengal drawing his attention to the Police oppression at Asansol and requesting the transfer of the Deputy Superintendent of Police. That too had no effect. After this even the stoutest defender of Imperialism will hesitate to say that there was justice anywhere near Ondal and Asansol.

P. 1930:— Part IIA. A reference to Russian conditions may appear objectionable to the prosecution but those who have undertaken to serve the Proletarian cause cannot be expected to be guided by their wishes or opinions. To tell the Indian Workers what is a matter of history or to supply them with a bit of information about Russia or to talk about Russian affairs before them or simply to make mention of Russia in their presence may be a crime in the

eyes of the Government here but is nothing unusual in the more advanced countries of the world. Many books have been written in England and America for the information of the workers of those countries about Russian Revolution and other aspects of Soviet state activities, economic, political, cultural, sanitary etc. Delegates from British and American trade union organizations have visited Russia from time to time and submitted numerous reports about the conditions of the Russian workers. These reports are studied and discussed by the rank and file workers of those countries with impunity. Besides their own press supplies to those workers day to day information about the various developments in the Soviet Union. What is perfectly normal everywhere else is regarded as a crime in India.

Of all the numerous speeches of mine on record only this P. 1930 series contains 2 references to Soviet Russia; one regarding help for Bombay strikers and the other about workers' rule and the absence of extremes of wealth and poverty in Russia. The first reference I casually made to show that the Railway authorities' expectation that the Lillooah strikers would not get any help was foolish. Help had come even from such unexpected quarters as the Indian National Congress and the petty bourgeoisie. There could not be any doubt about help from workers both Indian and foreign. It was the special interest of these to help workers on strike and I instanced the help already received by Lillooah Strikers from British Workers and by Bombay strikers from Russian workers. In fact some time later the Lillooah strikers also received Rs 10,000/- from Russia, to which fact I alluded in my Sitarampur speech on 14. 6. 28, P. 2508, P.W. 84. The second reference followed my statement that 5% of the people of the world had been keeping the remaining 95% in slavery for hundreds of years. After this statement it was necessary for me to give them the encouraging news about the state of affairs in present day Russia, otherwise they would have gone away with the impression that mass slavery being centuries old was an inevitable and permanent thing and that they must bow down to it; for however unpleasant it may sound to the bourgeoisie it is a fact that Capitalism is not a permanent category but a phenomenon which like every other phenomenon had a beginning and will have an end.

But that my object was not to preach Revolution or do propaganda on behalf of Soviet Russia is evident from the sentences that immediately follow my second reference to Russia in 1930 IIA, and also from the whole portion of the speech that preceded it, that is 1950 IA. The subject discussed in that part namely the cause and remedy of the misery of Indian workers provided me with an excellent opportunity for doing either. Had that been my intention I would not have held out the example of British workers

to my audience for their emulation. I would have spoken of the Russian workers only and their conditions under their own rule. I would not have pointed out to them the road followed by the British workers namely the road of Trade Union Organisation but that travelled by the Russian workers namely the road of Revolution or the Moscow Road.

I do not mean to suggest for a moment that I regard the preaching of Revolution to workers as wrong. What I want to point out is that even a Communist, supposing I am a Communist, can and does participate in the petty day to day economic struggle of the workers like any other genuine Trade Unionist not only for remote bigger gains but also for immediate and partial improvements and that in doing so he not only can but actually does lay aside for the time being all thoughts and talks of Revolution or the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. This point requires special stress in view of the prosecution's contention that we engaged in Trade Union activity not primarily for the immediate improvement of the worker's lot but to train them in solidarity and united action and also in view of the similar contention of the magistrate that the Communist hopes to improve the condition of the working class not in the immediate future but in the more distant future.

The History of communism after the Russian Revolution shows that a tendency existed and does still exist to some extent among certain militant working class groups in the continent who call themselves Communists to isolate themselves from all day to day economic and political struggles of the workers for immediate reforms and in fact from all movements of the masses and to concentrate solely on the task of bringing about a revolution, thereby transforming themselves from mass parties into sects and conspiratorial organisations, but this is not Bolshevism or Communism of the Communist International. It is an ultra leftist deviation from Communism. Lenin who characterised this deviation as infantile disorder fought it with as much vigor as he fought all Rightist deviations and open Reformism and opportunism. In order to counteract this tendency the 3rd congress of the Communist International had to issue the slogan "To the Masses." Marx in his own day had to contend with the Bakuninist anarchists who would have only economics and no politics. Later on this tendency was revived and further developed by Syndicalists in France and the I. W. W. in U. S. A. On the other hand the Blanquists in the last century and the so-called Communist labour groups in our own day would have nothing but politics, that is seizure of power by Coups D'etat. Communism is a synthesis of both economic and political struggles, sometimes of the ordinary Luddrom type and sometimes of a revolutionary nature according to circumstances. Experience teaches that one phase of the struggle is complementary to and is

as much necessary as the other. In fact in the conception of things of a communist economics takes precedence over politics as is shown from the following classical formulation of Marx in the preamble to the provisional rules of the 1st International: "the economic subjection of the man of labour to the monopoliser of the means of labour that is of life lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation and political dependence. The economic emancipation of the working classes therefore is the great end to which every political movement is subordinate as a means.

In fact we are here not for neglecting the task of fighting for the immediate improvement of the workers' lot on account of our revolutionary political pre-occupations but for carrying out the task rather more vigorously than the so-called genuine Trade Unionists would have done or can ever do, because the latter are the servants of the bourgeoisie, objectively if not subjectively. The reason for the deliberate misrepresentation of the relation of communism to Trade Unionism is not far to seek. The prosecution are seeking to drive a wedge between communism and the trade Union movement. This is the most important practical issue in the case. If the prosecution's contention is upheld by a judicial decision it will be illegal for communists to engage in ordinary Trade Union activity even in normal peaceful times.

The other speeches delivered in connection with the Ondal and Asansol strikes are in my view of the ordinary Trade Union type which could have been delivered by any Left wing labour leader.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

18. 3. 31

Q. In regard to the part you took in the Bauria Mill strike there is a volume of evidence: first the statement of P.W. 98 showing how the Bauria Union was formed etc., then documents P. 694, reports P. 2225, P. 2224, documents P. 107, P. 83, P. 115, P. 106 P. 109, P. 2111 to P. 2113, P. 116, P. 27, P. 526 (9), P. 1628P, P. 86, P. 70, P. 396, P. 395 (1), (2) and P. 1346. Some of these relate to money from Saklatwala and others to money from G.K.U. Bombay, others to meetings and associations etc. Have you anything to say in explanation of these and the part they show you took?

A. In order to explain my position with regard to Bauria strike which originally was a lockout it is necessary for me to state in brief how the lockout took place. The mill-authorities had been contemplating for some time past to introduce the single shift system of work in place of the double or multiple shift system under which the Bauria Jute mills had been working since their

foundation. This was a scheme of rationalisation adopted by many of the jute mills after the expiry of the period of war boom in order to lower the costs of production by reduction the number of workers roughly by $\frac{1}{3}$, and increasing the weekly working hours of each worker from 38 to 54 or 60, without allowing him corresponding increase of wages. Under this scheme the employers stand to gain everything but the workers lose heavily. Naturally they look upon it with disfavour and have desperately resisted wherever an attempt has been made to introduce it. In 1926 the system was simultaneously introduced in a large number of mills in one area, resulting in a strike involving 40 to 50000 workers and lasting for several weeks. The Fort Gloster authorities who were wiser by this experience did not want to introduce the change in normal conditions for in that case they feared the resistance of workers would be prolonged and vigorous so they were seeking an opportunity and no opportunity could be better than a temporary disturbance during which they could carry out wholesale dismissals of workers on the plea of having disturbed the peace, practise intimidation to break their morale, and introduce the change as a retributive measure without fear of much opposition. With this end in view they took to provoking the workers into acts of disorder. It is the usual practice in jute mills to stop the running of machinery $\frac{1}{2}$ an hour before the closing time, that is at 6-30 p. m. on the last working day of the week for the purpose of getting the machines cleaned. This time honoured practice was suddenly changed and orders were issued to the workers to clean running machines between 4.30 and 5 p.m. The workers refused. The management insisted and in course of an altercation they assaulted some workers and those retaliated. This is the violence I referred to in my speech of July 15, reported by P.W. 98 on which date I attended a meeting in Bauria for the 1st time. There were other provocations of a more or less serious nature which need not be detailed here nor need I enter into the many flagrant abuses which are a usual feature in all jute mills, and in fact all mills, such as fines of different varieties, forfeiture and withholding of wages, bribery, timecrediting, low rates of wages etc. The peculiar feature of the Bauria mills was that the workers were not allowed to go to their homes or to the bazaar to take meals or refreshments during periods of recess provided by law. They would be kept confined within the mill premises throughout the day from starting to closing time. On the top of this came an interference of an unusual character. There was a mohammedan graveyard, a communal property, on which moharram and other mohammedan festivals used to be celebrated and communal meetings held from time to time. The authorities suddenly declared this ground as company's property and prohibited all meetings and even celebration of Moharram. Disregarding the prohibition the

local mohammedans both workers and peasants assembled in thousands on the moharram day fully determined for a trial of strength with the authorities. Their overwhelming number and menacing attitude frightened the authorities who did not dare to interfere. This was the only piece of ground in Bauria which remained in possession of the workers to the end, and was used for meetings during the strike. Every inch of ground besides this in and about Bauria belonged to the company's which owned not only the mills but also about 20 villages in the neighbourhood, so that mill workers were at the same time the company's tenants. This is a unique feature of that company. No driving and cycling except for the European and Superior Indian staff of the mills was allowed on the company's roads, even on the District Board road which ran through the mill area. At certain periods of the year, usually twice, nobody was allowed to use any of these roads without formal permit. This was the position that I found on 15.7.28. 2 days before this date one of the 3 mills had been closed by the authorities without any notice or statement of reasons. Some of the workers had been contemplating to go on strike in sympathy with their locked out comrades. This was brought to our notice by a few workers at the meeting. We saw the inopportune-ness of the step at the time because we thought that it would be easier for the newly started union to feed the locked out workers of one mill than to help all of them if all went on strike. That is why both comrade Ghosh and I asked the workers repeatedly not to go on strike. P.W. 98 and P. 223 (Ghosh). It should also be mentioned that the Bauria jute-workers Union was formed at this very meeting of 15th July and not earlier as suggested by P.W. 68. The union was formed under the auspices of the B.T.U.F. (Bengal Trade Union Federation). On July 16 2 mills started work, the 3rd remaining closed. The manager of one of the 2 working mills dismissed 5 workers in the morning; some of the other workers pressed him for reinstatement of the dismissed men but he would not agree. In the middle of the discussion the workers were suddenly attacked by the mill jemadars and boatmen, about 200 strong. The cries of the attacked men brought other workers to their help and a melee ensued in the course of which police opened fire and wounded 23 workers. All the mills were at once closed down and remained so for a fortnight. As is usual in such cases and as was desired by the mill authorities whole-sale arrests and intimidation followed and continued for 1 week. After a week as things were gradually settling down and as the workers were eagerly expecting to see the mills open and hoping to go back to work a notice appeared on 25.7.28 announcing the authorities decision to introduce the single shift system of work from the date of reopening. The mills remained closed for 5 days even after this notice and only 1 mill out of 3 was reopened on the 1st

August. This mill remained open for 2 weeks only and was shut down on 14/8. After this date (P. 118) all the 3 mills remained closed continuously for more than 2½ months, reopening one on 1/11 and the remaining 2 on 7/11 so that except for an interval of only 2 weeks all 3 mills were continuously closed for full 3½ months from 16/7. It is significant that the Bengal Jute Mills Association's annual report which appeared about the time of the July disturbance mentioned Bauria as having introduced single shift on and from 16/7 the very day of the disturbance. As for the workers the notice of 26/7 greatly depressed them. None the less they stood up against the change. At this point they were forced to refuse to work. From what has been stated so far it will be seen that the workers had not gone on strike before the introduction of the new system. Though they had many serious grievances they had made no demands nor had they walked out of the mills voluntarily. It was after the announcement of the change of system that the strike began.

There were many factors which were responsible for the prolongation of the strike for 6 months: the chief among them was the attitude of the authorities. They tried all possible means to break the strike, thereby stiffening the attitude of the workers also. From the beginning they engaged black-legs from 1st to 14th August and then from 1st November onwards. Knowing that the union was distributing a little relief they got the union office closed and stopped relief work. They closed all roads and even the market which was situated in the Company's land in the mill area to the strikers. There being no other market nearby the workers were compelled to start a temporary market on the Communal ground mentioned above. Even this was not tolerated. Under orders of the S. D. O. who throughout the strike acted as a henchman of the authorities this market had to be closed. Forcible eviction from quarters took place as usual. Arrests were almost a daily occurrence. When all these failed to demoralise the strikers' raids by armed Goondas, in the guise of blacklegs, were organised on Workers' villages, even lame and paralytic persons and women folk were not spared. The authorities would do all this and many things more but they would not negotiate with the union. As for us we were not only ready but eager for settlement. As direct negotiation was out of the question we did seek the help of several intermediaries one after another, first Mr. B. P. Pyné, the leading counsel of the Howrah Bar and Lal Mohan Ghose Asst. Secretary B.P.C.C; second Mr. K.C. Roy Chowdhri labour M.L. C. and Mr. Campbell Forrester M. L. C., third Mr. Watts the senior partner of Or. Dignam and Co, the firm of solicitors who were legal advisers to the Fort Gloster Co, 4th Mr. Keshoram Potdar Marwari merchant and Dr. J. M. Das Gupta a prominent member of B. P. C.C. (P. 1118), 5th Mr. Durgacharan Banerjee junior partner

of Or. Digram and Co.; 6th Madan Mohan Barman of B. P. C. C. and a Councillor of Calcutta Corporation and Subash Bose President B. P. C. C. (D 19) and last, Mr. Reid Superintendent of the Fort Gloster Mills (see P. W. 98). But Mr. Ogg the managing Director of the company was adamant. He would have nothing to do with the Union (P. 118) and not even with the strikers. He was out to break the strike and teach a lesson to the strikers and ultimately he did succeed in breaking the strike. It may be pointed out that the strikers who had begun with several demands gave up all one after the other except the one relating to the shift question over which the strike had occurred.

The report P 2225 is substantially a correct one except for the omission of the word 'only' after "increased rates"; and the substitution of the word 'agitation' for 'movement'. The speech was made in Bengali. I claim that the view of the T. U. movement here expressed is not peculiarly Communist. Even Lord Passfield and Mrs. Webb whom nobody will dare to accuse of Communism or sympathy for Communism after defining a Trade Union (in their History of Trade Unionism, 1920 Edition) as a continuous association of wage earners for the purpose of maintaining or improving the conditions of their working lives, add the following footnote: "in the first edition we said "of their employment;" this has been objected to as implying that the T. U.'s have always contemplated a perpetual continuance of the Capitalist or Wage system. No such implication was intended: Trade Unions have at various dates during the past century at any rate frequently had aspirations towards a revolutionary change in Social and Economic relations.' A historical study of the working class movement as it has developed in the different countries both Capitalists and Colonial confirms this view. The English Trade Union movement upto 1799 was sufficiently troublesome. They had to be forcibly suppressed by the Anti-combination laws of 1799. These laws remained in operation for 25 years. When in 1824 the Trade Unions became again legal they at once entered upon a revolutionary career and continued to have revolutionary aspirations till 1848 the year which saw the biggest wave of Chartism. In France, in Germany, in America, etc etc. the T. U. s have often played a revolutionary part, and had as their aims attainment of Socialism. In the Colonial countries such as China and Java their role in the National Democratic Revolution has been predominant.

The prosecution and the Magistrate on page 11 of C. O. have repeatedly stated what the Trade Union movement is and should be.

In the passage I refer to the Magistrate expresses with the greatest clearness not the nature of the Trade Union movement as

it is, but the limitation, which, the bourgeoisie try to impose upon the movement. The Trade Unions in order to conform to the interests of the Bourgeoisie must be primarily concerned with the immediate economic conditions. They must enter politics only in so far as is necessary to get remedial legislation passed; in other words they must have no other ambitions which go beyond the bounds of bourgeois politics. They must not have a policy of their own for the reconstruction of the national economic and political life. They must accept Capitalism, and the Bourgeois State without question. There is no doubt that at certain times and in certain places the bourgeoisie has succeeded more or less completely in imposing these limitations upon the Trade Union movement. But I maintain that these are limitations and that they are imposed from without by a hostile class. This case is part of the effort to impose these limitations upon the Indian Trade Union movement and is therefore an attack of a most dangerous character on that movement. My attitude is a plain denial of the whole position expressed by the Magistrate. I do not take my stand on any abstract right. I base my view on the realities of the class struggle. I am opposed to the attempts of the bourgeoisie to dictate its policy to the working class. I claim that it is the natural and proper policy of the Trade Union movement to put before itself as its aims not only the fight for improvements within the system of capitalism both by economic means legislation but also the attainment of socialism through the overthrow of Capitalism and in a colonial country the revolutionary fight for independence. These are the historic tasks of the working class which it is forced by its position to undertake. In the next sentence of my speech P222 I was speaking of the fight for national independence. I believe and my belief is based on a study of historical facts and confirmed by recent events that this fight will not be led and carried through by the Indian bourgeoisie or even by the petty bourgeoisie who as a class with all their seemingly revolutionary fervour will play a more or less active oppositional role and will ultimately go over to the camp of counter revolution. This fight will be led and carried through by the genuinely revolutionary proletariat in conjunction with the revolutionary peasantry and a section of the petty bourgeoisie. It will also be clear from this sentence that I was not speaking of the ultimate fight of the workers for socialism but of their immediate fight for national Independence.

Much stress has been laid on Moscow gold in this case. Labour leaders like Mr. Andrews, Messrs. Shivrão and Kirk have vehemently denounced Moscow gold stained with the blood of the innocents. On the other hand a moderate leader like Mr. N. M. Joshi has defended it and justified its acceptance. The British

Trade Union Congress leaders refused to accept Moscow help during the general strike and the miners lockout in 1926, although the miners federation did not scruple to accept it. The controversy is still raging abroad with much vehemence on either side but in India the Government set it at rest at least for some time and will most probably for ever after this case by issuing the Public Safety Ordinance which empowered them to confiscate all foreign help for Indian workers. The ordinance was obviously directed against Moscow and other radical organisations in foreign countries. The intention was to cut off the Indian Labour movement from all foreign contact and to make prolonged and effective strikes impossible by stopping all sources of help. I regard this action of the Government as most mischievous. I am not only opposed to foreign working class help from whatever country it comes but do actually welcome it. When the British bourgeoisie who have suffered so much at the hands of the soviet Government through the confiscation of their property and the repudiations of their debts, when they do not scruple to trade with Soviet Russia and receive Moscow gold, for any labour leader to decline help from the workers of that country can only mean that he is more inimical to Russia than the British bourgeoisie. I therefore had no hesitation to appeal to Comrade Saklatwala for help for Baurea strikers.

The prosecution have suggested that the Workers Welfare League is child of the Comintern. Nothing can be more ridiculous. The Workers Welfare League was founded in 1917, the year of the 'Russian revolution by one Mr. Arthur Field. The Comintern was founded in 1919 and the Red International of Labour Unions in 1920. It has also been alleged by the prosecution that the Workers Welfare League is a Communist body. I emphatically deny the allegation. The League is a nonpolitical body and includes among its members representatives of all working class organisations, Communist and Non-Communist. The membership of the League is by affiliated organisations: the total number of such organisations being 83 in 1927: among affiliated societies are the Iron and Steel Confederation, the London Society of Compositors, the National Amalgamated Furnishing Trades association. The National Union of Boot and shoe Operatives etc. The 1927 Report of the League P1359 shows that general cooperation also existed between the League and the British Trade Union Congress. It is very significant that not one of the Scotland Yard C. I. D. witnesses brought out to India at much expense could testify on any point regarding connections of the Workers Welfare League. The objects of the League are in short to safeguard the interests of Indian workers, to lay facts about the conditions of Indian labour before the workers of England, at the same time making it quite clear that the exploitation of labour in any part of the Empire is detrimental to the general interests of the workers in the Empire. The League has done

some very useful work in England on behalf of the Indian workers as will be seen from its reports.

It has been the set policy of British Imperialism to prevent British working class from helping the Indian workers and the attitude of the prosecution in regard to the Workers Welfare League is part of that policy.

This organisation that has done so much to link up the struggling Indian workers with their British comrades is to be first dubbed as a body under the influence and control of communists. It is then to be marked as a conspiratorial organisation, in this way making it possible for the Government to step in and break the link that has been forged. I received £ 10 from the Workers Welfare League. My Association with Johnston and telegram to League Against Imperialism: the prosecution have proclaimed that the League Against Imperialism is also a Communist Organisation; according to them it is a body which is definitely Communist and is doing the work of the 3rd International under the camou flage of being a wider body. The Magistrate also has been pleased to exercise his gift of irony at the expense of this Peculiarly Non-Communist organisation. The League Against Imperialism is not a Communist body. It is a wider body including many organisations and persons who could not possibly join the Communist International or be considered Communist. It is of course a revolutionary body. It stands definitely for complete independence in the Colonies, that is for Revolution. It has never denied or attempted to observe that fact. The report on the development of the League Against Imperialism in the Anti-Imperialist review records on page 95 that P. J. Schmidt in Holland, one of the most active and energetic of the younger Left Wing Socialists rendered excellent service to the Anti-Imperialist Movement by building up the Dutch Section of the League on a broader basis with the cooperation of Socialists, Bourgeois Radicals and National Revolutionary Indonesians. Most of the sections here enumerated would be repudiated by Communists in relation to their policy in the Imperialist Country, for there almost all including the Left Social Democrats are not revolutionary. But in regard to the Colonies Social Democrats, as Mr. Brailsford has said, can in theory support revolution if there is no effective machinery for constitutional advance, and even consistent bourgeois radicals who in theory must object to the rule of one country over another may support Colonial revolution. The League Against Imperialism is therefore a genuine embodiment of the united Anti-Imperialist front and communists take part in it on the same terms as others openly and professedly and not under a camouflage, in order to further and carry out their programme of supporting the Colonials' revolution which is also the programme of

the League. It is some of the other bodies and individuals who do not really support that Policy which is the Policy of the League who must be accused of dishonesty. I appealed to the L. A. I. for help for Bauria strikers but I did not appeal only to this body and to Comrade Saklatwala. I also appealed to Messrs. N. M. Joshi of Bombay and J. F. Syme of Dundee and to the International Federation of Trade Unions Amsterdam. I received Rs 250/- from the Jute and Flax Workers Union, Dundee. I translated speech P 2224 of Mr. Johnstone of the L. A. I. at a meeting in Bauria on I think 2. 12. 28. From his speech the character of the organisation which he came to India to represent at the Jharia A. I. T. U. C is clear. It nowhere smacks of Communism.

The sum of Rs 500/- sent by Girni Kamgar Union for Bauria strikers was sent to Muzaffar Ahmad and not to me and I never received it because the strike collapsed and so the meeting spoken of by M.A. in P 1346 never took place. In a note to Ghosh in connection with this money M. A. says that I was not acting under his orders as I was not a member of the party (P 73).
Q. In connection with the Chengail Strike the evidence against you consists of the statements of P. W's 27 and 98 and a letter P 526 (15) Ghosh to Spratt dated 23. 4. 28. Have you anything you think it necessary to say about this evidence?

A. Reserved for tomorrow.

(Sd.) R. L. Yorke.

19. 3. 31.

Q. Question on last page repeated.

A. I opposed the S.D.O's proposal as it stood. I remember to have explained the reasons for my opposition at length to the meeting. These have been omitted from his report by P. W. 27. At least one and the main-reason was broadly indicated by this witness in his examination-in-chief before the Lower Court but very significantly he has dropped it in this Court. In order to explain my attitude I need go a little into the history of the origin of the Union as well as of the strike. In early March there was a strike in the Ludlow Jute Mill, Chengail. It collapsed after 3 or 4 days. About 250 workers were discharged, most of them did not leave the place. They stayed on and invited the Bengal Trade Union Federation to help them to form a Union. The B. T. U. F. accepted their invitation and under its auspices a Union was formed towards the end of March with the discharged workers as first members: those men joined the Union in the hope that through its influence they would be able to get back their job before long, see P 2228, 1st paragraph, which is a correct account except that the figure of discharged workers given there is according to my information an underestimate. Gradually the workers

at the bench also began to join the union in batches; this roused the anger of the mill management. From the very beginning they took up a hostile attitude towards the union, both its officials and members. Exactly a month elapsed between the inception of the union and the April strike. In the course of this month no less than 100 workers were discharged for being members of the Union. As soon as a worker would be discharged he would be asked to at once vacate the Company's quarters which by the way were not supplied free to the workers but let out on rent. If he refused or delayed his room would be broken open and belongings thrown out. There were many instances when discharged workers were not allowed to finish their cooking or partake of their halfcooked meal. This was the attitude of the management towards the Union members. Their attitude towards the union officials was no less hostile. All the adjoining grounds being owned by the Mill Company there was no office room available for the union near by. Although an office was at last secured it was about 1½ miles from the mill. Enlistment of members of the union was not possible there, especially on week days. So the Secretary of the Union made several attempts to enlist members in the workers' quarters, on the express invitation of the workers, but each time he was prevented by Jamadars acting under orders of the management from entering the lines. Further during the one month between the formation of the union and the next strike the secretary wrote several letters one after the other to the manager of the mill drawing his attention to the frequent dismissals and persecutions of the workers on account of union activity, to the many abuses prevailing in the Company's line and to other grievances of the workers which were causing unrest among them and also requesting him each time to take back the dismissed men including those victimised during the March strike. None of those letters was answered. Some were not even received. At last feeling himself helpless the Secretary of the Union appealed to the Secretary of the B. T. U. F. the higher T. U. body, to move in the matter. Accordingly the Secty. of the Federation wrote a letter to the Manager drawing his attention to the numerous complaints of the workers and protesting mildly against his attitude of indifference towards those complaints and of hostility towards the Union. This letter was delivered to the Manager by a spinning Sardar named Mahadeo, on the morning of 23rd April. The very name of B. T. U. F. appearing in print on the cover of the letter made the Manager so angry that instead of opening it and reading its contents he tore it to pieces and trampled them underfoot in the presence of the bearer whom he also dismissed on the spot. The news of the insult to the Big Union (B. T. U. F.) and of the victimisation of Mahadeo an active member of the Union spread among the workers and the strike followed on the same afternoon, 23rd April. For the causes of the strike see P. W. 98 who corroborates my

statement. On the following day the water supply to the worker's lines was suddenly cut off from noon till evening. As the workers were not prepared for it they had not stored water beforehand. It was hot and meal time and there was no fresh water tank near by. This is classwar in practice and not in theory. What wonder that the workers would cherish bitter feelings against their employers and regard them as their enemies.

Soon after the above occurrence took place the meeting reported by P. W. 27. The S. D. O. came from the Manager's office and told us that the Manager was willing to receive a deputation of workers but was on no account prepared to negotiate with the Union officials or recognise the Union. That meant that the victimised men both those who were the original members of the union and those who were subsequently dismissed on account of their union membership were to stay where they were. They would have no chance of reinstatement. That meant a split in the ranks of the workers between the Unionists and non-unionists and that the victimisation of the unionists would go on as before. I at any rate could not assent to such a proposition which I regarded as a betrayal of the interests of the workers. What is there a union for if it does not fight for its recognition and surrenders its right to existence to the will of the employer?

This was the major consideration: there were others no less important. Every-where the employers insist on negotiating with their own men and not with outsiders, that is union officials. It is not out of any special love for their own men. They know that their own men being subordinates and mostly illiterate are no match for them, and that it is not difficult to bully them by threats or bluff them by empty promises, whereas in the outsiders they meet their equals and they know that it is not so easy to dupe or defeat them. If in spite of their unequal position some of the workers display unusual courage or skill in discussion with their masters they are marked out as 'undesirables' and sacked at the earliest opportunity. Sometimes the mere fact of being elected representatives is sufficient to jeopardise the position of those who are so elected, as they are suspected by the authorities to be the ringleaders. Moreover in the case of a settlement with the union officials the employers have to affix their signatures to the terms of settlement where-as if it is an agreement with their employees the terms of agreement need not be reduced to writing and signed. Verbal promises suffice and it is always easier to break them with impunity than to repudiate a signed document.

Visualising all these consequences of a deputation of workers not assisted by union officials I suggested an alternative to the S. D. O. It was that the deputation should go to the management, place before them the strikers demands, should not enter

into any discussion with them and should bring back the management's terms to the meeting which would have the final authority to accept or reject them, or to suggest any modification. In other words I suggested that the deputation should act only as a channel of communication between the workers and the management and not have the power to conclude an agreement on the spot without reference to the rest of the workers. I think this suggestion had a double merit. On the one hand it would not have exposed the members of the deputation to the displeasure of the management, on the other it would have avoided a split in the ranks of the strikers. This suggestion for obvious reasons was not accepted by the S. D. O. I may add that the workers fully agreed with my view point whose correctness was established by the subsequent developments and results of the strike. The management had to yield, they had to negotiate with the union officials and sign an agreement with them. Some of the victimised union members were at once taken back, the rest were to be reinstated within a stipulated period. Some of the other grievances were also redressed. Though formal recognition was still withheld from the union, virtual recognition was granted and that is what I aimed at, because that made it possible for us to settle future disputes as far as possible through negotiation and not through strikes.

Thus it will be seen that I did not oppose the S. D. O.'s proposal for the sake of our own prestige or to impede a settlement. Obviously the prosecution have brought forward this piece of evidence against me with the object of proving that I wanted to prolong the strike in pursuance of Communist tactic. The argument of the prolongation of strike does not hold good in this case because on the day on which the incident took place the strike was only 24 hours old and any question of prolongation would be considered premature by any rational man on the 2nd day of the strike. Apart from that I have diligently searched through practically the whole range of Communist literature available in this case—and whatever faults the Communists might or might not have this much credit must be conceded to them that they have not made a secret of their views, aims, programme and tactics—nowhere I have found prolongation of strikes advocated as a tactic. To say that we can prolong a strike against the wishes of strikers is as absurd as to say that we can bring about a strike where there is no serious discontent. Both the arguments do us too much honour in that both credit us with superhuman powers. We wish we had such powers because in that case we could gain our object only too soon and spare mankind a lot of degradation and misery which it has still to suffer, but unfortunately the fact remains that we have no such powers. It is only the Capitalists or those who represent their interests in this Court or outside, those who are dead to all the sufferings of the workers, who look upon them

not as human beings with distinct will and individuality of their own but as mere hands or instruments of production, it is only they who can advance such frivolous arguments. Others who know the workers, who have lived with them, worked with them and suffered with them will dismiss such theories with the contempt they deserve.

Q. In connection with the Scavengers Union you made a speech P. 2104 on 8.3. 28 and there is evidence of P.W.'s 53 and 88. Have you anything to say about this ?

A. I wonder why this speech of mine has been brought forward in evidence. This is the 1st speech in my life that I delivered before a workers' meeting. I claim that there is nothing Communistic about it. It is an ordinary Trade Union speech. Whatever statements I have made in it are true. It is true that the Chief Executive officer of the Calcutta Corporation was bent on breaking the strike by force and had asked the help of the Police for that purpose. I had seen Sergeants and armed constables escorting black-legs in motor lorries and bunches of them posted at street junctions. Firearms and lathis were much in evidence. On the very first day of this strike police interfered and arrested five strikers subsequently intimidation on a large scale was practised and there were numerous cases of actual assault by the Police upon the strikers, especially in Gaokhanas. The Ch. Ex. Officer himself stated "I was asked by the members of the Budget Special Committee to take all possible means to break the strike." Mr. K. S. Roy the then Secretary of the B.P.C.C. condemning this action of the Ch. Ex. Officer said "this method of breaking the strike displays a mentality which is uncommonly like the mentality of the Government. That our officer should have called in the Sergeants who assaulted us during the Hartal (meaning the Anti-Simon Hartal at beginning of 1928) to assault the Scavengers is to say the least disgraceful (P. 548 (5))." I attended this meeting on behalf of the Calcutta Corporation Teachers Union of which I was then a member. The scavengers and the teachers being employees of the same Corporation it was not unnatural for the one section to sympathise with the other.

Q. You had some connection with the Young Comrades League: the exhibits are P. 566, P. 565 and P. 568 and there are others on the record perhaps not directly relating to yourself. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. P. 565 shows that I was present at a meeting of the Young Comrades League on 11-8-28. The signature there is my own. P. 568 shows that I was present at another meeting on 8-2-29: the signature there is also my own. Both the names occur in the list of members. This may give rise to the presumption

that I was a member of the League, but that is not a fact. The remark against my name in P. 565 shows that I was invited by the League to attend its meeting and that I was there as a guest and not as a member. There is no such remark against my name in P. 568. This is obviously an omission. It is a fact that I was not a member of the League even on that date, that is about 1½ months before my arrest. I could not be a member of the League for the obvious reason that the constitution of the League set a maximum age limit of 30 and I was even in 1928 well above that limit. In P. 565 there is a slip of paper dated 28-7-28 containing a list of promised donations; the donation promised by me is shown as Rs 2/-. Then in P. 568 there are 2 slips of paper both undated each showing that I promised Rs 1/- as donation. I remember to have given some small donations to the League. P. 566 shows that I had agreed to teach Hindi to the members of the League just a month before my arrest. Unfortunately the class never met. Beyond this I don't think there was any other connection between myself and the League. This shows that I could not accomplish much in the way of debauching the minds of the Youth, for as the Magistrate has rightly pointed out my activities lay almost entirely in the Labour field.

Q. In connection with the Simon Commission Boycott there is about your activities the evidences of P. W's 35, 36, and 145 translator and Exhs P. 1937 and P. 2469. Have you anything to say in explanation of these? (It was pointed out to accused that P. 2469 did not appear to have been proved in this Court.)

A. I delivered the speech P. 1937. I also delivered another speech at the same meeting P. 2469 which has not been proved in this Court. All sorts of organisations took part in the Anti-Simon meeting, the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee, the Youth League, the Students Association, the Sikh League etc. The workers and their representatives and also a right to participate on the same terms as others and to voice their protest and put forward their own platform. In 1927 both the All India Trade Union Congress and the Indian National Congress had passed resolutions boycotting the Simon Commission. The same resolution had been reiterated by the Indian National Congress in 1928. The Jharia session of the A. I. T. U. C. in 1928 had defined not Dominion Status but Socialist Republic as its goal. The Simon Commission is an old history. The result of its labours has been scrapped even by those parties who sent it out so triumphantly to India 3 years back. Its report has found its proper place among the old archives of the British museum. I said in P. 1937 that "we want such a Government under which the full right to strike should exist and if the managers declare a lockout that would amount to a crime. (The reporter probably confused 'zulm' with 'jurm') we

want such a Government under which bullets will not be used (on strikers)". These are the minimum conditions which must be fulfilled in order to make it possible for the workers to improve their lot. A limited right to strike may exist on paper but it is seldom recognised in practice. A worker as soon as he downs tools is regarded as an outlaw. I did not characterise the Government under which these conditions are possible of fulfilment. I left the question open. It is for the Capitalist Governments to answer whether it is possible for them to fulfil these conditions or not. These demands may be considered wild and fantastic and impossible of fulfilment under any Government on earth. I claim that they are not. Professor Scott Nearing the eminent American economist and Mr. Jack Hardie write "any strike called against a state organisation is not directed against the State as such but against a particular branch of the state apparatus which has deviated from the general policy of the state. The state therefore will not take any action to break up the strike, will prevent strikers from interfering with strike breakers, will not permit the use of police to protect the interests of the employer, private or state. A strike against a state establishment in the Soviet Union therefore presents the anomalous phenomenon of state sympathy being upon the side of strikers and against one of its own autonomous branches." (The economic organisation of the Soviet Union P. 188. Vanguard series). The prosecution and the Magistrate have repeatedly stated that we aim immediately at setting up a Workers' Republic on Soviet Lines, or aimed immediately at the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. That is not my conception. The essential condition for the Proletarian Revolution and the setting up of a socialist society is the existence of a sufficiently developed industry as a basis. I do not consider that the growth of large scale industry in India is yet sufficient to serve as the basis for the immediate transition to socialist organisation. The great bulk of the manufactured goods consumed in India even in present conditions are imported. Most important of all the means of production are not manufactured in India at all and even accessories for industry, transport and agriculture are produced only to a small extent. Further the actual strength of the working class in consequence of this position is insufficient to enable them to undertake immediately the immense task of instituting the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and carrying on at once the struggle for socialism. That is why I demanded neither the Dictatorship of the Bourgeoisie nor that of the proletariat but the rule of the Masses, that is of the workers peasants and all those who toil and are exploited.

P. 2469 shows that I stand for complete freedom of India from British Imperialism and that I want complete national independence. I claim that I am an internationalist. That does

not prevent me from being a nationalist. I distinguish between Nationalism and Nationalism. The Nationalism of oppressed Colonial countries struggling for independence is a progressive force while that of Imperialist countries which oppress the weaker countries I regard as reactionary. As an internationalist I stand for a free federation of all the peoples of the earth, but that cannot be achieved unless all are freed from the yoke of subjection and unless all stand on a free and equal footing. The federation represented by an empire is a unity forced upon the backward and conquered countries by a dominating country. Therefore I am as much opposed to Imperialist Nationalism as I am in favour of Nationalism of the Colonial oppressed races. It is a sheer misrepresentation to say that we are anti-national. Our differences with the so-called Nationalist leaders are based on this fact that those leaders are not leaders of national revolution but leaders of a nationalist reformist movement. They are not striving as the prosecution say of them for independence: they are striving for dominion status or something even less than dominion status as shown by recent events. They are for a compromise with Imperialism in accordance with the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie. We are against a compromise with Imperialism. On the contrary we want to overthrow it. I am therefore entitled to ask who are the better nationalists, we or they? It is again a sheer perversion of obvious facts to say that we are antinational.

Q. In regard to your activities on Lenin Day, 20th Jan. 1929 there is evidence of P.W. 4982, and 92 (Translator) and P. 2459 report of your speech. Do you wish to say anything in explanation of these?

A. I delivered the speech P. 2459. If the middle class can have its revolutionary heroes in Cromwell and Hampden in Washington and Jefferson, in Robespierre and Napoleon, in Mazzini and Garibaldi and if it is not a crime to honour their memory and teach their lives to the children, it should not be a crime to pay respect to the memory of such working class heroes as Babeuf and Blanqui, Marx and Engels, Liebknecht and Luxemburg and above all Lenin, the greatest revolutionary of the world. He was greatest because his conception was wider and his vision larger than the others. These fought for the privileges of a small class. Lenin fought and died for the abolition of all class privileges and of all classes. He was the world's greatest idealist and the greatest realist in one. His achievement in the realm of both theory and practice is unique. He has left a legacy of sound, proletarian ideology and tactics to the international working class movement. It is not the Mausoleum under the walls of Moscow Kremlin but the Communist International which stands as a towering monument to Lenin and Leninism. As long ago as 1919 or 1920 Mr. Bertrand Russell who does not accept

Lenin's philosophy said that this century will go down in history as the century of Lenin and Einstein. Even Mr. Churchill the champion of the big interventionist policy in Soviet Russia in 1918 and 1919 and the uncompromising enemy of the Bolsheviks penned a glowing appreciation of Lenin only the other day. Although my object was not to heroworship Lenin but to explain his principles as far as I understood them, in the reported portion of my speech there is nothing of Leninism: it was only a theoretical exposition of Marxism which is the common stock in trade of even Social Democrats of the Labour and Socialist International. Similarly there is nothing in it of the Russian revolution or of the Comintern.

P.W. 49. There is nothing surprising in the statement about the next revolution reported by this witness. It could be made even by a Tory diehard over a cup of morning tea.

Q. In regard to your part in the Jharia A. I. T. U. C. conference of 1928 there is evidence of P.W.'s 123 and 254. Do you want to say anything about these?

A. I attended the Jharia session of the A. I. T. U. C. on behalf of the Bauria Jute Workers' Union, where I supported a resolution moved by Diwan Chaman Lal protesting against the use of police and military against strikers and suggesting the organisation of a general strike in the event of such force being used in future. The Government-publication "Industrial Disputes in India, 1921-28" records 5 recent cases of firing, in the Kharagpur strike 1927, Bombay Textile strike 1928, E. I. Railway Lillooah strike 1928, S. I. Railway strike 1928 and Fort Gloster Jute Mill (Bauria) strike 1928. Besides these cases of actual firing hardly any strike of importance has taken place in recent years in India in which other forms of violence by the police have not been used. From the time of my joining the Labour movement up to the time of the Jharia congress, that is in the course of 10 months only my own experience had been extensive and painful in the extreme. I had seen strikers being beaten and arrested by the police in the 1st Calcutta Scavengers strike, in the 1st Ludlow Jute mill strike, in the Lillooah strike, Ondal strike, Asansol strike and in the Bauria strike.

Sd. R L. Yorke.

20/3/31

Q. In regard to your part in the occurrence on 30.12.28 when a procession of workers is said to have invaded the Indian National Congress Pandal, there is the evidence of P.W. 49 and 254. Have you anything to say about this?

A. The prosecution theory that the workers' demonstration to Congress on 30. 12. 28 was organised and led by Communists or

members of the W. P. P. is entirely baseless. Both responsibility and credit for this demonstration belong fully to Mr. K. C. Mitra and to none of us although I and some others took part in it. It was several months before the Congress met in Calcutta that Mr. Mitra had conceived the idea of an All Bengal Labour Conference to be held within the Congress Pandal at the time of the Congress Session. This idea Mr. Mitra communicated to me in August 1928. To secure the use of the Pandal for the Conference he carried on negotiations with the executive of the Congress Reception Committee and at last obtained their permission. To avoid conflict with the business of the Congress it was agreed that the Conference should meet and finish its deliberations before the time fixed for the Congress Session. December 30 was fixed as the date of the Conference. Handbills in Hindi, Urdu and Bengali were printed and distributed by Mr. Mitra in and around Calcutta inviting the workers to assemble in the Maidan on the morning of the 30th. To avoid trouble to the Congress authorities and also because most of the workers did not know where the Congress Nagar was located it was thought expedient to assemble the workers first on the Maidan and thence to take them in a procession to the Congress Pandal. Notice announcing the date, time and place of the Conference appeared consecutively for 9 or 10 days before the Session of the Conference in the programme of engagements Columns of the Forward which was at the time the organ of the Reception Committee of the Congress. Several copies of the Forward bearing the announcement of the Conference D 173 (1) to (7) as well as a number of hand-bills distributed among the workers (P. 149 (32 b)) have been filed as Defence Exhibits.

On the evening of 29/12 Mr. K. C. Mitra visited Bauria, distributed hand-bills among the strikers, and invited them to join the Labour procession and Conference on the following morning (P.W. 98). The report of the witness also records that "he (K. C. Mitra) left the meeting to make arrangements for the above procession." Asked by the court how he knew Mr. Mitra's intention witness replied that he did not know how he knew. It was a lie. Mr. Mitra himself had made that announcement to the meeting. The fact is that Mr. Mitra had left the meeting before it was over and while taking leave of the meeting he had mentioned that as the reason for his early departure. The meeting was also informed both by M. Mitra and myself that a demand would be made from the Congress of Rs 25000/- for the relief of the Bauria strikers (P. 2225). Mr. Mitra had already drawn up and printed a list of 5 or 6 demands to be passed at the Conference and presented to the Congress the following day. The presentation of these demands was the main object of the Conference and not the capturing or smashing of the Congress as the prosecution

fantastically suggest. As far as I am concerned I attended the Conference simply because there was the demand for help for the Bauria strikers. Otherwise so pre-occupied was I with the strike which was nearing its collapse that I would not have moved out of Bauria which at the time demanded my constant presence. In fact as soon as Mr. Mittra on behalf of the Conference presented the list of demands to the President of the Congress I left the Conference for Bauria and did not stay till the end of the proceedings.

On that day the Congress Session had to be postponed for a couple of hours because the procession could not reach the Congress Pandal within the scheduled time. The delay was caused not by us, but by the Police authorities who would not at first allow the procession to proceed from the Maidan to the Congress Nagar and held it up for more than 3 hours, thereby upsetting the time table of both the Conference and the Congress. On account of this delay and as it was about time for the regular session of the Congress the office bearers of the Reception Committee of the Congress who were the persons primarily responsible for the admission of people into the *pandal* did not know for some time what to do, because from the delay they had concluded that the idea of the Conference had either been abandoned or that it had not materialised. But as soon as they approached the President of the Congress with the news of the arrival of the procession at the gate and explained to him the reason for the delay he postponed the Session of the Congress for 2 hours and permitted the workers to enter the Pandal and finish their deliberations during the interval. The workers had to wait at the gate only for so long as it took to obtain the President's permission. It is a downright lie to say that the volunteers overpowered and the workers entered the Pandal by force. Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru the General Secretary of the Congress and some other Congress leaders went to the gate to receive the workers and conducted them into the Pandal. Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru presided over the Conference as P. W. 49 indirectly admits. Pt. Moti Lal Nehru the President of the Congress also addressed the Conference (P.W. 254). As I have said I did not stay up to the end of the proceedings so I am not aware whether or not any resolution about workers Government was passed. P. W. 254 did not make mention of any such resolution. I would not be surprised if it were passed for that would be a proper resolution for a labour Conference to pass. P. W. 49 admits that Mr. K. C. Mitra was very prominent at the meeting and spoke. As a matter of fact he does not remember the name of any other speaker in the meeting except Mr. K. C. Mitra. He also admits that his information was that Mr. Mitra was organising the demonstration. P. W. 254 also says that Mr. K.C. Mitra was connected with the procession so out of the mouth

of the Police witnesses themselves it is established that Mr. K. C. Mitra was the organiser of the demonstration and the moving spirit of the Conference. Anybody who knows Mr. K. C. Mitra cannot accuse him of anti-Congress feelings, in fact he has a weakness for Congress. The prosecution evidently fabricated this evidence regarding our invasion of the Congress Pandal. They did it not out of a tender solicitude for the Congress for the character of that solicitude has been revealed by the series of Viceregal Ordinances declaring Congress activities and organisations illegal. They did this to mislead the people as to the nature and aims of our activities but the people will not be deceived by such tricks of the prosecution. They will see through the game.

I would like to say something more about P. 111, the Trade Union Thesis presented to the A. I. W. P. P. I must have received at the A. I. W. P. P. Conference.

About P. 107 notice of meeting at Bauria for 27-12-28 I would like to say that this meeting never took place.

Q. In the course of the evidence quoted already and in other documents, belonging to you and others, such as P. 41-42, P. 119, P. 121, P. 146 etc. there is evidence associating you in these activities with a number of accused, e. g. Spratt, Goswami, Ghosh, Chakravarty, Banarjee, Muzaffar Ahmad, Basak, Huda etc. etc. Have you anything to say on this subject?

A. I have said about myself, about others I don't want to say anything.

Q. Is there any other matter covered by the evidence against you on which you wish to offer any explanation to the Court? I have of course, to point out that in this case it is almost impossible for the Court's questions to be exhaustive.

A. Though the Court has not asked me because there is no evidence on the point I do not want to hide from the Court that I am a Communist by conviction. A study of the course of development of human history from the primitive communist through the patriarchal, classical and feudal down to the modern bourgeois and socialist stage, a similar study of the rise and development of Capitalism from the Commercial through the industrial to the present financial monopolist or imperialist stage, a study of the way in which the economic and political life of India has developed under the British imperialist rule, a first hand knowledge of the appalling poverty, misery and degradation of the Indian masses under Imperialist exploitation and oppression, and the conviction gained through an active participation in the economic struggles of the workers of the impossibility of improving their lot within the system of Capitalism in general and Imperialism in particular have

made a Communist. Up to the time of my arrest I was not a member of the Communist party of India. Not being a member of the party I could not possibly have received sealed packets of instructions from the Communist International. I spontaneously reacted to the specific situations as they developed in the way I did, and if that is the way of the Communist International it shows how correct and scientific it is, and I claim that anyone else not already corrupted by Reformism would have acted just like myself under the same circumstances.

I would also like to say something about the charge : I am charged with conspiracy against the King. Besides the 30 comrades in the dock one of the organisations with which I am alleged to have conspired is the Communist International. As regards the conspiratorial nature of this body this is what no less a person than 'King' Stalin says : "in the west the hirelings of the imperialists and the manufacturers of forged letters spread reports to the effect that the Comintern is an organisation composed of conspirators and terrorists.....Let me explain that Communists never have had and never will have anything to do with the theory and practise of conspiracies against individual persons. The theory and the practice of the Comintern is based upon the idea of organising a revolutionary mass movement against Capitalism. This is the true task of the Communists. Only ignoramuses and idiots can confound conspiracies and individual acts of terrorism with the policy of the Comintern which is based upon the promotion of a mass movement."

As regards ourselves the charge is equally baseless. The words conspiracy and conspiratorial are used in 2 senses, one the bourgeois legal sense of illegal and secret, the other the proletarian tactical sense of isolated from the masses. In none of these 2 senses can our activities be dubbed as conspiratorial. Upto the time of our arrest neither the Communist Party nor the Workers and Peasants Party was an illegal party. They had therefore no need to carry on underground work. Of all the astounding features of this case the most remarkable which every detached observer has commented upon is the absence from the prosecution evidence of any acts on our part of an illegal character. Even the Home member to the Government of India had to admit in the Legislative Assembly in March 1929 that none of our actions in themselves were contrary to the law. As regards our views we have never made a secret of them. Moreover our activities having been directly connected with the struggle of the masses are not open to the charge of being conspiratorial even in the proletarian tactical sense. Here is the classic pronouncement of Marx on the subject of conspiracy; commenting on the 1st Communist trial in Europe in 1852 he wrote : "he is a coward that under certain circumstances

would not conspire just as he is a fool who under other circumstances would do so." We claim that we are neither fools nor cowards.

This about conspiracy. Next about the king. Comrade Stalin has already said that Communists do not conspire against individual persons. I was extremely amused at being charged with conspiracy to deprive the king of his Sovereignty. There is no sovereignty left to the King of which I can deprive him. The British bourgeoisie has already deprived him of his Sovereignty. I regard the King as an anachronism. Kingship is characteristic specially of the later stages of feudalism and the earlier stages of the growth to power of the Bourgeoisie. "The King" is essentially an alien in a bourgeois country and if he is retained he becomes steadily more and more as a puppet. The typical developed country is a Republic. Consistent of bourgeois radicals are republicans. There was in the 19th century a fairly active republican propaganda on the part of a wing of the British Liberal party, a bourgeois party. It is obvious that all Socialists should be Republicans and it is indicative of the corruption of the Labour and Socialist International that several of its parties, as for example the British Labour party, are tolerant if not actively in favour of monarchy. Thus solemnly to accuse me of conspiracy to deprive the King of his Sovereignty is simply a piece of demagogic humbug. If I were charged with conspiracy against the British bourgeoisie (although here again I deny that I conspired) it would have been nearer the truth, for as everybody knows the sovereignty of the king is a legal constitutional form which hides the true relationship of India to Great Britain, namely the rule of British Capital over India.

This is a case which will have Political and historical significance. It is not merely a case launched in the ordinary course of its duties by the Police against 31 criminals. It is an episode in the class struggle. It is launched and conducted as part of a definite Political policy. It is an attempt on the part of the British imperialist Government of India to strike a blow at that force which it recognises as the real enemy which will ultimately bring about its overthrow, which has already taken up an attitude of irreconcilable hostility towards it and has already shown a very menacing strength, the masses of the poor and exploited population of this Country. It is an attempt by the Imperialist Government to strike a blow at its enemy not only by removing from the field a mere 31 individuals but by reading a lesson to all who would follow the line of the mass revolutionary struggle in future, and by establishing a number of convenient legal Precedents which will facilitate the smashing of the Workers and Peasants movement by lawful and constitutional means. This case in spite of the denials of the prosecution is an attack upon the workers' Trade Union Movement, an attack upon the peasants' movement and attack upon the movement for the independence

of India from British Imperialism. I do not plead for mercy or even for justice before this Court. This is a class court and in relation to an offence directed against the ruling class itself the conception of justice has no meaning. Nevertheless I do not passively offer myself as a sacrifice to the cruelty of Imperialism. I challenge Imperialism to stem the rising tide of mass revolutionary struggle for complete national independence by wreaking its vengeance on us. Wherever I have spoken of the King I was speaking of the institution of Kingship.

Q. You along with other accused filed before the Magistrate a long list of defence witnesses of whom only a certain number appear to relate to your case. Please state which if any of these witnesses you wish this court to move the Magistrate to summon to give evidence in your defence.

A. I do not propose to call any witness.

(Sd.) R. L. Yorke,

23-3-31

Sd. Radha Raman Mittra

Q. You have read through your statement. Are you satisfied that the above is a correct record of your statement.

A. Yes.

(Sd.) R. L. Yorke,

24-3-31.

(Sd) Radharaman Mittra.

Certified that the above examination of the accused R. R. Mittra was taken in my presence and hearing and in fact by my own hand contains a full and true account of the statement made by the accused.

(Sd.) R. L. Yorke,

25-3-31

In the Court of R. L. Yorke I.C. S. Addl. Sess: Judge Meerut.

In the case of King Emperor Vs. P. Spratt and Others
Examination of Shamsulhuda

accused under section 364 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, made before me R. L. Yorke, I. C. S. Additional Sessions Judge at Meerut on the 23rd day of March 1931.

My name is Shamsulhuda; my father's name is Mohd. Shafi alias Mir. Ansar Ali; I am by caste No Caste; 27 years of age; by occupation Businessman; my home is at Calcutta Police station Taltola; district Calcutta, I reside at 2/1 European Asylum Lane.

Q. You heard your statement in the Lower Court P. 2585 read out to you in this court on 16th March. Was that statement correct?

A. Yes.

Q. There are some papers showing you to be a member of the Communist Party of India, namely P. 1295, 1300 and 1303. Have you anything to say in explanation of these?

A. Communists scorn to hide their views and aims. They openly declare that their purposes can only be achieved by the forcible overthrow of the whole extant Social order. "Let the ruling classes tremble at the prospect of a Communist revolution. Proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have the world to win." I am a Communist and I stand by Communist Party of India: I do not agree with those who say that the working class should not enter politics, that it has no politics. Neither do I agree with the patriots who say that their politics is the politics of the working classes. The working classes have a double task to perform. It is the working class who has to fight for national independence in cooperation with the peasantry. The independence of India can be achieved by revolutionary struggle of the Proletariat and the peasantry. The struggle cannot be carried on to the victorious end by bourgeoisie which collapses before talks of reform and few concessions to its own class. It is the proletariat and

* Pt. Proletariat, the peasantry who will carry on the revolutionary struggle and it is the *Pt. which has to lead. This leadership of the working classes, finds its expression in a class party of the Pt. that is "Communist Party." The immediate aim of the C. P. I. the attainment of independence from Imperialism, the destruction of feudalism, nationalisation of land and key industries and the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and peasantry, the immediate aim is a national Democratic revolution. That is why Communist

co-operate with and join genuine anti-imperialist Organisations like the W. P. P. and the League against Imperialism. These organisations are not Communist but desire and fight for independence of India and of the emancipation of the Proletariat and peasantry. Therefore Communists are found in them. Similarity of the immediate aim of one with the limited anti-imperialist aims of the other, facilitates the game of the Government to purposely confound every anti-imperialist revolutionary organisation with the Communist party. Freedom from British imperialism is not the Ultimate aim of the C. P. but the immediate aim. The ultimate aim of the Communists all over the world is the aim of Communist International. "Communist International, the international workers' association is a Union of Communist parties in various countries. It is a world Communist party. As the leader and the organiser of the world revolutionary movement of the Pt., the upholder of the principles and aim of Communism, Communist International strives to win over the majority of the working class and the broad strata of the propertyless peasantry, fights for the establishment of the world Dictatorship of Proletariat, for the establishment of the world union of Socialist Soviet Republics, for the complete abolition of classes and for the achievement of Socialism, the first stage of Communist society." (P 2339, P12, P. 1208 (3)). In the attainment of this aim the independence of the colonial countries like India and China is a stage because the international independence weakens imperialism and emancipates the peasantry from the feudal burdens, clarifies the class struggle and hastens the social revolution.

The ultimate aim of the Communist has been vulgarised by the prosecution which tries to excite the prejudices of the ignorant people by telling them that the ultimate aim is to establish a Soviet Republic; all of which will be under the control of Moscow. Imperialism, while exploiting the millions of workers and peasants for itself, wants to frighten away the colonial toilers from joining hands with the international Proletariat especially with the Victorious Proletariat of Russia as organised in the Communist International, by spreading stories of the Red Imperialism, but the working class and toilers, have nothing to fear from the toiler of Russia but on the contrary the Victorious Proletariat of Russia is the only true ally of the toilers of India and so is the Communist International. The C. I. is not a Russian institution or a body of handful of conspirators. It is a world union of Communist Parties which in themselves are formed of the best elements of the working class. The C. I. is the essence of the will of the world Proletariat and therefore is the champion of the Proletariat and the peasantry of every countries. The C. I. being world union of Communist Parties is not and cannot be identical with the Soviet Government of Russia. This Soviet Government is the Government of workers and peasants of Russia and is elected through Soviet

Congresses of workers and peasants. Neither is the Soviet Government identical with the Russian C. P. Russian Communist Party possesses leadership in the Soviets and succeeds in influencing and convincing the Proletariat and peasantry that its leadership, its policy is the only correct one and thus guides the workers' state towards the realisation of Socialism.

Sd. R. L. Yorke.

23-3-31

Q. The house search which is in evidence against you is that at 2/1 European Asylum Lane Calcutta of which the witnesses are P.W.'s 30, 31, 33 & 36 and the exhibits concerned P 353 to P 550 and P 2509 and P 2510 excluding P 424 - P 434. All these are of general importance in the case and in some cases, perhaps of special weight in your case. Do you wish to say anything about this search ?

A. Before my arrest I was living some different place and I moved to 2/1 European Asylum Lane just to save my room rent. W. & P. P. as a part of working class can house anybody who work for their cause. I was a member of W.P.P. and as such I had a right to live there. When I was arrested on 20. 3. 29 there were some outsiders living with us and as such I don't think I am fully responsible for the documents found there, because these belonged to the party and not to any individual.

Q. In regard to your connection with the Bengal Transport workers Union and incidentally with the W. P. P. of Bengal there are some documents and speeches: P548 (10) 2 notices, Reports P 1929 (1), 1927 and 1935 and documents P 544 3) and 491. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. It has been urged against the Communists that they want to use Trade Unions as a cloak for revolution. This is merely an outcry of Imperialism in which it is also supported by the Indian Bourgeoisie, in order to prevent the Communists doing any work in the Trade Unions. The Trade Unions are the class organ of the Proletariat to fight its economic battles as against employers in the industrial field but it has been demonstrated by the historical experience of the working class that a mere Trade Union struggle even to the extent of a general strike cannot solve the irreconcilable opposition of interest between the workers and the Capitalists, because Capitalism and Imperialism in the last instance use the machinery of the Government to violently suppress the working class; use of machine guns, police, S 144 A. C. P. C. confiscation of newspapers, imprisonment of leaders, all these methods are used by the bourgeois Imperialists to suppress the Workers' organisations like Trade Unions.

This attack of the whole State machinery cannot be resisted by the Trade Unions only, because there are generally organisations of separate groups of workers. The task of the revolution, the overthrow of Imperialism can be done only by a Political Party of the working class which contributes its best most reliable intelligent and fearless element to the class Party without distinctions of trade or craft: thus to charge the Communist with using Trade Unions as a cloak for revolution is illogical. The Communist works in Trade Unions to fight the economic battle of day to day demands for the Partial improvement of workers' lives, for convincing them of the necessity of the working class struggle on a bigger scale, of the revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie as a class. The T. U.'s by themselves alone cannot emancipate the working class. It is the task of the revolutionary party of the Proletariat.

I worked in Bengal Transport Workers Union of which I was the General Secretary and for the dock workers also. Calcutta being one of the biggest ports in India there is a huge army of dock workers and transport workers. The condition of these workers is worse than that of any other classes. They possess comparatively less steady employment, they are engaged by contractors and the employment depends on the trade of the season. In order to secure favours of the contractors they have to go on perpetually paying commission. The contractors profit both ways. With no housing provision, no steady employment, exploited by the contractors, the dock workers and transport workers require a strong organisation of their own. Referring to my activities in connection with their unions the Magistrate in his committal order remarked that my object was not to organise them on the T. U. lines but to recruit them for the party. This betrays the ignorance of the aim of the Communist. I did want to organise them into a union but as I have already said that merely T. Unionism will not help, they must also organise politically. The T.U.C., the General Labour office organised by imperialists and their agents, have been passing bundles of resolutions for the improvement of the workers but to no purpose. Only a strong organisation and ultimately revolutionary action can save the workers from degradation, poverty and exploitation; a fight under the leadership of the Communist Party alone can give them 8 hours day, minimum wages, political power, education and real life.

Q. In regard to your activities in connection with the Bauria and Chengail mill strikes there is the following evidence: Bauria:- P.W 98 also P.25; P. 27 P.5,6,7) and P.526 (9): showing that you were at Bauria on 11.11.28, 28.11.28 and 6.1.29 and were associated with other accused there. Chengail:- P.W 37 showing you went there as also to Bauria on 28.11.28 with Mr. Johnstone of the League Against Imperialism and others.

Have you anything to say about these ?

A. With regard to the Bauria strike and Chengail strike I have nothing to add to what comrade Radha Raman has said because I used to go occasionally, that is once or twice. Therefore I have not much knowledge about Bauria and Chengail as comrade Radha Raman. I agree with him whatever he says.

As regards Johnstone I met him at Chengail where a meeting was held. I came to know that comrade Johnstone was a representative of the League Against Imperialism to the Indian National Congress, to the A.I.W.P.P. Conference, and to the A.I.T.U.C. Comrade Johnstone has come to India to express his opinion on the imperialist exploitation in Europe and America and he came to tell Indian workers how the Imperialists antagonised workers of India with American workers and European workers. He said at the A.I.T.U.C.—“in America they told the Textile workers “after 9 months you must have a reduction in wages because we have to compete with the cheap labour in India.” They told the workers in Bombay that “in this city you must accept low wages because we have to compete with the cheap labour in Japan” so we see in every country one set of toilers is set off against another.’ Comrade Johnstone is or was a member of the League Against Imperialism, the organisation which wants to liberate from the imperialist exploitation; especially the aim of the League Against Imperialism is to help the colonial people, to liberate them from the imperialist domination. Comrade Johnstone came to this country to give a clear point of view of the League Against Imperialism in regard to Indian independence. The League Against Imperialism was organised in 1927 in order to lead the colonial peoples towards their goal and the oppressed people as a whole.

Q. There is evidence of activity on your part along with Spratt accused at Jamshedpur: vide P. W. s 101,102,103 and P. 122 and P.2207, P.2210 and P.2210A. Have you anything to say about these?

A. I delivered a speech in Jamshedpur before the Steel workers of the Tata Iron and Steel Co., (P.2207). I found it necessary to go and speak before the workers in Jamshedpur because of the peculiar position of the workers there. The workers there are employed by Tata Iron and Steel Co. This company belongs to the big Tata Combination and is considered as a national industry or concern. It has been the practice of several Nationalist leaders who meddle in the affairs of the workers at Jamshedpur and elsewhere to preach patriotism and love to the workers and in the end tell them to have no strike or struggle with the capitalists of this so-called national industry. It is necessary to expose the hypocritical game of the nationalist bourgeoisie as it is harmful to the working class. For such a game did the bourgeois nationalist take interest in the workers

fight in Jamshedpur and Calcutta; while a few of the petty bourgeois leaders were doing this, the bigger bosses were voting crores of rupees by Bounties and Protection to the Tata Steel in the Legislative Assembly. The bourgeoisie preaches to the working class not to enter politics, but the same bourgeoisie uses politics. The Legislative Assembly has been giving bounties since 1924 on the pretext that a national industry was suffering losses, but when a member, a moderate Trade Unionist, proposed that the Act which gave millions to the Company should grant the protection to the workers, the removal of these grievances, better housing, medical aid, education etc, the bourgeoisie in the Assembly refused. A European Superintendent of the Dairy of the Company received 1200/- P.M. while the workers' children got no milk or education. The Company paid from 1916 to 1921 a profit of 1200% while the workers had to fight even to get an allowance for the rising of prices. This Company illustrated the tremendous power of capital. The whole town belonged to the Company so that if a worker shows any opposition he can be packed and sent off at a moment's notice. Even the machinery of justice which is said to be impartial to all belonged to the Company. Some of the European servants have been given magisterial powers in the town and one such a servant, a magistrate during the strike gave his verdict against the strike and as a magistrate ordered firing on the workers, killing 5 of them, and the Nationalist bourgeoisie votes crores for Tata. It is therefore necessary to expose the treacherous role of Nationalist bourgeoisie, to show the working class and the peasantry that the bourgeois is fighting for its class interest, for the land-lords and for the usurers and once it gets a few concessions it will ally completely with the Government against the Proletariat and the peasantry. During the Jamshedpur strike the nationalist leaders like Diwan Chamanlal member of the Whitley Commission and Subash Bose did the work of the bourgeoisie and in the end wanted to teach the heroic workers contentment and love. The workers were betrayed and it was necessary to warn them against the treacherous bourgeoisie, so I went to Jamshedpur. I only advised the workers not to be guided by the hypocritical promises but to have their own organisation, their own leadership, to organise on class lines and to carry on a struggle for wages and better conditions and for national independence.

Q. P. W: 52 S. I. P. N. Banerji deposes to a speech P. 2146 made by you on 7-10-28 at a meeting of protest against the Public Safety Bill and the Trades Disputes Bill. Have you anything to say about this?

A. As far as this speech is concerned I do not remember what I said and what other speakers said because the C. I. D. Reporter said 'in the course of their speeches the speakers referred to the Russian Revolution.' Anyhow if I said what appears in P.2146

I maintain it. In the 1st place I went to Matiaburz to invite the workers to attend the A. I. W. P. P. Conference, the conference which would give them proper lead towards their goal that is Independence. In reference to Russia, if I said at all about the Russian revolution, it is perfectly right to teach the worker experience of Russian revolution. Before the revolution the Russian worker and the peasant were exploited by handfuls of robbers. The Russian workers could not go on strike for their legitimate demands of wages, and shorter hours. When they used to go on strike they used to be shot down like a dog. After the brutal exploitation by Czarist Government and the feudalists and capitalists in general they could not resist this exploitation any longer. The Communist Party of Russia at that time gave them proper lead towards their goal by which they overthrow the barbarous Czarist Government and established their own Government. If India wants to be free from the British imperialism like Czarism in Russia the Indian worker has to be taught experience of Russian revolution in order to overthrow the barbarian Government in India, and therefore I said if I said at all.

Q. In regard to your activities at the A. I. T. U. C. Jheria in December 1928 there is evidence of P. W.'s 254 and 123 which shows that you were associated there with a number of your co-accused and that you spoke on a Resolution regarding organisation of general strikes. Have you anything to say about this.

A. The T. U. C. or A. I. T. U. C. was the congress of the working class. In that congress not only I myself and my co-accused attended but also many reactionary and moderate T. Unionists also attended. If I attended that Congress I commit no conspiracy against the King Emperor to deprive him of the sovereignty of British India. If the Trade Union Congress was a conspiratorial body the whole of its members would have been put in the dock but fortunately or unfortunately it was not so and they were not put in the dock. That shows that the T. U. C. is not a conspiratorial body. The Government wanted to put in prison us because we held certain views, secondly to deprive us from taking part in the working class activity. Government had arrested us first to ruin the working class movement which was growing revolutionary. Government knew by its C. I. D. reports that we are connected with the working class and as such we represent their views. Government always supported moderate reactionary Trade unionists like Diwan Chammanlal, N. M. Joshi, to send them to the Geneva show, and put them in as factions in the working class movement to destroy the militancy and revolutionary Consciousness. These gentlemen, working in the T. U. movement since T. Unionism was born in India, could not do any useful work for the starving masses of India. They always

tried their best to capture any union which was formed by some of us for the Geneva show. This Geneva Labour office or show was formed by Imperialists, mainly British, French and other great Imperialists. In order to make propoganda on behalf of the said organisation, because the Geneva show found very great difficulty to fulfil the grievances of the colonial Proletariat, Colonial people is undergoing so many exploitations of imperialists and landlords and Capitalists in general: on account of this exploitation this oppressed people cannot resist the dominations of Imperialists. Therefore the Geneva show is trying its best to get the colonial people under their influence on the other hand by doing nothing. And the R. I. L. U is trying its best to help the Indian masses and colonial peoples in general in their economic and political struggle against Imperialism. Therefore all this Imperialist fraction in the Labour movement in order to sabotage the revolutionary international.

Q. In regard to your activities in connection with the A. I. W. P. P. Conference there is the evidence of P. W. s 36 and 254 and of P. 669: there is also evidence of P. W. 90 in regard to the procession which went under A.I.W.P. P. leadership from Shradhanand Park to the Congress Nagar on 23.12.28. Have you anything to say about this?

A. As regards the fact that I attended the A. I. W. P. P. Conference and I took part in the demonstration on 23-12-28 my participation in the A.I.W.P.P. Conference and the demonstration itself does not make a conspiracy to dethrone King George V. If A. I. W. P. P. was a conspiratorial body this conspiracy would not be tried here.

About my membership of the W. P. probably your honour has not got any documentary evidence before you but I voluntarily admit that I was a member of the Bengal W. P. P. The W. P. P was not a Communist party. Its aim was to secure independence and democracy for India. Neither the bourgeoisie nor the petty bourgeoisie as a class can bring about this independence. It is the task only of the working class and the peasantry. The peasantry by itself cannot achieve anything. It must have the leadership of the Proletariat. On the other hand in an agrarian country like India the Proletariat by itself cannot successfully carry through the revolution unless it has the support of the peasantry in the countryside. The W.P. P. was organised to establish this necessary alliance between the workers and peasants.

Q. There are also some miscellaneous documents: (I do not think it is possible to be certain of being exhaustive in questioning you or possibly any other accused.) There are Ghosh's diaries P. 41-47, the group photograph P. 457 and P. 601 (1) a slip, the fact that the Bengal Transport Workers Union and the Y.C.L.

office were in 1 room (P.W. 71.) • Have you anything to say about these?

A. The B.T.W.U. office was not at the Chitpur Road. Its office and head office was at 2/1 European Asylum Lane. The other Chitpur office formed or set up by somebody whom I myself dont know much and I do not know whether he was a member of W.P.P. of Bengal. He used to come occasionally at our office and he asked me to put up a signboard saying Transport Workers Union at the Chitpur Road, something like a branch office, because he told me there are many workers who work in the Bara Bazar and he wanted to recruit those people. I forget his name too. I had been once over there to investigate what he was doing. I found that he was doing nothing on this line that is recruiting. That is all I know. As regards photograph P. 457 it is certainly mine and I dont deny it. To be photographed with a comrade is not a conspiracy also. Prosecution wanted to connect me with the others: if taking a photograph is an association for conspiracy in the imperialist country, it is absurd. Secondly as regards the words "G.P. of Bengal Communists." When we were arrested on 20.3.29 this photograph was found at the office at 2/1 European Asylum Lane. Inspector Ismail instructed S. I. Alauddin to put these words on it and it was not written by us.

Sd. R. L. Yorke.

24. 3. 31.

Q. • You said yesterday that there were some other points you wished to explain about which I had not asked you. What were those and what did you wish to say?

A. In 1928 November first I went to Bauria at the request of one of my comrades in order to see the condition of the party there. There I met Kishori Lal Ghosh accused. That very day I had a time with him for Sunday to come to Bauria and Peasants Party meeting. I wrote a letter to him that I shall call a meeting of the party with comrade Spratt. Spratt and I met at the railway station. Naturally he gave us train fare and the achievement of all sort of absurd documents to show my high a revolution for different people. According to Trade Union Republic, A Call to strikers and attended a strike meeting is a leader Union Movement, T.U. leaders. My attending Bauria meeting Party Principles and or a few other meetings cannot be called a Workers and Peasants Party. His Majesty of his sovereignty in British programme and methods absurd charge. If by attending few meetings length our conception King Emperor's sovereignty in India could be cancelled. have been done long ago and the King Emperor's sovereignty in India today.

The Communist International is the vanguard of the suffering millions of the world and will liberate them from the Imperialist domination. I therefore stand by the principles and programme of the Communist International; though I hold the principles as I have stated now I say that I have not conspired between 1935 and 1939 against the King's sovereignty as the charge is. It is my belief that the independence of India, that is of the Proletariat and peasantry, cannot be brought about by the conspiracy of individuals but the revolutionary action of a whole class, the exploited toilers of India. My activities during this period were purely Trade Union activities and perfectly legal : neither is the holding of Communist views a crime nor is the T. U. activity, and to call the combination of both a conspiracy is absurd. I have finished.

Q. Your name appears as signatory to the general list of defence witnesses presented to the Committing Magistrate. Do you wish me to move the Magistrate to summon any of these witnesses to give evidence on your behalf ?

A. I wish for time till tomorrow to consider this question.

Read over in open court to accused who is satisfied that it is correct.

Sd/- R. L. Yorke,

25. 3. 31.

Sd/- Shamsul Huda.

Certified that the above is a full and true record of the statement of accused made by him in my presence and hearing and has read by me with my own hands.

admit that
was not a Co.

Sd/- R. L. Yorke,

25. 3. 31.

and democracy ft

bourgeoisie as a class,

task only of the work

by itself cannot achieve me.

the Proletariat. On t

India the Proletariat

revolution unless it h

side. The W.P.P. w

between the workers a

Sd/- R. L. Yorke,

26. 3. 31.

Q. There are also some

think it is possible to be q

you or possibly any othe

P. 41-47, the group ph

fact that the Bengal

Printing Press, Meerut (U. P.) India.

In the court of R. L. Yorke Esq. I. C. S. Addl. Sessions.
Judge of Meerut.

In the case of King-Emperor versus P. Spratt and others.

Examination of P. C. Joshi accused under section 364 of the
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, made before me R. L. Yorke
I. C. S. Addl. Sessions Judge at Meerut on the 24th day of
April 1931.

My name is Puran Chand Joshi; my father's name is Pt.
Har Nand Joshi; I am by caste No caste; 24 years of age; by
occupation student; my home is at Almora, Police-station Almora
district Almora; I reside at Almora.

Q. You heard your statement to the Lower Court P. 2593
read out on the 16. 3. 31. Is that statement correct?

A. Yes.

Q. In regard to your activities with the W. P. P. and the
A. I. W. P. P. there is the following evidence (Note: the evidence
noted below is all summarily explained to accused) P 126, P 131,
P 132, P 1116, P 329, P 322, P 348, P 2069, P 1432, P 1620P,
P 317, P 1619P, P 321, P 209, P 2409P, P345, P526 (6), and (8),
P 1621P, P 1875P, P 328, P211, P1433, P341, P2070P, P349, P325
P 460, P 333, P 331, P 310, P 347, P 429, P 1095, P 1097, P 452,
P 416 (16), P 2155P, P 1304, P304, (1097) P1099, P 1800, P 2148P,
P 1096, P 195, P1098, P 111c, P312, P316, P2071P, P 1338, P 210,
P 467 (1), P1763, P 1764, P 334, P 669, P 305, P 309, P 307, P 308
and P 306 and the evidence of P. Ws. 126, 173, 36 and 254 and no
doubt others e. g. 131. Have you anything to say about this
evidence?

A. I was the Secretary of the Workers and Peasants Party
of U. P. and a member of the National Executive Committee of the
All India Workers and Peasants Party. In briefest terms the
aim of the Workers and Peasants Party was the achievement of
independence from British Imperialism through a revolution for
the establishment of a Workers and Peasants Republic. A Call to
Action and the theses, for example Trade Union Movement,
Political Resolution, Workers and Peasants Party Principles and
Policy, which were passed by the All India Workers and Peasants
Party ^{conference} are the authoritative expositions of our programme and methods
of work. I would like to explain at some length our conception
of Imperialism, Revolution and Independence.

British Imperialism in India: the character of British Imperialism

I begin with Imperialism: Our slogan "Down with Imperialism" has been made synonymous with conspiracy to deprive the King Emperor of his sovereignty of British India. Besides legal jugglery this is mistaking the mere ornamental form for the reality. The real sovereignty over India is the sovereignty of British Finance Capital. The Britishers came to India as Capitalists, they conquered India as Capitalists and they rule India today as Capitalists. British Capital ruthlessly exploits the Indian people in the triple role of Merchant-Capital, Industrial-Capital and Finance-Capital, the last being the predominant form. British Imperialism is the class rule of the British bourgeoisie over the Indian people; the essence of Imperialist rule is that whatever is done or not done is according to the dictates of the British bourgeoisie and against the needs of the Indian people.

Political Resolution page 1 speaks of "Political control and economic predominance in India" of British Imperialism and on page 12 the sentences occur, "There must be no doubt as to the meaning of independence. It involves the destruction of Imperialist Political and Military control and economic penetration and hence necessitates revolution." I would like to explain these sentences and lay down premises which will show how the only way to secure freedom from Imperialism is through a revolution. I will begin with the economics of Imperialism and briefly examine it under three heads, the Industrial, Agrarian and Financial Policy of British Imperialism in India.

(1) Industrial Policy: British Capitalists wanted India as an exclusive market for their own industrial goods. To achieve this it was necessary to destroy the Indian industries and force the Indian people to buy British Industrial goods. Digby, a liberal-Imperialist economist in his "Prosperous British India" describes this policy in action thus: "The national industries have been ruthlessly destroyed and destroyed without any pretence at concealment of the circumstance that English Industries were to be benefited by the destruction. We compelled India to take our goods either with no import duty or with a nominal import duty."

Having accomplished this task the second part of the policy was to check the further growth of Industries in India. The positive policy pursued was "to turn the people more and more towards agriculture and less and less towards manufacture". (H. J. S. Cotton). The British bourgeoisie succeeded in this task because

of its control, of the state. Sir Valentine Chirol's admission is that "Our record in regard to Indian industrial development has not always been a very creditable one in the past." Still more significant is the official statement "Some time prior to the War certain attempts to encourage Indian industries by means of pioneer factories and Government subsidies were effectively discouraged from White Hall."

The War came as a revolutionary factor. Because of the War conditions the British industrialist could no longer export goods to India, on the other hand the demand for War material grew which had to be produced in India itself. It was not because of any "change of heart" that the British bourgeoisie acquiesced in and even helped the growth of industries in India, but it was only under the pressure of War necessities that Govt. was driven to abandon its former attitude of aloofness if not jealousy towards purely Indian enterprise" (Sir Valentine Chirol).

The rapid growth of industries in India during the War and the post-war period is an accomplished fact. The War policy was a temporary phase because of War conditions. It did not mean a change in the fundamental line of Imperialist policy from retarding industrialisation to encouraging and helping it; this is conclusively borne out by the Govt. policy towards the appeals for protection, ratio question, Reserve Bank Bill, Coastal Reservation Bill etc.

For realising the real importance of the industries in India it is not enough to know their extent but also who control them. "The ^{great} majority of larger concerns are financed by European Capital." "Indian Year Book 1924". In 1927-28 (Statistical Abstract of the Government of India) the value of British capital was about 5 times that of India. Thus the conception of current capitalist development of India as a national development is a dangerous delusion. In Indian industries British capital is the predominant partner and Indian capital is only its junior.

There is no independent industrialisation in India in the sense of the India industries developing to serve the entire economic needs of the people of India. Only those industries develop or are allowed to develop which British Imperialism wants in India or which do not conflict with the interests of British Imperialism. The Montague Chelmsford Report formulated this industrial policy thus "We cannot measure the excess of strength which an industrialised India will bring to the power of the Empire." Indian industries are planned to bring power and prosperity not to the Indian people but to the British Empire.

"Industrialisation of India" is an Imperialist lie and a canard. The correct way in conformity with the existing economic realities in the country is to characterise the Indian industries as "British Industrialisation in India".

Destruction of old handicraft industries and the arrested development of the new large scale ones results in an over pressure on land. The Famine Commission of 1880 reported "At the root of much of the poverty of the people of India and of the risks to which they are exposed in seasons of scarcity lies the unfortunate circumstance that agriculture forms almost the sole occupation of the masses of the population."

Dependence on agriculture and with it the poverty of the masses has been constantly increasing, as a table taken from R. P. Dutt's "Modern India" will show.

Census	Proportion of population depending on agriculture.
1891	61 per cent
1901	66 " "
1911	72 " "
1921	73 " "

British Imperialism prevents the industrialisation of the country which results in the poverty of people whatever of industrialisation is there it is controlled in favour of British industries and is unrelated to the Indian economy and as such of no real benefit to the Indian people; this industrialisation is dominated by British capital with Indian capital as the junior partner.

Therefore the struggle against poverty is the struggle against Imperialism and the struggle against Imperialism is also the struggle against Indian capitalism, the junior partner and ally of British Imperialism.

(2) Agricultural Policy: India is compelled to sacrifice the interests of its independent economic development and to play the part of an economic appendage to British capitalism by producing agrarian raw material for the industries of Great Britain. This monopoly control over the agricultural produce of such a vast continent such as India adds considerably to the strength of British Imperialism in its economic fight with other capitalist countries who do not possess colonies or whose colonies do not produce the articles grown in India.

The British bourgeoisie did not destroy Indian feudalism but superimposed capitalist relations on the existing feudal structure of Indian society. The retention of feudalism was dictated by the then existing political and economic circumstances. The British bourgeoisie wanted a social basis for its rule in India and for this support to the foreign rule the landlords were in return guaranteed the enjoyment of their feudal privileges. Moreover, the Imperialist State then was not so widely and efficiently organised as to itself undertake the task of the collection of land revenue and so it used the landlords as its revenue agents. In relation to British Imperialism the zamindars became its agents and hirelings, but for the peasantry they remained in the countryside as its exploiters, playing the role of the robber and oppressor.

Imperialism not only retained feudalism but also introduced capitalism in the agrarian economy. The first impress of capitalism was given when the peasant had to pay revenue and interest in money instead of in kind; with the introduction of commercial crops (like Jute, Cotton etc) the peasantry produced for the capitalist market and not for home consumption. Modern Transport related the peasantry to the Imperialist world-market.

The peasant masses are ground down under the double yoke of the most backward and brutal feudal-zamindari-Talukdari system and the most advanced and highly mechanised capitalist exploitation of British Imperialism.

(3) Financial Policy: In the modern epoch finance capital plays a very important role. It is by the monopoly control of Banks that the British bourgeoisie controls and guides the entire economic organism and thereby secures the retention and extension of its economic suzerainty over India. This purpose is fulfilled by the export of capital to India. Comrade Kussiñeen in his report on the Colonial Question before the 6th World Congress of the Communist International *figures: give the following figures:*

Year	British Capital exported to India
1919	1.4 million pounds
1920	3.5
1921	29.5
1922	36.1
1923	25.3
1924	2.6
1925	3.4
1926	3.0
1927	.8
1928	7.7
1929	10.3

In 1928 and 1929 the figures are from the Midland Banks.
Exchange is the master-key for the control of modern economic relations in society. The British bourgeoisie because it controls the Indian Government manipulates the Indian Exchange in its own interests. In the last 13 years; without counting the series of changes between 1916-1919 the Government of India has thrice changed the rate of exchange.

The result of the Imperialist financial policy are thus indicated by Mr. Faizullah Gangji President of the South India Chamber of Commerce "that the country is being slowly drained admits of no doubt, that the purchasing power of the people is dwindling is also certain as a result of the Government's financial policy" and he calls this policy "the policy of looking more to the interests of Great Britain than of India", further as a result of this policy "the state of almost all industries has gone from bad to worse".

What India means to British Imperialism—

Having stated the broad trends of the economic policy of British Imperialism in India I will now indicate the general results of this policy and examine them as they affect the two parties, the British bourgeoisie and the Indian people.

I will just answer the question "what India means to Imperialism." India is the centre, the hub of the British Empire. The Imperialists call India the brightest jewel in the crown of the Empire, because India is a veritable gold mine to the British bourgeoisie. "The Indian Trade directly or indirectly comprises one fifth of the whole British Trade (Lord Rothermere according to the Reuter Cablegram published in the 'Leader' dated 23rd February 1930). "More British Capital is invested in India than in any other individual country." (Mr. Sayer, the late Secretary of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce in the 'Statesman' of 29th January 1930). The Empire Crusaders in formulating the policy of "No Surrender to India" refer to the significant fact that 4 shillings in every British pound come from India.

It is difficult to make even an approximate estimate of the total profit the British bourgeoisie derives from the exploitation of India. The truth is carefully hidden under the heaps of statistics. Certain items however may be roughly computed on the lines suggested by Professors K. T. Shah and K. J. Khambata in their book "Wealth and Taxable capacity of India".

(1) For good Government, that is, to some tens of thousands of officials who represent the interest of British Capitalists in India,

the Indian people pay many millions of pounds per year. The term of service is short, pay more than lucrative, and on retirement a handsome life pension is given to these "better class" young Englishmen. Under this head Professor Shah estimates that 37.5 millions pounds are paid every year as Home Charges.

(2) *Interest on Capital.* British capital invested in companies etc operating in India is about three hundred million pounds. At six per cent interest, this gives £18 millions as the interest on capital invested in India (Interest on Government loans amounting to 13 million pounds is included in the home charges and other loans, municipal etc. are negligible).

(3) *Carrying Trade Monopoly.* Almost the entire shipping of India is carried on by British ships and insured by British Insurance Companies. Professor Shah gives figures from which the British share in Indian freight and passage charges can be reckoned as 25 Million pounds per annum. As regards the commissions, insurance etc. Shah's figures again give about six million pounds. Thus the carrying trade monopoly to the British bourgeoisie yields a total of 31 million pounds.

(4) *Commercial profit.* Shah computes profits on business etc. at the very moderate of five percent on capital to be 15 million pounds and he adds certain small items which come to 3.3 million pounds. Under this head, which may be called commercial profit, we get a total of 18.3 million pounds.

(5) *Industrial Profit.* Industrial goods sold to India were worth £89.4 millions in 1927-1928 and industrial profit on this sum at 15 per cent profit amounts to 13.4 million pounds.

In this way we get a grand total of 118.2 million pounds per annum as the annual profit which the British Bourgeoisie enjoys from its occupation in India. There are probably other items which are not given here and the rate of interest and profit are probably under estimated. The total can therefore be put safely at a minimum of 120 millions.

It is of interest to note that Professor Shah's own estimate is two hundred and twenty crores of rupees per annum and Professor Eugene Varga puts the figure at 167 millions pounds and calls it a modest estimate.

India, moreover, represents material advantages for British Capitalism which cannot be expressed in figures, for example the

disposal of the Indian treasury, the employment of Indian soldiers in English wars etc: etc:

The British Bourgeoisie started its piratical career in India with the launching of the East India Company with a miserable capital of £ 70000. To day it reaps a net yearly profit of at least 120 million pounds. The difference between then and now is simply this that the amount robbed now is immeasurably larger and is obtained 'according to law'. British money is 'invested' in India, British goods are 'purchased' and 'payment' must be made for whatever one buys. This seems like simple and free economic relations but when we remember that the back ground of these transactions is economic monopoly and extra-economic force the whole aspect is radically changed and they emerge as process of exploitation, naked, ruthless and brutal.

What British Imperialism means to India:—

Now I will analyse the other result of the economic policy of British Imperialism as it affects the Indian people, or, in other words state what British Imperialism means to India. On this fundamental question two schools exist. British Imperialists always refer to the ever increasing "moral and material progress of India," under their own rule and claim all credit as the creators and preservers of this "prosperity". The representatives of the Indian masses are incessantly delating upon the rapidly growing and now alarming impoverishment of the country and its people. We declare that by the principle of British Imperialist rule deliberately adopted this impoverishment is made inevitable. Both views cannot be right nor is there any middle course which would reconcile the two views, one is right, the other is wrong, either Imperialism is a progressive or a retrograde reactionary social force.

In its function as colonial exploiter British Imperialism in relation to India acts primarily as a parasite, sucking the blood from the economic organism of the latter. The fact that this parasite in relation to its victim represents a society with a highly developed culture makes it a so much the more powerful and dangerous exploiter but from the point of view of the Indian exploited masses this in no way alters the parasitic nature of its function.

The entire economic policy of British Imperialism is determined to preserve and increase Indian dependence on Britain, to deepen Imperialist exploitation and as far as possible to impede

the independent development of India. The fundamental tendency of colonial exploitation acts in the direction of hindering the development of the productive forces of India according to the needs of the Indian masses, of despoiling India of its natural riches, and above all of exhausting the reserves of human productive forces.

How does this policy of Imperialism work out in terms of the life of the Indian masses? It leads to their growing grovelling poverty.

In 1833 Mr. Wood, an Indian Civilian and a witness before the Parliamentary Committee on India said, "In India the Labourer of our provinces has no difficulty in maintaining himself and his family with independence without resorting to the charity of the public, and we know the reverse to be the case in our own country." This was the condition in the beginning of the British rule.

In 1880 Sir W. H. Hunter said "There remain forty million people who go through life on insufficient food." In 1893 the Pioneer summarizing the economic survey of Mr. Grierson said, "Briefly it is that all the persons of the labouring classes and ten per cent of the cultivating and artisan classes or 45 per cent of the total population are insufficiently clothed or insufficiently fed or both."

Digby in 'Prosperous British India' says, "1800 to 1825, 4 famines, and 1875 to 1900, 22 famines. To me it appears that the 22 as contrasted with the 4 are the product of our system of rule, of what we have done and what we have not done."

He gives these revealing figures about the diminishing income of the Indian people; "non-official estimated income in 1850 two pence per head per day, officially estimated income in 1882 1½ pence per head per day." His own analytical examination of all the sources of income in 1900 less than ¾ pence per head per day."

He concludes his detailed masterly economic survey of India in 1900 with these poignant words, "Look round, Look deeply, Steel your hearts for that which you shall see and hear, for you shall gaze upon a sum of human misery and will contemplate a mental and political degeneration, the like of which amongst civilized and progressive countries is no where else at this moment to be seen and probably was at no time during the recorded history anywhere to be seen." In the beginning of the 20th century

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald says, "The poverty of India is not an opinion, it is a fact." This referred to the condition in the first decade of the present century.

Professor K.T. Shah, the economist of the Indian bourgeoisie, surveying the economic conditions in 1920 says, "The average Indian income is so small that it is quite insufficient to meet even all the primary wants of food clothing and shelter. The average Indian income is just enough either to feed two men in every three of the population (or give all of them two in place of every three meals they need) on condition that they all consent to go naked, live out of doors all the year round, have no amusement or recreation and want nothing else but food and that the lowest, the coarsest and the least nutritious. Or, if they must meet all the other wants and require some clothing, however primitive, some house room however wretched, some destruction however primitive, they must consent to getting only one meal in place of every three they absolutely require or feeding one out of every three human beings in India."

Sir Basil Balckett, ex-Finance Member of the Government of India declared, "Extraordinary poverty of the masses is the salient feature of the life there (in India) (Pioneer dated 1st February 1930). Mr. L. R. Tairsee ex-President of the Indian Merchants Chamber Bombay said, "Their (referring to the masses) poverty, helpless and hopeless, has no parallel in the history of the civilized world". (Pioneer dated 2nd February 1930). Mr. G.D. Birla speaks in a similar strain. Their standard of living is so low that nothing could be lower." Leader dated 16th February 1930.

All the strength and energy of the Indian masses is directed towards struggling to exist against Imperialist tyranny and exploitation. Hungry slaves can neither think nor create. No 'defects' are inherent in any people, they are the result of definite social cause inherent in the existing social structure. It is the arrested and subservient economic development of India brought about by British Imperialism that is primarily responsible for the backward social conditions, for example, the total loss of the interestedness of the life, extinction of arts, non-introduction of sciences, existence of archaic social institutions etc. The 'cultural role' of the British Imperialism is the role of the executioner in relation to India, its life and culture.

The problem, British Imperialism and the Indian masses:—
I will now come to the problem which the economic policy of

British Imperialism creates and with which the Indian people are faced. I will state the problem as others see it and as we see it and also when we differ from the others.

The poverty of the Indian masses as result of the working of British Imperialism is admitted by all sections of Indian people. What next? What to do? What is the remedy? On this fundamental question there are fundamental differences which are determined by the class content of each political party in India.

The slogans like 'change of heart' 'mutual accommodation' express an entirely mistaken notion about the essence of Imperialism. Imperialism has no heart. It is the ruthless impersonal rule of Capital. These slogans are advanced by the possessing exploiting Indian classes, the landlords and the Capitalists and their political representatives. For these classes these slogans are correct, because as sub-exploiters of the Indian masses their interests are essentially antagonistic to those of the latter and essentially identical with the suzerain exploiter British Imperialism and they therefore only demand from British Imperialism a higher share in the total loot. 'Compromise' with British Imperialism is the platform of the Indian exploiters of the Indian masses.

The social basis of British Imperialism is that it is the class-rule of the British Bourgeoisie in India it exists for and by the exploitation of Indian masses. Exploitation and oppression are inherent in Imperialism. The interests of the exploiting British Imperialism and the exploited Indian masses are mutually exclusive, contradictory, and irreconcilable. There can be no change of heart because there is no ground for a change of heart; to assert such a possibility is to deny that Imperialism is Imperialism. The struggle of British Imperialism is the struggle for the continued retention of the exploitation of the Indian masses. The struggle of the Indian masses is the struggle for liberation from the exploitation, that is, for the complete destruction of British Imperialism.

The Indian struggle for national liberation from the yoke of British Imperialism is a mighty class war between British Imperialism and the Indian masses. For the Indian masses there can be no possible 'peace' or even 'truce', there is a ceaseless war, we mean war literally, and there can only be the victorious end of the class war, their complete victory and the entire annihilation of the class enemy British Imperialism with its contemptible agent Indian landlordism and its cowardly ally Indian Capitalism.

The Imperialist states:— Having dealt with the economics of British Imperialism I will now deal with the political part of our conception of Imperialism and explain what we mean by the 'political control' of British Imperialism (Political Resolution page 1), and the destruction of Imperialist political and military control (Political Resolution page 12), or, in other words: our conception of the Imperialist State and our attitude towards the same.

The Political Organ of the British Bourgeoisie:—The British Bourgeoisie holds its undisturbed sway over the Indian masses not only because of economic force but also by extra-economic force, that is, by control of the political power. The state in India is the political organ of the Imperialist Bourgeoisie. The purpose of this Imperialist State is to safeguard the existing interest of the British ^{bourgeoisie} against all attacks of the Indian masses and to further advance these interests of the British bourgeoisie in like manner.

This true character of the Imperialist State as the political organ of class-rule is sometimes admitted by the Imperialist politicians themselves and also by their Indian allies, the Indian Capitalists, in their responsible and representative capacity; for example Sir Ibrahim Rahamtullah now President of the Legislative Assembly as the President of the All India Industrial and Commercial Congress, Madras, 1927, said, "Britain has throughout been primarily concerned with maintaining the Indian market for her manufactures. Her political power has been used for the promotion of this object. The claim of a 'sacred trust' is a mere eye-wash. British banking and manufacturing interests are predominant in determining the policy which is pursued in this country."

Sir William Joynson Hicks, now Lord Brentford, and better known to the British workers as the notorious 'Jix', Home Secretary in the Baldwin Government which ordered our arrest, has these frank words to his credit, "We did not conquer India for the benefit of the Indians. I know it is said in missionary meetings that we conquered India to raise the level of the Indians. That is can't. We conquered India as the outlet for the goods of Great Britain. I am not such a hypocrite as to say that we hold India for the Indians. We hold it as the finest outlet for British goods in general and for Lancashire cotton goods in particular."

Absolutist in character:— Political resolution page 2 speaks of, "British political dictatorship." This means that we characterize Imperialist rule as dictatorial and autocratic. Political forms depend upon the economic structure of a given society. Such absolute economic dependence as that of India to Great Britain would

have been impossible to maintain under a democratic form of Government. Therefore the political regime of the British bourgeoisie in India is absolutist in character. The foreign capitalist nature of British Imperialism necessitates an absolutist Government, it could not be otherwise, nor is it otherwise, and what is most important to note, nor can it be otherwise as long as the flag of British finance capital flies over the Indian soil.

The intellectual hirelings of British Imperialism refer to the 'democratization' of the Government of India and the existence of an 'Indian Parliament'. The sham character of these 'reforms' has been exposed by the bourgeois Indian politicians times out of number. British Imperialism in the Simon Commission Report, the Government of India Despatch, and the whole proceedings of the Round Table Conference has made it unambiguously clear that there can be no transfer of political power (Finance, the army and foreign relations must be exclusively in the hands of the direct political representatives of the British Bourgeoisie.) The Indian Bourgeoisie can participate only in civil administration. The reforms under Imperialism are just a convenient camouflage to hide this unashamed absolutist regime. They are the toys presented by the step-mother, British Imperialism, to the naughty child, the Indian Bourgeoisie, to play with and bother her by crying no more. The absolutist class character of the Imperialist State is further borne out by the entire absence of political democratic liberties for the working masses. Under British Imperialism and its pitiful reforms only about 2 per cent of the people are enfranchised, that is to say, the entire working masses are disenfranchised. They enjoy no right of speech or association, their lips are sealed and their hands securely tied, while the exploiting classes enjoy these privileges. True to its nature the Imperialist State, all revolutionary activities and preparations while it encourages and supports all counter-revolutionary ones.

To speak or write that the existing rule is the rule of British Capitalists and their Indian allies, that they exploit the Indian masses, that the existing state is their political apparatus and safeguards their interest is called and punished as sedition (numerous cases launched against the members of the Naujawan Bharat Sabha speaking on these lines), to speak and write about class-consciousness and class-solidarity, to organize and conduct militant Trade Unions and strikes, or a national revolutionary party like the workers and peasants party, or the political party of the working class, the Communist Party, is "part of conspiracy to deprive the King Emperor of his sovereignty of British India" and

punishable with transportation for life. All these are the points at issue in this case.

On the other hand Mill-owners Association, Chambers of Commerce and European Associations are allowed to fight freely and fiercely for their economic and political interests. They openly ask the Government "to govern or get out and no damned nonsense". They demand the trial of working class leaders like our trial and summary trial of the revolutionaries as in Lahore, and special tribunal and ordinance legislation, they demand and get anti-working class legislation, like the public Safety Bill and Trade Disputes Acts, they claim and secure special protection for their industries and privileges for commerce at the costs of the consumers.

A Military Police state:—Sir William Joynson Hicks in the speech already referred to has this further statement to his credit, "by the sword we conquered India by the sword we should retain it." Naked brute force is the basis of British Imperialist regime. Organized violence is applied by the Imperialist state in the interests of the piratical bourgeoisie through its three institutions, the Army, Police and Prisons. It is a Military Police state.

The army in India is maintained for three purposes, first to guard the British Imperialist suzerainty over India against the attacks of other Imperialist powers, secondly to maintain the supremacy of the established Imperialist State against the attempts of the oppressed masses to free themselves from this domination as happened last year at Peshawar and Sholapur, thirdly not merely to fight for the Indian interest of the British bourgeoisie but for its Imperialist interest as well. The Indian army is "a part of the total armed forces of the Empire." (Esher Committee on Military Affairs). It has already been used to suppress the Chinese masses and the South American natives and ^{may} one day be used against the British workers themselves.

The great importance the British Imperialism attaches to the armed garrisoning of India is seen by the amounts spent on the military. According to Professor K. T. Shah, "Rupees 83 crores per annum or about 60 per cent of the central revenues—far more than perhaps any other country in the world of corresponding situation and ability"—are spent for the military occupation of India.

The army is used against maturer crises, for example acts of rebellion, but the function of the Police force is not to let the crisis itself develop, it is used against preparations for revolt, for example, demonstrations, strikes etc: The Police is for maintaining "Law" of

Imperialism and "Order" for Imperialism. Every political Indian now knows the Police lathi from personal knowledge. The Imperialist Police insults and outrages women (as at Contai, Bengal) and in the city of Bombay itself against which Sir Purushottamdas Thakur Das himself moved a resolution in a public meeting presided over by the ex-Mayor of Bombay Dr. Desmukh (Bombay Chronicle of 20th and 21st November 1930) kills young boys, (the drowning of the young President of the Bal Bharat Sabha Lahore during the last Satyagraha Campaign). The Labour Imperialist Mr. H. N. Brailsford writes these words about his tour during the Civil Disobedience period among the Gujrat peasants and the part therein of the Police. "A man is asked if he wants Swaraj. If he say 'yes' the lathi descends on shoulders or limbs, often the beating goes on without a word" (Bombay Chronicle 9.9.30). In a word the 'duty' of the Police is to terrorise the people into submission to British Imperialism.

The Police Force does not work all by itself, or entirely openly. It has a number of accessory organisations like Spies and Agents provocateurs (as the recorded evidence in so many terrorist conspiracies shows, J. P. Begerhotta, a Government spy, smuggled himself into the Communist party of India and was expelled when the party became aware of it); organised strike breakers and hired assassins are also systematically used to maintain Imperialist domination as the evidence in this case about the Bauria Jute Strike, Bombay Oil Strike and Textile Workers General Strike of 1928 will show.

The prisons are the enforced homes of the opponents of Imperialism. Those who cannot be terrorised into silence by the Police lathies are put under lock and key, divorced from their homes, comrades and fields of activities. Imperialist tactic is to check the revolution by jailing the revolutionaries.

A Bureaucratic State:—The Bureaucracy is the most important civil institution of the Imperialist State. The enslaved masses in revolt are dealt with by the Army and when in enforced submission they are made to work and pay for Imperialism or in default punished "according to law" by the bureaucracy. It is the Collectors and the Magistrates who realise the taxes of the State, who eject the tenant for nonpayment of rent to the zamindar, who decree the peasant's debt to the Mahajan and help in all the various processes of class exploitation.

The bureaucracy is called "the all powerful" in the Government. Lloyd George gave it a classic phrase "the steel frame of the

Indian Empire". It is truly so. It does not merely carry out the State Policy but it formulates that policy itself. Member of this permanent irresponsible bureaucracy control all the key positions in the Government. (All the Governors except Bombay, Bengal and Madras are drawn from it, so are most of the members of the Viceroy's Cabinet and in the provinces those in the reserved half of the Cabinet controlling mostly Finance, Land Revenue and Home Departments; all the permanent secretaries provincial and central come from this very source.

For absolutist Imperialism bureaucratic rule is very efficient because it systematises Imperialist robbery and most speedily realises its ill-gotten gains; for the masses of the people it is a debasing system, it kills all popular initiative and makes slavery a virtue, it produces serfs and not citizens.

The Imperialists states and the Political struggle:—^{the} Imperialist State is the class state of the British bourgeoisie whose allies and agents, the Indian Capitalists and landlords in accordance with their economic status under British Imperialism participate in it to a minor degree and in a subordinate capacity. It is an absolutist-Military-Police State, in short, a Czarist State. It serves its own purpose admirably well. British Imperialism through its economic monopoly extracts the surplus values produced by the toiling masses and the Imperialist State guards and guarantees this process, and the result is that the exploiters get economically stronger and politically more powerful while the poverty of the exploited and the slavery of the oppressed correspondingly increases.

Capital is not democratic but exclusive, therefore its highest expression, Imperialism, cannot be democratised. Economic monopoly and political domination go together. Just economic Imperialism exploits the working masses and cannot serve them, similarly its political organ the Imperialist State oppresses and rules over the masses and it cannot "grant" them liberty. Political struggle is the highest form of economic struggle and political liberty is the price of victory won after the total destruction of the political enemy; it cannot be bargained for with the enemy, it must be won; political power is not transferred, it must be captured. No Round Table Conference but Revolution, this was our theoretical formulation and political platform.

British Imperialism and class structure of Indian society:— The idea of class struggle in general and its application to Indian society in particular has in accordance with their incurable habit been first vulgarised and then ridiculed by the Prosecution. The Prosecution represents Imperialism which is the party of Reaction

and lives upon class exploitation. They are social criminals, we are social rebels, ^{we} therefore deny the social law of class struggle; we represent the exploited masses who are the victims in this class society, we naturally stand for class emancipation and therefore accept, apply and broadcast the revolutionary conception of class struggle.

Page 1 of the Workers and Peasants Party Principles and Policy says, "The policy of the party is based on a materialist analysis of society and the fact of class struggle between different economic classes. It is sometimes denied that ~~the~~ ideas apply to India which either individually or in common with other eastern countries is held to be exempt from the ordinary process of human and social evolution. This is the counter part of a supposedly idealistic view commonly expressed by ruling classes even in western countries and is merely an attempt to use religion and spirituality in the interests of economic exploitation and class rule. It is manifest that material forces dominate India as they do all other societies and with very similar results."

"It is claimed that ^{the} organization of Indian life is on the basis of caste and not of class. It is true that the obsolete system of caste still dominates Indian society, though to a steadily diminishing extent, in its private and domestic relations. But the fundamental political and economic relations between employer and employee, landlord and tenant etc., are practically unaffected by caste or religion and divide Indian society effectively for economic and political purposes into a small number of classes with well defined mutual actions and reactions".

I will try to explain how the class structure of Indian society and the class struggle operating within it affects the struggle against Imperialism and for independence. Our thesis put briefly is that in India today National Revolution means a Workers' and Peasants' Revolution; we struggle against Indian landlords and capitalists because we stand for independence and these classes are against independence, and further independence can only be achieved through a revolution, therefore we stand also for revolution and these classes are against revolution. Thus we maintain that a genuine struggle for independence, that is the platform of independence through revolution, involves a simultaneous struggle against Indian landlordism and capitalism. We reject with contempt the accusation that by following this path we create a breach in the national front. Workers and Peasants' Party's Principles and Policy page 5 says, "The Workers' and Peasants' Party creates no split; it merely proposes to take intelligent account of the actual situation."

What is that actual situation of which we propose to take an intelligent account and which we claim bears out our own thesis ?

In India British Imperialism has allied itself with certain classes (feudal) and subordinated others (Indian capital) to itself, it lives on the ruthless exploitation of the Indian masses. It affects the various classes of Indian society differently and this varying degree of the extent and intensity of its exploitation determines the varying attitude of these classes towards British Imperialism. Each class adopts those political tactics towards Imperialism which would advance its own class interests best.

The Indian Princes and Landlords:—The Indian princes and the landlords together form the feudal block in India and are the remnants of the old order. Their existence is a historical anomaly and would have been an impossibility today were it not for the fact that they have been artificially preserved by British Imperialism for its own purposes. British Imperialism is a foreign capitalist rule and it was necessary for its continued existence and success that it must have the support of an influential section of Indian society and this task could be best served by bringing over to its side the last ruling class with all its power and influence over the people of the country. British Imperialism guaranteed to them their rights of exploiting their subjects and tenants provided they exercised this right under the hegemony of Imperialism and gave to the foreign capitalist rule their unstinted social support. This is the basis of the feudal-Imperialist coalition.

Pro-imperialist and anti-independence:—The interests of these feudal classes are completely identical with and subordinate to those of British Imperialism, therefore they are the minions and lackeys of British Imperialism; fully conscious of their own class interests, they are the consistent opponents of independence and supporters of Imperialist domination.

The March 1930 Session of the Chamber of Princes passed a unanimous resolution regarding, "its emphatic disapproval of the policy separation from the British Empire," and "their deep and unflinching devotion to the throne." They are also proud of their subservience, for says, the Maharaja of Bikaner, "in being singled out for attack as the antagonists of the Independence Movement the Indian princes cannot but feel that a compliment has been paid to them" (Leader, February 6th, 1930).

The following is an extract from a letter of two hundred prominent Zamindars of Bengal headed by Maharaja Sir Pradyot Kumar Tagore to the Viceroy. "To say that the Indian people

(meaning of course themselves) are enjoying greater freedom under the British *Raj* is a true expression on the feelings of those who have a real stake in the country and on that account a better knowledge of its advancement." (Pioneer, 7. 7. 30)

A Conference of the landlords of the United Provinces under the presidentship of Sir Ram Pal Singh whom Dr. Mukerji accused would gladly have called a progressive nationalist Taluqdar passed these resolutions, "The Conference condemned the spirit of revolution and Communism creeping over the country from outside. It strongly deprecated the adoption of the Independence creed by the Indian National Congress (Leader; 9th February 1930).

Counter-revolutionary.

These feudal classes with unashamed pride offer their sword and their arm in the service of British Imperialism because the defence of British Imperialism is the defence of their own feudal rights. They themselves declare their intention to support Imperialism and fight revolution in every form and at all stages. They are the most determined counter-revolutionaries.

On the eve of the launching of the Civil Disobedience campaign the Maharaja of Bikaner said, "We are bound to offer our countenance and cooperation to the Government of British India for the maintenance of peace in the country and for upholding the peace of ordered Government." He advanced the threat of actual counter-revolution against any attempts to abolish the Native States thus, "If the nationalist movement in its desire for symmetrical pattern of Indian political life decided to act as if the State did not exist the prospects before the whole country are gloomy indeed, for we shall not hesitate to take all measures necessary for the vindication of our rights." (Leader; 6th February 1930).

The identity of interest of British Imperialism and Indian Feudalism is accepted and the counter-revolutionary role of feudal landlords recognised and encouraged by the Imperialists themselves. The Viceroy replied to the address of the Taluqdars of Oudh in these words, "You have spoken of your devoted loyalty to the throne and the person of our Sovereign, of your determination to maintain the partnership of Great Britain and India and of your resolve to combat all disruptive propagandas and activities. I need no such assurance from a body whose past record bears ample testimony to the willing assistance they have

given in times of crisis. In the complex political problems that now confront us I am glad to think that the Government can count with assurance upon the wise counsel and co-operation of the Taluqdar of Oudh." (Leader, 8. 2. 30).

The Indian Bourgeoisie not a revolutionary class:—

The Economic position of the Indian Bourgeoisie is that the Indian Commercial Capital is the native agent of the British Bourgeoisie and the Indian Industrial Bourgeoisie is the junior partner of the Imperialist Bourgeoisie working in India itself; Indian capital as a whole is engaged in economic activities together with the British Bourgeoisie. The two capitals are interlocked and their interests are not essentially contradictory to each other, therefore the Indian Bourgeoisie is not a revolutionary class. Representative class organisation of the Indian Capitalists clearly make out and admit their own role.

The Secretary of the U. P. Chamber of Commerce in a letter to the Government of India says, "My Committee represents a section of the people who stand for the maintenance of law and order, have a considerable stake in the country and cannot be dismissed as irresponsible agitators." (Leader, 10th May 1930).

The Indian Merchants Chamber of Bombay in a letter to the Government of India says "No one appreciates more than a body of Indian business men the importance of the maintenance of law and order." (Times of India, dated 15th May 1930).

Ultimately counter-revolutionary.

The Indian Bourgeoisie is not only not a revolutionary class but is opposed to revolution and will ultimately play a counter-revolutionary role. It is bound to the Imperialist Bourgeoisie by numerous economic threads and has no important independent existence of its own, so that the destruction of British Imperialism would be the annihilation of the Indian Bourgeoisie itself as a class. The movement of the revolutionary classes, workers and peasants, is directed towards the total destruction of Imperialism and therefore also against Indian Capital. Moreover Indian Capital itself directly exploits the workers and the peasants and so their movement is against the interests of the Indian Bourgeoisie in a direct manner as well. The Indian Bourgeoisie is fully conscious of this situation and is therefore opposed to national revolution and when the revolution actually breaks out it will play a counter-revolutionary role and be on the other side of the barricades with the Imperialists.

Actually oppositional

The Indian bourgeoisie demands in the economic field room for expansion, that is Industrialization, and increased attendant activities and to achieve this protection, to secure these objects it also demands a corresponding share in the control of the State. This political demand is expressed as full responsible Government, Swaraj, or even as Purna Swaraj.

The nature of these demands must be clearly understood. They are not anti-imperialist demands. On 8th April this year Mr. Shri Ram presiding over the meeting of the Federated Chambers of Indian Commerce said, "We do not want anything more than Dominion Status but we cannot accept anything less than Dominion Status." (Statesman 9th April 1931). It is amusing to learn that the "Independencewala" Mahatma blessed in person this conference. Khaddar wearing Mr. L. R. Tairsee as President of the Indian Merchants Chamber said about Independence, "We business-men ought to have the spirit of 'business as usual' and not be deterred by the Independence resolution which should be read in one and one sense only, for example, Pickwickian sense, "On the repudiation of foreign debts he said, "The only way to meet such a cry is to pay no attention to it and to show by action more eloquent than words that you take it as a cry of light-weight imbeciles the cry of those who have adopted the motto of Nietzsche talk dangerously." We business-men should know what is what and discount it 110 per cent." (Pioneer dated 2nd February 1930).

These are ignoble but frank words. The Indian bourgeoisie consciously and emphatically does not stand for political and economic independence from Imperialism but for the preservation of Imperialism and an advantageous compromise with it, it demands reforms within the frame work of British Imperialism and bargains for the improvement of its own position under Imperialism. It is a colonial, bourgeoisie to day, its ideal is that it may be decolonised dominionised, that is, it may have free room for economic expansion, increasing share in the joint exploitation of the masses, opportunities for tapping new resources, of course all these under Imperialist suzerainty.

How does British Imperialism react to these demands of the Indian bourgeoisie? The fundamental line of the Imperialist policy is.

(1) To subordinate the economy of India to that of Great Britain and prevent the independent development of the former.

(2) Within the Indian economy to maintain unimpaired the suzerainty of British Capital over Indian Capital.

(3) For these purposes to retain control of the State.

The demands of the Indian bourgeoisie to be dominionised and liberated thus go against the fundamental line of the Imperialist policy; conceding to these demands would be disturbing the Imperialist equilibrium. The position of slave owner, of monopolist supreme exploiter Imperialism reserves for itself alone.

This divergence between the demands of the Indian bourgeoisie and the needs of the British bourgeoisie gives rise to conflicts between the two. Because of this conflict of interests, the Indian bourgeoisie is not subservient to British Imperialism (like the landlords and the princes) but is forced to oppose British Imperialism. In relation to Imperialism it plays an oppositional role.

The oppositional role itself is of a varying nature, sometimes it is constitutional opposition and at others mass opposition, which particular role at a given time the Indian bourgeoisie plays or will play depends upon the actual objective conditions.

Constitutional Oppositions

When in its mass campaign it has been defeated by the might of Imperialist forces and on the other hand scared by the rise of revolutionary forces (as happened during the last Non-Co-operation Movement and the recent Civil Disobedience Campaign), it gives up mass agitation as a form of struggle against Imperialism and starts constitutional opposition to Imperialism for all it is worth, as for example go to the Round Table Conference, enter Legislatures, try to get economic concessions by the passage of Tariff Bills, grant of bounties etc. Indianisation of more properly bourgeoisie of the services etc. This tendency in favour of constitutional opposition is further strengthened if Imperialism grants some reforms and concessions (as happened after the War, Montford Reforms, Industrial Commission, Fiscal Commission, and will happen now after the passage of the new Reforms Act) so that the Indian bourgeoisie by working them may somewhat better its own economic position.

Reformist Mass Opposition

The relations between British and Indian Capital do not remain static. They are constantly changing with the growing needs of both the classes. To avoid the threatening danger of the growth of revolutionary struggle British Imperialism grants

certain petty concessions and petty reforms to the Indian bourgeoisie. After the revolutionary crisis is over, Imperialism sabotages the working of these reforms and takes back the concessions one after the other. Thus in sheer self defence, what to say of advancing its interest aggressively, the Indian bourgeoisie is forced to fight British Imperialism on a bigger scale than constitutional opposition. This new oppositional tactic is the reformist mass opposition or Satyagraha.

The tactic of mass reformism is applied by the Indian bourgeoisie for ~~to~~ purposes.

The first task is to exert mass pressure on Imperialism by organising mass demonstrations, romantic defiance of laws by individual volunteers, boycott, picketing and advancing the threat of no-tax campaign. In their totality these tactics result in a mass 'demonstration' against Imperialism and should not be confused with mass struggle against Imperialism.

The second task is to check the growth of revolutionary forces and take all possible care to prevent the development of mass reformism into mass revolution, which would be suicidal to the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie itself. This is done by the following measures, by scriptural insistence on non-violence, by controlling the whole machinery of organization through dictators, war councils etc. by corrupting the significance of revolutionary incident, for example, Jatin Das was hailed as the apostle of soul force, and lip homage was paid to the heroism of Bhagat Singh but political violence condemned, genuine revolutionary upheaval of Peshawar was "proved" by a Congress Inquiry Committee to have been a non-violent affair, isolation and condemnation of patently revolutionary uprisings like Chauri Chaura, Chittagong, Sholapur, Panvel Islampur, Kishorganj, Buldana, Tharrawaddy etc.

The tactic of mass reformism is admirably suited to exert pressure on Imperialism but it should not be confused with mass revolution which is opposed to mass reformism; mass reformism is not a step towards revolution but a move directed against the revolution. If mass reformism develops into mass revolution that would be in spite of and against the bourgeoisie and because of the working masses.

The bourgeoisie oscillates between these two tactics, constitutional opposition and reformist mass opposition, but since it is the weaker side it has again and again to capitulate to Imperialism.

This capitulation to Imperialism and going over to counter revolution is not final as long as the danger of mass revolution is not actual or imminent; till then it continues playing an oppositional role though in varying degrees.

The bourgeoisie speaks with two distinct voices; to threaten Imperialism and dishonestly get secure the support of the masses, it cheaply talks of independence, ending of the British exploitation, reduction of land revenue etc., all this is sheer bluff and bluster; when it comes to peace parleys and actual business talks before Imperialism it puts forward the demand of "substance of independence" which is neither independence nor full Dominion Status but "Dominion Status with safeguards" or more correctly ^{more} Self-Government, thus dominion status is its ideal and not even actual demand.

What its own actual status would be does not depend upon the Indian bourgeoisie but upon what British Imperialism is prepared to or forced to concede, one thing is certain that it must be consistent with the Imperialist domination. There may be a reshuffling of the existing economic and political apparatus but not any fundamental change, politically the Indian bourgeoisie may be associated in the administration but actual political power and its organs will be withheld from it, economically it may get some room for expansion under the direct control of Imperialism but for all the concessions made British Imperialism will correspondingly increase its own economic strength. British Imperialism is too powerful to care for a name (when it is inconvenient to it), it looks after the substance. Indian bourgeoisie may get Dominion Status in words ^{and} its promise but not in action, a travesty but not the reality of Dominion Status.

1-5-37

Since the British Bourgeoisie cannot willingly concede Dominion Status and the Indian bourgeoisie is too weak to extract it, so the later has either to accept or acquiesce in whatever British Imperialism itself freely grants. But this leads to a further important result the compromises between the two are of a partial and temporary nature and the Indian bourgeoisie continues playing an oppositional role in relation to Imperialism until it is thrown into the arms of Imperialism and counter-revolution by the national revolution itself.

The petty bourgeoisie.

The petty bourgeoisie is lower in the social scale than the bourgeoisie. It is as a class exploited under Imperialism though less than the working masses. The arrested development of the

national economy results in the pauperisation of this class which further finds expression in the growing unemployment. Mr. G. D. Birla in his Presidential address to the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce (February 14th, 1930) summarised the conditions of this class thus: "The middle class population has to put up the hardest struggle possible to keep body and soul together and is amongst the worst victims of unemployment."

The petty bourgeoisie itself is exploited by Imperialism but is also used as an agent of exploitation. It is employed in the administrative (clerks, supervisors, Government servants etc) and distributive (small shop-keepers and the like) organs of society. This contradictory position of being a class itself exploited and also helping Imperialism to exploit the toiling masses debars the petty bourgeoisie from playing any Independent role in the political struggle.

If it is exploited less than Proletariat, it is oppressed equally with the Proletariat, and what is more it feels this lack of rights more keenly because it has had the advantage of the cultural and educational facilities of the modern epoch and is therefore a politically conscious class.

When the bourgeoisie is in constitutional opposition to Imperialism as in 1923 to 1929 the petty bourgeoisie sees that the economic and political concessions which the Indian bourgeoisie is able to secure from British Imperialism do not in any way better its own position, therefore it realises the contradiction of its own interest with Imperialism and becomes critical of the Indian bourgeoisie. During this period there is a drift from the bourgeois constitutional camp towards radical political activity independent of the bourgeoisie (rise of the Youth movement, Independence League etc.) and a growing interest in modern revolutionary philosophies and activities (for example Communism, Anarchism, the Russian Revolution and the Chinese Revolution). The petty bourgeoisie is not hostile but only critical towards the bourgeoisie, it does not completely identify itself with the working masses but is only sympathetic to them.

During periods of mass reformism (as in the last non-co-operation movement and the recent Satyagrah movement), the petty bourgeoisie as a class subordinates itself to the bourgeoisie leadership and forms its heroic tank and file. By thus merging itself with the Bourgeoisie the petty bourgeoisie neither advances the cause of national liberation nor its own class interest. It mistakes the oppositional role of the Bourgeoisie for a revolutionary role and the reformist struggle for the revolutionary struggle. The petty

bourgeoisie works under the delusion that it is using the bourgeoisie while the actual fact is that the bourgeoisie uses the petty bourgeoisie in its treacherous task of winning concessions from Imperialism and in sabotaging the growth of revolutionary forces. It plays into the hands of the Bourgeoisie by not fighting to overthrow the reformist leadership of the bourgeoisie in the National struggle. The petty bourgeoisie of itself fails to distinguish between struggle and struggle and the accompanying tactics and tactics.

The petty bourgeoisie is an intermediary class between the Proletariat and the Bourgeoisie; it is not a homogeneous class but is composed of diverse sections therefore the whole class cannot take a uniform attitude towards the national revolution but it will split up when faced with the actual crisis.

(1) The sections allied to land, usury and the Bureaucracy though they suffer in the existing order yet are too closely bound up with it, being themselves exploiters they may lose their all with the overthrow of Imperialism, therefore they support the national reformist path, follow the bourgeoisie and will ultimately go over to counter-revolution.

(2) Clerks, petty traders, shop-keepers, employing artisans etc.—their standard of living is low and is growing lower under Imperialism but they consider themselves lucky in having secured even this much and all their effort is directed to clinging to this wretched life and they cannot afford to take any risks. They are vaguely, in a humanitarian manner sympathetic to the Workers' movement, they are mostly full of cynicism and defeatism. They hesitate before the revolution and take a neutral stand. They are not opposed to the other people destroying the Imperialist bondage.

(3) Students, unemployed youth etc. are the most virile elements of this class. They react in the most sensitive manner to existing exploitation and oppression. This section will fight for and identify itself with the revolution as the only way out of this mire. They however import into the mass movement the petty bourgeois ideology of vacillation and hesitation, the revolution is not to accept the leadership of these intellectuals but they have to accept the leadership of the revolutionary class, the Proletariat.

The Proletariat: its class enemies:—

The Indian proletariat is the class most exploited under the

Imperialist system. The class enemies of the Proletariat are—

(1) Indian Capitalism which directly exploits Indian Labour as Industrial-Capital and also as Merchant-Capital through profits on goods sold to the workers.

(2) British Imperialism: The Imperialist State directly employs and exploits the Indian workers, for example in the Railways, Public Works etc. There are also industrial works and plantations which are managed and owned by British Capitalists themselves. British Imperialism by its control of the State deprives the Proletariat of all political rights and thus denies it even the opportunities to fight for its own rights.

Labour conditions:—Messrs. Parcell and Hallsworth in 1928 published the results of their All India Enquiry into the conditions of working class life. Even these Labour agents of British Imperialism are forced to come to these conclusions:—Housing and Sanitation about the workers chawls they say, "Unutterably bad and cannot in any decent sense be regarded as 'homes'. Had we not seen them we could not have believed that such evil places existed. The overcrowding and insanitary conditions, almost everywhere prevailing, demonstrate the callousness and wonted neglect of their obvious duties by the authorities concerned."

Wages:—"Speaking generally the wages question can be reduced to a fairly simple statement. All inquiries go to show that the vast majority of workers in India do not receive more than one shilling (less than eleven annas) per day. We are not understanding the position specially having in mind that in the wages field there is a veritable maze of exactions, deductions and forfeitures.

"Upon these miserable pittance the workers are expected to keep body and soul together and labour throughout the whole working day (often in a vitiated atmosphere and under most irksome conditions) which on the average cannot be less than one of ten hours."

"It may be said with truth that millions and millions of men, women and children get only half and often less than half the amount of food needed to maintain the very lowest state of life. It is undeniable that the Indian Workers are half-starved and badly clothed as well as horribly housed."

Not only are the existing conditions so disgustingly bad but there is no hope for the future. They say, "As far as we can judge it would appear to be the definite policy of the employing class in India to stabilize poverty on a permanent basis."

It is these conditions of life and work without any hope of betterment to which the existing order has forced the working class that make it as a class irreconcilable to Imperialism and the deadliest enemy of British Imperialism and its ally Indian Capitalism.

~~D/1531~~

Since the British Bourgeoisie cannot willingly concede Dominion Status and the Indian bourgeoisie is too weak to extract it, so the latter is either to accept or acquiesce in whatever British Imperialism itself freely grants. But this leads to a further important result—the compromises between the two are of a partial and temporary nature and the Indian bourgeoisie continues playing an oppositional role in relation to Imperialism until it is thrown into the arm of Imperialism and counter-revolution by the national revolution itself.

The Petty-bourgeoisie.

The petty bourgeoisie is lower in the social scale than the bourgeoisie. It is as a class exploited under Imperialism though less than the working masses. The arrested development of the national economy results in the pauperisation of this class which further finds expression in the growing unemployment. Mr. G.D. Birla in his Presidential address to the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce (February 14th, 1930) summarised the conditions of this class thus "The middle class population has to put up the hardest struggle possible to keep body and soul together and is amongst the worst victims of unemployment."

The petty bourgeoisie itself is exploited by Imperialism but is also used as an agent of exploitation. It is employed in the administrative (clerks, supervisors, Government servants etc) and distributive (small shopkeepers and the like) organs of society. This contradictory position of being a class itself exploited and also helping Imperialism to exploit the toiling masses debars the petty bourgeoisie from playing any independent role in the political struggle.

If it is exploited less than Proletariat it is oppressed equally with the Proletariat and what is more it feels this lack of rights more keenly because it has had the advantage of the cultural and educational facilities of the modern epoch and is therefore a politically conscious class.

When the bourgeoisie is in constitutional opposition to Imperialism as in 1923 to 1929 the petty bourgeoisie sees that the economic and political concessions which the Indian bourgeoisie

is able to secure from British Imperialism do not in any way better its own position, therefore it realises the contradiction of its own interest with Imperialism and becomes critical of the Indian bourgeoisie. During this period there is a drift from the bourgeois constitutional camp towards radical political activity independent of the bourgeoisie (rise of the Youth movement Independence League etc.) and a growing interest in modern revolutionary philosophies and activities (for example Communism, Anarchism, the Russian Revolution and the Chinese revolution). The petty bourgeoisie is not hostile but only critical towards the bourgeoisie, it does not completely identify itself with the working masses but is only sympathetic to them.

During periods of mass reformism (as in the last non co-operation movement and the recent Satyagrah movement), the petty bourgeoisie as a class subordinates itself to the bourgeois leadership and forms its heroic rank and file. By thus merging itself with the Bourgeoisie the petty bourgeoisie neither advances the cause of national liberation nor its own class interest. It mistakes the oppositional role of the Bourgeoisie for a revolutionary role and the reformist struggle for the revolutionary struggle. The petty bourgeoisie works under the delusion that it is using the bourgeoisie while the actual fact is that the bourgeoisie uses the petty bourgeoisie in its treacherous task of winning concessions from Imperialism and in sabotaging the growth of revolutionary forces. It plays into the hands of the Bourgeoisie by not fighting to overthrow the reformist leadership of the bourgeoisie in the National struggle. The petty bourgeoisie of itself fails to distinguish between struggle and struggle and the accompanying tactics and tactics.

The petty bourgeoisie is an intermediary class between the Proletariat and the Bourgeoisie; it is not a homogeneous class but is composed of diverse sections therefore the whole class cannot take a uniform attitude towards the national revolution but it will split up when faced with the actual crisis.

(1) The sections allied to land, usury and the Bureaucracy, though they suffer in the existing order yet are too closely bound up with it, being themselves exploiters they may lose their all with the overthrow of Imperialism, therefore they support the national reformist path, follow the bourgeoisie and will ultimately go over to counter-revolution.

(2) Clerks, petty traders, shop-keepers, employing artisans etc.—their standard of living is low and is growing lower under Imperialism but they consider themselves lucky in having secured even this much and all their effort is directed to clinging to this

wretched life and they cannot afford to take any risks. They are vaguely, in a humanitarian manner sympathetic to the Workers' movement, they are mostly full of cynicism and defeatism. They hesitate before the revolution and take a neutral stand. They are not opposed to the other people destroying the Imperialist bondage.

(3) Students, unemployed youth etc: are the most virile elements of this class. They react in the most sensitive manner to existing exploitation and oppression. This section will fight for and identify itself with the revolution as the only way out of this mire. They however import into the mass movement the petty bourgeois ideology of vacillation and hesitation, the revolution is not to accept the leadership of these intellectuals but they have to accept the leadership of the revolutionary class, the Proletariat.

The Proletariat :—its class Enemies:—

The Indian Proletariat is the class most exploited under the Imperialist system. The class enemies of the Proletariat are:—
(1) Indian Capitalism which directly exploits Indian labour as Industrial-Capital and also as Merchant— Capital through profits on goods sold to the workers.

(2) *British Imperialism.* The Imperialist State directly employes and exploits the Indian workers, for example in the Railways, Public Works etc: There are also industrial works and plantations which are managed and owned by British Capitalists themselves. British Imperialism by its control of the State deprives the Proletariat of all political rights and thus denies it even the opportunities to fight for its own rights.

Labour Conditions.—Messrs Purcell and Hallsworth in 1928 published the results of their All India Enquiry into the conditions of working class life. Even these Labour agents of British Imperialism are forced to come to these conclusions:—Housing and Sanitation; about the workers chawls they say, "Unutterably bad and cannot in any decent sense be regarded as 'homes'. Had we not seen them we could not have believed that such evil places existed. The over-crowding and insanitary conditions, almost everywhere prevailing demonstrate the callousness and wonted neglect of their obvious duties by the authorities concerned."

Wages.—"Speaking generally the wages question can be reduced to a fairly simple statement. All inquiries go to show that the vast majority of workers in India do not receive more than one shilling (less than eleven annas) per day. We are not understating the position specially having in mind that in the wages field

there is a veritable maze of exactions, deductions and forfeitures).

"Upon these miserable pittances the workers are expected to keep body and soul together and labour throughout the whole working day (often in a viliated atmosphere and under most irksome conditions) which on the average cannot be less than one of ten hours."

It may be said with truth that millions and millions of men, women and children get only half and often less than half the amount of food needed to maintain the very lowest state of life. It is undeniable that the Indian Workers are half starved and badly clothed as well as horribly housed."

Not only are the existing conditions so disgustingly bad but there is no hope for the future. They say, "As far as we can judge it would appear to be the definite policy of the employing class in India to stabilize poverty on a permanent basis."

It is these conditions of life and work without any hope of betterment to which the existing order has forced the working class that make it as a class irreconcilable to Imperialism and the deadliest enemy of British Imperialism and its ally Indian Capitalism.

The Leader of the National Revolution.

The Indian Proletariat is the historic leader of the mighty anti-imperialist struggle. It will lead the struggle not to mislead or betray it like the bourgeoisie, but it will and it alone can lead the Indian toiling masses to victory against Imperialism for the following reasons:—

(1) It is a class which is economically exploited and politically oppressed under the bourgeois-Imperialist order; it comes into direct contact with their modern engines of spoliation and slavery therefore the exploiters and their institutions are not remote and unknown to the Proletariat. The Proletariat knows the enemy and its ways.

(2) It is a property-less class and therefore has no interest at stake in the existing order. This characteristic is a guarantee of the fact that the Proletariat will not only fight but carry the fight to a finish.

(3) It is employed mainly in Industries and Transport, the central cells of Imperialist order, and so occupies a strategic place in the economic organism.

(4) It is a producing class and its services are indispensable for without the workers neither the factories nor the railways can run. It is not only employed in strategic places but there it occupies a controlling position.

(5) It is disciplined and organised by the very conditions of its work; it is employed in large numbers in large scale enterprises and works with modern methods of production, here it acquires technical and scientific skill and this with the environment of work dispels all placid contentment and superstitions or religious illusions which the peasantry retains; it learns to work en masse in an organised manner and this further encourages collective thinking and engenders a revolutionary spirit.

The Proletariat is thus not only best placed but also best prepared to fight Imperialism.

The Peasantry.

The class enemies of the peasantry are:—

(1) The Landlords: The land actually tilled by the peasant is owned by the landlord who appropriates a substantial part of the agricultural produce as rent. By virtue of their monopoly of lands the landlords control the very life of the peasantry through the control of their means of life. This enables the zamindars to levy further illegal cesses and impose conditions of personal bondage. The landlords are the real power in the country-side, the robbers of and terror to the peasantry.

(2) Mahajan- Sahukar: The Indian peasant is so poor that for paying rent, buying bullocks etc. and for the general financing of harvest he has no surplus capital and has to go to the Mahajan Shylocks for loans. The Mahajans rates of interest are so usurious that once the peasant gets indebted to him he cannot get out of his clutches. The Mahajan also controls the life and liberty of the peasantry because of his economic hold over them. The money-lenders themselves are fast becoming a landlord class, they attach the land of the peasant on his inability to pay the usurious interest and debt.

(3) The Indian Merchant class: They buy from the peasants their agricultural produce at the lowest possible price and they sell to them the industrial and other goods at the highest possible price, both as buyers and sellers they cheat the peasantry.

(4) British Imperialism: In the Ryotwari areas the State itself is the land-lord and British Imperialism fulfils the role of

land-lordism by its high land-tax. The Imperialist State controls the Exchange policy which is manipulated in the interest of the British Bourgeoisie, the peasant is forced to accept less price for his agricultural produce and pay more for the British goods. The high taxation falls predominantly on the peasantry since they form the huge majority of the population and it affects them the most since they are the poorest section of the population. Like the Proletariat the peasantry suffers from a total absence of political rights.

This quadruple alliance of the most backward and the most modern force of exploitation creates havoc among the peasantry. It guarantees to them permanent hunger instead of food, hovels instead of homes, a diseased life and a premature death instead of medical and sanitary arrangements, and the police lathi instead of rights.

Not the Leader of the revolution.

The peasantry like the Proletariat is the most exploited class under Imperialism and therefore a revolutionary class but unlike the Proletariat it cannot be the leader of the revolution for the following reasons:—

(1) It is geographically scattered over a very large area, distributed in 635,655 villages, this is a position quite different from that of the Proletariat which is concentrated in large number in a few big towns; therefore, the peasantry cannot be easily organised nor deal united effective blows against Imperialism.

(2) It works on an individual scale on the land, with the most primitive methods of production divorced from the conditions and actualities of modern life. This material environment produces individualistic tendencies as distinguished from the collective discipline and work of the Proletariat.

(3) Unlike the Proletariat, it is not a homogenous class, there are serious class gradations within its own ranks, as for example the landless, poor, middle, and rich peasantry. In periods of struggle the interests of the various sections would come more into conflict with each other than in normal times and the peasantry could not function as a solid class; this demands the alliance of another united class which may hold the exploited sections of the peasantry together.

The Ally of the Proletariat

The peasantry cannot fulfil its revolutionary role as the

leader of the revolution but it fulfils that role as the ally of the Proletariat.

For the Proletariat the alliance with the peasantry is essential for victory. In an agricultural country like India where 73 per cent of the population lives on agriculture the peasantry is numerically the most important class. The Indian Proletariat itself is numerically weaker than that of the western countries and therefore cannot bear the whole brunt of the Imperialist might unaided. The peasantry is engaged in the most important single industry of the country, agriculture, therefore the alliance with the peasantry is necessary not only to strike at Imperialism through a peasant strike (no-tax no rent campaign) but also for feeding the Proletariat during the revolution.

For the peasantry the alliance with the Proletariat is equally essential and easy to accomplish. The Indian Proletariat is very young and has been recently recruited from the countryside with which it maintains living social contacts. Both the classes have got common class enemies.

The alliance between Proletariat and the peasantry rests on the strongest possible basis—they are bound by common class-interest against common class-enemies and it will endure till the glorious common-aim is achieved. The Proletarian-peasant alliance is thus a historic necessity without the peasantry the Proletariat cannot capture power and without the Proletariat the peasantry cannot liberate itself.

United National Front—a Myth

British Imperialism does not exploit and oppress the various Indian classes uniformly nor are the interests of these classes uniformly opposed to Imperialism. The picture of the whole Indian nation (all the classes together) unitedly opposed to Imperialism is a fiction, it is to retain an illusion not corresponding to the facts of Indian social life.

A realistic analysis of Indian society, its various classes and their mutual co-relations and the relations of these classes to Imperialism gives us a different picture, we get not one united front but three class fronts:

(1) The Pro-Imperialist, counter revolutionary front consisting of the Indian Princes and zemindars.

(2) Revolutionary anti-Imperialist front: It consists of the workers, peasants and revolutionary youths i. e. all the revolutionary

classes directed against Imperialism and also against the forces directed against the revolution. This is a solid block because the interests of each class represented here do not conflict with each other but complement each other, the unity of these classes does not corrupt or weaken but strengthens the whole front. This front has the foundation of a rock, material class interest, and not hypocritical lying words to cover class conflicts, the foundation of sand.

It is a genuine anti-Imperialist front because it consists of those classes whose interests are essentially contradictory to Imperialism; therefore this front can never betray a national struggle nor compromise with British Imperialism. The very purpose of this front is death struggle against Imperialism, its total destruction and therewith the liberation of the Indian people. It is not possible to overthrow British Imperialism without simultaneously attacking its counter-revolutionary hirelings, so the anti-Imperialist front is also directed against the Princes and Zemindars.

The anti-Imperialist front is a revolutionary front it accepts the only possible way of overthrowing Imperialism, Revolution; it systematically and consistently follows the strategy and tactics of revolutionary struggle; it definitely rejects reformism as a method of struggle for the victory over Imperialism, the revolutionary tasks impose upon the front the further obligation of exposing the illusion of "peaceful" revolution spread by the bourgeoisie to cover its own treachery and retreat; revolutionary classes follow revolutionary methods and non revolutionary classes the reformist ones, methods of struggle are not independent of class interests but are deliberately planned to suit and advance those class interests.

(3) Oppositional Reformist Bourgeois front.

The Bourgeois front is oppositional and not anti-imperialist, that is, its ideal is a compromise with and not the overthrow of Imperialism; it is reformist, advocating Non-Violence and the tactics 'of bended knees', which are often bent double and not revolutionary; it is class collaborationist in character and definitely repudiates the revolutionary tactics of class-struggle.

The bourgeoisie stands between the two forces, the pro-imperialist counter-revolutionary front and the revolutionary anti-imperialist front. At a given situation how far it is from the Imperialist front depends upon the policy of Imperialism and not upon its own desire for it has no genuine fighting power and capacity.

The Indian Bourgeoisie is too closely bound up with Imperialism to enter the revolutionary block. It is actively hostile to the revolutionary mass movement. The chief feature of national Reformism is that it exerts a braking, retarding influence on the development of the revolutionary movement in so far as it is successful in drawing the toiling masses in its wake and holding them back from the revolutionary struggle. The Indian bourgeoisie is never near the revolutionary anti-imperialist front, the degree of its distance from this camp depends upon the growth of the revolutionary movement itself, when the mass revolution becomes actual and menacing the Indian bourgeoisie would be a willing member of the pro-imperialist counter-revolutionary camp.

To advocate a coalition of the revolutionary front with the Bourgeois front would be an opportunist error of the gravest type based on an entire misunderstanding of the role of the bourgeoisie. It would only result in mystifying and shackling the revolutionary front and denying the very reasons for its existence.

Thus our final formulation of the various class forces in Indian society in their relation to Imperialism and revolution is:— the national revolution is the class revolution of the Workers and Peasants against British Imperialism, and its agents and hirelings, the Indian Princes and landlords, and also its ally, the treacherous Indian Bourgeoisie.

We amusedly await another grotesque mis-representation of the forces to the national revolution by the present Crown counsel. His predecessor had tarred us 'Anti national', to isolate us from the rising tide of the National movement and to scare away the Indian Youth from our platform by playing upon popular superstitions. No political party can represent the interest of all the classes of Indian society because they are contradictory to each other. We are definitely anti-imperialists and for the toiling masses therefore we are also against the zamindars and the Capitalists who are exploiters of the masses and the agents and allies of Imperialism.

We also await your Honour's "judgment," the trying Magistrate diligently hunted for 'honest' nationalists amongst us so that he might discharge them. He meant by 'honest' nationalists, harmless bourgeois Reformists and not national revolutionaries. We raise our outstretched arm, against British Imperialism and refuse to go down on our "bended knees" before it.

We announce that it has been our proud privilege to represent against the apparently mighty British Imperialism the really mighty revolutionary anti-imperialist front. We prefer being on the right side with history than on the right side with British Imperialism.

We are National revolutionaries, neither traitors to the Indian Masses nor cowards before British Imperialism.

Revolutionary Perspective.

The Prosecution with their usual crudeness have tried to make out revolution as a black mysterious thing and ourselves engaged in its illegal distillation. How do we visualize revolutionary perspectives ?

Revolution.

Revolution to Imperialism is dreadful, by us it is adored. Why ? What is our conception of revolution ?

Bourgeois Feudal Imperialism sits like the Old man of the Sea on the shoulders of the Indian masses, it is a reactionary retrogressive social order, a standing menace to the progress and prosperity of Indian society. The masses are faced with the choice between chaos and revolution. Imperialism forcibly checks the independent development of the productive forces, therefore Indian society is in a permanent state of decay, this social stagnation makes revolution inevitable; under Imperialism the condition of the Indian masses grows worse, and worse there is a guarantee of a permanent increase in their poverty and slavery, these intolerable conditions of life make revolution necessary. Both these factors are the outward expression of the same tendency, the fundamental policy of Imperialism, and they together prove the historicity of revolution.

Revolution is the historical destruction of the old social order and the forcible overthrow of its ruling class which has no progressive mission to fulfil, and the historical inauguration of a new social order and the installation in power of a new ruling class which has a progressive mission to discharge. Revolution is therefore both destructive and constructive, it is destructive of the exploiters and the oppressors and constructive for the exploited and the oppressed.

Revolution is not to be justified according to the sections of the Imperialist Penal Code or defended before Imperialist Court law, the inevitable success of the revolution is its own justification, and it speaks through the voice of history.

Violence Vs: Non-violence

The question of violence vs: non-violence has assumed in

no other country such political importance as in India. The workers and Peasants Party Principles and Policy (Page 8) says, "The Workers' and Peasants' Party does not deny the general utility in Indian conditions of non-violence as a tactic but maintains that it will not be necessary for the Indian Movement to use this tactic at all times and in all conditions." Why do we oppose non-violence as a principle or even as a permanent method of struggle, in short, why are we against non-violence and for violence?

The aim of the national struggle is the achievement of success and the fulfilment of its aim. The struggle and its success are the real issue for the masses. The classes threatened with the struggle for the safety of their own class interest, precondition, the struggle itself, thereby they emasculate the struggle of liberation and eliminate its chances of victory. British Imperialism makes the national struggle a legalistic issue national struggle is either legal or illegal, and it decreases that constitutional or harmless non-violent struggle is legal, and revolutionary therefore necessarily violent national struggle is illegal. The law is the law of Imperialism meant for its continued preservation and not to facilitate its destruction. To accept conditions dictated by British Imperialism on the National struggle which is directed against it is to repudiate the struggle itself.

British Imperialism rests on an organised system of violence which operates through its Army, Police and Prisons. It itself uses violence against the working masses fighting for their own rights and justifies this violence according to 'law'; on the other hand it forbids violence to be used by the masses to free themselves and condemns it also according to 'law' Imperialist justification of Imperialist violence but condemnation of mass violence is illogical but it is not a question of logic but of class interest and as such clearly understandable.

The Indian Bourgeoisie raises the issue to an abstract plane. It declares non-violence to be moral and violence immoral. In the mills, shops, and fields the daily relations of the Indian bourgeois with the Indian masses are based on starving wages, weary hours of work and indiscriminate use of violence in all forms. The Indian bourgeoisie is very violent and immoral towards the masses but very non violent and moral towards British Imperialism. What is the explanation of this contradictory attitude? The Indian bourgeoisie, as has already been discussed, cannot and would not destroy British Imperialism, it only fights for some concessions from it, but even in this reformist struggle it has to enlist the support of the Indian masses and at the same

time guarantee that the masses would not wage a revolutionary struggle, therefore to shackle and chain but yet utilize mass energy it gives out the slogan of Non-violence. 'Peaceful' revolution is no revolution, it is ultimately peace with Imperialism, the word revolution is only used by the bourgeoisie to satisfy its petty bourgeois following and thus be able to cloud their political sense still more successfully. Non-violence is the cloak used by the hypocritical Indian bourgeoisie to hide its own cowardice, incapacity and unwillingness to destroy British Imperialism.

Seriously accepting non-violence as a principle of the national struggle is losing all sense of revolutionary perspective; it is leading the struggle into a blind alley, it means that the struggle would not advance to higher stages but keep on marking time and ultimately collapse before Imperialist Police *lathis* and the bullets of the armed soldiers, it is a surety of the fact that British Imperialism would not be destroyed and the struggle because of this impossible condition and the reactionary pacifist mentality which it creates, would of itself disintegrate. Non-violent Revolution is at once the Bourgeois vulgarisation of the national revolution and its virtual repudiation.

The Indian workers and peasants are revolutionary classes, for them the destruction of British Imperialism is an imperative necessity, therefore they advocate and support violence. The Indian masses can not determine methods of struggle on juristic or ethical grounds but they are determined for them by the position and might of their class enemy, British Imperialism, with its Police, Army and all the paraphernalia of modern warfare, all of which are used by it unhesitatingly and most brutally in its own defence. Revolutionaries are realists. Their task is to understand these real material factors and not to escape or avoid them but to meet Imperialist violence by organised vast violence.

A great lesson of all the revolutions of the world in the various stages of history is that no ruling class has ever been overthrown except by violence. A ruling class never voluntarily surrenders its power, ^{only} it is defeated in a bloody violent struggle. Political power is never transferred but only captured after an armed victory.

Revolutionaries fight and expose the use of violence on the working masses by British Imperialism because it is counter-revolutionary violence, used for reactionary purposes of national and class subjugation, they support violence used by the masses against British Imperialism which is ^{the} revolutionary violence used for progressive purposes of national and class liberation.

Revolutionaries also fight and expose the artificial importation and propagation of the illusions of constitutionalism, reformism and Ahimsa among the toiling millions, because they sap revolutionary enthusiasm, damp revolutionary initiative and corrupt the revolutionary ideology. Our justification of violence is historical, above the holy horror of the hypocritical Indian bourgeoisie or the fright and frown of the hired agent Imperialism. British Imperialism sends straight to jail or to the gallows those who advocate or use violence against it, while the British bourgeoisie itself when fighting British feudalism beheaded one King, launched Civil War under Cromwell and dethroned another King. What is the explanation of this contrast? It is to be found in the exigencies of class struggle then the British bourgeoisie was a revolutionary class fighting against British feudalism, today it is a counter-revolutionary class keeping in subjection the Indian masses and the British workers. Bourgeois violence during bourgeois revolution succeeded, mass violence during mass revolution will likewise succeed.

The Course of the National Revolution.

Revolution is not an artificial phenomenon arbitrarily imposed upon society by a few romantics, therefore there is no ready made plan or sketch of the revolution. The course of the national revolution can however be visualised from past revolutionary ~~classes~~ experience and the position which the revolutionary occupy in society and the ways in which they react actively against their conditions of life.

There is a great difference between the older bourgeois revolution and modern national revolution:—

(1) The historical milieu of the two is fundamentally different though they are formally analogous. The most important difference is that between the two the whole cycle of capitalist development has run its course. During the older period the bourgeoisie was the leader of the revolution against feudalism and it undertook the organisation and political training of the people in the modern period on the other hand the Proletariat is the leader of the revolution and has to fulfil all the tasks of political leadership.

(2) The actual revolutionary period was formerly very small confined to street fighting, barricades, conflict with and destruction of the armed forces of the feudal State and a rapid capture of power by the bourgeoisie. Revolution was then almost synonymous with insurrection only. During the present period when the Proletariat is the leader of the revolution the period of actual struggle is long.

and the revolution consists of a series of successful struggles. This long period has a historical purpose of its own. Workers and Peasants alone can destroy Imperialism in the modern epoch but in order to be able to destroy it they require a high degree of political education, of class consciousness and organisation. These conditions can not be fulfilled in the existing order, when opportunities for education, right of free speech, and of class organisation are deliberately and positively denied to them. All these conditions can not be fulfilled by mere leaflets, pamphlets and speeches but only by the living political school, i.e. by the fight and in the fight, in the continuing course of the revolution itself. For the working masses six weeks of revolutionary period is equal to six years of mechanical political education. Revolution elevates, organises, and educates them and in this sense plays a very great cultural role, by fitting them with qualities and capacities for the seizure of power.

British Imperialism drives the toiling masses to greater and greater starvation and misery. Workers and Peasants are producing classes and they react to this Imperialism drive by refusing to produce any further for the expropriation of the exploiting classes, this refusal to work for their own enslavement works with fatal result for the ruling class.

The peasants' strike takes the form no-tax no-rent campaign but this stage is merely negative. It is a sign of the inability and consequent refusal to bear existing economic burdens. During this struggle however, all the peasant masses are mobilised as a class against a great and genuine class grievance, the system of ~~less~~ tenure. The peasant movement must advance to the positive and higher stage when the landlords' land is forcibly seized by the peasants and the moneylenders' papers burnt by them. The peasant movement is directed against feudal-Imperialism. The revolutionary struggle of the peasantry results in the collapse of the economic system especially when it is mainly agricultural as in India and the crumbling of the State power which is unable to cope with a movement so widespread and deep-rooted.

The workers' strike against British Imperialism and Indian Capitalism by going on strike. The modern economic life is so highly concentrated and centralised that in any period of deep revolutionary crisis the individual strikes in the various industries and centres have large ramification and are widespread. The general strike is not mechanically brought about on a fixed date by a Firman but grows out of these individual strikes. The workers on strike to make the struggle more powerful and effective coordinate their individual activities and call upon the whole working

class to join the common struggle. The general strike of the entire working class means a loss of millions of rupees daily to the employing classes, violent disturbance of the economic equilibrium of society and the isolation of the State apparatus from the general population because of the strike on the railways, posts and telegraphs. The general strike is the heaviest frontal blow at British Imperialism.

There is an inner mutual interaction in the separate workers' and peasants' struggle because of the modern economic organisation of society. This fact finds an outward expression in the organisational and ideological coordination, co-relation and centralisation of the two struggles, which are directed against the common enemy the bourgeois-feudal-Imperialism, and for the common aim, its destruction.

British Imperialism meets this menace itself and its allies by pitting its entire armed might against these revolutionary struggles to down them in blood. The crucial problem then arises that the revolutionary mass movement has either to collapse before this show and use of Imperialist armed force or on the contrary meet and crush it and march forward to final victory. Armed mass insurrection is the highest stage of the upward growth of revolution. The prize of the victory is the Capture of Power, the Destruction of the Enemy and the Liberation of the People. We, therefore, hail and salute the final armed mass uprising of those who are slaves today but will be free after it.

The masses have not to decide whether armed insurrection is ethically or legally justifiable or not, it is forced upon them by British Imperialism which inevitably uses all methods of violence to crush the national movement, mass insurrection is at once the defensive and the final offensive of the masses, it is in the end a simple equation of force versus force. The problem which has to be consciously decided, however, is the when and the how of the armed insurrection.

Police "Theory" of the Revolution

The exploiters by their own policy create revolutionary conditions and when they see their erstwhile willing slaves rising in revolt they come to the comfortable conclusion that revolutions are "produced" by "agitators" and their seditious "propaganda." To restore their falling rates of profit and loss of business they order their State forces to resort to lathis, bayonets and prisons this in the picturesque phrase of Rosa Luxemburg, is the application of the

principles of police materialism and not historical materialism. Revolutions can not be stopped by killing or jailing revolutionaries.

Among other decadent bourgeois brain waves we come across expressions like "creating" or "making" revolutions (in the late Crown Counsel's Address and the Magistrate's Committal Order) and it is seriously levelled as a serious charge against us as if revolution is an avoidable phenomenon, or a romantic aberration, or a social crime. Revolution is nothing divorced from the social and historical environment. We decree nothing, we only analyse the method of motion of the revolutionary masses and accordingly act. Revolutions are achieved in the words of Lenin, "with the masses and through the masses." "Individuals may be suppressed, the masses never" (Workers and Peasants Party's Principles and Policy, page 7)

D/2 5. 31

The Programme of the National Revolution: The Character of National Revolution. In Marxist terms the character of the national revolution can be described as Bourgeois Democratic that is, the national revolution has to fulfil those tasks for modern Indian society which the French Revolution of 1789 and the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848 performed or attempted to perform for western Europe, the destruction of Feudalism and the Democratisation of the state. During that period of Bourgeois revolution in the 19th century when the Indian society was in a state of flux while Feudalism was decaying and Indian Capitalism was rising to take its place the conquest of India by British Imperialism was achieved. Instead of Indian Capitalism itself destroying Indian Feudalism the whole social aspect of the problem was fundamentally changed with the advent of foreign capitalism, which adapted itself to Indian Feudalism and subordinated Indian Capitalism to itself. The independent social development of India was forcibly suppressed by British Imperialism and under the yoke of British Imperialism, the highest form of capitalism, we have travelled the whole cycle of the Capitalist development in more than one century of foreign rule.

The national revolution thus has to solve two problems one historically long overdue and the other comparatively new—

(1) Removal of the age old Feudal incubs artificially preserved by British Imperialism.

(2) achievement of national emancipation from foreign capitalist domination.

The national revolution is in this way an anti-imperialist agrarian revolution.

The Indian revolution is Bourgeois Democratic in character but is emphatically directed against the Bourgeoisie and not led by it. The role of the Bourgeoisie and its attitude towards the revolution is exactly what distinguishes the modern revolution from the older revolutions. During the older purely bourgeois revolutions the bourgeoisie was itself an oppressed class and its interests were contradictory to the Feudal regime; it wanted the abolition of Feudal landlordism so that the surplus produced by the peasantry may not all be appropriated and wasted by the landlords but should be available for investment in industries and secondly that the peasants should not be bound to the land but liberated from personal bondage to the feudal lord so that the Bourgeoisie itself may have plentiful supply of cheap 'free' labour. To fulfil these two anti-feudal tasks it demanded the Democratization of the State. Having captured power the bourgeoisie smashed the mass movement which itself was leading because the masses wanted to carry the revolution further; it succeeded in doing this because in that period the Proletariat as an organised class did not exist and the village and the town poor were too disorganised and isolated.

In the modern epoch the social perspectives have radically changed, existence of British Imperialism for 150 years in India has altered the class relations of society (as I have already shown which have materially affected the forces and the counter forces of the revolution. Today the hangman of Feudal-Imperialism and the leader of the national revolution is the Proletariat and not the Bourgeoisie, on the contrary the Bourgeoisie is the ally of British Imperialism against the revolution. Therefore the national revolution is directed against Bourgeoisie and led by the Proletariat. To describe the National Revolution as "bourgeois democratic but directed against the bourgeoisie" is no doubt correct Marxian terminology and the divergence between the character and the leadership of the revolution is explained by historical development, but this complex characterisation confuses the common people. Marxism is for the common people, so we have discarded this old terminology in our popular literature and when we now describe the character of the national revolution we say it is an "anti-imperialist agrarian revolution" and as for its leadership we say it is to be won under the hegemony of the Proletariat. These terms are simple, clear and positive. With the march of history many things change and so do technical terms of social sciences.

The Tasks of the Revolution: Imperialism

A. Anti Imperialist Tasks.

- (1) Repudiation of all Imperial debts,

- (2) Confiscation of the entire foreign capital operating in India.
- (3) Nationalisation of Banks and the means of exchange.
- (4) Nationalisation of the means of transport.
- (5) Nationalisation of the key-industries like Iron, Coal and Textiles.

This economic programme is directed to completely destroy the economic hold of British Imperialism over India and it strikes at all its existing strong-holds. This programme can only be realised after a victorious revolution.

This programme makes no discrimination between Imperial and Indian capital; they are so inter-allied that no distinction is possible. Moreover, the Indian bourgeoisie is opposed to revolution and it will fight against the revolution and so the whole class will have to be suppressed as counter-revolutionary and this cannot be done as long as its economic power which binds it to British Imperialism is not smashed; to leave economic monopoly in the hands of the Indian Bourgeoisie is to help counter-revolution and pave the way for the restoration of British Imperialism.

B. Democratic Tasks

Dominion Status is the platform of the Indian bourgeoisie, signalling its inclusion in the Imperial fold as a junior partner and the elimination of radical contradictions between the interests of the two classes. Dominion Status means political peace between the indigenous and Imperial capital on the basis of agreed share of each from the total exploitation of the toiling masses, and opportunities for further expansion and development to the Indian Capital.

Dominion Status however does not change the political status of the masses of the people or better the economic conditions of their life. Dominion Status guarantees to British Imperialism its armed occupation of India and through the control of foreign policy the right to use Indian men and money in future wars for the greed of Imperialist masters. The existing economic strangle-hold of British Imperialism would remain unloosened, its Commercial domination, Industrial suzerainty and Financial hegemony is guaranteed and not destroyed under Dominion Status.

In short, the slavery and the robbery of the Indian masses is not removed but perpetuated under Dominion Status; the only difference is that they become the joint slaves of British Imperialism and Indian Capitalism. Dominion Status is the Swaraj of the few exploiters and not of the exploited many.

Complete Independence of India expresses the irreconcilability of the interests of the people of India with British Imperialism, Independence demands the total severance of connection with the Empire. Today Imperialism is the ruling class and after its overthrow it will be the implacable enemy of liberated India against which we shall have to guard the triumphs of the revolution. Any 'association' with Imperialism would only show that the revolution has been incomplete and Independence not achieved. Association with Imperialism has only one meaning sub-servience to Imperialism.

Independence expresses the political ideal of the Indian National revolution only negatively, that is, its attitude towards the Imperial connection; positively stated it is the establishment of a Workers' and Peasants' Republic. Independence from British Imperialism must necessarily result in the establishment of a workers and peasants Republic because the form of the revolutionary state depends upon the revolutionary classes who fight for power and lead the struggle. Workers and Peasants alone will fight for the revolutionary overthrow of Imperialism and when political power will be captured by these classes they will naturally create their own class State. Independence cannot result in the creation of a formal Bourgeois Republic as in Europe during the Bourgeois Democratic period, because the Indian bourgeoisie is not a revolutionary class, on the other hand it is against the national revolution and for an alliance with British Imperialism. Bourgeois Republics were established in Europe by the Bourgeoisie because against Feudalism and during Bourgeois revolution it was the leader of the revolution and therefore after the seizure of the power succeeded in establishing its own State. To think of the possibility of the establishment of a Bourgeois Republic in India after the victorious national revolution is to entirely mis-understand the class-relation between the Indian Bourgeoisie and the British Imperialism, it is to retain a pitiful illusion and hug a hopelessly unhistoric idea.

The character of the National Revolutionary State is described in Marxian terms as the Democratic Dictatorship of the Workers and Peasants which means, real, complete, and full Democracy for the workers and peasants, and the ruthless Dictatorship of the Workers and Peasants over the Imperialists landlords, and Capitalists. Both these tasks Democratic as well as Dictatorial will be achieved by the following measures:—

(1) Destruction of the Imperialist State machine which is the creation of Imperialism for the suppression and oppression of the masses, therefore the working masses can not simply take it

over and use it for their own purposes, for their new tasks they must create a new State.

(2) No bureaucracy but a civil service responsible to the Panchayat Soviet with right of recall.

(3) No Govt. employee to be paid more than the wages of an average skilled worker.

(4) No standing army but a national militia of the workers and peasants.

(5) Disarming of the exploiting classes and mass arming of the workers and peasants.

(6) Creation of the Military Revolutionary Committee to deal with the enemies of the revolution.

(7) Universal adult suffrage with the disenfranchisement of the exploiting classes.

(8) Complete freedom of the Press and Speech to all the revolutionary parties but not to the counter revolutionary parties.

(9) Right of association for the toiling masses.

(10) Minimum wage of Rs 45/- per month to all workers.

(11) Guaranteed work.

(12) Eight hours day as a transition to six hours.

(13) Social, health, old age and unemployment insurance.

(14) Free compulsory primary education to all till the age of fourteen.

(15) Abolition of all class, caste or race disabilities.

(16) Complete cultural autonomy to all minority communities with right of forming completely autonomous republics.

C. Anti-Feudal Tasks.

Feudal economy has been preserved by British Imperialism, and the landlords are the closest allies of the foreign rulers therefore the agrarian revolution is the very axis of the national revolution. The concrete tasks of the agrarian revolution are:—

(1) Confiscation of the estates of the big landlords and their distribution by the Peasant Panchayat Soviets.

- (2) Repudiation of all agricultural debts to the Mahajan Sahukars.
- (3) Usury to be prevented by law.
- (4) Guaranteed cooperative credit at a minimum rate of interest.
- (5) A steeply graduated agricultural incometax.
- (6) No agricultural tax for the peasants owning less than the economic unit of land.

On the correct coordination of the agrarian revolution to the national revolution on the basis of these concrete tasks depends the support of 37.8 millions landless peasants and 173 millions poor peasants to the movement of national liberation. Half the total area of India (excluding Burma) is under the Indian Princes, 52 percent of the total British India is under the zamindars (20 p. c. as permanently settled zamindari and 32 p. c. as temporary zamindari); thus millions of toiling peasants live under conditions of feudal bondage and servitude whose liberation is an essential part of the national revolution. A democratic society cannot be built on the back of feudal serfs when the zamindars and mahajans appropriate the major part of the produce of the peasantry, on the other hand a prosperous peasantry enjoying the fruits of its own labour and where agricultural surplus will be available for the creation of new democratic industries is the essential base of such a society. National production and welfare both demand the destruction of feudalism and the liberation of the peasantry.

National Revolution is International

Imperialism today is a world phenomenon and British Imperialism is only a part of it. World Imperialism is organized economically in Trusts, Cartels etc. and politically in the League of Nations, on all important matters the various Imperialist powers have a common policy and act unitedly on an International scale for example blockade and intervention in Soviet Russia and intervention in the Chinese revolution, Disarmament or rather agreed Armament. Imperialism is organized and operates on a world scale. The struggle against Imperialism therefore is a world struggle. The success of the national revolution depends upon a clear recognition of two factors, firstly that the Indian revolution has got international enemies in the Imperialists of the various countries, and secondly that it has likewise International allies in all those forces which are struggling against Imperialism.

The foremost among the International allies of the national revolution is the first Workers' and Peasants' Republic of history, Soviet Russia. Czarist Russia was part of the world Imperialist economy, today one-sixth of this part of the globe is outside the Imperialist Sector and under Socialist therefore anti-Imperialist economy. The very existence of Socialist Soviet Russia is a standing challenge to World Imperialism as shown by the virulent and bitter propaganda of the World bourgeois Press and this anti-Imperialist character of Soviet Russia makes it an ally of the Colonial peoples. The friendship of workers Russia with the oppressed nations is not hypocritical but real, is not merely confined towards but finds expression in deeds as is shown by the Soviet Policy in Persia, Afghanistan and China where the Soviet voluntarily gave up all the special concessions, privileges and extra territorial rights extorted under Czarism from these nations.

The various Imperialist powers have colonies and each colonial possession is used to suppress the colonial revolt in another, for example, Indian Troops have been used against the Boers, Zulus, Abyssinians, Egyptians and Sudanese in Africa, times out of number against the Chinese people the latest time 1927, and also against the Persians, Arabs, Turks and Afghans, Australian Troops were landed in India in Madras in 1930 to guard British Imperialism against the Civil Disobedience Movement. The masses of these colonies are robbed and plundered by Imperialism the same as ourselves. Enslaved colonies are the bulwarks of Imperialism and colonial rebels are fellow fighters in the common revolution against Imperialism.

The Imperialist bourgeoisie does not only exploit the masses of the colonial countries but also the workers of the Imperialist countries as well. The aim of proletarian revolution in the capitalist country and of the national revolution in the colonial country is the same, the destruction of the class rule of Imperialism, therefore the interests of the two are common interests. In declaring community of interests with the British workers we stumble against the staggering fate of the British party which calls itself the "Labour" Party.

The Labour party is not a party of the British working class against British Imperialism but the party of British Imperialism in the British working class, it is the third party of the British bourgeoisie. The anti-working class character of this party is borne out by the fact that it betrayed the general strike of 1926, it has itself smashed the Woollen Strike of last year, though it has been two years in office it has not yet repealed that grossest piece of anti-working class legislation the Trade Disputes Act, the

unemployment figures have been mounting higher and higher under its regime, it has not carried out a single working class legislation against the British bourgeoisie. When this is its record at home is it any wonder that it has followed the full blooded Imperialist and definitely anti-socialist policy in relation to India. During the Civil Disobedience Movement it imprisoned over 70 thousand people, declared Martial Law, issued 11 Ordinances, hanged the Sholapur insurrectionists, the Lahore comrades, and on the constitutional issue has not even conceded the demands of the Indian bourgeoisie for Dominion Status. It has done all this because it is an Imperialist party.

There is no difference between the Right Wing and the Left Wing of the Labour party. We had a representative of the Left Wing Mr. H. N. Brailsford making a show of his alleged socialism in the box, in his evidence he declared that his party the I. L. P. would concede the Right (not the fact) of India to Independence but if India demanded Independence they would put forward arguments against it. Outside the box this Labour Imperialist had been carrying on propaganda for the Labour Government. These Left Wing Labourites talk a slightly different language than the Right Wing Labourites but when it comes to deeds there is no difference between them, they are as much Labour Imperialists as the rest.

The British Labour Party and the I. L. P. are both affiliated to the Second International miscalled Labour and Social International but whose true label ought to be the International of Labour-Imperialism and Social treachery. The truly Imperialist and shamelessly anti-socialist character of this International is proved by its own resolutions and the colonial policy of its various sections. The Brussels Congress passed this resolution on India, "The L. S. I. supports the efforts of the Indian people to obtain autonomy. Dominion status under Imperialism and not Independence from Imperialism is exactly the declared policy of British Imperialism ~~itself~~."

Ramsay Macdonald the faithful dog of the British bourgeoisie referring to China wrote "The liquidation of unequal treaties by a mutinous mass is something which cannot be tolerated". The Chinese Revolutionists to him are a mutinous mass and their revolutionary acts intolerable.

Jouhaux the French Socialist and one of the most important leaders of the Second International, goes further and justifies even slavery, he says about forced labour in the Colonies "For the sake of

justice it must be recognised that forced labour of natives has several good reasons for existence. In the backward countries voluntary labour could scarcely be expected from the natives..... philosophically speaking it can be said that there is no excuse for forcing labour upon men but as a matter of fact the necessity for resorting to forced labour is unavoidable”.

In the Berlin Conference of 1919 German Social Democracy protested against the fact that Germany was deprived of its colonial slaves and at the Marseilles Congress through the mouth of Hilferding it demanded colonies for Germany.

The Dutch Party openly declared in its report to the Second International that the slogan “separation of Indonesia from the Netherlands” is not its slogan. Stockvis a Dutch Social democrat referring to the numerous death sentences on Indonesian revolutionaries had the impertinence to say, “Justice had also something to say and death sentences cannot be avoided”; the Dutch socialists did not defend but on the other hand condemned in Parliament this bloody revolt in their colony.

The real Workers' International is the Communist International. On its colonial policy it says, “Let us not separate the two things. Let us struggle against Social-Democracy while we struggle against, and for the victory of revolution in the colonies. By our propaganda, our agitation and our direct revolutionary activity we must succeed in showing all the oppressed peoples of the world that there is only one course open before them if they wish to liberate themselves from the yoke which oppresses them, the course of revolution to which we call them, and there is only one banner under which they can fight—the banner of the working class and we must show them that in struggling for their liberation they are struggling for the liberation of the entire world, and that this banner is ours, the banner of the Communist International.” (Comrade Ercolis co-report in 6th World Congress of the Communist International).

The Communist Parties of the various countries do not co-operate with their Bourgeoisie like the “Socialist” Parties but fight for its revolutionary overthrow. The third International and its various sections have always actively supported the colonial revolutions throughout the world, whether they be in China, Indonesia; Morocco, Syria or India. The Communists are the real Socialist and Internationalist both in words as well as in deeds, they are the true political representatives of the Proletariat.

Our case for which the Labour Party is responsible and our convictions for which it will be responsible conclusively prove the antagonism of the Labour Party to the National Revolution, on the other hand the presence of three British Comrades in the dock proves the true solidarity of the interests of the Indian masses with the British Workers. The collapse of the Labour Party in the working class movement of Great Britain is as inevitable as the collapse of National Reformism in the Indian National struggle. With the progress of the revolutionary movement in both the countries our union will become more apparent and stronger as well, and will triumphantly herald the destruction of British Imperialism.

Soviet Russia, Colonial peoples and the workers of the Capitalist countries are the three social forces directed against Imperialism, they have got common-interest and common-aims, therefore they are the historic allies of each other. Imperialism is organised on a world scale, therefore a successful struggle against it must also be organised on a world scale. The World League against Imperialism is the common united platform of all these anti-imperialist forces. To the League against Imperialism are affiliated the national revolutionary parties of the various colonies the workers organised in Trade Unions of the various Capitalist countries and the Present Unions and also the revolutionary Youth Organisations. The League against Imperialism is to us what the League of Nations is to World Imperialism.

The late Public Prosecutor took needlessly great pains to show that we were Internationalists and from this argued that we were anti-national, in his propagandist zeal to pander to political superstitions and thus damn our revolutionary platform he out did himself. We are national revolutionaries and anti-Imperialists, our revolutionary Nationalism makes us Internationalists and our Inter-nationalism makes us the most scientific and modern National revolutionaries, because national revolution is a part of the world revolution and we are only a unit in this international struggle.

Revolutionary Organisations

The British Imperialism is not confined merely to the surface of Indian life, on the other hand from the Patwari to the Viceroy, the Mahajan to the Imperial Bank and the street pedlar to the big exporting and importing firms it is one system which pervades and subjugates the entire social life of the people. British Imperialism is a very

complex and highly organised system of exploitation. Conspiratorial military coups against Imperialism therefore are futile because they are necessarily independent of the revolutionary mass, nor can be isolated elemental up-risings overthrow British Imperialism, they only prove the existence of grievances and the will to fight. The spontaneous struggle against British Imperialism must be consciously organised, for the achievement of victory against organised British Imperialism organised mass force must be hurled. British Imperialism is an organised social system, and national revolution a well planned struggle of those class forces opposed to British Imperialism. Organisations play, therefore, a very important part in the movement of national emancipation.

Trade Unions and Peasants Unions.

They are mass organisations of the Workers and Peasants, they consist of all the members of the class in the given trade or industry. In these class organisations British Imperialism makes it criminal to preach class consciousness and class solidarity; that is, the propagation of class ideology and class morality; while the exploiting classes are allowed to do the same within the members of their own class, for example by phrases like 'honour the uniform' 'act the gentlemen' 'play the game fair' etc. Class propaganda of the exploiting classes is etiquette and ethics while class propaganda of the exploited classes is preaching sedition and preparing for conspiracy; the former is necessary for class rule while the latter is a definite danger, but in spite of British Imperialism these qualities will develop because the interests of these classes are antagonistic to it, and these will be consistently propagated by all those who are conscious of the mission of the toiling masses.

The aim of these mass organisations is to fight for both the immediate and the ultimate class interest of the workers and peasants, the former by redressing the daily grievances of their life by limiting the extent and intensity of existing exploitation, and the latter by ending this exploitation itself; both the tasks are part of the same struggle, in peaceful times the defensive part of the struggle predominates and in the revolutionary period the offensive. It is through these organisations that the working classes act en masse whether it be to check bourgeois-Feudal-Imperialism or to destroy it. The defensive struggle is very important but not all important, it strengthens the working masses, organisationally, ideologically, and materially, and thus prepares them for the final struggle, it is not the final struggle itself.

We fought against the intrusion of both national reformism and social reformism into the workers and peasants movement. The

National Reformists (like Jumnadas Mehta, Subhash Bose, Jawaharlal Nohru, Rvika Ginwalla etc.) tried to subordinate the revolutionary mass movement politically to the Bourgeois Reformist movement while taking no part in the daily struggle of the toilers to get their economic grievances redressed. Their aim was on the one hand to prevent the growth of the mass movement on revolutionary lines and on the other hand use it to increase the bargaining power of the Bourgeoisie with British Imperialism. The national Reformists are the labour agents of the Indian Bourgeoisie to whom the masses are so much cannon fodder in their reformist struggle against British Imperialism.

The social Reformists, (like Joshi Bakhale & Co) declare that the Workers and Peasants should have nothing to do with politics as if it is not these very classes who suffer most from the political domination of British Imperialism, on the contrary these are the classes who have to do the most with the political struggle but with the revolutionary political struggle. They further declare that the working masses should confine themselves purely to the economic struggle by getting the petty grievances of their every day life redressed, that is, the toiling millions must not strive to end slavery but merely modify slavery. The social Reformists by their repudiation of the political struggle and limitation of the economic struggle within the frame work of existing society, act as the labour agents of British Imperialism.

Both the national as well as social Reformists combine in denouncing the class struggle, thereby the independence of the class-interests of the workers and peasants, and their revolutionary role, in fact their right of class emancipation and thus making a veiled assertion of their continued class-slavery.

Reformism is exotic in the workers and peasants movement, therefore we fought and exposed this tendency which was our foremost revolutionary task. The interests of workers and peasants are independent of all the other classes and antagonistic to the exploiting classes therefore the independence of their organisations has to be maintained at all costs, for on their organisations depends their strength to fight. We participated in their daily struggle and fought for the redress of all their grievances but made it clear to them that there can be no permanent improvement in their conditions of life in the existing order and that to achieve any appreciable improvement in their lot they have to destroy their class enemies organised in the present Bourgeois Feudal Imperialist society. We rejected class collaboration the poison supplied by the exploiting classes to the exploited and adopted the revolutionary

tactics of class struggle. In short, we stood for workers and peasants organisation on revolutionary and not reformist lines, pure and not corrupted.

Workers' and Peasants' Party.

The Workers' and Peasants' Party was a mass anti-Imperialist party; it was a party of those classes whose interests are opposed to Imperialism in a revolutionary manner. Its membership consisted of the affiliated Trade Unions, Peasants Union, Revolutionary Youth Organizations and the individual revolutionary intellectuals. The Trade Unions concern themselves primarily with the economic struggle and are industrial organizations, the W.P.P. on the other hand guided the political struggle and was the political organisation of Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist front.

The Prosecution denies that the Workers' and Peasants' Party was a Nationalist party and as proof they bring forward the polemics in the party literature against the Congress leadership and on particular political topics strong criticism of individual Congress leaders. Political struggle is not independent of the class-struggle therefore there are two types of Nationalism, bourgeois nationalism and revolutionary nationalism.

The Congress is a Bourgeois Nationalist Party i.e. in the political field it stands for the class-interests of the bourgeoisie. Its political platform is not independence from and destruction of British Imperialism but Dominion Status under a compromise with British Imperialism.

Before Madras at each successive Congress Session the resolution of Independence was turned down, the Madras Independence Resolution was a mere bluff the answer of the Indian bourgeoisie to what they called the appointment of the "all-white" Simon Commission and that it was not serious was made clear by the Nehru Committee Report which was framed on the basis of Dominion Status. In the Calcutta Congress the Bourgeois Leadership definitely repudiated Independence by endorsing the Nehru Committee Report. Between Calcutta and Lahore British Imperialism refused to accede to the bourgeois demand and on the other hand the petty bourgeois rank and file of the Congress was getting rebellious of the existing leadership, therefore when the negotiations between the Viceroy and Gandhi-Nehru failed on December 23, 1929 the Congress Leadership accepted the Lahore Independence Resolution for the dual purpose of threatening British Imperialism and to retain the leadership over the petty bourgeoisie. The second Independence Resolution too was not genuine. The eleven

points which the Mahatma called the "substance of Independence" were nothing more than administrative reforms in the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie plus some stunts to appeal to the popular imagination but all realisable within the Imperialist fold. During the Yeravada Peace Parleys the betrayal of Independence became complete and final, the actual Congress demand was "Dominion Status with Safe-guards", but even this was not conceded by British Imperialism.

After this came the Delhi Truce Terms of March 4, 1931, when the Congress capitulated to Imperialism without any terms, without getting from Imperialism any new concession on the constitutional issue than what had been already conceded at the Round Table Conference. The Times (London) commenting Truce Terms wrote "There has been no surrender of any vital or indeed of any important interest, to the extremists elements in the Congress Party, and still less to those outside it". (Reproduced in the Leader March 20, 1931). We hope the most influential organ of British Imperialism knows what it writes about especially on what directly concerns it. The final upshot of the Delhi Truce was that the Congress did not secure but betrayed Independence. Here is a confession in the Mahatma's own words "Purna Swarajya does not exclude association with any nation much less with England. It is quite compatible with India remaining within the Empire," (An interview given to the Associated Press reported in Bombay Chronicle 8. 3. 31). The "Statesman" on 5. 3. 31, commenting on the Truce under the heading "Change of Heart" wrote to assure its own class. "The doubters will probably at first continue to doubt but we do not share their doubts. Those who question Mr. Gandhi's sincerity are those who are not acquainted with the man or have not studied his career. At every decisive point he has stood by Britain and if there is one conclusion that can be drawn from his past it is that he plays no double game. If he decides to come in, he comes in, and he may be counted on to bring his great influence to produce a harmonious result". This is a correct appreciation of the Mahatma's role of political treachery. The "Statesman" goes on to say "Mr. Gandhi has risen to the height of his occasion", our only comment on this is that traitors and not fighters are praised by the political enemy. On 6. 3. 31 the "Statesman" again in a leading article entitled "Peace at Last" expressed its "relief and joy" over Delhi Settlement and the News Chronicle (London), the organ of British Liberal Imperialism, called the Delhi Truce the "best news" (Hindustan Times 6 3 31), they were both right for by the Delhi Truce the Indian Empire was saved for British Imperialism.

The Karachi Congress paid lip-homage to the goal of Independence but instead of repudiating the Delhi Terms it "endorsed" that betrayal of Independence. Are we wrong when we say that the Congress Leaders are traitors to Indian Independence? The Mahatma himself said to a group of journalists, "The Congress has never made any bid for Victory" (Hindustan Times 7. 3. 31). He has now entered what he calls "the path of cooperation," cooperation with the Imperialism, cooperation with the enemy. His activities in his own words are now confined "to make absolutely final what today is provisional". (Hindustan Times 7. 3. 31). Only last week he piteously declared "I have no war mentality". The Mahatma and the Congress wants peace with Imperialism and "Independence" within the British Empire, we stand for war against British Imperialism and Independence from British Imperialism. We have nothing in common.

In conformity with the platform of compromise the Congress follows the methods of compromise and not of struggle, the tactics of reformism and not of revolution. Even during the periods of Stayagrah, i.e., mass reformism, the Congress differentiates itself from mass action with revolutionary possibilities, for example, the Congress isolated the G.I.P. Railway Strike of 1930 instead of participating in it and turning it into an All India Railway General Strike, it actually asked the striking workers to apply for an Arbitration Board from the Imperialist Government, (Ahmadabad Congress Working Committee Resolution); the Congress has roundly condemned all the peasant uprisings during the recent Civil Disobedience movement.

We had differences not only with the frankly bourgeois Right Wing Leadership but also with the pseudo-revolutionary Left-Wing Leadership consisting of Jawahar Lal Nehru, Subhas Chandra Bose, Nariman and Kichlu etc. These Left-Wing Leaders call themselves Republicans and some even socialists, and talk cheaply of ending the exploitation of Workers and Peasants. They have got no platform independent of the Right-Wing and on every crucial occasion they subordinate themselves to the Right Wing (for example, Jawahar Lal's virtual neutrality at Calcutta, signing the documents containing the demand of Self-Government and willingness to join the Round Table Conference in the Yeravada documents taken to the Viceroy by Sapru and Jayakar, all these Left leaders supporting the Mahatma in his non-violence, and asking the people to prepare salt as a method of winning Swaraj). The difference between the Right-Wing and the Left-Wing is of words not of actions, therefore for all material purposes they act as one. The

Left-Wing leaders talk a different language than the Right ones but they do not make this distinction concrete by formulating a definite programme of the demands of the workers and peasants and fighting for the same, when it comes to deeds they do not give a revolutionary lead as distinguished from the reformist Right but on the contrary ask their followers to support the Right Wing. Thus the petty-bourgeois following which has become disillusioned with pure bourgeois nationalism and takes the radical words of the Left Wing seriously is an action kept subordinated to the Right-Wing reformism and prevented from joining the revolutionary movement.

What I have said about the Left-Wing held good before Karachi but during and after it the position has considerably changed. The pseudo-revolutionary, Left leadership is now becoming anti-revolutionary for example Jawahar Lal Nehru himself moved the resolution on Bhagat Singh condemning political violence, the least that could be expected from a Left was first to get this clause removed or in the end to remain neutral no other prominent Leftist opposed this resolution which disgraced the memory of three revolutionary martyrs and denounced Revolution. It cannot be said that their opposition was to individual violence only for the Congress resolution condemned political violence as such not only its use but also its advocacy.

From Madras to Lahore the Leftists owed sentimental allegiance to Independence and if they did not oppose they at least criticised Dominion Status, though the practical revolutionary implications of Independence were neglected by them almost entirely (as we pointed out in our Political Resolution page 9). Shortly before or at Karachi they accepted or acquiesced in the Truce but none of them opposed it. Jawahar Lal's defence was "the duty of a soldier" which according to him was "to obey and not to question Congress decision". (Hindustan Times 6. 3. 31.) he failed to realise that in accepting the Delhi Truce he was acting not as a soldier but as a black-leg. If Congress decision meant support of Imperialism then it was the duty of a soldier of Independence to rebel against the Congress but non-revolt from the Congress only means that he has become a new recruit of Imperialism. Subhash Bose withdrew his opposition to the Truce because he said the Left Wing wanted to present a united front to the bureaucracy under the Mahatma's leadership he fails to realise that the united front with the Mahatma means united front with Imperialism naturally not for Independence but against Independence and for some concessions from Imperialism and to forge new chains for the slavery of the Indian masses at the Round Table Conference.

D-4-5-31

"The present position of the Left-Wing can be reduced into two slogans (1) Independence through Round Table Conference and not through Revolution, that is, national Independence as a free gift from British Imperialism, the National enemy (2) and Socialism through the good-will of the Princes. This political stand is not only grossly dishonest but also patently treacherous. They no longer stand for complete Independence from British Imperialism, that is, for the necessary and immediate severance of connection from the British Empire, but according to the Karachi mandate to the Congress Round Table Conference delegation (which the Left has accepted) they stand for "Independence" in the sense of partnership in the British Empire but with the right of separation that is for full bledged Dominion Status. If there is a successful Round Table Conference the Left may also become anti-Independence in a more defined manner.

The Congress Left is thus not a genuine but a sham Left, it is not even pseudo-revolutionary but is becoming anti-revolutionary, it no longer stands for Independence but is supporting anti-Independence activities. (Delhi Truce, going to the Round Table Conference etc;)

The Left-Wing short, is no longer on the Left but has become a Wing of Imperialism. We consider it therefore our primary revolutionary duty at this particular stage to expose and denounce this Left-Wing; support of the Left Wing means support of the Right-Wing which has gone over to Imperialism; adherence to the Left-Wing thus ultimately means acceptance of and not struggle against Imperialism.

The entire Congress leadership stands, in their own words, between British Imperialism and Revolution. The Workers' and Peasants' Party stood for the destruction of Imperialism by the revolutionary action of the organised masses. The differences between the two were fundamental, it was Bourgeois Nationalism vs; Revolutionary Nationalism, that is, the Bourgeoisie Vs. the Working Masses, Dominion Status Vs. Independence, Reformism Vs. Revolution. The statement of these differences does not make us anti-national but only clarifies the central issues before the Indian masses. The attacks of Bourgeois Nationalism on Revolutionary Nationalism are unjustifiable because they check the growth of revolutionary forces, and thus, serve the purposes of re-action, and counter-Revolution, on the other hand the attacks by Revolutionary Nationalism on Bourgeois Nationalism are justifi-

able because they hasten the development of the Revolutionary movement and are therefore progressive. This is, however, only a historic justification, in actual practice both the schools inevitably attack each other because the differences are deep and their mutual interests conflicting.

We attacked the Congress leadership which is reactionary and reformist but we worked within the Congress to win over the Congress rank and file which is recruited from the petty Bourgeoisie and is therefore objectively revolutionary. We appealed to the Congress following to join the revolutionary anti-Imperialist front and leave the oppositional reformist camp of their bourgeois leaders; we appealed for a united front with the petty bourgeois Congress rank and file against Imperialism and against the reformist leaders on the basis of the revolutionary mass programme. The fight against this shackling bourgeois leadership is an essential part of the struggle against Imperialism because it deludes the people with its sham oppositional gestures for a genuine revolutionary struggle, and spreads illusions about a peaceful revolution and Independence within British Imperialism and not necessarily outside and against British Imperialism.

The Workers' and Peasants' Party was a national revolutionary and not a Communist Party whether veiled or otherwise. The Workers' and Peasants' Party did stand for Independence through Revolution but this makes it national revolutionary and not Communist. The Workers' and Peasants' Party was the national reproduction of the World League against Imperialism to which it was to be inter-nationally affiliated and not to the Communist International while the recognised Communist Parties are necessarily affiliated to the Communist International and of which they are the only national sections. The Communist Party is the party of the Proletariat while the Workers' and Peasant Party was a coalition of the Workers, Peasants and revolutionary youth, that is, all the anti-Imperialist Classes. The programme of the workers and Peasants' Party was national revolution while the Communist Party stands for social revolution, that is, it is pledged to carry through the national revolution to the next stage of the social revolution. The Workers' and Peasants' Party had only one historical task, the Communist Party stood for two.

If the Workers' and Peasants' Party was a political organisation independent of and distinct from the Communist Party it does not mean that it was opposed to the Communist Party, on the other hand it frankly and whole-heartedly cooperated with the Communists; the Workers' and Peasants' Party did not cooperate with the

Communist Party on the platform of the social revolution but the Communists cooperated with and worked in the Workers' and Peasants' Party on the platform of the national revolution, National Revolution and Social Revolution are not antagonistic to each other in the eyes of the Communists but National Revolution is only the minimum and immediate programme of the Communists; on the other hand the Workers' and Peasants' Party worked and in hand with the Communists because Non-cooperation with the Communists would have meant virtual non-cooperation with the working class whose political representatives they are and also the under estimation of the revolutionary role of the working class, the class which is destined to be the leader of the national revolution. The national^{and} social revolutionaries are both revolutionaries and at the present stage by cooperation they mutually strengthen each other. It is the Imperialists and the Bourgeois-Reformists alone who denounce the Communists because to both of them revolution whether national or social is a scare and a night mare. When the Prosecution calls the Workers' and Peasants' Party a "veild Communist Party" and confuses national revolution with Social revolution it is not merely a case of weak brains but of calculated and deliberate mischief. British Imperialism under the plea of Communism and on the basis of the judgment of this case wants to declare all agitation and organisation for genuine national Independence that is, the platform of Independence through Revolution illegal and criminal by subsequent legislation. This case is nothing else but crude propaganda for this sinister counter-revolutionary end.

Conclusion

British Imperialism, organised into a social system with decadent Indian feudalism and corrupt Indian Capitalism, means unheard of poverty and unparalleled slavery of the Indian masses. The social progress of India and the life of the Indian masses demands the destruction of this Bourgeois-Feudal-Imperialism. For having struggled against this vicious and unbearable social system, for being revolutionaries, we will be condemned to imprisonment. National revolution, however, can not be postponed by depriving a few revolutionaries of their personal freedom, revolution is both inevitable and necessary, it will come. National revolution is the historical impeachment of British Imperialism by the Indian masses and then bullets and not words will speak.

As regards what is alleged to be my correspondence and the proof of the evidence of my association with the other accused I have to say only this that this question is being asked to incrimi-

nate me and my fellow co-accused. It is not my task to prove the prosecution case but to contest every item of it, I leave it to the prosecution to prove it according to law and I will argue against it according to law. I do not admit any item of it.

Q. The evidence against you in connection with the Young Comrades League is as follows: P 327, P. 330, P 332, P 335, P 313, P 347, P 429, P 147. Have you anything to say about this evidence?

A. As regards the documents concerning my connection with the Youth Movement in general I do not admit any one of them. P 147 was not known to me and it is not signed by me. I have nothing to do with it or with the organization of which it purports to be a draft.

I was a member of the Allahabad Youth League which was an ordinary Youth League and of which Jawahar Lal Nehru was the President.

The Young Comrades League was an idea which could not be actually carried out. It was to be a federation of study circles of young intellectuals not party members in W. P. P. It was quite distinct from the Young Communist League as the programme of the Young Communist International or the Young Communist League of Great Britain will show. This is what I have to say about my connection with the Youth Movement.

Q. In regard to your membership or proposed membership of C. P. I. of the Communist Party of India the evidence is P. 1303 and P. 1310. Have you anything to say about these?

A. I am a Communist by conviction but I was not a member of the Communist Party of India. The Magistrate's remarks "he applied for membership of C. P. I." and "his application to become a member of the C. P. I." etc. are an unwarranted inference not substantiated by the evidence. There is no document purporting to be my application for membership to C. P. I. on record (for example as they are alleged to be in the case of comrades Mirajkar and Usmani).

As regards P. 1303 and P. 1310 I know nothing about them. They were not written by me and were not known to me.

I was a Communist student at the time of my arrest or in other words I was professionally a student but with Communist views. I therefore consider the charge of conspiracy merely as an attempt to victimise me for my opinion. There is no evidence

against me even of strikes, speeches or demonstration i. e. those acts which Mr. Kemp grandiloquently declares are overt acts. I am saying this to expose the ridiculousness and the hollowness of the evidence against me but I also realise that under Imperialism Communism has not the "status" of an opinion it is recognised only as a danger.

Q. In connection with Lenin Day celebration there is in your case the letters P. 324 and P. 343. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. I do not admit either of these documents. When Lenin Day ~~was~~^{ought} to have been celebrated that year I was at Allahabad and there was no Lenin Day demonstration or meeting there either organised by me or anybody else.

I may add that not even the Prosecution alleged that any Lenin Day was celebrated at Allahabad.

Q. There is a good deal of evidence indicating that Krantikari was started as a Party organ, the documents are : P. 2409 P P. 1620 P, P. 526 (6), P. 526 (8), P. 2069 P, P. 1875 P, P. 416 (16) P. 452, P. 1097, P. 310, P. 209, P. 1621 P, P. 1854 P, P. 1894 C, P. 197, P. 342, P. 433. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. The answer I have given about correspondence and association holds good as an answer to this question too.

Q. P. 2094 connects you with the Naujawan Bharat Sabha and P. 344 with the W. P. P. of the Punjab. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. As regards P. 344 my answer to the search will cover this point. As regards my alleged letter to the Nau Jawan Bharat Sabha my answer is the same which I gave about association and correspondence in general.

Q. Krantikari being according to the evidence the organ of the W. P. P. of U. P. and you its Secretary have you anything to say in explanation of the articles appearing in P. 431 T, that is in the issues of Krantikari dated 17th and 24th November 1928, 1st and 8th December 1928, 5th, 14th, 21st and 28th January 1929?

A. The answer which I have given about correspondence and association in general holds good for this question as well ?

Q. There are a number of articles written by you on record: P. 313, P. 319, P. 320, P. 346 and P. 427. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. The answer which I will give about the search will cover first four documents and the answer to the Karantikari's evidence covers the answer to P. 427.

Q. P. 303 Pyam Mazdur and P. 311 a Diary and P. 336 Immediate Tasks of the Communists was also recovered from you and P. 1086 shows you a subscriber to Payam Mazdur. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. As regards P. 1086 I do not know anything about it and my answer to the search will cover the question about the other documents.

Q. I have put to you already all the documents exhibited from your search. P. W. 131 has deposed to that search. I gather you wish to say something about it ?

A. The search list is not signed by me. I did not carefully supervise my own search and so can not say which documents are mine and which are not. It is significant that the search list was not signed either by the Hostel Warden Professor Thompson or the University Proctor Professor Rudra though both were present and available on the spot. Moreover the University Proctor has magisterial powers. It is the usual practice to get the search list countersigned by the Hostel or University Authorities or their representatives present when students are arrested. My table was commonly used by several students whom I had to tutor. I was a tutor for History and Politics and was in-charge of the Seminar classes on these subjects of the B. A. students residing in Holland Hall. My room was always kept open even when I was away and my friends as is the general practice in our Hostel often used to leave their things at my table and in my room just in the same way as I several times used to leave my papers or books on the tables or in the rooms of my other friends.

Q. P. 326, P. 765, P. 323 and P. 340 show connection between you and Sahgal accused. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. The answer I have given about search and also about association and correspondence covers this point.

Q. P. 1298 is a piece of W. P. P. Bengal paper with your name and address on it found in Ghate accused's search. Have you anything to say about this ?

A. P. 1298 is not in my handwriting and I do not know anything about it.

Q. Do you wish me to move the District Magistrate to summon any of the defence witnesses named in your list?

A. I am a signatory to the general list of defence witnesses but at this stage I can not specify who are my personal defence witnesses because I not only suspect but have some evidence of the fact that the defence witnesses are being terrorised by the Police.

I would like to say something about the charge and the case in general.

As regards the charge of conspiracy I entirely agree with what comrades Radha Raman and Chakarvarti have already stated.

When I said on Friday that "revolutionaries are realists" your Honour interrupted me with the words "except in a court of law." Your honour is wrong. Mr. Kemp's favourite complaint is that the accused do not take the case seriously, he is partly wrong. As far as the charge against us as accused is concerned we consider it a fraudulent prosecution of opinions and can not take it seriously. But we take the trial itself very seriously. In this case, we are not on trial but British Imperialism is on trial before our final Judges, the Indian Masses. We are not accused but Prosecutors. We have no doubt that the final judgment of our real Judges will be forward to "Revolution". Mr. Mitra, Junior Crown Counsel is seemingly interrupting me, on that Red Day he will cry and not laugh.

Mr. Kemp should realise that we are revolutionaries not philistines, and your Honour may note that we are realists in a revolutionary and not in an opportunist sense.

Q. You have now read over your statement and it has been corrected and amended as and where requested by you. Are you now satisfied that the above is a correct record of your statement?

A. Yes.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

12. 5. 31.

Sd. P. C. Joshi

12. 5. 31.

Certified that the above is a full and true record of accused's statement taken in my presence and hearing and corrected as and where requested by him and acknowledged by him to be correct.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

12.5.31

Corrected by Piran Chandra

Saraswati Machine Printing Press, Meerut., U. P., India.

In the Court of R. L. Yorke I. C. S. Addl. Sessions Judge Meerut

In the case of King-Emperor Vs. P. Spratt and others.

Examination of Sohan Singh Josh accused under section 342 of the Code of Criminal Procedure 1898, made before me R. L. Yorke, Addl. Sessions Judge at Meerut on the 18th day of May 1931.

My name is Sohan Singh Josh; my father's name is Baba Lal Singh; I am by caste No. Caste; 33 years of age by occupation brought up as peasant; I have adopted Journalism as a profession; my home is at Chetanpur, Police-station Majitha, district Amritsar, I reside at Islamabad P. S. Sadar Amritsar.

Q. You heard your statement P. 2596 in Lower Court read out in this Court on 16.3.31. Is that statement correct?

A. Quite correct.

Q. The following evidence relates to your early history in this case and connection with the W. P. P. of the Punjab and the Lyallpur Conference:—

P 2329 P 1, P1404 (1394, 344, 495, 736), 2051 C, 747, 730, 1468, 1608, 549 (18), 1234, 1641, 1642, 2052 (2079), 2093, 1901 P, 1393 (451), 766, 549 (17) and 1956. Have you any thing to say about these?

A. To begin with I want to make it quite clear, for the satisfaction of the Prosecution and the Court, that I am not going to retract a single word or a single comma that I spoke or wrote outside, because it is not in keeping with my nature to be a renegade to my principles for fear of imprisonment or even death. On the other hand what I could not speak freely outside, I shall speak in an unfettered way here before this Court. There is no reason why I should not speak here in the same strain at least as I spoke outside. I will not therefore prevaricate; I will not equivocate. I will be as harsh as truth and as uncompromising as justice as Lloyd Garrison, of the Abolition fame, said. I am not afraid of this bourgeois Court, knowing full well that it represents my enemy, the British Imperialism. I know, and nobody knows me better than myself that I am innocent and I am going to be punished for nothing. Hard Labour for years is a foregone conclusion for me. I know that the sentence that is going to be passed on me will not be a "miscarriage of justice", as some people who know me well will say, but, on the other hand it will be deliberate class justice in practice. The prospect of getting hard labour for years even cannot prevent me from speaking my views strongly, because I feel strongly on all the points for decision in this case.

I begin with W. P. P. Punjab first. The Workers' and Peasants' Party of the Punjab came into being on the 12th of April 1928. The need of this party for the Workers and Peasants was shown in the Gurmukhi Kirti as far back as April 1927 (P 745). No organisation can come into life unless objective conditions are ripe for it. The Non-cooperation movement had failed because the Congress had betrayed the peasants by passing the now famous Bardoli resolution and taking sides with the landlords and Zamindars. The Hindu Muslim fights were going on and it was peasants and workers who were suffering most in the communal fight. In order to put a stop to this fratricidal strife and make the people realise that, be they Hindus or Muslims, Sikhs or Parsees their interests were identical, some Hindu, Sikh and Muslim workers who detested these communal strifes and wanted to put an end to them by organising the masses without any differentiation of creed or religion and by putting forward common demands, gathered together, at my initiative, in the Jilianwala Bagh, Amritsar, and found this party. The formation of this Party came about not because of the wire-pulling of somebody but because there was in the Punjab no organisation based on economic realism to represent the interests of the workers and peasants. I was thinking of forming some party that will put forward an economic programme of the workers and peasants when my attention was drawn towards the activities of the workers' and Peasants' Parties of Bombay and Calcutta. I, along with some other friends, therefore, made up my mind to form a party approximately on the lines of those Parties. This is the history of the birth of the Punjab Workers' and Peasants' Party.

Activities.

The Punjab Workers' and Peasants' Party held its second Conference at Lyallpur as invitation card (P.766) shows it. The first Conference of which I was the President, took place at Hoshiarpur as P 746, the Gurmukhi Kirti of October 1927, shows it. I was one of those who took prominent part in holding the Workers' and Peasants' Conference at Lyallpur on 28th, 29th and 30th September 1928. Comrade S. A. Dange was to preside, but he could not come owing to the strike obtaining in Bombay. I sent invitation letters to Mr. Kidarnath (P 766), to Mirajkar (P 1234), to Dange (P 1608) and (P 1641), to Ghate (P 1642), to Muzaffar Ahmed (P 2052) and to Mr. Spratt (P 549(17) and P 2079 is the same thing as P 2052, asking them to attend the Conference. Only Mr. Kidarnath attended it, others could not come.

We deliberately held the second Workers and Peasants' Conference at Lyallpur because the influence of the Zamindara League was very strong there and the peasants of that district were completely under the control of the big landlords and sahkars. Our object in

holding the Conference there was to free the peasants from the leadership of the land'ords ^{and zamindars} and to show the Zamindara League in its true colours. The proceedings of this Conference are not fully reported. As the General Secretary of the Party, I can claim that we did succeed to a great degree in our ^{object. The peasants came in large numbers to} Conference. The Punjab Provincial Political Congress which was holding its session at that time refused to give us the use of their Pandal. We were therefore forced to hold the Conference in the open, the result was that after a short time of our starting the Conference the Congress Pandal became empty because the peasants left the Conference of the Congress and came to us. The Congress people became very furious with us over this affair. We passed many resolutions there. The Conference was a great success.

The third Session took place at Rohtak. The workers at Rohtak had taken permission from me, as the General Secretary to the Punjab party, to hold that Conference and besides I had promised them to go personally and attend the Conference. Mr. Arjun Lal of Ajmere was the president of this Conference. P. 1468 is my speech there. This speech is not fully reported. At some places, it is mis-reported but it fairly well gives my views. I spoke against the philosophy of predestination and emphasised the fact that man, as well as a class is the architect of his own fate. I divided the classes into the rich and the poor according to the Marxian teachings and showed that their interests were antagonistic to each other. I clearly put my position when I said that the workers and peasants wanted neither a White Bureaucracy nor a brown one but they wanted the Government of the Workers and Peasants. I told the audience in plain words that unless the land-hunger of the peasants was satisfied, no change for the better could take place in the bad conditions of the peasantry.

Many thousand peasants attended the Conference and in my opinion it created a very good impression amongst them.

Besides these activities the Workers' and Peasants' party organised many meetings in conjunction with the Naujawan Bharat Sabha. Almost every speech of mine emphasises the fact that it is the Workers' movement that can really bring salvation to the country. The "Friends of Russia Week", I definitely know (though not reported in P 1910 T) was celebrated under the auspices of the W. P. P. as well.

Besides many processions were taken out under the leadership of the Party. The Press Worker's Union Amritsar, Motor-driver's Union and some other small unions of the workers were formed by the party.

At the inception of the party Raizada Hansraj was elected

President, but when found out after a short time that he was a Congress man, he was chucked out of the party. It was decided afterwards by the Party to have no President at all. Only General Secretary and Secretary were made responsible for the carrying out of the injunctions of the Party.

Five men were elected at the time of the formation of the Party to frame rules and regulations. One or two of them could not or did not take part for reasons best known to them. The rules and regulations (P 344) were duly passed by the Executive Committee of the Party and were printed under its orders for explaining the objects and aims of the Party. The workers and peasants everywhere gave support to our Party. The opposition came, as expected, from the Capitalists, landlords and their Agents.

The Workers & Peasants' Party was not a Communist body. It was an Independence Party in the real and full meaning of the term. There is no denying the fact that a number of Communists were working side by side with the non-Communists in the Party. The Party aimed at the establishment of the National Democratic Independence through revolution. It was openly a revolutionary body of the militant workers and peasants, who being dis-illusioned by the Congress defeatist Politics, had risen in revolt against it. It had nothing to do with the Congress and was in no way connected with, or under the influence of the Congress. In fact this was a party diametrically opposed to the Congress and was under-mining the influence of the Congress in order to wrest the leadership of the workers and peasants from its hands. No man professing to be a Congress-man was allowed to use the platform of the Party.

The Party struck root because the peasants were dissatisfied with the existing Zamindara Leagues and besides there was no organisation to put forward the class demands of the workers and peasants. The Lahore Zamindara League was an affair of the few individuals of Lahore who would go once in a while to the village people to grind their own axe. It was a force in 1907 when Sardar Ajit Singh was the leader of this movement. After him the League remained only on paper. Charges of embezzlements were levelled against it, of late, by many peasants. Now it is only a bogus organisation having no following or membership. Nothing more nothing less.

The Zmindara Leagues were not class organisations. They are of the Class collaborationist Nature. The Workers' & Peasants' Party was a body based on class struggle. The Party had its branches at the Ludhiana, Rohtak, ^{and} Bangal Kirti Dal in Calcutta and was making great headway when I was arrested.

The activities of the W. P. P. Punjab were open and above

board. There was nothing of conspiratorial nature about it. It was never made illegal. Its activities were being published in the Press.

In 1906 I gave the proceedings of the Conference at Lyallpur. I delivered many speeches there. In one of my speeches addressing the peasants I said, "No Imam Mehdi or any Avatar will come down from above to free you from bondage. You workers and peasants constitute the power that confers victory on all rulers in the world. Time is come now that we should fight for ourselves and establish Raj in the world for 98%. If you once make up your mind you can be free soon."

Because of the superstitions spread by religion there is an impression abroad in the toiling masses that some miracle will happen or some Saviour from on high will descend on earth to deliver them from the shackles of slavery. I refuted with vehemence, such defeatist ideas corroding the minds of the workers and peasants by emphasising the above facts. Disorganised individuals and religious maniacs, not knowing the strength of disciplined organisation, indulge in this sort of maudlin sobstuff or sloppy sentimentalism which is a great blocking stone to the development of the Workers' movement and stands in the way of the realisation of our objective. It is our own right hand that will shiver the chains that bind us hand and foot. The mass movement cannot develop unless such non-sensical ideas are given the go-by.

Further on in the same exhibit I said "the existing system which is altogether unjust and tyrannical should be overthrown. It can only be overthrown if a Proletarian revolution takes place in the world". Now why I am a great enemy of this system? Why do I want to end it?

India was made a colony for the purpose of buying raw materials at the lowest possible price from the peasants, selling manufactured goods at the highest possible price to them and making the greatest possible profits by exploiting the indigenous labour ruthlessly. This is the materialist interpretation of the conquest of India. All talk by the interested parties about the civilising mission, "white man's burden" and hundred one such other catch-phrases is sheer cant and humbug. It is employed simply to throw dust in the eyes of the unwary toilers and moilers.

For the purpose of fleecing us we have been made quite helpless so that we should offer no resistance to the plunder of our rulers. We have been deprived of all rights of Independence. All arms have been taken away from us. A rigid Arms Act has been enforced. A man having a pistol in his possession without license is given seven years' rigorous imprisonment. Even an ^{one} has not escaped the Arms Act, not to speak

of other fire-arms. We are treated with contempt in our own country, while foreigners are given the most privileged and the most remunerative official positions. Before the war we could go to foreign countries and secure employment there (see also P1903T). But now we are kicked out and treated like felons and criminal tribes. In almost all countries restrictive laws for emigration have been passed specially to keep us out. Our National have no right in foreign countries. They have to face insults and disgrace every where. Formerly the peasants could go to the towns and get employment there but now-a-days there is an army of unemployed already in towns. So there is no scope for us any where in the wide world. We the peasants are only the producers of commodities for the capitalist market, feeding ourselves on tears and misery.

That is not all. The greatest burden of taxation falls on our shoulders. The State expenditures keep growing year after year. The State debt has increased by leaps and bounds. The Bourgeoisie and land-lords, having some voice in the Assembly and Provincial Councils know how to evade taxation for themselves and levy more taxes on the poor and on those who are already dying for want of food and other necessities of life.

We have to bear not only the political oppression but also the heaviest burdens for the upkeep of the State. The burdens are imposed in such a manner that their true character is concealed. Along with the high direct taxes to bleed us white, the Government have introduced a system of indirect taxation whereby a tax is placed on the most necessary commodities. Thus taxes are paid over in the price of the commodities in an invisible way and the masses remain ignorant as to the amount of taxes that they actually pay. To what extent the consumer is taxed on Salt, Sugar, Coffee, Beer and Oil etc., is difficult to calculate. The masses have no idea to what extent they are fleeced. These taxes weigh more heavily on the large families and they are therefore the most unjust form of taxation imaginable and to cap all, we are squeezed dry by the land-lords and money-lenders. In fact we are not living but somehow or other eking out our existence. Any man can go into the country and see for himself walking skeletons of humanity made brutes and inhuman by starvation and want. Who is responsible for this miserable condition of ours? If not our exploiters, our guardians of "law and order", and of property, who else? Are we kept in this state so that we may be easily used for cannon-fodder in the event of next war? I think so.

But perhaps one may say that the Government is doing its utmost to bring happiness and prosperity to the people by starting Cooprative Credit Societies. But we know what these Cooprative

Societies are, because we know the inside story of these societies. They are controlled by big landlords and ~~bankers~~ ^{landlords} ~~sovereigns~~ in their own interests and credit is not given to the needy but to those who are controlling them. Besides these societies cannot supply the demands of the masses. Only a small percentage of peasants is given credit while all others go without it. Furthermore, what with rigid rules of security and sureties and what with shortage of capital, they are of no material help to the peasants. We know besides, that they are used by the capitalists and the landlords as their propaganda centres and they play a great part in the Election campaigns. So in the last analysis they are so many instruments in the hands of the rich minority to keep the poor recalcitrant peasantry under their control, so that they remain servile and always support their masters' reactionary policies. And those who have got votes are simply the "voting cattle" for the property-holders, because the right of vote is based on property.

The atmosphere for the peasants is therefore dark and gloomy but there is a ray of hope. This Imperialism as it develops produces germs within itself of its own destruction and in the working class is growing its enemy who will destroy this unjust and tyrannical system that allows exploitation and spoliation of the masses by a handful of capitalists, and bring into being a system where every body will be a producer and the exploitation of man by man will cease. So our hopes lie in the working class who will be the leader of the revolution and in cooperation with whom we will get freedom from all these tyrannical laws and rulers.

The subject matter of this document P/393 was drafted by me but this copy in Gurmukhi is not in my handwriting. I think the handwriting of this document is the handwriting of the editor of the Kirti.

P 2051 C was written by me to Muzaffar Ahmad about the formation of the W. P. P. in the Punjab. I think he wanted information about the party through somebody and I wrote this letter direct to him.

P 2093, P 2093 (1) and P 1901 P I do not remember whether I received those letters or not.

P 549 (18) To the best of my knowledge these two letters were sent in a cover to Muzaffar Ahmad so that he might be able to forward them to Comrades Bradley and Spratt. I had no personal touch of any sort with them. I had read in the newspapers that they were taking interest in the Workers' movement and since I was organizing Workers in general and peasantry in particular I thought it would help forward our movement if they would come and attend the Conference.

P. 747 and P. 730 I will deal in dealing with Kirti.

P. 2329. I wish I were a prophet to tell the court who wrote this document and how it came to be written. I am sorry to say that I know nothing about this. I did not see Comrade Spratt in Lahore at the time of his visit there in July 1927. I met him first in the All India Trade Union Congress Cawnpore. In the Committal Order the Magistrate says "Spratt seems to have met him in July or August 1927". But this is not true. I never met him earlier than November 1927. It was there that I asked him to contribute to our paper and he promised to do so. That is why I wrote to him directly and asked him through Muzaffar Ahmad as well to contribute to us (P 609 and P 419.)

Q. In regard to Kirti as a party organ and your connection with it there is the following evidence: P 1410, P 701, P 1406, P 1409, P 748, P 749, P 750, P 1637, P 1449, P 609, P 1638, P 1639, P 1876 526 (25), P 1603, P 1640, P 419, P 2147, P 1895, P 1085, P 1403 and statement of P. W. 195. Have you anything to say in regard to these?

A. I was joint managing director of the Kirti Magazines from September 1927 to 20th March 1929 as Exhs. P 701 and P 746 Gurmukhi translations page 25 show it. The Committing Magistrate writes in his order (page 34) that the Kirti was edited by me; that is not a fact in the face of the above exhibits. I was never the editor of the Kirti. Further on, on page 206 the Committing Magistrate states that I became manager of the Kirti. Nor was I ever the manager of this paper.

The policy of the Kirti was in the hands of the editor. I had nothing to do with the direction and control of its policy. The editor was quite free to write anything, subject to one condition which he was made to sign at the time of the appointment that he would have to discuss things in the paper from the Marxian standpoint.

My duties as joint managing director were as follows:

(1) To push the sale of the Kirti by making subscribers and sale agents in different places.

(2) To write letters in consultation with the editor to men in the labour movement with marxian views for contribution to the Kirti, the rejection or acceptance of which was in the hands of the editor.

(3) To secure advertisements if possible.

(4) To find photographs and get blocks made of them for the publication in the Kirti.

For the fulfilment of these duties I had to go from place to place. Besides, in order to fetch promised articles from contributors in time from Lahore. I had to go to Lahore twice or thrice every month. Balwant Singh P. W. 195 admits that I "was often sent to Lahore by the Press to fetch blocks, ink and paper etc." also. The entries in the Cash Books against my name are there to show that I went in the interests of the paper to those places and spent the money.

Besides I used sometimes to take money in advance when I was short of money and afterwards used to return it. P. W. 195 Balwant Singh admits this too. All the registers are not here to prove to the hilt my contentions, but I say that I spent the money for the furtherance of the sale of the Kirti. In regard to the money spent for going to and coming from Calcutta, it was also taken in advance and I was to return my share of Rs 50/- or so but on being arrested I could not do so. I wrote P 419 and P 2053 P to Muzaffar Ahmad, P 609 to Spratt, P 1637, P 1639 and P 1608 C to Dange and P 1638 and P 1640 to Ghate asking them to contribute to the Kirti. The editor told me to do so because the men who were asked to contribute were Marxists and were taking interest in the Workers' Movement. Some of the letters show that I have signed on them for "editor".

I used to contribute articles to the paper over my own name, now and then, as well, but it was in the hands of the editor to accept or reject them.

The Government and its agents were making a lot of propaganda against the Kirti Magazines in order to suppress them. The Civil and Military Gazette of Lahore was foremost in leading this propaganda. The book "India" ~~and~~ yearly publication by the Govt. of India written by Mr. J. Coatman, Director of Information Bureau, written for the purpose of presenting a review of Indian affairs to the British Parliament had a few words about us as far back as 1926-27. It said:—

"According to the open and undisguised desires of the Soviets to control the indigenous movements of India and to exploit them for their own ends work is being done in Bengal and some other places. The beginning of this has been made by the Soviets by having established connections with the disaffected Sikhs of America, China and India. The latter conspiracies have resulted in coming out of a Magazine from Amritsar the name of which is Kirti (original not available, retranslated from Urdu Kirti June 1928)."

This paragraph brings into relief two things:— firstly, that the Kirti people had connections with Russia and secondly that they were receiving money from some outside source. The second

point about the money is not expressed but implied and is put in a very clever language.

Now in regard to the 1st point the Kirti of June 1928 P. 747 had a leading article under the heading "Have we any connections with Russia?" This article was written by the editor with the consultation of the managing directors. In it, it was made quite clear whether we had any relations with Soviet Russia or not. The article says "We declare that we have no connection directly or indirectly with Bolshevik Russia, nor do we receive any material help from the Russian people" (Page 13). Further on "Government have charged us with having connections with Russia. We challenge the Government to bring a case against us and to prove that we have any relation with Russia, otherwise, the public will understand that it is merely a lying propaganda carried on to discredit the Kirti Magazines".

"Our view point should be understood clearly. The British Government considers a political organisation creating relation with Russia as dangerous to its existence, because Russia is a political enemy of Great Britain. But we, having faith in the creation of international relations do not dislike the idea of establishing relations, with Russia. We only say that we have no relations with Russia upto now and perhaps even if we try in the present circumstances to establish connections with Russia we shall not be successful". (page 14.)

This explains our position in relation to connections with Russia perfectly clearly and I think that the Prosecution have not brought and cannot bring an iota of evidence to show that we have any connection with Russia in any way whatsoever. Our not having any relations now cannot, of course, preclude us from having any connection with Russia in future, if and when practicable.

D/-19. 5. 31

In regard to the second point the Government officers seemed to be very anxious to know the source from where the wherewithal for the Kirti was coming, though the source was being revealed in the Magazine itself. The Urdu Kirti of August 1928 page 72 shows also this anxiety of the Government officers to know this source. The Kirti Magazine was wholly an independent paper. It never received any financial help from any outside source. Nor was it a paper of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. Its costs were borne by the subscribers and whenever there were any deficits, special appeals were made from time to time to the subscribers to help the paper (P. 701 and (746 and 447, the Magazines themselves)).

Such appeals were generously responded to by the subscribers. Thus the paper was paying its way and had not had to depend on any outside source.

—In order to prove this contention I want to draw the attention of the Court and the Prosecution to the following numbers of the Gurmukhi Kirti (P. 746) where the names and addresses of the donors and subscribers are given with the amount donated.

Gurmukhi Kirti July 1927 from page 427 to 430
" " August 1927 " " 491 to 501
" " April 1928 page 65
" " June 1928 from page 65 to 69
" " July 1928 from page 65 to 78
" " August 1928 page 65
" " September 1928 page 66
" " November 1928 page 65

In round numbers the total amount of subscription and donation comes to more than Rs. 16000/- There was therefore no need for us to look to foreign help and the anxiety of the Government to know the source of financial resources of the Kirti simply betrays its idiocy as well as foolishness.

This brings me to the question of 'Moscow Gold'. The prosecution and others of the same kidney have spread scare stories from time to time about the Russian gold pouring into India. I do not know what colour this gold has. But I do know that one method though a stale one—of discrediting or condemning a man or an organisation is to charge him or it with receiving foreign money and being an agent of a Foreign Power. This trick has been tried many times, by the Imperialists of all the countries and has almost always stood them in good stead for some time. Even Comrade Lenin was charged brazen-facedly by the Czarists and the Mensheviks with receiving money from, and being the agent of, German Imperialism. We know that our enemies have great resources at their disposal and are past masters in inventing such scare stories in order to deceive the people. But we do not care a brass farthing for them for we know that our cause is just and will ultimately triumph. And I say with all the force at my command that no propaganda of whatever malicious nature it may be, can deter me from the course I am following.

But one point I want to make clear. It is the common right and practice of the strikers of one country to appeal to the workers of the world for financial aid. And in order to show in practice that the workers of different countries are brothers, and of the strikers by class and struggle, they help them materially and morally. Even the strikers of one trade are joined in strike out of sympathy by the workers of other trade in order to bring pressure to bear on the employers, though the workers of other trades may have no special grievances of their own. The Proletariat knows very well that the struggle between Capital and Labour cannot be fought successfully unless the workers of the world join hands and cooperate internationally. The workers of one industry help the workers of the other industry because of class relations and class interest. The workers, unmindful of colour, race or country, have been helping and will go on helping one another to express their International Class solidarity and united front, the whinings and whimpings of the Imperialists notwithstanding. I therefore make bold to say that it is the inevitable right of Trade Unions to give help to the striking workers whether they happen to be inside or outside a country. Likewise the striking workers of the Indian Trade Unions have every right to receive financial aid from workers abroad including the Russian workers. The Imperialists may fret and foam but the workers cannot give up this their—most cherished right. The Proletariat knows that the internationally organised Capital can only be overthrown by the inter-nationally organised Labour.

With regard to Darbar & Co: I say definitely that we, Kirti management, had no connection with it, nor did we ever use it as a cover address. The Kirti had, to the best of my knowledge, nothing to do with this Company in any shape or form. We never received any letter through this Company.

I do not know how some papers of this Company were found in the Kirti Manager's office. It is Balwant Singh, Prosecution witness no. 195, who was to tell something about this because he was occupying that room but he denied having any knowledge of it. I do not know anything at all about this. The letter produced here P 1410 has never been seen by me outside this Court.

I remember having sent money-orders twice to Comrade Usmani as payment for the articles contributed by him to the Kirti. The prosecution witness Balwant Singh says correctly that once a money-order was sent to him and came ^{back} and again ^{it} was sent back and it was received, the receipt of which, the same witness says, was filed by him.

P 1408: is a register containing the names of those persons to whom Kirti was sent gratis because they were supposed to contribute articles to the Kirti now and then. Some of the names written in this register are in my own hand-writing. Some of these persons did contribute to the paper while some did not.

P. 1406: The design of this poster was sketched under my instructions and the wording was also drafted by me and I bear the full responsibility of it.

P 1876 (526 (25)) and P 2147: I do not know anything about them and I never received them.

I think that I did receive one or two letters from Mr. Jhabwala but I cannot say whether I saw P 1449 or not.

I remember having received two or three letters from comrade Usmani but I am not sure whether I received P 1895 or not. It never reached me as evidence of P. W. 179 shows.

P 1085 is a letter sent by me to comrade Usmani.

Q. In view of the position you held in the Kirti it is alleged that you were responsible for all the articles bearing on this case in any way in the Kirti magazines from May 1927 to the time of your arrest such as articles contributed by others, those contributed by yourself, and editorials and the like: these have been selected and printed in the Gurmukhi and the Urdu translations specifically your own. The articles are Martyrs in Gurmukhi December 1926, Free Afghanistan in Gurmukhi January 1927, and Tangle of the Royal Commission in the Gurmukhi December 1927. The list of other articles is very long and I do not think it is necessary to indicate them one by one. Have you anything to say about these?

A: I am not responsible for any of the articles appearing in the Kirti magazines over names other than my own. The editor or the writers of the articles are responsible for them. I bear full responsibility for the articles written by me, namely, those mentioned in the question.

Q. Regarding your connection with the Nau Jawañ Bharat Sabha: evidence is as follows: P 1403, P 1882, P 712, P 207, P 1877, P 485, P 2164 P. P 909, P 890 (2) and evidence of speeches which will be dealt with under the head of speeches. Have you anything to say about these?

A: The Punjab Nau Jawañ Bharat Sabha came into existence in the second week of April 1928 in Amritsar. Being fed up with Congress reformist politics and sick of the fights

over communal questions like communal representation or the question of Jhatka and Halal or music before mosque or Tanzeem and Sangathan and Tabligh or Shuddhi, some young workers of Amritsar belonging to all communities decided to hold a conference of the Punjab Youths along with the Conference of the Punjab Provincial Congress that was to take place under the Presidentship of Mr. Jawahar Lal Nehru on the 11th, 12th and 13th of April 1928. I was one of them. The Conference was announced in the name of 'the Punjab Young men's Association'. It took place and youths of all places of the Punjab came in large numbers. The young men of Amritsar and Lahore took especially prominent part in making it successful. After a long-drawn-out discussion over the name it was decided by the Subjects Committee to call it as the Punjab Nau Jawan Bharat Sabha by which name the youth organisation of Lahore that was formed some months back and was only locally known, was called. The purpose of the foundation of this youth organisation was to build up the Youth Movement on economic in place of communal programme. The communal programme was the cause of all communal fights in the Punjab. This Youth Movement, therefore, was a revolt against communalism.

The Prosecution is surprised at the attacks on religion or religionism made by the members of the Naujawan Bharat Sabha. But there is nothing to be surprised at. The very aims and objects of the Sabha make it abundantly clear why attacks were launched against religionism or religiosity. The rules and regulations of the Sabha P 245 T say:—

(a) To establish a complete independent Republic of Workers and Peasants throughout India.

(c) To have nothing to do with communal bodies or other parties which persist in having separate communal representation and which disseminate communal ideas.

(d) To create the spirit of general toleration among the public considering religion as a matter of personal belief of man and to act upon the same fully.

(f) To organise workers and peasants.

That is why no man of communal views was allowed to become a member of the Sabha. That is why the chief plank of propaganda was anti-Communalism and 'anti-Religion'.

As regards the allegation of the Prosecution of "capturing of all the known existing Youth Organisations", it is false on the face of it. With regard to Naujawan Bharat Sabha I can definitely

say that the question of its 'capturing' cannot arise, because it was not existing before at all, but was brought into existence by us.

From the very beginning I have been a member of the Sabha. From its very inception I was the President of the City Naujawan Bharat Sabha Amritsar. I was also elected President of the second Provincial Naujawan Bharat Sabha Punjab.

The Naujawan Bharat Sabha is not a Communist body. It is, in fact, a revolt of the petty bourgeoisie against the Congress Leadership. While in the Lahore Conspiracy cases, the Prosecution, and for the matter of that the Government, are trying to prove that it is a terrorist organisation, here in the Meerut Case the Prosecution seem to suggest that it is a Communist body. But knowing the inside story as I do, I emphatically say that it is neither. This is an organisation of the petty bourgeois or lower middle class who are oppressed by the British Imperialism and who want to free themselves economically and politically from the Imperialist yoke, and in order to do so are trying to organise the workers and peasants to fight the battle of economic as well as political freedom. They realise quite well that the Congress is a Bourgeois body and in spite of its professions and promises, it can not fight for the interests, of the petty Bourgeoisie, the workers and ~~the~~ peasants. Knowing full well that single handed this Class cannot give a successful battle to British Imperialism and thus improve its lot, they want the help of the workers and peasants—the two classes that can fight Imperialism to the finish, and bring about revolution. Their aim is the establishment of the Independent Republic of workers and peasants because in that aim that they see the solution of their miseries and a good opening for better life: There may be half a dozen Communist, more or less, and a few Terrorist, if at all, in it, but that cannot make the Naujawan Bharat Sabha as a whole a Communist or a Terroristic body, though it cannot be denied that it certainly had and has tendencies towards Socialism.

I was one of those who took prominent part in building up this organisation. I went to various places to deliver lectures in order to form local Naujawan Bharat Sabhas. I delivered many speeches in connection with this Sabha. Exhibit P 1903 T is one of them. I moved a resolution in the second Conference of the Naujawan Bharat Sabha of which I was the elected President, cendemning the Government for the detention of some Punjabis and Bengalis under regulation 3rd of 1818 without trial and without proving any case against them. I also deplored the attitude of the Press towards the movement of real freedom. The Press is in the hands of such people as are running it for the interests of the Bourgeoisie or for their own interests. It is not.

servicing the interests of the masses. It is leading our thought to such direction as cannot be useful to the emancipation of India in the real sense.

In regard to religion I said that it is only a mean of exploitation. These religious hymns are only a farce to hoodwink the masses. In Jullandar (P 1883 (3) T) I said "People are taught religion, religion Heaven, Heaven, but those who teach us to put up with the present orders of things, even if starving, sit in motor-cars and live in magnificent houses. We, the poor, work for the whole day and when we come home in the evening, we cannot get even dry bread." I have no reason to go back upon what I said then. I hold the same views even now.

In P 1911 T I said, "We oppose this religion, we are prepared to pull out the roots of religion because it sets two brothers by the ears and throws a veil over economic realism."

"The abolition of religion, the illusory happiness of the people," said Marx, "is a demand for the real happiness. The demand that one rejects illusions about one's situation is a demand that one rejects a situation which has need of illusions."

Religious world is merely a reflection of the real world. Religion is under the influence, if not under the control, of the ruling class and their one concern in a commercial world of competition is to keep the people convinced that their success or failure does depend upon their competitive activity and cleverness, thus keeping them divided for the purposes of exploitation.

P 1879 (1) T is another speech of mine in connection with May Day celebrated at Lahore. There I spoke for the destruction of Imperialism and the establishment of the Government by the workers and peasants. And I went to add that I stand by these words even now.

In P 1912 T I said, "There are only two per cent people who are sucking our blood and want to keep us under their yoke. Until these two per cent people who are fattening on our income are eliminated and the reins of Government come to the hands of the peasants and workers, peace can never reign in the world..... If peace is to come in the world it will come only when riches and poverty in the world end." These are common place things that can be uttered by any man who has ever cared to study the existing order of the society. The theory of Marx of the 'Increasing Misery' of the workers and peasants is coming true before our very eyes. We see in our day to day life the rich becoming richer and the poor poorer. There is no need to go into statistics to show this, because it is so palpable a fact that it requires no demonstration or proof.

Just after the Conference of the 2nd Naujawan Bharat Sabha I sent a letter to Comrade Muzaffar Ahmed (P 485). The minute book P 1403 produced here in the Court bears my signature on many places. Being the President of the City Naujawan Bharat Sabha Amritsar I had to sign the proceedings of the Sabha, after reading them. Just as I said before in connection with the W.P.P. Punjab, we did try to form some local Unions in Amritsar. We passed many resolutions about the current topics and I shoulder the responsibility, as the President of the Sabha, of those resolutions.

The Diary (P 909) produced here is my own and written with my own hands. It contains chiefly the notes of how each day was occupied. I was keeping this diary because I had information from some source, which it is not for me to reveal, that the Government was trying to implicate me in some terroristic Conspiracy Case. I would like to explain my views on individual terrorism when I come to deal with my speeches. I will deal with my Presidential speech P 1877 etc. and P 890 (a) when I come to deal with my speeches.

THE CONGRESS.

At the outset I want to give information to the Court that I was the Vice-President of the City Congress Committee Amritsar, and Executive Member of the Provincial Congress Committee, Punjab and a member of the All India Congress Committee. I am not bringing forward these facts to get my sentence reduced or to save my skin in any way, for things have come to such a pretty pass in this case, that to say that one is a Congressman and a follower of Gandhi at that, has become defence and, so it seems, an open sesame to release. I am bringing forward these facts to show that I was not anti-Nationalist as the Prosecution alleges a Communist always is, but on the other hand, I was and am such a Nationalist as not to lose sight of real National Democratic Independence itself.

The world war brought a great awakening ^{to} the masses, the world over. It unleashed the revolutionary wave which swept over all lands. Then came the Russian Revolution of 1917. It also gave a great revolutionary impetus to the movement of the workers and peasants all over the world. India had its share of the "revolutionary" movement also. From 1919 to 1922 there came a great national awakening in India. Those days of non-violent Non-Cooperation are still within living memory. Mr. Gandhi, as every body knows, was the leader of the movement. At the height of the movement in 1922 the peasants began to show revolutionary tendencies. They began to seize lands from, and refuse rents to,

the landlords. Gandhi's non-violence was thrown over board by the peasants and some spies were murdered at Chauri Chaura. This all was too much for Mr. Gandhi to stand. He wants, firstly, a non-violent "revolution" but the masses had exceeded the limits. Secondly he is an advocate of the interests of the Bourgeoisie and the landlords. Therefore, it was not in accord with his principles to allow the poor peasantry to seize lands belonging to the landlords. Mr. Gandhi remained true to his principles of advocacy of non-violence and the interests of the Bourgeoisie and the landlords. He called off the whole movement and after some time when the masses saw that they have nothing to gain from ^{the} movement they withdrew and the whole movement collapsed.

It was then that the Congress leadership showed itself in its true colours. Before that there was no mass movement and no one knew what the mass of peasants required. It became quite clear then ^{that} the peasants wanted to satisfy their land hunger by seizing the land of the Zamindars (landlords). But the Congress could not yield to their demands because Congress itself is a body of the bourgeoisie, landlords and the wavering petty bourgeoisie.

The resolution that the Congress passed at the time of calling off the movement furnishes interesting reading. It says (para 5) "The working Committee advises the Congress workers and organisations to inform the ryots (peasants) that withholding of rent payment to the zamindars (landlords) is ^{in fact} contrary to the Congress resolution and injurious to the best of the country. The Working Committee assure the zamindars that the Congress movement is in no way intended to attack their legal rights and that even when the ryots have grievances, the Committee desires that redress be sought by mutual consultation and arbitration."

So there was a clash of interests between the peasants and the landlords. The former wanted to withhold the rent payment and seize lands but the Congress representing the interests of the latter gave its verdict that the best interests of the country demanded that the peasants should go on living and doing as before. That is to say, the interests of the 90 per cent of the peasants were not the best interests of the country but it was the interests of a handful of landlords that formed the best interests of the country. The Congress exposed its true character that under the slogan of national freedom it was fighting for the interests of the landlords and the bourgeoisie, and the poor peasantry were simply pawns in the game of political chess. In one word, the Congress wants to take over the reigns of the present Government without changing the economic and political order of things or without benefiting the poor peasantry in any way. But all the same it wants to keep the

hegemony of the revolutionary masses in its own hands in order to utilise the movement for its own ends.

The fact is that the Congress has no programme for the peasants. The Bardoli peasants struggle proved this contention to the hilt. In the Bardoli struggle in 1928 the peasants showed what revolutionary capacity they possessed. They refused to give the enhanced revenue to the Government, upon which they were subjected to all sorts of tortures, but they did not budge an inch. From the very beginning of the struggle the leadership was very apologetic. It insisted that it was simply a struggle for the improvement of the economic conditions of the peasantry of Bardoli and had nothing to do with politics. It was not willing to make this movement an all India one. From the very start the leadership was bent upon coming to a compromise with the powers that be. In fact it was started with the object of a compromise. In order to show their bona fides to the Government leaders over emphasised the economic, while forgetting the political side altogether. They did not want the peasants to know that every struggle for bread is a political struggle. What is politics after all, if it is not the solution of the bread question? Besides, the interests of the leaders were also involved because the land revenue had been increased on their lands also, so they were ready if at all to go up to the non-payment of increased land taxes only, and not upto the seizure of lands by the peasants or the agrarian revolution. (I will deal with the agrarian revolution later on). Thus the movement was betrayed because it was the landlords who were the leaders and who were unwilling to go forward.

The slogan of Khaddar is reactionary and meaningless to the masses. It has nothing to appeal to them. The slogan of national freedom did and still does appeal to certain strata of the peasantry but the way the Congress has been handling the situation has shown to them, beyond doubt, that the Congress is out and out for the landlords and has nothing to offer to the poor peasantry as well as to the agricultural proletariat. It has not, upto now, seriously launched the slogan of adult suffrage even. Nor has it ever spoken seriously of progressive graded taxation, not to speak of the seizure of the land by the peasantry.

In Provincial Councils and the Assembly the poor peasantry has no representation at all. No one ever champions their cause there. The members who are elected on the Congress Ticket always support the interests of the moneylenders and the zamindars to the detriment of the interests of the poor peasant, because they are elected by them, as the right of vote is given to those who pay a land revenue of Rs 25/- at least and the poor peasantry having no vote at all. Under these circumstances the poor peasants are doomed to pay heavy taxes and live like pigs.

In regard to the freedom movement the difference between the Communists and the Congress is this. The Communists are willing to cooperate if and when possible, with any revolutionary body to bring about the bourgeois democratic revolution. The national struggle remains in the forefront of our programme. But while fighting for freedom we make it quite clear to the masses that there is a clash of interests between the landlords and the peasants, that there is a class struggle going on between them. We criticise and expose the irresolution of the bourgeoisie and the landlords in the struggle. We tell them frankly that these big zamindars and bourgeoisie at some time or other will come to an agreement with the foreign Imperialists, therefore they should be on their guard, and should continue the struggle when the movement be betrayed by them. We see at this time in India that the landlords are going over to the Government. The bourgeoisie can go up to obtaining what they desire, after that they bitterly oppose the revolution and stand in the way of further progress. That is to say, they do not want that the exploitation of the peasantry should cease. They simply want that in place of white governors, ministers and judges, brown ones should hold the same positions. They want to keep intact the system that is grinding the poor down. They want to keep landlordism as it is. They do not want to satisfy the land-hunger of the peasants, nor do they want to set aside the mortgage decrees, nor do they want to abolish the crushing debts of the peasantry. While we stand for giving lands to the poor peasantry abolition of debts and setting aside of mortgage decrees.

Further we tell the peasants that the only class that is historically out to bring about a thorough all round revolution is the proletarian class and that they should fight under the leadership and banner of that class. Experience has shown that the bourgeoisie can not carry on the revolutionary struggle to the end. Scared by the gigantic sweep of the revolution it will abandon it and go into the camp of the counter revolution. But that cannot mean the defeat of the revolution because treachery of the bourgeoisie will sharpen the class struggle the more and increase the revolutionary energy of the exploited class. Our ultimate aim is not the bourgeois democratic revolution but social revolution. Bourgeois democratic revolution is only a half-way house.

In fact the Congress does not want a revolution, because revolution will overthrow the present economic system and establish a new one. Besides it will put a stop to all exploitation, and that is the very thing that the Congress does not want to happen. It has not even the courage to carry out in practice the moderate slogan of no-taxation without representation.

The Prosecution are surprised at our "feelings of hatred" towards the Congress leaders but there is nothing in that to be surprised at. Communists everywhere expose in its true colours, every reactionary movement and its leaders in general, and every movement reactionary in content but posing to be revolutionary in words in particular. That is why we castigate the Congress as well as its leaders, in season and out of season, when it poses to be the protector of the interests of the workers and peasants while actually it is exploiting them for its own and every minute of their lives. We at the same time every where think it our duty to support every genuinely revolutionary movement against the existing social and political conditions in society.

Further the Prosecution charges us with having intentions of "Capturing" the Congress. I want frankly to inform the Prosecution as well as those who think with them that we have no such intentions. The Congress with all its bourgeois traditions, bourgeois content and bourgeois history is of no use to us. Workers and peasants will have their own class organisations before which the Congress will pale into insignificance. It is the workers and peasants who are today mainstay or the sheet anchor of the Congress. When they will understand its real and true character and realise their own strength, they will withdraw their support from the Congress and the latter will collapse like a house of cards. With these views in mind we therefore cannot have any ambitions of "capturing" the Congress.

Q: In regard to your connection with W. P. P. of the U. P. there is the following evidence:—P. 549 (16), P 1090, P 431, P 2196, statements of P. W.'S. 126 and 173. Have you anything to say about these?

MORNING 1st PART

D/-20-5-31

I attended the Meerut Conference of the Workers and Peasants on being invited by the Mazdur Sangh. The overwhelming majority of the men present in the Conference were peasants as my speech shows. I moved the resolution on the abolition of landlordism Ex: P. 1090 T in the Conference. I delivered a speech also in placing this resolution before the Conference. The speech is not taken verbatim. There are many gaps left in it, besides it is mis-reported. The Urdu word 'Taqat' is translated as force while according to the text it should have been 'strength'. The word 'Jathebandi ki' is left out before 'Taqat' making it Jathebandi ki taqat, that is, the strength of organisation or on the strength of organisation. The word 'Jatha' is translated in brackets as organisation while it means a number of

men. It was the word "Jathebandi" that was spoken and which means organisation. There are many other misrepresentations also, but I am not going to bother my head about them. The report fairly well represents my views and that will, I think serve the purpose of the Court as well as the Prosecution.

It is not to my knowledge that any Workers' and Peasants' Party was formed at Meerut. I do not know anything about the paper *Krantikari* P. 451 except that I heard its name when I was outside. I do not know who is responsible for putting down my name there. I did not and do not know whether this was a W.P.P. paper or not, nor do I know anything about Ex: P 549 (16).

I came to Meerut on the invitation of the Mazdur Sangh. I do not remember whether I received the telegram P 2196 or not. Most probably I did not. Our post was censored and intercepted. I remember cases in which telegrams addressed to me were delayed for more than a week and sometimes never delivered. I had to suffer a great deal of monetary loss on account of these delays ~~for no~~ ^{delivery.}

Q. The following pieces of evidence relate to your connection with the A. I. W. P. P.—P. 467 (7), 2093, 467 (1), 11, 902, 915, 891, 892, 894, 916, 669, 467 (5), 2147, 1873 P, 2151 P, 468 (1), 910 and statement of P. W. 90. Have you anything to say about these?

A. I was elected President of the All India Workers and Peasants' Party Conference Calcutta. Comrade Dharni Goswami on behalf of the Reception Committee informed me of this fact. The Conference took place in the Albert Hall Calcutta and I delivered my Presidential speech Ex: no P 596. I stand by every word of my address and bear the full responsibility for it.

(P 891) A. I. W. P. P. Principles and Policy, (P 892) Political Resolution, (P 894) the same in Urdu and (P 916) Trade Union Movement:—All these Theses and Resolutions were passed under my Presidentship and I am quite prepared to shoulder the responsibility of all of them. I fully stand by the views expressed in them.

(P. 669) General Report:—I cannot say anything about the General Report found on Comrade Bradley. I did not know anything about it before my arrest.

Resolution for Johnstone^e—I moved two resolutions of protest against the arrests of J. W. Johnstone^e of America a fraternal Delegate of the Conference from the League against Imperialism and of three men from the Punjab M. A. Majid, Ramchandra Kapoor and Kidarnath Sabgal. The^e arrests had occurred a few days before the Conference. I moved a resolution that the All India Worker's and

Peasants Party be affiliated to the league against Imperialism. In another resolution moved by me I protested against the detention of three Comrades under regulation of III 1818. I also moved a resolution in the Conference as the President sympathising with Dr. Vishwanath Mukherji in his sufferings at the hands of hired ruffians of Zamindars, and congratulating him on his fight for the interests of the peasants against their oppressors. In regard to the resolution protesting against the policy and encirclement and preparation for war by the British Government against the U. S. S. R. I will explain my position when I come to deal with books.

I do not know anything about P. 467 (7).

I do not remember having received P 2093 *and*

I think it never reached me.

In regard to P 467 (1) I do not know anything at all.

I do not know also about P 11.

P. 1873 P:—Just as I have said above, I did receive a letter from Comrade Dharni Goswami informing me that I had been elected President of the Conference but I do not remember whether this is the copy of the same letter or not.

P. 468 (1) I remember having sent one telegram to Ganvani informing about my arrival in Calcutta. P. 2151 P. I also sent a letter to Comrade Muzaffar Ahmad informing him that I was getting ready with my address and would be starting soon for Calcutta.

P 910: It is my diary written in my own handwriting and the entries therein are correct.

I was in charge of the procession that was taken from Shardhanand Park to the Congress. Nagar at the time of the All India Peasants' and Workers' Conference. At the end of the procession there was a meeting where I addressed all those who took part in the procession.

In regard to this All India Workers' and Peasants' Conference I want to add that I gave every facility to the newspaper reporters as well as Government reporters. I know that there were Police reporters in the Conference who were taking notes. No body was allowed to put any obstacles in the way of reporting. I being the President did not stop any reporter from coming in and taking reports.

The fact that no written Police or Government report of this Conference has been filed by the Prosecution shows that they

have deliberately suppressed evidence on this Conference and have depended on the oral statements of the witnesses which are self-contradictory and therefore false. I do not know if any of those persons who gave the oral statements in this court about this Conference ever attended this Conference, at least, they were not prominently noticeable like other policemen.

After the Calcutta All India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference was over, I was invited by Mr. Sundram to go to Tata Nagar Jamshedpur and address the workers of the Labour Federation founded by Mr. Manik Homi. I went there and addressed the meeting of the workers. P. 2208 is my speech. I said that the workers are the actual producers of wealth and capitalists are exploiting them ruthlessly.

I would not allow such things to continue and would like to change the existing system. Labour is not paid even the most minimum wage of Rs. 30/- a month. The Government was always siding with the Capitalists to the detriment to the interests of the workers. I remember having said that we should bring a change in the existing order of things like Russia. Though there are some mistakes yet the speech is fairly correct.

Q: The following documents relate to your connection with activities in the A. I. T. U. C:—P. 1878 C, P. 2097 C, P. 1901 P. and P 905 and statement of P. W. 111. Have you anything to say about these ?

A: I attended the A. I. T. U. Congress held at Cawnpore. I was representing the All India Telegraph Workers' Union there. I did not move any resolution nor delivered any speech but I did take part in the proceedings of the Congress, in Cawnpore. I also asked some of the men gathered there to contribute articles to our paper and almost all men whom I approached promised to contribute to the paper.

I did receive the resolutions P. 905. They were in a registered letter. There was nothing besides the resolutions in the cover.

In regard to the letter P. 1901: I did not receive that letter.

P. 1878 (C): I do not remember anything about this.

Q. In regard to your connection with the Communist Party of India these are the following pieces of evidence: P. 1295, P. 1300, P. 1303, P. 1310, P. 416 (7) and P. 458. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. I am a Communist in the Marxian Leninist sense and in no other. A Communist is not a murderer or a brigand or a

burglar as the Bourgeois Press from time to time makes him out to be, nor is he a blood thirsty terrorist. He is a man like other ordinary men with this difference that he has different but very strong views on life and the existing society. A Communist is one who knows the doctrine of the requisites for the emancipation of the Proletariat, that is to say who understands the determinants of the Proletarian movement, foresees its course and results and whose chief aim in life is to organise the workers and peasants on a class basis with a view to destroy the Bourgeois supremacy and conquer the political power by the Proletariat. He is not worth the name if he does not devote his life to the bringing about of such revolution as will root out all the social injustices and economic inequalities from off the face of the earth.

*The term 'Communism' is used to designate the principles of Marxian Revolutionary Socialism as practised by Comrade Lenin. One must be careful to distinguish this sense of Communism from the senses in which it has often been used in Europe namely (1) the Communist anarchism of Kropotkin, (2) Decentralisation and a system of loosely associated local Communes, and (3) the conception of the abolition of all personal property. The distinctive feature of Communism is not the abolition of property in general, but the abolition of bourgeois property. Communism corresponds rather to what is often referred to as 'Scientific Socialism,' only with a special emphasis on its Revolutionary aspect. In one word, Communism is a theory and practice of revolution.

A communist in order to be a true Communist must belong to the Communist Party of the country in which he lives. I, claiming to be a good Communist had the honour to be a member of the Communist Party of India. I do not remember the date on which I was admitted to the party.

Now one of the purposes of starting this case is to make the Communist Party of India illegal. There are Communist Parties in other parts of the world which are perfectly legal and carry on their work openly and legally. Even in the British Empire which is a collection of slave countries in the iron grip of Great Britain and which we are out to smash up, Canada, Australia and Africa have legal Communist Parties with affiliations to the Third International. In Britain herself is a Communist Party of Great Britain which is affiliated to the Communist International, as its own propaganda organs and carries on propaganda work openly and legally. Our Communist Party of India was not affiliated to the Third International at the time we were arrested, though we had a mind to get it affiliated as soon as possible.

The British Government in India wants to make a discrimination in regard to our country in as much as they do not, (1) want

to let the C.P.I. exist legally and (2) they do not wish to allow us to have any connection with the Third International. Now every man who knows anything about his rights of citizenship, knows perfectly well that this is an attack on the elementary rights of organisation and association and no man of any worth will take this attack lying down. We have been fighting and we will fight still for the legal existence of our party, but if the Party is made illegal then there will be no alternative left for us but to set up an illegal Communist Party of India. Because we believe that the only true and the genuine party of the Indian workers and peasants, that truly interprets their desires puts forward and fights for their programme, that stands by them through thick and thin and never betrays them, is the Communist Party of India and objective conditions require that it must exist in India whether legally or illegally. I claim that we have every right to have the Communist Party of India legally. Besides, the Communist Party of India has every right to affiliate itself to the Communist International.

I would have no objection to admitting this photograph P. 458 as mine only if I knew when it was taken. The fact is that I know nothing about it. Somebody might have taken this photograph in the Calcutta streets or somewhere else.

I do not know anything about the constitution of the C. P. I. (P. 416 (7)). I never saw it before my arrest.

I would have taken great pleasure in explaining all the exhibits alleged to be found in Comrade Ghate's possession but I am sorry to say that I am helpless because I do not know anything about them at all.

Q. The following documents found mostly in your possession link you with the Bengal W. P. P.—P. 721, 904, 914, (23), 886, 903, 885 and 893. Have you anything to say about these?

A. I do not know anything about this P. 721 but I know that the manager Kirti Amritsar did receive some copies of 'A Call to Action'. He sold some of those copies and the money was returned, to my knowledge, to the Ganvani office Calcutta.

The Kirti office received P. 904 and I took it to my house to read it. It was found in my possession. In regard to the views expressed therein I have no hesitation in subscribing to them.

I do not know anything about this Manifesto P. 914 though I can have no objection to subscribe to the views expressed therein.

This document P. 886 was also received by the Kirti office and I had taken it home to have a look at it. I bear the responsibility of having it in my possession.

P. 885 was in my possession but I cannot tell the Court wherefrom it came because it was lying in the office and I took it home. In regard to the above documents also I do not know the source from where they came to the Kirti office.

The same answer applies to P. 903

P. 893:—Yes, this book P. 893 'A Call to Action', was also found in my possession. I had taken it from the Kirti office.

Q: The following speeches are in evidence against you P 1903, P 1879 (1), 1883 (3), P 1912, P 1911, P 1910, P 1884 (1), P 1906, P 1090, P 1905, P 596, P 2203, P 1904, P 1882, P 1877, and P 1468. Have you anything to say about these over and above what you have already said about source of them earlier?

A. As the President of the All India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference at Calcutta as well as the President of the Nau Jawan Bharat Sabha Lahore (P 596 and P 2070), I put forward certain programme for the peasantry, the chief points of which are as follows: (1) Landlordism be abolished (2) The national debts of India should not be acknowledged (3) Indian States be abolished (P 890 (2) T). Besides I was one of the members of the Committee that drafted the resolution on the demands of the peasantry in the All India Workers and Peasants Party Conference. Further more, in my speeches at Meerut and Rohtak (P 1090 T and P 1468 T) I emphasised that the conditions of the Indian peasantry can not be bettered unless landlordism is abolished without any compensation. There is so much confusion about our programme that it will take sometime to explain it fully. I therefore crave indulgence of the court.

AGRARIAN REVOLUTION.

British Imperialism inspite of its past administrative reforms as well as its technical improvements will not be able to solve the agrarian problem. The administrative reforms have not been anything more than weak palliatives which did not and cannot go to the root of the question, the rights and powers of the intermediary parasitic classes. Imperialism is no doubt interested in granting stability to the actual cultivator in order to secure stable agrarian production but it must at the same time not displease the zamindars, moneylenders and intermediaries, whose support it must enlist as bulwarks of reaction and counter revolution. Thus these administrative changes cannot touch the property rights of the zamindars and intermediaries that is to say they cannot touch the capitalist relations obtaining in the country side. If occupancy rights are granted to a section of the ryots these again tend to become the cultivating sub-landlords and an under ryot with the

same difficulty of insecurity grows up under them (Ryots). This has been the case in Bengal. If a Land Alienation Act prevents transfer of land to a moneylender outside the agricultural tribe—the moneylender reproduces himself inside the tribe itself. Even if the great efforts of the technical improvements were to fructify, it will only benefit a thin stratum of rich peasants having large holdings. The misery and poverty of the poor peasantry who form the overwhelming bulk of the entire population of India, remains untouched. Any scheme of agricultural development which keeps the existing social order with its peculiar inter-mixture of feudal capitalist relations must necessarily lead to the aggravating of the problem through mass evictions and through the increase in the number of the landless labourers.

Bourgeois nationalism certainly likes to play the role of the champion of the poor peasantry as against Imperialism. It certainly wishes to use its influence on the peasant masses as a weapon extort further concessions from Imperialism. But its community of interest with the rural exploiting classes, prevents it from putting forward or even supporting the immediate class demands of the poor peasantry. At best they have made common grievances of the zamindars and the peasants against the Government, planks of their agitation and carefully avoided all issues involving the class conflict between the peasants on one side and the zamindars and the middle men on the other.

OUR PROGRAMME.

The Workers' and Peasants' parties have from the very start clearly and lucidly formulated all the immediate and pressing demands of the peasantry both against Imperialism and zamindars. In their detail, these demands differed for different provinces, but in principle they demanded (1) abolition of intermediate tenures (2) reduction of rent, fixing up a maximum scale of rental (3) abolition of all Nazranas and Bhaints etc. (4) illegal cesses to be cognizable offences (5) fixed rate of interest (6) stopping transfer of land to non-agriculturists (7) abolition of Batai (see also P 888T).

The immediate partial demands of the peasants themselves were taken up by the workers' and peasants' parties as the planks of their platform and their propaganda. As these demands stand they contain an unbridgable class conflict between the poor peasants and the rural exploiters. This class conflict need not be imported from outside. What is needed is the recognition of it. These partial demands form the basis for agitation and organisation of the peasantry for the redress of their immediate economic grievances. As the struggle proceeds on this basis - as the organisation of the

peasants grows, the peasants themselves will come to the point of making the revolutionary demand for sole rights over the land they cultivate and hence the elimination of the landlord class (see Political Resolution no. 2 also).

PROGRAMME OF AGRARIAN REVOLUTION.

This revolutionary demand "land to the peasantry, abolition of the entire parasitic landlords class, is the kernel of a programme of agrarian revolution. Before I deal with other implications of the agrarian revolution, before I deal with classes that will carry it out and, with its future perspectives I shall first answer the question how the overthrow of the parasitic landlordism is the essential and inevitable pre-condition of any real development of agriculture, of any substantial betterment of the economic conditions of the broad masses of the peasantry.

The cancellation of all the zamindari rights in land, as well as of all unproductive intermediary tenures will remove the greatest obstacle in the way of satisfying the land hunger of the millions of poor peasants. A rational redistribution of holding will then be possible. This redistribution could then be carried out by the village council representing the poor peasants of the village. Every peasant will have an inalienable right in the holding he cultivates with his own and his family's labour. Every redistribution, transfer or exchange will not be carried through the medium of sale but through the agency of village council elected by the cultivators themselves. Thus land ceases to be a commodity and as a result land speculation ceases. Moneylenders and middle men can no longer appropriate the land of the peasants. Land becomes the common property of the people. Land is nationalised. These changes will create the first essential pre-condition for stable agriculture and security of the cultivator on his land. Further those lands which are today "closed" by the zamindar and rendered unavailable for cultivation will be expropriated and divided among the landless peasantry.

THE IMMEDIATE GAINS

The agrarian revolution will abolish as if by a single stroke, the immense tribute which the peasantry today has to pay to the zamindars and the middle men. 53 per cent of the total arable land in British India is owned by the big zamindars. Mr. K.T. Shah, the economist of the bourgeois nationalism, estimates the tribute appropriated by the zamindars at 25 per cent of the total agricultural produce of this area. This comes to 175 crores annually. We must add to this the tribute taken from the peasantry by the non-agriculturist landowners of the ryotwari areas. In the

ryotwari areas 50 per cent of the land is owned by the sub-landlords who do not cultivate it, but extract rents from those who actually cultivate it. This total rental may be roughly taken as half the total land revenue from the ryotwari areas which is Rupees 20 crores. Thus Rupees 185 crores is annually appropriated by the zamindars and middle men. This tribute does not return to the land in the form of improvements, manure etc., directly, nor does it do so indirectly as the whole of this income is as yet untaxed. An agrarian revolution will alone abolish this heavy tribute. This will put a stop to the robber economy perpetrated against the soil today. It will leave a greater margin to the peasant, as it will increase his per capita income by 25 per cent. It will tend to stabilise agricultural production immediately on the existing basis.

D. 21.5.31

AGRARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE NATIONAL REVOLUTION.

The tasks of the Agrarian Revolution shall have to be carried out against the Zamindars and middlemen, who are the direct oppressors, and against Indian Bourgeoisie, which has, as we have seen, affiliations with the rural exploiting classes, against Imperialism which is the biggest oppressor and as such is interested in keeping up its smaller allies, the Zamindars and the bourgeoisie. Hence if Agrarian revolution is to be successful, it must be accompanied by a National Revolutionary struggle against the existing Imperialist Feudal State.

National Revolution is often described in our literature as a Bourgeois Democratic Revolution. The reason for this is that the Democratic tasks which the bourgeois revolutions of Europe performed in the 18th and the 19th centuries have still to be achieved in India. These tasks are (1) abolition of landlordism (2) elimination of all pre-capitalist forms of exploitation (serfdom, Feudal cesses and services etc.) (3) end of the autocratic rule of the princes (4) substitution of the Imperialist Feudal State by a Republic based on adult suffrage. Thus we see that Agrarian Revolution must necessarily form part of a Bourgeois Democratic Revolution. The consummation of these tasks in a country is in itself not inconsistent with the subsequent development of that country on capitalist lines. In fact that is exactly what happened in Europe after the Bourgeois revolutions. The overthrow of the autocratic rule of the feudal princes and landlords opened up the field for Capitalist development and modern industry. The peasant was freed from his feudal fetters and subjected to capitalistic exploitation. Agriculture emerged out of its backward stage and entered the phase of modern large scale farming under the domination of Capital. This was possible in the period of dawn of

Capitalism when the bourgeoisie was a progressive and a revolutionary force. Today in the period of Imperialism, in the period of decline of Capitalism, the Bourgeoisie has allied itself with remnants of Feudalism and is thus incapable of carrying through the task of Bourgeois Democratic Revolution. This is true of the Imperialist as well as of the Colonial Bourgeoisie. The Indian Bourgeoisie is, as we have seen, bound up with ties of common interest partly with Imperialism and partly with the landed aristocracy. It cannot carry out these tasks without endangering its own interests.

The National Revolutionary struggle is undoubtedly a struggle of the Indian people against foreign Imperialist domination but it is at the same time, a class struggle. These classes of the Indian society which are the most determined and courageous fighters against British Imperialism cannot deliver the deadly blow against their bitterest enemy without simultaneously hitting at their native oppressors and exploiters. The Indian Bourgeoisie has its differences with Imperialism and is today playing an oppositional role and parading as the champion of the Indian people against Imperialism. But no sooner does the National revolutionary struggle enter on its decisive phase than the Indian Bourgeoisie will come out as an openly and aggressively counter-revolutionary force and ally itself with the princes, Zamindars and Imperialism against the revolutionary workers and peasants. Thus the national revolutionary struggle cannot be carried to its logical conclusion without assuming an acute form of class struggle—of workers against Capitalist of peasants against Zamindars, of all the exploited against all the exploiters. The broad masses of the peasants cannot be brought into the struggle against Imperialism except on the programme and platform of their class demands. And how can the national revolutionary movement of a predominantly agricultural country like India, be powerful enough to defeat Imperialism, unless it draws in the millions of its peasant masses? The class demands on the basis of which our Party approaches the peasant are not picked from books, nor is it necessary to tutor them to the peasantry. In fact these demands have been put up by the peasants themselves in their own way. They have led to isolated and spontaneous clashes in the past and are leading to similar agrarian conflicts to-day. A systematic agitation and organisation of the peasantry on the basis of these demands will mean the unfolding of the class struggle in the rural areas. This class struggle is not of our making, just as the struggle between Labour and Capital is not of our making. It exists independently of us, on the very basis of the society in which we live. What we wish to emphasise is this that until this class struggle assumes a conscious form, becomes nation wide, until it rises to the pitch of an Agrarian Revolution and until it is linked up with the

political struggle for national liberation led by the Proletariat—until then, the success of the National Democratic Revolution will not be guaranteed. It is in this sense that we say that the Agrarian Revolution has been and remains the axis of the National Revolution.

THE ALLIES OF THE PEASANTRY.

The Agrarian Revolution is many times mis-understood as a revolution of the peasantry as a class fighting single handed against its oppressors. The history of the peasant movements of the world teaches us that this was never so. The agrarian revolutions of the past have been carried out either under the leadership of the Bourgeoisie or the Proletariat. There were no doubt peasant struggles in the pre-Capitalist period before either the Bourgeoisie or the Proletariat was born. One such example which was carefully studied by Fredric Engels was "the Peasants' wars in Germany in the 15th century" Exh: P. 1183, (D. 407). The modern Proletariat was not born. The Bourgeoisie was weak and young. The peasants carried out single handed a most heroic struggle against their oppressors, but were ultimately defeated and had to bow down under heavier chains of serfdom.

In the epoch of Bourgeois Revolutions that is in the dawn of Capitalism the agrarian revolutions were fought and won under the leadership of the Bourgeoisie. These agrarian revolutions led to the abolition of serfdom, of feudal dues, cesses and services and in some places (for instance France) led to the complete abolition of feudal ownership in land. Feudal exploitation of the peasants made way for Capitalist exploitation. Setting free for serfs. Supplied cheap labour to the new industries. Growth of industries made the application of modern methods in agriculture possible. With these modern methods, large scale farming became possible—now that fetters of Feudal ownership were either destroyed or modified so as to suit the needs of the Capitalist economy. The large Capitalist farmer expropriated the small peasant and exploited the land labourer. The exploitation of the peasant was reproduced—but on a higher ^{or the plane} the plane of the Capitalist society. Such was the course of the Agrarian Revolution of the Bourgeoisie which led to the introduction of Capitalist agriculture. The relation of serf versus master was abolished but was replaced by the relation of labourer versus Capitalist farmer.

AGRARIAN REVOLUTION UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT.

In the epoch of Imperialism, the development ~~as~~ Capitalism in the backward countries follows essentially a different course.

The Capitalist development in such countries proceeds more or less under the aegis of the finance-capital of a more advanced Capitalist country. This development proceeds under the retention of most of the remnants of Feudalism. The indiginous Bourgeoisie which grows up is less independent more parasitic and has affiliations to the landed aristocracy. It is for this reason that the belated agrarian revolution in such countries cannot be carried out by the Bourgeoisie. A classical example of this type is the agrarian revolution in Russia. Lenin has told us that this revolution was not carried out by the Bourgeoisie. "Even the March revolution, the revolution of the Bourgeoisie and of the party of 'compromise' promised the peasants this victory over the land-owners. But it did not keep its promise. Only the November revolution, only the victory of the working class in towns, only the authority of the Soviets, made it possible to free the whole of Russia from end to end from the mischievous heritage of our former serfdom, from the economic exploitation of the peasantry by the land owning Bourgeoisie, whose yoke pressed impartially on all peasants without distinction." (Land Revolution in Russia P 1149 page 5).

What was true of the Agrarian Revolution in Russia will be far more true of the Agrarian Revolution in India. We have seen that the Indian Bourgeoisie will be incapable of carrying through the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution. The Indian peasantry shall have to look to different quarters for an ally in the Agrarian Revolution.

During the last decade a new class which is the characteristic product of the Capitalist development of modern India has come to the fore in the political arena. The industrial working class or the Proletariat is objectively the bitterest and the most determined opponent of Imperialism. The Proletariat is the only class which will carry through the National Revolution to its conclusion and accomplish its Bourgeois Democratic task. The Proletariat in India occupies a vital position in the Imperialist apparatus of domination. It works in its factories and war industries. It runs its net work of transport and traffic—the Railways dock, etc. In comparison with the other sections of the toilers it is far more advanced, more concentrated, more disciplined and far more organised. The rapid growth of political consciousness and organisation among the working class is a potential menace to Imperialism (the present trial is but one of the many futile efforts of Imperialism to avert this menace.) For these reasons the Proletariat is the potential leader of national revolution in India and as such the principal ally of the peasantry in its struggle against the Government and the landlords. In fact the alliance of the Proletariat and the peasantry

is the fundamental pre-requisite for the success of the Agrarian Revolution in India.

The Imperialist State in India as a Police state oppresses the workers and the peasants alike. When the starving worker strikes against the Capitalist master, it is the Imperialist baton which intervenes on behalf of the Capitalists in the name (that is to say under the pretext) of 'law and order'. When the tax-burdened peasant grows restive under the load of an enhanced assessment it is the 'Kitchener's squadron' which is sent to 'reason' with him. The Imperialist State as an exploiter state exploits the peasants as a rack-renting landlord in the ryotwari areas. It exploits the workers as the Capitalist Financier of Railways and Port Trusts etc : The peasantry has no doubt other exploiters to fight against for example the Zamindars, sub landlords and the money-lenders. Even in this struggle as I have shown the Bourgeois Nationalists failed to support it. It is the Proletariat which alone can support its struggle against all its exploiters.

The hard school of strike struggle in which the Proletariat is ceaselessly engaged awakens the peasantry to consciousness that it cannot emancipate itself from Capitalist exploitation unless and until it deals a death blow to Imperialism in India. This task of overthrowing Imperialism cannot be achieved by the Proletariat single handed. It must link up its struggle with that of the broad masses of the peasantry. It must organise itself into a political party with a programme of an all round popular revolution. It must mobilize under its red banner all the oppressed and the exploited classes and marshal them against Imperialism.

The fighting alliance between the Proletariat and the Peasantry has a further basis in India. The Indian Proletariat is to a considerable extent a floating population. A considerable section of it oscillates between the city and the country side. Many poor peasants wander into the city in search of a short time employment to earn a little cash and then return to their villages. This floating section of the working classes forms the living link between the stable permanently settled—Proletariat of the cities and the poor peasants and the land—labourers of the country side. The stable Proletarian too is the poor peasant of yesterday and thus knows the plight and misery of the peasantry full well. Thus the proletariat alone is the truest and the best ally of the peasantry in its fight against its oppressors.

THE TACTIC OF AGRARIAN REVOLUTION

We have seen that the oppression of Imperialism in India aggravates the Agrarian crisis by worsening the

condition of the poor peasantry and by swelling the ranks of the landless peasants. The National Bourgeoisie was the first to appear in the Indian political arena, to demonstrate their opposition to the ruling Imperialist Feudal block. Their opposition is not of a revolutionary but reformist and class collaborationist character. Hence it cannot and does not result in the formation of the class organisations of the peasantry. The demonstration of the bourgeois opposition against the Imperialist feudal block however even if they do not have any deep foundations can exert a certain accelerating influence on the process of the political awakening of the wide masses of toilers specially the peasantry. This initial ferment could in spite of the wishes of the Bourgeoisie be made the basis of the class organisation of the peasantry which is the first step towards the Agrarian Revolution.

The peasant organisations, such as came into existence under the leadership of the Bourgeoisie, were always dominated by the rural exploiters. The organisations which came into existence in the ryotwari area under the aegis of the land leagues were dominated by the rich sub-landlords. So are the zamindar leagues of the Punjab under the thumb of the landlords and the moneylenders. The Kisan Sabhas which grew up in the U. P. during the days of Non-Cooperation Movement collapsed after the Oudh insurrection and were not revived afterwards. The only organisational form which the bourgeoisie has pressed forward is the "Village Panchayats" based on Caste System. The Village Panchayats with their semi-religious atmosphere are admirable instruments to secure the ~~domination~~ ^{domination} of the village bosses over the cultivators and blur the class conflict in the village. The peasant organisations of the bourgeoisie as they stand today are hopelessly inadequate and unsuited to the task of unfolding the agrarian revolution.

The party of the proletariat can not discharge its task as the ally of the peasantry by merely issuing paper programmes of agrarian revolution. The proletariat must come forward and show to the peasantry the way to form their own class organisation to fight for its immediate economic demands—organisations somewhat similar to what the proletariat itself has built for itself in the cities, as for example Trade Unions. The peasant unions will only include peasants who cultivate the land with the labour of their own family as well as the land labourers in the initial stages. The peasant unions must on no account contain the village exploiter, that is the rich peasant, landlord the moneylender and the trader. It is only when this condition is fulfilled that the peasant unions will be a suitable basic organisation for the peasant struggle for partial demands. The preliminary unit of organisation will be naturally

the village. But in the event of struggle for partial demands such as reduction of enhanced taxes, abolition of illegal cesses and stopping of the oppression of the officials etc. The union will undoubtedly grow and embrace a number of the surrounding villages or even a Taluqa. During such a partial struggle the peasants will learn to form an elected executive body of the union which will make a centralised and proper guidance of the struggle possible. The formation and the functioning of such a body as the peasant committee marks the next step in the organisational training of the peasantry. The peasant thus learns to get his business done through a properly elected representative body of his own class. The peasant will learn the art of self-government through his peasant committees. In fact the peasant committee as a class organisation is the nuclear unit of self-government on which the future republic of workers and peasants of India will be based.

The peasant committee bears the same relation to the peasant union as the strike committee does to the Trade Unions. The proletarian cadres coming over to the peasantry from the cities, will materially assist the peasantry in the formation and functioning of such peasant committees. It is only when such peasant committees consisting of class conscious cadres of peasantry spring up every where, it is only when such cadres are steeled in the struggle for partial demands, that it would be possible to unfold and lead a countrywide no-rent no-tax campaign. A no-rent no-tax campaign thus organised on a definite class basis can in no way be stopped or betrayed by the machinations of the national bourgeoisie.

Such a no-tax no-rent campaign however will not raise itself to the level of agrarian revolution, unless it is simultaneously backed up by a country wide general strike of all the workers of India. In the event of such simultaneous action, the alliance between the peasantry and the proletariat will take concrete forms—and the death knell of Imperialism will thus be sounded. The peasant committees and strike committees shall function in close cooperation on the basis of a broad national revolutionary programme. These committees will act then as organs of struggle for the national revolution. As the struggle proceeds the peasant committees will proceed to the first act of the agrarian revolution—the seizure of the lands of the big zemindars. The lands thus seized will be distributed among the poor peasantry, under the democratic authorities of the peasant committees. The first act of agrarian revolution cannot have stability unless there is a simultaneous capture of power by the workers and peasants committees in conjunction with the soldiers committees. The organs of struggle will thus grow ~~over~~ into the organs of power—the

workers' peasants' and soldiers' soviets, which will be the basic units of the workers and peasants republic of India. The further progress and success of the agrarian revolution can only be guaranteed by such a national Government.

Here I have but cursorily sketched the character and the trend of the organisational growth of the Peasantry leading up to agrarian revolution. I need not go into detail to outline the various organisational forms. In fact we did almost no organisational work amongst the peasantry up to the time of our arrest but it is necessary for me to point out that our organisational programme for the peasantry was open and above board, and closely resembled the well recognised organisations such as Trade Unions, Strike Committees etc. The class conflict on which alone such organisations can be based I want to emphasise once, again is not of our making. It exists in spite of us, thanks to the capitalists feudal character of our society. What the party—the class conscious vanguard of the working class—does is to recognise this class conflict and to harness its maximum motive power through such class organisations in order to crush the parasitic exploiters of the society and free the path for unhampered social and technical progress—and for an equitable distribution of the products of the labour.

NON-VIOLENCE VERSUS VIOLENCE ETC!—

I was the General Secretary of the W. P. P. Party of the Punjab, the object of which was "to win freedom from the British Imperialism by every possible means" (P 344). This shows that I have no faith in Gandhian non-violence. In 1911 in my speech at Mahalpur says that "we passed the resolution at the Amritsar Political Conference that liberty should be attained by every possible means. At that time our big leaders came forward and remarked, "why are you going into the jaws of death. Wait a bit. The doctrine suggested by Gandhi is right". But the young men said that the slaves of every county had a right to free their country by any means, no matter whatever might happen for securing liberty and whatever price they might have to pay for it". I shall therefore explain my position in regard to violence and non violence.

I am of opinion that non-violence is a creed of the weak of the reformists and defeatists and all those who are satisfied with the present order of things and do not want to dare and die for the creation of a better world, notwithstanding the ethics, definitions and praises of non-violence and condemnation of violence by Mr. Gandhi. It is a creed of those people who want to keep the present property-relations intact, that is to say it is the creed of the feudal landlord the reformist bourgeoisie and all other property

owners of India. The masses have ^{enough} never accepted it, say whatever Mr. Gandhi may. They have nothing to gain from this creed because it cannot satisfy their land-hunger and establish a workers' and peasants' Government. The starving man cannot wait. He is in despair and therefore does not stop to consider his choice of means. For him little attaches to life. He has nothing to lose save his bonds and he therefore risks everything during the time of an upheaval which shall prepare for new conditions of life and things and in which he hopes to gain the world. Even the Non-Violence Movement led by Mr. Gandhi has shown the spirit of the starving man. Non-violence, truth to tell, has been more honoured in the breach than in the observance. On analysis, one can show to the hilt that non-violence of Mr. Gandhi is in reality a very thin disguise for the class interests of the property owners of India, nothing more nothing less.

Nowhere in history has non-violence ever succeeded and it cannot and will not succeed in India. Violence has been the rule in history. Whether it was a movement for the abolition of slavery in America or a fight for Chartism in England or any other radical movement in any other part of the world, violence has played its part. The truth is that violence is ^{quite} essential for the real progress of mankind and is a mid-wife to all social changes, new births and new orders.

Violence is a re-actionary force when used to prop up a decaying order. The Anti-abolitionist's use of violence in America was re-actionary, so is the British Government's use of violence against us and other Indians, a case of the use of violence for reactionary purposes. The reactionary force can save a decaying system for a time but not for a very long time. It can prolong its life for a short time but can not keep the order alive for ever. The decaying system crumbles down at last with the use of great or small revolutionary force.

Now this is my view point in regard to violence and non-violence. The Prosecution as well as the court knows that no violence has been attempted so far in the course of our movement, that is to say, no act of criminal or illegal nature as a lawyer will put it, has been committed by us. Only the appearance in Indian politics, of political parties, not believing in Gandhian non-violence has frightened the Imperialist bourgeoisie into taking action against us. Violence as long as it is not practised, remains only of academic interest, nothing more nothing less. The Prosecution as well as the Court cannot get away from this fact.

If one has any faith in Democracy (for which the last world war was fought according to the bourgeois hypocritical view point) and believes in free discussion and exchange of views as Liberals

generally profess, then the penalising of the mere expression of views that are unpalatable to the possessing class is simply preposterous, highly intolerable and absolutely unpardonable. But the truth is that tyrannical governments do not allow free discussion as well as free exchange of opinion because perhaps, in the ultimate, this may end in suggesting ways and means by which a slave country can emancipate itself from the foreign yoke.

Just picture to yourself, Sir, what a hard task we had to perform. We did not believe in non-violence. The whole Indian atmosphere was and is resounding with the preaching of non-violence. No body who spoke anything against non-violence was heard. If one dared to speak one was likely to be called a provocative agent. The followers of Mr. Gandhi were having every thing in their own way. They were shouting from the house-top "The Indian civilisation teaches non-violence in word, thought and deed. India has nothing to learn from any body else. She has a special genius. She has a special message to deliver to the world. She cannot adopt the western, that is to say, violent methods in her struggle for freedom. She will show a new method of winning freedom to the world". While a handful of men of our way of thinking tried to refute these views in private talks and guarded written language. We did say and say now "It is sheer national arrogance to speak of "special messages of non-violence" and having nothing to learn from any body else. Such tall talks should not be indulged in by any sane man. Non-violence is a will-o-the-wisp. No social and political change of importance has been accomplished in the world without violence. "Not believing in violence is not believing in gravitation" as Trotsky said, "Force cannot be eliminated as long as capitalist society exists. The present system is based on violence and the ruling class has the monopoly of the use of violence by controlling army, navy and police and allowing no body to possess arms, let alone manufacture them. It is only socialism that will eliminate force by passing the way for the future communist society".

But when the whole of India is resounding with non-violence when no Gandhite wants even to listen to the opposite views it becomes all the more necessary and incumbent upon those who hold the opposite views, to voice forth their standpoint so that the pros and cons, ins and outs of both sides be dispassionately considered and right view point adopted by the people. To confess the truth, we could not do what we ought to have done. The reason is that the law of the land stood in the way and we tried to steer clear of it as far as possible. But in spite of that fact, that we committed no illegal act, we were caught all the same. Strange are the laws of Hindostan but stranger still are those who execute and administer them.

The only violence that has been committed so far is the violence practised against us and not by us. Justice demands that those who have charged us with this trumped up conspiracy should be arrested, brought hand-cuffed and fettered (as was done to us) under the shadow of bayonets and guns charged with our wrongful confinement, kept in solitary cells for days together and made to compensate for the wrong done to us. But the tragedy is that there is no justice in the Bourgeois world.

This brings me to the question of revolution. In P 596 at the end of my speech I wrote, "Let us comrades then fight to bring about such a beautiful order of things. But all this cannot be achieved without revolution for a revolution is the only friend of the poor and the helpless. It is revolution alone that will bring real brotherhood and liberty to mankind." Again my speech Exh. P 1911 T says, "The revolution of Russia has given this much. If you want to remove hunger and poverty from the world then I say you will have to get ready like Russia and create a revolution.

I have talked a lot about revolution in my other speeches also. I have said many a time that revolution is the only panacea for the ills of humanity. I have exhorted the young men to work for revolution. I quoted Bernard Shaw in my speech P 207 who says "A man who is more than thirty years of age, who knows anything about the existing social system and is not a revolutionary— is a man of inferior type." (quotations is from memory).

Now what do I mean by revolution ?

By revolution I mean National Revolution that is to say the coming about of a state of affairs by which India attains complete Independence without having any connection whatsoever with imperialist Britain. By revolution I mean the confiscation of the British vested interests in India and the repudiation of the national debts. By revolution I mean that India be the real mistress in her own house in the real sense of the phrase, controlling her own finance, armies and navies and allowing nobody in any way whatsoever to interfere in her internal as well as external affairs. The national revolution will grow ~~over~~ into the social revolution that is to say revolution for the establishment of socialism leading to the Communist society in India but this second revolution will take place after the first.

I want to emphasise the fact that it is the economic conditions that bring about revolutionary situation and not men and propaganda alone though there is no denying the fact that they do play a part too. We as Marxists simply tell the masses to what directions the things are drifting and in order to meet the situation they should prepare themselves, otherwise they will be taken

unaware and will have to pay a heavy price. That is all. If revolution were to be brought about only by a handful of men and a little propaganda then the Governments have nothing to be afraid of, because they have at their back and call thousands of men who not only support the Governments but also do propaganda on their behalf. Besides the Governments have propagandists in the shape of teachers, professors and priests who inculcate reverence for and obedience to law and authority and respect for property on young impressionable minds. Aside from this, all the churches of religious societies all humanitarian clubs and most of the newspaper offices from their propaganda centres as well as agencies. The Governments have resources to employ and buy as many propagandists as they wish so they can put a stop to all revolutions. But that is not the case. Revolutions are not manufactured nor do they grow on bushes. They are not carried about in suit cases, they are not commodities of export and import and they have never been exported, cut and dried, and well-finished, from one country to another in history. They grow out of the miserable condition of the people. It is the objective conditions that bring about revolutions and when the objective conditions are right then nothing on earth can stop a revolution.

Capitalism is not a permanent system.

Just as Feudalism outlived its usefulness and yielded place to capitalism, so must Capitalism outlive its usefulness and one day give place to Communism, but the Bourgeoisie will not, under any circumstances, renounce their ownership rights of their own free will so a revolutionary force will have inevitably to be employed in the long run. Up till now history has not thought of any other method and there cannot be any exception in the case of India.

A revolution operates on natural as well as historical laws and no person or party alone can create a situation which makes revolution possible. A Communist can only be a servant of the revolution but not its master. Moscow may or may not, aid, encourage and stimulate revolutionary movements but only deep economic political and social conditions, however, can produce them. The basic springs of revolutionary movement depend on the Communist as little as on the Bourgeoisie. The Communists decree nothing. They simply analyse:—

They do not shout "revolution, revolution" dogmatically but show its inevitability analytically and objectively. That is all.

No class can be raised to power by the whims of an individual or the intrigues of a clique and least of all by assassination or bribery. No 'paid agitator' ever made a revolution that

brought any benefits to humanity at large. Revolution does not come due to agitation but due to bad social conditions. Three dozen Spratts or Sohan, Siughs with a few thousand rupees—if it be granted it came—cannot bring about a revolution, if objective conditions are not ripe. These 31 men most of whom have no money to buy bare necessities of life cannot make revolution, because revolutions are never made at pleasure, but break out organically from the conditions and social development. This is the view point of the Communists. The Bourgeoisie which believes in "man makes history" will of course always say that it is the evil nature of the Communists that is responsible for all the ills in the world, while we hold that it is the result of stage in evolution which society has reached. These conflicting view points simply go to show the different outlooks that Bourgeoisie and the Communists have on life.

Having explained my views on violence and revolution I wish to make one more point clear. It is about individual terrorism. I think that the Court and the assessors, by now, know that we are not dynamitors, bombers or assassins. We are ordinary people belonging to the petty bourgeois or proletarian class looking at the world as it is, with Marxian Leninist search-light under which nothing remains hidden and obscure, and everything becomes as clear as noon-day light.

The Committing Magistrate honoured me by quoting P 1905 T which is a speech of mine and contains the following, "I would like to point out that our Naujawan Bharat Sabha does not repose confidence in Terrorism. We understand that individual terrorism has not succeeded any where. We can murder a few persons by this method but they can be replaced by other tyrants. In this way this system cannot be changed, nor can any injustice and oppression be ended. Hence our object is to overthrow this system and not to murder individuals. Mass Civil Disobedience and mass no-Tax campaign should be launched. It is for this reason that we lay emphasis on organisation."

Again my presidential speech in the Naujawan Bharat Sabha Conference P 207 T says, "I want to declare in clear words on behalf of the Sabha that we do not believe in individual Terrorism. We believe in revolutionary mass action only and this is the only method with us by which we can secure complete Independence." After more than two years' incarceration, I see no reason to change my opinion in regard to the above expressed views.

Getting disgusted with the Congress Reformist politics and liberal defeatist policies, not being armed with the revolutionary Marxian-Leninist ideology and seeing no hope of the attainment

of complete Independence soon, impatient middle class youngmen resort to individual terrorism. Being not realists but idealists and being more exploited and oppressed, they cannot bear the burden of unemployment and other depressing conditions. The sufferings of the petty bourgeoisie are intense under Imperialism. A section of the petty bourgeoisie, becoming ~~is~~ convinced, by its life experience ~~that~~ there are no chances of a happy life under the existing conditions, takes into its head to strike at the enemy. We appreciate its courage, its sacrifices and its selflessness, but all its energies are misguided and misplaced because its view is vitiated by the over estimation of the role of the individual as it wants to overthrow Imperialism by individual action. In fact its whole philosophy is built on Individualism.

History has shown that Terrorism is futile and cannot be successful any where in the world. It was tried in Russia, it was tried in Ireland and many other countries but it did no good to the workers and peasants or to any other people. Marx and Lenin waged life long fights with the Terrorists and they never did agree with their methods. Therefore we the Marxists cannot believe in Terrorist methods because we are convinced of their uselessness as a practical revolutionary policy. We look upon this as upon other policies from the class standpoint. Individual terrorism is essentially a petty bourgeois policy. It arises when the mass Revolutionary Movement is not yet developed. The petty Bourgeoisie is such a class that effective solidarity or mass action on its part is practically impossible. Therefore a section of it takes to terrorism.

We think highly of some of the revolutionary virtues of the Terrorists. They represent an advance in that they oppose non-violence. They have advanced from the position of the Bourgeois Nationalists but have reached only the limits of petty bourgeois nationalism. In order really to serve the cause of Independence and the National Revolution they have to go one step further, to the mass Revolutionary Movement.

Individual Terrorism and Red Terrorism should not be mixed up together. The latter is employed only when the state machine is captured by the Proletariat and not before. We are convinced that the overthrow of Imperialism and Capitalism will come about as sure as death through the revolutionary mass action and the form of the Government after their overthrow will be the Dictatorship of the Proletariat which will end in the ultimate establishment of the Communist society.

As the President of the All India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference (in P 596) I suggested that "if our party decides

to seek affiliation with these Internationals (that is Comintern and Krestintern) none will be more pleased than I."

The Prosecution has made much play of this statement of mine in the opening address. The Conference did not accept my suggestion of affiliation of A.I.W.P.P. with the Comintern or Krestintern because the A.I.W.P.P. was not a ^{party} proletarian party or a Communist party. The resolution that was given to me to be put before the Conference (and it was afterwards passed) was to affiliate the party with the League against Imperialism which stands and fights for the National Independence of all countries, I have said in my statement somewhere above that even the Communist Party of India was unaffiliated with the Communist International at the time of our arrest and that is a fact.

The question can be asked why I did not advocate the affiliation of the All India Workers' and Peasants' Party with the Second International or Socialist International. The answer is very easy and clear. Any body who has cared to read the history of the 2nd International knows that it is lost in the swamp of Reformism and adaptation to the bourgeois States. It consists mostly of opportunists, reformists, ~~and~~ careerists. It has distorted Marxism and put aside revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat - the two fundamental principles of Marxism. It lays all emphasis on gradual transition of socialism through bourgeois democracy - the modern clever method of the bourgeoisie to re-enforce its dictatorship over the working classes and to impose its own class will upon the people. Besides it is dead against revolutionary struggle of the peoples for emancipation from imperialism. To be true to myself I therefore could not plead for the affiliation of the All India Workers' and Peasants' Party to the 2nd International.

Although I was not affiliated to the Comintern in any way I want to declare here in this Court that I believe in the programme laid down from time to time by the Communist International. The 3rd International in my opinion is the only International that is in thought word and deed, the standard bearer of Marxism and the advance guard of revolution. It is a world communist party consisting of all the communist parties of various countries. As the leader or organiser of the world revolutionary movement of the proletariat and bearer of the principles and aims of communism it stands and fights for the wiping out of the privileges of the bourgeoisie, for the establishment of a world union of Socialists Soviet Republics, for the complete abolition of classes and for the achievement of Socialism, the first stage of communist society.

The Communist International expresses its views on developments in the world most frankly - most brutally frankly. It knows

no beating about the bush, no shilly-shallying. It analyses the bourgeois economic situation most scientifically. Its task is to sum up the practical revolutionary experience of the working class, to cleanse the movement of its admixtures of opportunism and social patriotism and to unite the forces of all true revolutionary proletarian parties in order to further and hasten the complete victory of the Communist revolution. The programme of world revolution laid down by the 3rd International is the only programme that can emancipate the workers of the world from the shackles of economic, political and social slavery.

The 3rd International is the International of open mass action, of the revolutionary realisation the International of deeds.

The 2nd International became completely bankrupt during the world slaughter of 1914-19. It showed that it had no backbone no grit and nerve to face the situation created by the world war. Besides it had and still has no definite policy on the question of the colonies of the Great Powers. Not with standing its anti-war resolution passed just before the war declaring.

"Should War, nonetheless, break out their duty to intervene to bring it promptly to an end and with all their energies to use the economic and political crisis created by the war, to rouse the masses of the people from their slumbers, and to hasten the fall of capitalists domination."

The majority of the official parties went in support of their Governments as soon as the War broke out. Its members and parties began to preach submission in the name of "defence of father-land" and "civil peace". Its adherents of one country began to butcher their fellow workers - i.e. its adherents of another country. The Socialist International betrayed its internationalism and socialism in 1914. The War in fact killed it.

February and March of 1919 was the most troubled period in post-war Europe. The whole continent was covered with burning ruins. Europe seemed on the brink of a social upheaval that threatened to sweep all governments into the dust bin of history. The nations were hungry and disillusioned, the masses of people were clamouring for food. Hunger and cold, epidemics and moral savagery were rampant through out the length and breadth of the continent. The armies were tired and were unwilling to fight. Bourgeois culture and all the works of the experts were in ruins. All promises made by the bourgeoisie before the War proved a hallucination. It was at this time that the 3rd International first met in Moscow in the 1st week of March 1919 to urge on the workers and peasants to put an end to this process of disintegration, disorganisation and shattered economic life and to proclaim

revolution from the house—top in order to bring about the rule of the workers and peasants in every country and to reconstruct social, economic life anew.

The Comintern is haunting, as a nightmare, the minds of the bourgeoisie of the world. It is a sharp thorn in the side of the Imperialists because it is the deadliest enemy of Imperialism. This is the reason why a great hue and cry of "subversive propaganda" is being raised now and then against it by the world Imperialism. This is why the various governments have always put in the forefront the question of "propaganda" before having any diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government which by the way has no control over it. This bogey of propaganda is not a new thing. It started with the very inception of the Communist International and perhaps will remain as long as the last vestiges of Imperialism remain.

A great Chinese wall of prejudice, misunderstanding and propaganda has been erected by the Imperialists and capitalists to cut off Soviet Russia from the rest of the world partly because the Head Quarters of the 3rd international happen to be in Moscow, and partly because the success of the Soviet system is spelling the ruin of world Imperialism. All sorts of cock and bull stories are being manufactured by the interested parties including the Prosecution in regard to the relations between the Soviet Russia and the Comintern.

The British bourgeoisie has been taking more prominent part in the crying down of Bolshevik Russia since the General Strike of May 1926, because the Russian workers did not only set a bad example of bringing about the Russian Revolution before the British workers, but also offered them money during the strike. The British Imperialists could not stand the monetary help from the Soviet workers. This is why they have been hurling all sorts of invectives against the Bolsheviks Russia since then.

INVASION OF INDIA BY RUSSIA.

The propaganda that Russia has designs on India is ^{perhaps} almost as old as the hills. Old Czarist Russia was a Empire and like other empires and Imperialist ambitions to increase her spheres of influence still more. It wanted, there is no doubt about it, to annex India and drive out her rival Britain from Hindustan but with the coming in power of the workers' government in Russia, all annexationist designs and ambitions no longer remain. Because Soviet Russia not being an Imperialist power, is not only against setting up empires herself but is also out to destroy all existing

empires which are the causes of innumerable miseries, innumerable sheddings of blood and the enfeathering of the colonial or semi-colonial countries. Any one who says now when the Soviet Power is in the saddle that Bolsheviki Russia has annexationist designs on India is either a fool or a knave or both. For workers' Russia that can, in her internal affairs, grant even the right of separation to the oppressed nationalities—the former colonies of the Czar—that can in her external affairs “solemnly declare to the Turkish and Moslem world her desire to help the Moslem race in its fight for its lost liberties,” whose influence can actually make Afghanistan independent of the British Government and strengthen struggling Turkey—cannot think of attacking and can never attack India. Bolsheviki Russia that can declare “all treaties, conventions and agreements concluded by the late Czarist Government with Russia and tending to the diminution of the rights of the Persian people completely null and void,” that can “resign all rights to the loans furnished to Persia by the Czarist Government and declare such loans null, and not to be repaid; that can after condemning the colonial policy of capitalism hand over to the Persian people, the financial sums, valuables in general, the assets and liabilities of the Discount Credit Bank of Persia, and similarly the moveable and immoveable property of the said Bank existing on the territory of Persia”—cannot look wistfully at India. Further Soviet Russia that can proclaim to China that she rejects all claims to the “Boxer Indemnity” and other special and extra-territorial privileges, that can denounce all treaties of the former Czarist Government with China and can willingly return to China without compensation all Chinese territory seized by the Czar—cannot, can never have any designs on India.

Has any Imperialist power on earth done any such revolutionary things in the history of the world? Is not India being ground down before our very eyes under the Imperialist iron heels, while the Imperialist bourgeoisie in spite of our crying for freedom and equality do not see their way to loosen their iron grip over India. The truth is that there can be no comparison between the revolutionary workers' state and a counter revolutionary Imperialist state.

It is the vested interests in India that are, in spreading such scaremongering stories about Russia, playing the double game of discrediting Bolsheviki Russia in general, and Communism in particular, and that believe that continual mud-throwing will stick somewhere on some body. Unfortunately there is no lack of such fools in India who swallow such capitalistic propaganda and who come to believe that there is a danger of invasion

from Russia. The medical world has not found any remedy for a man who has eyes to see things as they are, but does not see.

In regard to the other speeches I may say that they fairly well represent my views. The reporters have misrepresented me at some places, they have not been able to follow me at others, but I do not see any benefit will accrue if I go into detail to show the discrepancies in the reporting of the speeches. Besides I have no patience for this tedious work. It will be sufficient I think, therefore, for the purpose of the Prosecution and the Court to say that, taking all in all they show my views approximately correctly.

D. 22 5-31.

Q.^a The following miscellaneous items relate to what may be called connections :—P. 146, 433, 458 (already dealt with) 463, 1086, and 1398. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. With regard to P. 146 I do not know how my name happens to be there. The same can be said about the Krantikari office register P. 433, that is to say, I know nothing about it.

I do not know anything about P. 1086.

P. 463.—I did receive some letters from Comrade Muzaffar Ahmad but I cannot say anything about this receipt.

P. 1398.—I remember that there were some books in the Kirti office. They were in charge of Sardar Bhag Singh Canadian.

Q. In your search a number of books and periodicals were found such as P. 884, 895, 895, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 906, 907, 908, 912 and 920. Have you anything to say about these and also about item 27 of P. 883, your Islamabad searchlist.

A. In my Presidential address P. 596 I wrote "I have been greatly pleased to see that the League against Imperialism is trying to organize the Revolutionary workers and the National movements of the Colonial countries on International basis and the importance of its propaganda work can be judged from the fact that the literature produced by it has been proscribed under the Sea Customs' Act by the Government of India."

BOOKS ETC.

Two lists of books and papers proscribed and prohibited from entering India by the British Government had been exhibited in the Lower Court by the Prosecution. I mean Exhs. nos. P. 2489 and P. 2490. By reading these exhibits any man of ordinary intellect can come to the conclusion that the Indian Government

have banned Communist Literature in India and do not wish that anybody should acquaint himself with the Communist theory even from the social logical point of view, let alone the spread of Communism in India. Why? Because in the opinion of the Government. "There is none more generally hostile to reconstruction than the doctrine and the practice of Communism," and further because "even if it were a mere theory I do not think that its propagation should be allowed to continue unchecked." (Sir James Crerar in the Asserably Debate on Public Safety Bill on 10th September 1928).

This shows the Government's attitude towards Communist theory and principles. It is, therefore, no surprise for us that all publications issued by or emanating from (a) the Communist International or (b) any organisation affiliated to or controlled by or connected with the Communist International have been prohibited from entering India once for all. Not only that. The Imperialist Government cannot tolerate any propaganda even against Imperialism for they have prohibited from entering India "any literature emanating from the League against Imperialism" under the Sea Customs' Act.

In plain words this means that the British Government do not permit the Indians to know anything about Communism and Imperialism and they want to keep us quite in the dark in regard to Russia where the socialist order is being built up and where the Russian workers and peasants are enjoying the benefits of the revolution that they brought about on November 7, 1917 to emancipate themselves from the yoke of Imperialism. This is why none is allowed, even if one applies for a passport to go to Russia to see things for himself. It means that the people of India should learn and take their politics and views from the Anglo-Indian papers or from books written by the Loyalists who sing pacons to the Imperialist Government and that we should not see the other side of the medal or should not form any views other than those of the possessing class because it is only lukewarm criticism that is being permitted by the Imperialist Government. Any book that exposes the true character of Imperialism and Capitalism, any paper or pamphlet that paints the "Steel Frame" in its true colours is put under the ban. There is no freedom of speech or freedom of press or freedom of association in India. If these elementary rights of citizenship were prevalent in India we would not have been in the dock today. Harmless books like "India in bondage" by Dr. Sunderland of America and "Bharat man angreziraj." by B. Sunder Lal-books which criticize the British Government in a lukewarm way have been placed on the index, what to speak of the Communist books. In reality the long and short of this case is to ban Communism in India. That is why we find so many books being proscribed and prohibited by the British Government from

entering India. That is why we have Press Ordinances and Press Acts. The Government stands in the way of the development of our intellects even, because it teaches us intellectual dishonesty by allowing us only to feed on rotten Loyalist stuff and not permitting us to read books newspapers and pamphlets that question the very existence of this Government and the prevalent order of things. Having all means of propaganda (church, college, press and theatre etc.) at its disposal and throttling the little of the anti-Government propaganda that exists, the Government has succeeded in completely poisoning the minds of the people in India by dangling before their eyes the so-called "benefits of the British Raj." But we, to our cost, know what these benefits of the British Raj are and what they mean.

No lover of Independence, no believer in freedom of opinion will tolerate complacently this state of affairs and things. Government wants to keep us in ignorance because ignorance of a people gives a long lease of life to a tyrannical Government. I think, some proscribed books have been found in my possession. I admit that they are mine. I perhaps knew that they were proscribed but still I was possessing them, because I believe that they were proscribed under tyrannical laws, because I think that by proscribing these books the Government wants to dictate only those opinions to the people that are to its liking and that prolong its span of life. Fortunately or unfortunately I have a knack of disobeying all those rules, regulations, orders and laws that stand in the way of forming my own opinions and doing my own thinking. I think that it is the right and duty of every man to do his own thinking and form his own opinion and in order to do this he should have free access to every book that he likes. We know that all the powers of the Church including those of the Inquisition could not stop the champions of Research and Inquiry from finding out the truth according to their lights though every book that was not in accord and consonance with the Bible was put on the Index.

~~Dt. 22-5-31 (Morning part II)~~

"During the middle ages, Popes and priests used to prescribe books for the people so that they might stick to those very ideas (given in those prescribed books) and might not be able to think anything for themselves. These Popes and priests regarded the people as fools and wanted to keep them entangled in such views as might not enable them to get rid of their slavery. But can the young men bear such a humiliation and act upon the selfish counsels of the Government in this age." (P. 207 T).

None has been able in the past to suppress the spirit of inquiry and investigation, none will be able to do so in future, all

tortures, sentences and hangings notwithstanding. I should say that we may be crushed by tyrants but no tyrant can crush the doctrines that we believe in because they are powerful enough to tide over all difficulties and obstacles that beset their party in the long run to crush those very tyrants.

The late Mr. Langford James in the opening Address before the Lower Court ~~defence~~ ^{defended} the functions of the State, as looked at by an ordinary man, thus:—

“Any ordinary person who thinks about the State, regards it as an institution which....is there to guard the liberties and rights of all the citizens in the State and see to the best of its ability that they all get fair play and equal treatment”.

Now any worker or peasant with an ordinary intellect, from his experience, and to his cost, knows that the modern bourgeois state is not the guardian of the interests and “rights of all the citizens.” It is a class State and is only the guardian of the interests of the bourgeoisie. Not only that. It is a very good tool in the hands of the bourgeois class that can use it just as it suits it against anybody. It is only the hangers-on of imperialism who draw glowing pictures of the impartiality of the State in order to gull the masses. The bourgeois State is a bourgeois State, notwithstanding the smoke screen of law and law courts throws down to cover its nakedness.

The quint-essence of this book “State and revolution” (P. 900) is the refutation of the idea that the State is above class and looks after the interests of all the citizens. The State is, whatever be said by the apologists of Imperialism the product and manifestation of the irreconcilability of classes. It is the instrument of the ruling capitalist hierarchy for the oppression and exploitation of the toiling millions. To have control of the State is to have the monopoly of violence, for the State consists, in the main of special bodies of armed and unarmed men (army, navy, police, prisons and judiciary etc.,) who act only in the interests of the ruling Imperialist class and always against the oppressed class. The State therefore is an instrument of an organised force and as such can only be captured and overthrown by revolutionary violence of the Proletariat. The State is used for the oppression and exploitation of the Proletariat and peasantry who will eventually when objective and economic conditions demand it, capture it and with the overthrow of the State machine, Imperialism and capitalism will finally and irretrievably be overthrown. This is how the Marxists look at the State. Being a Marxist I accept these views.

In the “Proletarian Revolution” (P. 1898) Lenin shows how Kautsky has distorted and adulterated the Marxian doctrine of the

dictatorship of the Proletariat and how he dreams of the attainment of full power by the Proletariat "peacefully that is in a democratic way", thus turning a renegade to Marxism. This theoretician of the Second international paints bourgeois democracy in rosy colours and obscures the question of the Proletarian Revolution. Lenin castigates him for so doing and shows that bourgeois democracy while constituting a great historical advance in comparison with feudalism, nevertheless remains and cannot but remain a very limited, a very hypocritical institution a paradise for the rich and a trap, a delusion for the exploited and for the poor. Just as we know today, to our cost, that the rule of the bourgeoisie is in reality the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie i. e. to say an authority maintained by the bourgeoisie by means of force over and against the Proletariat and not bound by even bourgeois laws so will the Proletarian dictatorship, after the revolution, be an authority maintained by the Proletariat by means of revolutionary force over and against the bourgeoisie and not bound by any laws. This is the sum and substance of this book. I of course subscribe to these views.

The book "Marx Lenin and Science of Revolutions (P.1920) is a criticism of Marxian theory and philosophy. The Prosecution have exhibited it because the words Marx, ^{and} Lenin, Science of Revolution form the title of this book. If they had taken care to read it they could have found that this book could not serve their purpose. This book is ^{not} a Science of revolution but a Science, if at all, of something else than Revolution. This book is such that it will go to throw cold water on the revolutionary enthusiasm and exuberance of those who are not well grounded in Marxian dialectics. The author accuses Marx of "inconsistency" and says that whatever Marx wrote about theoretical matters had "vague obscurity" about it. He dubs the writings of Marx as "metaphysical and religious" and opines that "Materialism of Marx is not materialistic" at all. He calls in question the well-known statement of Marx in the Communist Manifesto that "All past history, with the exception of primitive stages was the history of class struggles" and stigmatises it as "this obviously preposterous assertion." In one word, the burden of this book is that Marxism is no philosophy at all, it is only a "purposive thought".

One feels tempted to write another book to refute this book from the Marxian standpoint. But this is not the place to do anything of the sort. The Prosecution have also abused Marxism as "fantastic" "antiquated" and "grotesque". My answer to the Prosecution as well as the author of this book is this.

There is no need to refute the critics of Marx. History refutes them. Even while they pen their last lines to their

"Critical Examination", they find themselves having to pack up their bags before the gathering storm of the Collapse and the Revolution. The very language of the Press, the very speeches of the statesman become unconsciously Marxian. A hundred ~~ten~~ times "disproved" and discredited by critics whose names are now only known to Marxian students, for half a ^{Century} ~~Country~~ declared "obsolete and antiquated" by theorists whose writings already carry about them the flavour of Pre-war antiquity, a thousand times denied and watered down by faint hearted followers afraid to break with bourgeois learning and prejudice—today Marx stands master in the modern world—the key to its interpretation and the power that moves it.

Modern India (P. 884) is an analysis of (1) the causes of poverty of the Indian masses (2) of the loot and plunder of India by British Government and (3) of the rôle of the bourgeois nationalist reformist movement. It says that historically the plunder of India during the 17th and 18th centuries was one of the principal sources of primitive accumulation which made the development of capitalism in Britain and the industrial revolution possible. The control of India is the key-stone of the British Imperialism. It shows that the mass of the Indian people, the peasants and industrial workers, constituting 9/10th of the people are held at present under a double yoke. There is (1) the Imperialist domination of the British bourgeoisie who control the apparatus of Government and subject the people to the exploitation. Large scale British Capital through the mechanism of taxation, finance and banking, loans and debts, the ownership of the railways, of the greater part of the industrial enterprises, of the plantations and mines and the operation of the large importing companies. Then in addition, there are the Indian landlords and the bourgeoisie, ruling princes, merchants, manufacturers lawyers, small traders and moneylenders who prey upon the people under the aegis of the British Govt. and exact their share of the spoils. From this double yoke arresting social development, follows the intense poverty and misery of the mass of the Indian people who have been reduced to the lowest level of any country in the world.

This double yoke under which the Indian people are held, makes also the exceptional difficulty of their fight to free themselves. They have to fight both the Imperialist exploiters and their own exploiters and in fact increasingly a united front of both. The Indian bourgeoisie has played a double rôle. On the one hand, they naturally grudge the lion's share of the Imperialist exploiters and their own inferior position, and would not be averse to securing the whole spoils for themselves if that were possible, or at any rate to making use of popular agitation to secure a better bargain for

themselves. On the other hand if there is any sign of a popular movement feebly developing, such as would inevitably endanger also their own privileges and position, they at once draw in their horns and hasten to the side of the Imperialist bourgeoisie and to its guns for protection. Thus the Indian bourgeoisie step forward on the one hand as the true spokesman and representatives of the national cause, calling on the people to follow them in the name of the national unity and freedom and forget all class distinctions. But as soon as a crisis comes and their property is endangered they speedily sacrifice the national cause to their class interests and line up with the Imperialists in a common counter revolutionary front. The treacherous role of the Indian bourgeoisie gives rise to the essential problem of the Indian national movement. Mr. Gandhi is only the mouthpiece of the Bourgeoisie. He cannot cut himself loose from the upper class interests and prejudices in which he has been brought up. He can only regard the workers as instruments of Labour to be kept in their proper place. This view he has expressed many times in his speeches. His phraseology of 'non-violence' is only in reality a cover conscious or unconscious for class interests and the maintenance of class relations of power. In fact Mr. Gandhi, from the workers' view point, is the agent of the Indian Bourgeoisie and stands between India and revolution.

The book shows that the only way of making the National Revolution successful is to base it on the workers and the peasants with a political and social programme expressing the interests of the masses. The Indian workers are rapidly showing themselves the leading political force of the coming stage in India. It is they who in alliance with the peasants will build up the Indian Commonwealth of the future.

The author makes out a good case before the British workers to support and help forward the political and social organisations of the Indian masses. Previously the subjection and the poverty of the Indian masses was one of the concealed basis of the higher standard of the British workers. Today an opposite process is developing with extreme rapidity. The industrialisation of India under British control—to-day India is officially classified as one of the eight leading industrial nations of the world—means that British Capital, in proportion as the home position becomes difficult, is using its control of cheap labour in India to open up enterprises there and under-cut the British workers and thus on the basis of this competition to lower wages at home. Signs of this process are visible in iron, steel, and jute. In consequence the hastening of the Indian emancipation and the weakening of British ~~domination~~ in India, have become an urgent and immediate concern for the British working class and every day this alliance of interest is becoming more widely understood.

The author therefore urges in the first place on the British Workers to clearly declare their unqualified recognition of the right of the Indian people to govern themselves and their opposition to any policy of armed force to hold India in subjection. In the second place they should assist the Indian workers in organising them politically and socially, not merely on a programme of limited economic aims but on a programme of full social and political freedom. In the third place, the British Workers should fight for full rights of organisation and propaganda for the Indians. He further exposes the Labour Government as lackeys of Imperialism and for introducing new measures of repression. Bengal special ordinances, the butchering of the Indian people, the Cawnpore (and now Meerut) cases are only the few cases in the innumerable black deeds of the Labour Government. P. 897.—'India and the Next War' consists of some articles by Miss Agnes Smedley and published in the 'Weekly People' of ~~Labour~~ ^{Labour} and the Daily Forward of Calcutta. It was I who collected them and got them printed in the book form. The initiative was purely mine and mine alone. I being against the war had launched the anti-war propaganda. These articles appealed to me. I thought it would serve our purpose better if I would publish them in the book form and sell them at the cost price. I contributed a small foreward to this book also, the responsibility of which I fully bear.

The growth of armaments in European countries is going on with feverish speed. Any man who knows anything of the world knows this fact perfectly well. Every country spending a tremendous proportion of its Annual Budget on the preparations of war. All the talk about the outlawry of war is simply to humbug the ignorant masses. All peace pacts all anti-war meetings of the League of Nations (which in parenthesis is a League of the Imperialists to perpetuate the slavery of the Colonial people that have fallen a prey to them) and all disarmament proposals are merely to lull to sleep the fury of the people against war. It is not the Communists alone who are talking about the coming war. Any man who reads papers daily knows that even the Bourgeoisie themselves are seeing it coming in seven league boots.

Imperialism, the monopolist stage of Capitalism, sharpens all the contradictions of Capitalism to such an extent that peace becomes but a breathing spell for new wars. The surface of the earth and its economic wealth (excepting Proletarian Russia) is almost completely monopolised by a few big powers. The uneven political and economic development of the various countries, however, again and again creates the necessity for a new division of the world. In the last analysis, this cannot take place except through wars waged by the decisive Imperialist countries against

one another. At the same time, however, the exploitation of the hundreds and millions of Proletarians and Colonial slaves can be maintained only by bloody wars of oppression.

War is inseparable from Capitalism. From this it follows that the abolition of war is possible only through the abolition of Capitalism that is through the overthrow of the Bourgeois class of exploiters. All other theories and proposals, however realistic they may claim to be, are nothing but a deception calculated to perpetuate exploitation and war.

I have touched upon the question of war in my Presidential address to the A. I. W. P. P Conference Calcutta P 596 and the second Naujawan Bharat Shabha Lahore P 2070. I took prominent part in celebrating 'the Friends of Russia Week' in Amritsar (P 1910 T). Besides a resolution against war preparations was moved by me in the Calcutta Conference the text of which reads, "This Conference protests against the policy of encirclement and preparation for war pursued with increased vigour by the British Government against the U. S. S. R. and warns the working class against the disastrous consequences economic and political to India and also the Worker's Republic and throughout the world."

This Conference calls upon all organisations to conduct a country wide propaganda and protest against the war policy and to prepare for direct action by the workers in the event of a war."

I want to explain all these speeches as under:—

The last war was a war to gain colonies. It was at the same time a war with the aid of the colonies. To an unprecedented extent the population of the colonies was drawn into the European War. Indians and all the Colonial people battled on the European continent—what for? for the right to remain slaves of England and France?

The British Government made as many promises as black berries. The masses were told that that would be the last war and after conquering it 'Democracy' would prevail and prosperity would come to all. The peasants did form then and do form now the bulk of all the armies. They went to the trenches over seas to fight the battles of the Bourgeoisie and the Capitalists, and were killed in their tens of thousands in the different theatres of the world war. The war was won for the predatory sharks of Imperialist Bourgeoisie after spilling rivers of blood. But what did it bring to the millions Prosperity? No, nothing of the sort. On the other hand it brought misery and poverty in the shape of increased taxes, increased national debts, with increase in prices in manu-

factured goods. Did it bring Democracy to the masses? Not at all, they are denied uptill now the right of voting. The White terror has increased. The country is being ruled by ordinances. The political and economic oppression has passed all previous limits.

The peasants fought and shed their blood in the hope that their condition would get better but it has gone from bad to worse. Now they realise, when the hypnotism of war hysteria is over, that they were hoodwinked by the Imperialist Bourgeoisie during that time. The after effects of this world slaughter have opened their eyes and given them a rude shaking. The revolutionary consciousness that they have been acting as the tools of the Imperialists uptill now is growing within them apace. They now realise that while other people were out to get rid of Imperialism, they were working as hired lackeys of Imperialism to crush those peoples and perpetuate predatory Imperialism. Now it has dawned upon them that Imperialism is no less an enemy of theirs as it is of the other people. They went to China and throttled the Chinese freedom. They helped in crushing many strikes of the workers who were out to establish their rights and better their economic conditions. Now they realise that they have been playing into the enemies' hands.

During the war many revolutionary changes took place in the Governments of many countries. Many kings were dethroned and in many countries Democratic Governments were set up. The workers and peasants of many lands stood aloof and opposed the war tooth and nail. In many countries revolutions took place. In Russia the workers and peasants after a long drawn out struggle took over the reins of the most tyrannical Government and established a Workers' and Peasants' Government. This all has caused the peasants to think that this Capitalistic and Imperialistic system is not a permanent one and since it is crushing them with all sorts of burdens, the sooner it leaves the stage, the better would it be for them. The class conscious peasants hope in future never to be party to the perpetuation of this tyrannical system.

Now preparations are again being made for another world war. Imperialism cannot flourish without wars. This time, most probably, the war will be against Soviet Russia, because Workers' and Peasants' Russia is a thorn in the flesh of the Bourgeoisie of the world. The class conscious peasants and workers look upon Soviet Russia as their father land because it is there that the first worker's and peasant's Government has been established, it is there that the workers and peasants are ruling in complete harmony; it is there that the workers and peasants have driven away the landlords and capitalists and taken in their hands all the land and

means of production. Russian revolution has set before the workers and the peasants of the world an ideal to live for and die for. It inspires them to do deeds of dash and daring, and they are not only hoping to establish a Workers' and Peasants' state in every country but are also ready to spill their last drop of blood for saving it from the attacks of foreign predatory powers.

In this epoch of revolutions, the Russian Revolution will always shine as a beacon light in the history of the world. It will always show a path to revolution and victory, to those who want to establish the Communist society on earth. It will enthuse workers and peasants to work for revolution to bring about their own government. Therefore they cannot hence forward help any predatory power to attack and crush Soviet Russia.

P. 895 and P. 896: I borrowed these papers from the editor of the Kirti and took them home. I do not know where from they came and how they came.

P. 899: This book was found in my possession and I subscribe to the views described therein.

P. 901. This book was found also in my possession. It gives a good account of the General Strike of the British Workers from the Marxian standpoint. This book belongs to the Kirti Library and was borrowed by me from Sardar Bhag Singh.

P. 906. This book was sent for review from the Partap Cawnpore Office and afterwards it was put in the Kirti Library. I had taken it home to read it.

P. 907. This book also I borrowed from the Kirti Library.

P. 908. As far as I remember this book was sent to us for review but unfortunately no review was published.

P. 912. I do not know anything about this except that these papers were lying in the Office of the Editor and I took them home to read. I do not know anything further than this.

Q. P. 1897 P, P. 1898 and P. 1899 are 3 articles by M. N. Roy addressed to Durbar and Co., alleged to have been meant for Kirti. Have you anything to say about these.

A. I do not know anything about P 1897 P.

I never saw it before nor do I know anything about Bhai Ishwar Singh referred to in this letter. I do not know anything about the other two exhibits also.

Q. Is there anything further with which I have omitted to deal or about which you wish to say anything ?

A. In order to answer the question whether I conspired with all or some of the other accused to deprive the King Emperor of his sovereignty in India, fully, it is necessary to split the question in two parts (1) Whether I conspired with all or some of the accused and (2) to deprive the King Emperor of his sovereignty of India. I take first part (1) about conspiracy. What does a conspiracy mean to a man in the street. A conspiracy means dark corner meetings, with vengeance and murder on the lips of those who take part in them. It means secret whispering and underhand dealings in some underground dens. It means manufacturing of bombs and procuring of firearms by clandestine methods and last but by no means the least it means attempting the lives of individuals, having sympathy or connection with the Government in order to terrify or overawe the Government with a view to wrest some reforms from it.

Now the evidence that has been laid by the Prosecution against me before the Court goes to show that I am not guilty of any of these things and rightly so for I have attended no dark corner meetings and have murdered nobody. Not even a blunt axe was found with me at the time of my search, let alone firearms. Nor was I caught red-handed with bombs in my hands attempting on the life of some official. In fact I came of my own free will to get myself arrested, knowing full well through the good offices of a friend that my house was surrounded by the police and they wanted me. But I had no consciousness of guilt of any sort and came a way from the fields where I had gone for a walk and courted arrest. How truthful the Prosecution witnesses are, can be seen from the simple fact that they did not see their way to admit in so many words that I came of my own accord to get myself arrested.

The charge of conspiracy against me is false. In fact whatever I ^{was} doing was open and above board. Communists do not hide their opinions but trumpet them forth from the house-tops. There is nothing about me that is secret from or unknown to the Government. Whether I stayed at home or went outside, I was day and night, and night and day shadowed by the ubiquitous C. I. D. Whether I went to Mahalpur or Rohtak whether I went to far off Calcutta and Jamshedpur I was followed like a shadow not only by the C. I. D. men but by the Government reporters as well.

There was not a single meeting addressed by me that was not reported. Almost all my speeches have been brought here

in the Court. Every man that met me and talked with me was daily reported by the watch-dogs of the Government. There were some four or five C. I. D. men who would sit day in and day out before the Kirti Office. Even if I went to the bazar to buy something they were dogging my steps there too. Even in my village Chetanpur they had spies. My going to and coming from the village was duly reported. There is nothing that the ubiquitous C. I. D. did not know about me. They even knew what I ate in the morning and what in the evening. Not only that. They were censoring my correspondence very minutely. Not a single letter of mine escaped the argus-eyed C. I. D. Even letters from and to my wife, sister and near relatives were opened, read and perhaps photographed. They have not brought those letters here for obvious reasons. But it goes without saying that they were prying into them and perhaps keeping copies of some of them, if not of all of them.

It is known to the Court that I along with other accused have committed no criminal overt act. The late Prosecution Counsel Mr. Langford James admitted that fact in the lower court as well as before this court in the opening of this case. But the Prosecution alleges that at the time of the revolution I along with the other accused "will kill off the bourgeoisie." Revolution is in the womb of the future. When it will take place I do not know what I will do. Perhaps I will kill off the bourgeoisie perhaps I will not.

This killing or not killing depends on the situation then. It is mere speculation at this time when there is no revolution, on the part of the Prosecution as well as mine, to say that we will do this or we will do that. A mere repetition of the formula of "depriving the King Emperor of his sovereignty in India" does not and can not make a conspiracy. It is just like the story of a man who did not believe in ghosts but he was persistently asked by the spiritualists to believe in and think of them and he will come to have a full faith in them. He did come by the persistent efforts of the spiritualists to believe in ghosts. So is the Prosecution spiritualist doing by the repetition of the formula of depriving etc. etc. to make the Court and the world believe that there existed a big conspiracy in India. I have no illusions on the point that the Court will—I doubt very much whether the world also will—come to believe the Prosecution story—that I along with the other accused did conspire to deprive the King Emperor etc. etc. and had it not been for the good offices of the all-pervading C. I. D., rivers of blood would have flowed in India and perhaps India would have been lost to the British. The truth is that there was no conspiracy at all just as there are no ghosts in the world. This case is simply

fore-stalling an enemy in the growth of the workers' and peasants' movement and under one pretext or another depriving the working class of their best friends who were out to give them a new ideology to free themselves. This is the whole truth. All this talk about the conspiracy etc. has no leg to stand on and is merely done to throw dust in the eyes of the unwary public. Therefore the charge of entering into a conspiracy etc. is absurd and false on the face of it and has no truth at all.

As regards part (2) of this question i.e. depriving the King Emperor of his sovereignty in India I want to say that a Communist does not bother his head about what kings' rule but what classes rule. Individual rulers do not count with him at all. It is a class that rules that counts with him. A Communist will never dethrone any individual king and set up another in his stead but will certainly have in mind the dethronement of Imperialism and Capitalism and the replacing of them by workers' and peasants' governments, the world over. He will certainly like to deprive the Imperialists and the capitalists of their sovereignty of the world and set up the sovereignty of the workers and peasants the world over. I want to tell the Court that I am not in favour of installing a king in India or some where else. I am a Marxist and the Marxists cannot believe in kingship and monarchy. After studying history I have come to the conclusion that kings are drones in society and they live on and by the exploitation of the poor people. Historically speaking they are a hindrance to the growth of the political, social and economic conditions. That is why I said in my speech Ex. P 1911 T. "Sometimes there was the age of the feudal lords and sometimes of the kings. Now all ages will end. The present is the age of the workers," and Ex. P 1904 T. "The persons who know my views know already that I am totally against kings. We do not want kings, nor should we allow any body to become a king. We want to cut the roots of capitalism. That is why I have so often expressed my opinion that the Indian States be abolished and along with them the puppet kings of those states who dance attendance on the Imperialist bourgeoisie.

D/-23-5-31.

I am in favour of the complete transformation of society. I stand for the cleansing of the Augean stables of all elements of Feudalism, Imperialism and all other kinds of slavery in society. I am therefore of opinion that there should be no kings on earth. Even Republicans and Democrats, the world over, are of the same opinion, though perhaps for different reasons. That is to say they do not believe in kingship and monarchy. I am here not talking of the special brand of the so called Democrats

who adhere to Democracy and still hold that there is no harm in having a king as an ornamental figure.

Kings were the product of the Feudal system of production. As soon as the feudal system of production comes to an end and is superseded by a Capitalist system the death warrant of kingship and monarchy is signed. But it does not die with the supersession of the feudal system at once. It struggles for its existence and dies hard. But there is no doubt about this that sooner or later it does leave the stage as it has done in many countries during and after the world war. Just as feudal system and monarchy are replaced by Capitalism and Bourgeois Democracy so will one day Capitalism and Bourgeois Democracy be replaced by Communism and Proletarian Democracy. This is what the Marxists believe and this is what I believe. Kingship and Feudalism are in reality an anachronism in this epoch of Proletarian revolutions.

Having expressed my views on Feudalism, Kingship and monarchy I admit that I did celebrate Lenin Days, May Days, I did join the demonstrations against Simon Commissions and other tyrannical acts of British Imperialism; I did deliver many speeches and hold some Conferences to expose British Imperialism in India but these opinions and acts of mine do not constitute a conspiracy and I have done nothing so far to deprive the King Emperor of his Kingdom in India.

No case of conspiracy is and can be made out against me on the basis of what has been brought against me in this Court. Hence there cannot be any chance of my conviction under this charge in any impartial court but the court that I have to face unfortunately is not an impartial one. It is a Bourgeois class court and there can be no question of justice being given to a Proletarian like myself. The only case that could be started, if at all, against me was that of sedition under section 124 A. I have no hesitation in admitting that I have delivered fairly strong speeches but I make bold to say that if freedom of opinion and freedom of speech be allowed in India then no case under that section even can be started. Unfortunately ours is a land where freedom of opinion, liberty of speech and other elementary rights of men are unknown. Any section therefore is handy for a Government that is out to crush our movement the workers and the peasants at the point of the bayonet.

REASONS OF STARTING THIS CASE.

(The Court objects to the relevance of this). The most important question of all questions is what are the motives that compelled the Government to launch this case. I have racked my brain to know the real motives underlying this trial. I have come to believe that

British Government started this case not because there was any conspiracy existing in India but because there were certain "reasons of state" for so doing. We are merely the victims of those reasons of state.

Firstly taking a bird's eye-view of the case one can know at once that the years 1927-28 were the years of the acute development of the Labour Movement in India. The class struggle was getting intensified. The National Movement in this period was at its lowest ebb. The leaders who were Nationalists through and through a few years ago had taken a complete somersault and become communalists now. The Hindu and Muslim fights were at their highest. The news of the riots between the Hindus and the Mohammadans was the order of the day. Imperialism felt quite safe and was laughing in its sleeves, being proud of its doings because it knows very well that an effective method of keeping India in bondage is the creation of strifes between the various religions, above all between Muslims and Hindus. In this period of tension the workers whether Hindus or Muslims, Christians or Sikhs were completely united in demanding as one man of their employers that their grievances be removed and wages increased. Their interests being one and the same the Hindu-Muslim question could not affect them in any way though certain religious fanatics made efforts to sow dissensions there too. These two years were the years of strikes and of class struggle. The Government was viewing the Labour Movement with alarm and had used lathi charges and bullets at many places to put a check to this movement. Many workers were killed at various places but the movement was gathering volume by leaps and bounds. The Government gave its policy away when its mouth piece Sir James Crerar on 10th September 1928 moving the Public Safety Bill in the Assembly said, "but it may be said that there is no urgent necessity for any measure of this kind to deal with them (that is Communists). The view of the Government on that point is simply this, that they (the Government) cannot accept the responsibility of allowing the present state of affairs to continue unchecked even for a few months or a few weeksand that it would be in excusable folly and the dereliction of duty on their part to wait until mischief very hard to remedy had been wrought."

"The fundamental question is this whether the avowed objects and expedients of the Communist doctrine and activities are to be taken seriously or not. My contention is that they must be taken seriously and *dealt with without delay*".

It is as clear as noon day from the above that the Government was intent upon crushing this movement. Sir James Crerar

went so far as to say that "even if it (Communism) were a mere theory, I do not think that its propagation should be allowed to continue unchecked". After this the Viceroy left no doubt when he said at the end of 1928 "while every allowance must be made for the genuine grievances which the labouring classes feel, there can be no doubt that the un-rest of the past years has been due in no small measure to the activities of certain persons whose end is rather to promote anti-social purposes than to secure the betterment of the Workmen's lot. A disquieting spread of the methods of Communism has for some time been causing my Government anxiety.....All classes alike are threatened by the spread of these doctrines and no Government can afford to ignore this insidious danger." In order to avoid this 'insidious danger' it was necessary to arrest labour leaders. Small wonder then, that after a short time we were arrested and brought all the way here to stand our trial in this Meerut Conspiracy.

Secondly the Imperialist Capitalists of Calcutta Bombay and Madras were forcing the hands of the Government to take some immediate action against those who were, in their view, instrumental in organising labour and peasantry and bringing about strikes etc: They had passed resolutions in their British Chambers of Commerce demanding the removal of non-Indians from India. Not only had they supported the Government in a body on the Public Safety Bill but they also admitted tacitly, if not expressly, in the Assembly that they had, "instigated the Government to take some action against Spratt and Bradley". They went so far brazen-facedly to say "we consider that the Communist the Bolshevik Englishman is one who has fore-gone all claims of national consideration" (Sir Victor Sassoon in the Assembly). The workers were going out of their hands. Company Unionism—their pet child—was being replaced by fighting Trade Unionism. Their profits were dwindling down on account of strikes and demands of the workers for higher wages. These were the reasons because of which they wanted "the Government to be in a position to break up this organisation before it has been able to establish itself, before it has been able to teach our Indian fellow citizens how to carry on this poisonous work." (Sir Victor Sassoon).

And any man who knows anything about Imperialism and its underhand methods of doing things, knows all well how the Governments dance to the tune of these Imperialist Bourgeoisie. How they succeeded in their nefarious attempts goes without saying. This is the second reason of our being here in the dock.

Thirdly the discussion on the Public Safety Bill revealed that all the members of the Assembly whether Capitalists, Nationalists, Extremists or Liberals, though opposed to the passage of

this Bill and the giving of special powers to the Government were not opposed to any action being taken by the Government against those who were Communists, Indian or English, or who held Communist views. This fact emerged out of the debate quite clearly. The National members were unwilling to support the Bill but at the same time they made it quite clear that there will be no objection or opposition from their side, if under the existing law these men be arrested and got rid of. Some members went to the length of suggesting sections from the existing law under which the Communists could be arrested.

Leaving aside the less known nationlists, I give the opinion of Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya and the late Pandit Moti Lal Nehru. This is what Pandit Malviya said "I have said before that we are at one with the Government in desiring and willing to give Government every assistance, legitimate and lawful assistance to shut out the kinds of Communist activities indicated in the clause 2 (a) of the Bill" (Assembly Debates 1st September 1928). "In fact we know of no cases except this Allahabad (he means Cawnpore Communist conspiracy Case) trial which ended successfully in conviction. But there may be others. If so by all means try them.....but under Regulation III of 1918 nothing indeed be done. You have simply to take hold of the man and do as you please with him", said Pt. Moti Lal Nehru. Many other Nationalist Members of the Assembly went even further than this. But I do not want to waste the time of the Court in giving more quotations. Suffice it to say that the Government took the hint, after the refusal of the members to pass the Public Safety Bill into law to deport Comrades Spratt and Bradley, cooked up a huge conspiracy and arrested us under this charge.

The last but by no means the least reason of our arrests is the last British General Election which was to take place in May 1929. In the former Election the Conservatives had come to power on the strength of the notorious Zinovieff Letter which was published just on the eve of the Election resulting in their victory and which has been proved to be a forgery since then. Mr. Macdonald himself declared on March 1928 that the Letter "was a deliberately planned and devised concoction of deceit, fitted artfully for the purpose of deceiving the public and to influence the Election. That it played a major part in the verdict, no one will deny. That it was a fraudulent one, few will dare to deny."

In order to return to power again the Conservatives were on the look-out to stage a sensational Election stunt this time too. This was foreshadowed by the British Labour Press before our arrests. The Sunday Worker had published in unequivocal terms

in February 1929 that the Conservatives would do something sensational and would round up many men in India in order to remain in the saddle for one term more. The psychological effect of a sensational thing done at an opportune moment is admitted on all hands. There were less than two months left for the General Election. In order to catch votes from the British voters it was necessary to theatrically bring home to them that there was a great "Communist danger in India" which could only be averted if the Conservatives would remain in power. Hence our arrests and a crop of Red Letter threatening the lives of the officials immediately following our arrests-all propaganda meant for consumption for the British Electorate.

But the stunt failed the Conservatives because they did not succeed in the General Election. The Labourers with Mr. Macdonald, the leader of the 2nd International-as their Prime Minister came into power. The case started by the Conservatives for catching votes continued in order not to "break the continuity of the Government Policy". After the coming of the Labour Government into power this case became the prosecution of the 3rd International by the 2nd International.

To sum up there was no conspiracy at all. Only the "Red Peril" was haunting the unhinged mind of the Government. In order to remove that so called Red Peril, they, in arresting us, struck a blow at the elementary rights of the people and in order to justify that action, in the eyes of the world they trumped up this charge of conspiracy and foisted it upon us. This move in reality is taken to proscribe and stamp out Marxism and Communism in India. There can be no other motive than this in starting this case.

These are the reasons, in a nutshell, that conspired to foist this conspiracy upon us. In one word this is a case launched by those who own private property and who believe in a society based on private property against those who do not believe in private property and who think that private property is the cause of our ills.

At the very outset the Prosecution showed by their behaviour, by issuing statements to the Press, after locking us behind the bars, that their purpose in launching this case against us was nothing but propaganda against Communism, propaganda against Marxian philosophy and theory and propaganda against Soviet Russia. They tried to make Communists out as very dangerous persons whom every "normal" man should dread and hate. In this propagandist address with which he opened this case before the lower court the late Prosecution Counsel Mr. Langford James

said " To be a Bolshevik of unimpeachable character you require certain definite qualifications to which an ordinary man does not aspire. You do not love your country, you are anti-country, you are anti-God and you are anti-family. In fact a Bolshevik of unimpeachable character is anti every thing which the normal man considers decent".

In propagandist statements like this and in every other way they tried their utmost to prejudice public opinion against us. They left no stone unturned to damn us in the eyes of the public by painting us the Communists in the blackest colour possible. The phrase "armed revolution" was dangled before the eyes of the people without letting them know that the whole case was the prosecution of the Communist opinions and nothing more. They tried every way deliberately to mislead the public so that the people should not show any sympathy with us and throw us over board. So that the case be a smooth sailing. No wonder that that even a prominent lawyer like Pandit Moti Lal Nehru could not understand the real nature of the case and was easily taken in by the propaganda of the Prosecution. In a long letter of which I quote a very small passage to the Pioneer of May 23, 1929 he wrote "The question whether there is in India a wide-spread secret movement to murder Government officials and those who help them will soon come up for judicial decision in the Meerut Conspiracy Case. I refrain from expressing any opinion on the matter." If Pandit Moti Lal Nehru a lawyer of great legal acumen and talents can be gulled by the Prosecution propaganda what about the man in the street? Can he understand the implication of this case?

The truth is that the Prosecution was creating such psychology amongst the people which would help them to condemn us without any fuss from outside. The success of this propaganda was seen when Mr. K. F. Nariman our defence lawyer received a letter from some body warning him not to defend the "murderers" of Meerut. This psychology still retains its hold over the people. In such an atmosphere, no one can remain impartial and detached and there can be no hope of any justice from any bourgeois court on earth.

But here the Court and Assessors have their own political opinions on all subjects that are the matters of trial in this case and those views will weigh and go a long way with the Court and the assessors one way or the other. I have not yet met a man in my life who is not influenced by his own opinions and therefore evenhanded justice is out of the question.

Now this is a prosecution pure and simple for our Communist views and for our being Communists i.e. to say we are being tried for our politics. Politics is nothing if it is not an expression of the

class antagonisms and class views in society. We have been expressing these class antagonisms and class views outside and that is our whole crime. The Government do not want that these unpalatable views be uttered and they being in power want to suppress these views by hook or by crook. A few books, a few theses and some speeches simply show our opinions nothing more nothing less.

Now these books and pamphlets are very valuable to the Communists. They are not easy to understand. Being replete with technical and scientific terms "they will give headache to any one who tries to read them" said the Prosecution Counsel in the beginning of the case before this Court. Any man reading a few pages from some of these books, if not formerly introduced to this ideology, will certainly be bored-stiffed. It requires a Heroulian efforts to make converts to Communism. Besides to be a communist is not to lie on a bed of roses especially when one is under the British Raj and when sentence deportation, or detention stares you in the face at every moment of your life.

The Prosecution have tried to paint Communism in the worst possible colours. They have torn passages from the context and put their own interpretations on them. They have garbled their meaning and have tried to terrify people by declaiming Communism as the greatest evil on earth. But from our view point this is not so. This is simply a distortion of facts. Communism is based on experience culled from history. It lays down certain truths that are, historically speaking, irrefutable. A Communist can show that violence has been a necessary element in the progress of mankind. He can prove by facts taken from every day life that class struggle is not the figment of the imagination of the Communists but it does exist and sways the opinions of the bourgeoisie as well as the Proletariat one way or the other. He infers from history that just as feudal dictatorship was displaced by the bourgeois dictatorship so one day will bourgeois dictatorship be displaced by Proletarian dictatorship.

The economic conditions of the masses are miserable, indescribably miserable. Their standard of life has reached the utmost limit. The Government knows to levy taxes and its duty ends there. The hunger and famine are stalking through the land. Men are dying in their tens of thousands for want of bare necessities of life. Under the circumstances no White Terror, no Black and Tan or Star Chamber Methods and no amount of conspiracy cases will stop the revolution. These things can put off the revolution for a time but not for all time. The revolution will come, as sure as death, sooner or later, because in the present circumstances the inevitability of the revolution cannot be avoided at any price. And the

sooner the revolution comes the better will it be for the peasantry and the workers for it will wash away the Augean stables in no time and bring prosperity, happiness and social equality to the peasants and workers, thus putting an end to the exploitation of man by man.

We know that our views are spreading rapidly and people are coming to realise that it is socialism alone that will put an end to our miseries and social inequalities. The dawn of better days is coming. There is no doubt that darkness reigns supreme at the present time but it is the darkness just before the dawn. The mother has to suffer from the travails before the birth of a child, so we who want to bring into being a new order, shall have to pass through periods of travail before the advent of the red dawn of the new order. Our cause is just. We stand for social justice and social equality. Even if we are hanged, though there is no chance of a death sentence here, we shall die in the hope that our cause will ultimately triumph irrespective of the opposition and hostility of the powers that be.

One word more and I have done. This whole case is a big query asking us to choose between the opinions expressed in the documents and speeches (which mean in this court a heavy sentence) and release. I shall rather choose a heavy sentence than forego my opinions that are not to the taste of British Imperialism. I realise the nature and seriousness of this case fully well. The case is so serious, so very serious that any man by washing his hands of his former radical opinions and views, by giving an undertaking like Dharamvir that he will not be a Communist, will never ally with them, but on the other hand will abuse them every now and then and by swearing profusely by Bourgeois Reformist Nationalism, can easily get off scot-free. I abhor to buy release like this. Therefore I do not ask the Court to show mercy or give justice to me for I know that to ask for mercy or justice from the British Imperialism, my enemy, is to make a fool of myself. At this time we are in the iron grip of our enemy. Being Realists we willingly admit that he has every right to laugh us, to scorn or to toy with our lives as he pleases. Time may by the inexorable laws of nature come when it will be our turn to have the laugh on our side. In this epoch of revolution, nothing is impossible under the Sun. I therefore challenge the British Imperialism to do its worst, for I believe that no power on earth can crush our movement, because even if crushed it will rise again phoenix-like from its ashes and will crush the British Imperialism, our enemy, in the end. This whole statement that I have given is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth spoken by "honest Mr. Josh." The only thing that remains to be seen is the price that

I shall have to pay for this honesty. With these words I finish my statement.

Q. What about your defence witnesses ?

A. I have not yet consulted with my friends. I will say about this a little later. There is plenty of time yet.

Sd. Sohan Singh Josh

4/6/31

Q. You have read over the above statement more than once and it has been corrected as and where requested by you. Are you now satisfied that the above is a correct record of your statement.

A. Yes.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

4/6/31

Sohan Singh Josh

4/6/31

Certified that the above is a true and full account of the statement of S. S. Josh accused taken down by stenographers in my presence and hearing and corrected as and where requested by the accused and admitted by him to be correct.

L. R. L. Yorké

5/6/31.

Corrected by Puran Chandra

Saraswati Machine Printing Press, Meerut (U. P. India).

No. 14

In the court of R. L. Yorke I. C. S. Addl: Sessions Judge Meerut.

In the case of king Emperor versus P. Spratt and others.

Examination of P. Spratt

accused, under section 342 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, made before me R. L. Yorke Addl: Sessions Judge at Meerut on the 23rd day of May 1931.

My name is Philip Spratt; my father's name is Herbert Henry Spratt; I am an Englishman; 28 years of age; by occupation bookseller; my home is at 80 Waller Road London S. E., I resided at the time of my arrest at 2/r European Asylum Lane, Calcutta.

Q. You heard your statement in the Lower Court P 2597 read out in this Court on 16. 3. 31. Is that statement correct?

A. Yes.

Q. There is the following evidence on record relating to your history prior to coming to India, and in connection with your coming to India, and also showing your activities in correspondence with persons named as co-conspirators in Europe or your connection with them:—Statements of P, W's 16 and 4, P 2357, P 2315, P 2443, P 1950, P 2324, P 1951, P 1952, P 1006, D 371, P 2442, P 1497, P 1498, P 1859, P 2325, P 1953, P 1954, P 2326, P 1499, P 1500, P 1829 series, P 1955, P 2312, P 1828, P 1956, P 1974, P 2327, P 1007, P 2328 series, P 1968, P 1012, P 1008, P 2329, series, P 1009, P 1350 (5), P 1233, P 526 (45), P 2429, P 2430, P 1516, P 1518, P 1519, P 1491 (8), 2433, P 1501, P 1502, P 1503, P 526 (38), 526 (29), 526 (46), 2474 series, 674, 2431 series, 1530, 1531, 2116, P 526 (43), 546 (9), 546 (10), 2259, 2258, 526 (22), 2068, 2002, 2189, 2190, 2402, 2432 (2), 1675, 2192, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 1208 (1), 2419, 2409, 115, 2085, 526 (42), 526 (44), 650, 2191, 527 (1), 1335, 1336, 1100, 1475, 2001, 2001 (1), 2599, 2520, 525 (2) and statements of witnesses relating thereto. Have you anything to say about this evidence?

A. I want first to say something about communism generally, and will do so as briefly as I can. The prosecution always seems to think there is some sort of moral obliquity about being a Communist, and that people do not join the Communist party except for some discreditable motive. And generally the idea is commonly held that there is something if not immoral then at least abnormal or mysterious about Communists. I assure them that it is not so. As Sohan Singh has pointed out Communists are quite normal people in general. They support or join the party because it has what they regard as a sensible and practical policy, in the same

way as people join other parties. I do not mean that the Communist party is quite the same type of organization as other political parties but that does not affect my point. People become Communists principally because of the experiences which they undergo and the way society treats them. I may give my own case as an example. I do not mean that the treatment which I received personally was in any way bad or unusual. I mean that the social and political events which have occurred during my life time have been such as to impel one very strongly in the direction of a Communist policy, although I am not in the strict sense a worker that is a member of the class to which Communism makes the most direct appeal.

I was about 12 years old when the great European war began. I lived in London throughout the War time and experienced the very serious food shortage which prevail and the tremendous rise of prices which reduced my people fixed income to probably below ordinary working class standards. I lived through some dozens of air-raids which by the last year of the war had become quite dangerous and devastating affairs. One asked even then if another war comes in say 10 or 20 years' time what is going to happen to the civil population. A number of my relatives and friends joined the army and several were killed and wounded. I was about 17 years old and just beginning to take an interest in public affairs when the Versailles peace was negotiated and all the Allies' promises about justice for small nations and so forth were so flagrantly broken. At this time news began to come through about the condition of Central and Eastern Europe, a shocking story of blockade and famines and revolution and the breakdown of civilisation over an area inhabited by hundreds of millions of people. The pre-war secret treaties began to be published about that time too. I was just about going up to the University when the post war economic slump began and within a few months 2 million men in Britain alone were thrown out of work.

D. 25-5-31.

About two years later in 1923 the ^{invasion} ~~invention~~ of the Ruhr Valley by the French army and the Curzon ultimatum to the Soviet Government seemed to bring very near the prospect of another first class war. One could add any amount of detail to the picture I have tried to give. But it is unnecessary. It is enough to say that it became obvious to practically everybody of any generation that something serious was wrong with the world and that some fairly drastic treatment was required to set it right. It was obvious I say to practically everybody in 1919 or so. Unfortunately many people have now forgotten that very instructive period of history. But nothing has occurred since then it seems to me which

necessitates any alteration in the conclusion I came to them.
Drastic change is still urgently required.

So one cast about for a policy Fascism and policies of that sort became very popular about that time specially after the march on Rome in 1922. Fascism has a certain romantic appeal especially to middle class people like myself. It calls for order and discipline and other excellent things of that kind. But one soon begins to feel that these things and in fact all the distinctive features of Fascism, its organisation, its militancy its patriotism, and so forth are in their nature means. But when one asks what is the end which they serve what is the policy of Fascism one is disappointed. For broadly speaking it has no policy. It proposes to retain the old order which has broken down and shown its uselessness. The only modification it introduces is to substitute force for fraud as the first line of defence of Capitalism against the working class. The essence of the old order Bourgeois Democracy was that it concealed what nevertheless it always retained as its ultimatum weapon against the working class namely force and relied primarily and normally on deception Fascism reverses the order and in doing so of course it makes matters worse. It keeps Capitalism with all its faults and weaknesses in no way essentially altered. It increases the poverty of the masses accentuates the class struggle and in International affairs necessarily pursues an aggressive Imperialist policy and in that way increases the danger of war. In short from the point of view of one who desires radical change Fascism is a great disappointment. People are apt to be deceived by its spectacular and apparently revolutionary methods. But the content of its policy is sheer reaction. Fascism is no good. It does not solve the problem. In fact it makes no attempt to do so.

Of course Bourgeois Democracy the policy represented in Britain by the Liberal and Conservative Parties (and, one would now add, by the Labour Party) was ruled out from the beginning. It had some little credit left in Britain in contrast to the position in most European countries but that was simply because disintegration and collapse had not gone so far in Britain as elsewhere. Bourgeois Democracy made practically no pretence of having a policy. It did not seem to think that a policy was needed. Its confessed aim was to get back to pre-war conditions which simply meant the conditions which would produce a new world war.

Its only new suggestion was the League of Nations which was supposed to get rid of the danger of war for the future. I may remark that it is a characteristically Bourgeois Democratic attempt to cure the symptom and not the cause. The League of Nations nevertheless received at first a good deal of support from credulous people. But a little scepticism soon found much to criticize in it.

Its very origin from the notorious predatory Versailles Peace Conference was enough to arouse suspicion. Then one could not forget that its authors were the same men who had been responsible for the secret treaties then being published ; who had kept up the blockade of Germany and supported the White Guard armies in Russia, who were supporting one side or the other in the Greco-Turkish war ; and were maintaining the black and tan terror in Ireland. Actually it soon became clear that the League of Nations was no better than one could expect from the circumstances of its origin. It prevented war on the part of minor powers if the British and French Governments thought it expedient to stop them. Otherwise as in the case of the Greco-Turkish War and many others which have occurred since then it has done nothing. Its principal function has been to save central and eastern Europe from a working class revolution by organising the supply of reconstruction loans. Gradually it has assumed the function of a European block, an alliance obviously directed against the United States of America on one side and the Soviet Union on the other. That is, far from being a guarantee of peace, it has become an important part of the preparations for war. I need not say any more in detail about it. The record of the League of Nations is well known and it is only very naive people who are taken in by it. But with one's belief in the League of Nations gone there was nothing at all in the programme and possibilities of Bourgeois Democracy to keep one's allegiance.

The next alternative is the Labour Party which was at that time I mean shortly after the war advancing the claim to become the Government of the country. At first it seemed promising. It proclaimed Socialism as the only cure for the evils from which the world was suffering. Now this seemed the most sensible policy put forward by any body. Socialism being Internationalist could solve the problem of the International conflicts which is one of the most serious weaknesses of the Capitalist order. It could organise production and distribution internationally in a planned manner and so get rid of the periodical crises which afflict the Capitalist world. And it would solve the class struggle also.

But the history of the Labour Party in the years after the war, while it shows a tremendous numerical growth is at the same time a history of political and ideological collapse. Its formal programmes were always moderate and compromising but its propaganda was at first very radical and deceived many people millions one can say, and gave them false hopes about the policy it would pursue. But after the war it achieved a considerable Parliamentary success and under the lead of the Parliamentary Labour Party which actually obtained complete control it degenerated more and more. It began to break down on International questions.

Instead of opposing indemnities and repressions completely, it adopted the Capitalist policy of bringing them within the capacity of Germany to pay them. Instead of exposing the League of Nations it supported it vigorously. Instead of supporting the Soviet Union its attitude became more and more critical towards the only Socialist State. In domestic affairs it proposed the Capitalist measure for dealing with the war debt question of a Capital levy. But in the face of vigorous Capitalist opposition it dropped it. Its leaders began to intervene in strikes not as the workers' leaders but as impartial mediators, of course with disastrous results for the workers. It began to adopt the Parliamentary convention of treating question affecting the colonies as being neutral from the party point of view that is supporting Imperialism. This was the course of development which the Labour Party had been pursuing for some time and the Labour Government of 1924 and its complete exposure of the Labour Party was only a logical result of development which had been going on for several years. The Labour Government only completed the picture. It broke strikes and used the Emergency Powers Act against strikers. It used armed forces on a large scale against the Revolutionary Movement in the colonies. It carried through the new plan for getting reparatives out of Germany, the Dawes plan and so on. It had simply become part of the Bourgeois Democracy and the most dangerous and deceitful part at that.

It was this spectacle of the down-fall of the Labour Party which convinced me of the impossibility of achieving workers' rule and socialism by Parliamentary means. I saw that the criticism against Parliamentary Socialism which had always come from the radical section of the working class and especially the Syndicalists was substantially correct. The machinery of Bourgeois Democracy is a most subtle and powerful corrupting agency. And it corrupts not only the leaders but through them the whole rank and file of the working class. The reformist Socialists often claim that if under the Socialist Government the Capitalists resort to armed resistance they will be ready to use force against them. But their whole policy is directed against preparing the workers for a fight. Under the lead of the Reformists the workers are disarmed physically and psychologically. But it is not enough merely to say that the Reformist method cannot achieve Socialism. That is only a negative defect. Reformist Socialism is positively harmful. It leads the working class through theoretical acceptance of Socialism back to practical support of Capitalism, the Capitalist State and the counter-revolutionary forces. That is the fate of all these Reformist movements. They actually fight against the cause which they nominally espouse. The Communist International is not exaggerating when it calls Reformist Socialism the principal

support of Capitalism in Europe today. By 1924 then it was clear that Reformist socialism was no good.

The only remaining policy then was Communism. And when I came to study Communism I found that here at last was a policy which was serious, realistic and above all honest. Bourgeois and Social Democratic politics is necessarily dishonest for while actually pursuing the interests of the Capitalist class it has to conceal that fact and to persuade masses of working class voters that these policies are really in their interests. Communism cuts across this. It openly takes up a class attitude. It does not encourage any illusions about possible reforms until Capitalism is done away with. And there is no eclecticism about it. It has its own theory and applies it consistently to the actual situation.

But it is not only the honesty of Communism which appeals. The Communist Party is the only party which has a policy in the real sense at all. For it is the only party which has a theory. Communism as a theory which explains all the disturbing phenomena which we find now a days in the world of politics and economics in a consistent and plausible manner. No other party has any theory to speak of and consequently no policy either. The policies of the other parties whether it be Fascism or Bourgeois Democracy or Social Democracy are fundamentally opportunist policies. They consist of attempting to cure symptoms and not touching the real disease. They see for example economic crises. Now periodical crises have occurred ever since the first period of rapid expansion of Capitalist industry in Britain at the beginning of the 19th century and they have taken various forms apparently springing from various different causes. But one would have thought that it should be clear by now that these crises are necessary features of the Capitalist mode of production as such. They arise from that essential weakness of Capitalism which from the workers' point of view is exploitation and from the Capitalists' point of view is the production of surplus value the fact that the workers under Capitalism necessarily produce more than the equivalent of what they are paid. But the Bourgeois and Labour parties do not take this common sense yet fundamentally sound view. They fasten upon various superficial features of the particular crisis they are concerned with at the moment and think of curing the whole thing by eradicating that symptom. They talk much of the orgy of speculation, especially in America which preceded the present crisis and conclude that that was the principal cause. Or they point to the gold monopoly established in recent years especially by France and America and put the crisis down to that. Professor Gustav Cassel one of the most famous Bourgeois Economists writes an article in this year's "Times Annual Financial and Commercial Review" in which he maintains that this gold monopoly is the cause of the present crisis. Or they

want expansion of credit, or tariffs or reduction of wages or what not. In short they have no policy because they have no consistent theory. It is hardly necessary to say that the Labour Party is just as bad as the others. Some of its members will say that Capitalism is what is wrong. But at the same time these very men will take up the gold accumulation theory or the inflation theory or protection and so forth and leave the matter more confused than ever.

Then they see the menace of War. But instead of trying to get rid of the causes of War namely capitalists rivalry for markets and colonies, they tackle only the symptoms, armaments, of course without success. They see the class struggle and their policy varies from taking the workers' leaders into the Cabinet to shooting them anything in short except the obvious remedy ~~of~~ getting rid of classes in society altogether.

The Communist in fact seemed to me to be the only party which could possibly set things right because it was the only party which knew what was wrong. It is not necessary to go into the whole Communist theory of the matter. Shortly it is as follows. Communism does not remain content with observing all the things I have referred to namely wars, revolutions, colonial conquest, economic crises, class conflicts, armaments, secret diplomacy and preparation for new wars—it does not see these things separately, in isolation as representing individual problems to be tackled individually, but as symptoms so to speak of an abnormal condition of society as a whole. The economic theory of Communism leads it to expect that the capitalist economic order will prove ultimately to be unstable. The fluctuations of prosperity which Capitalism has always experienced will grow more violent and eventually when the world has become to a sufficient extent drawn into the Capitalist system and when concentration of Capital has proceeded far enough and so on, prosperity will tend as a whole to sink. This development will have repercussions in the form of intensified international and class conflicts and the revolt of the colonies. This is the period which is described as that of the decay of Capitalism.

Communism naturally concludes that the present period is that in which this theoretical conclusion is being realised. Of course in practice it does not work out quite smoothly and easily. The crisis affects some countries more than others. Some are involved before others and so on. That is inevitable. Social theory after all is very abstract and can make predictions only of a rather general character. But nevertheless the evidence compels one to accept this theoretical analysis of the present period as sound.

The conclusion from that is that it is of no use to try to cure

one feature or another and leave the Capitalist system as a whole as it is. The only way to improve the situation is to get rid of the origin of these symptoms that is to say Capitalism itself.

Now many Socialists Labour Party members for example would agree with this in theory. But their practice is nothing but the old Capitalist one of tackling details and leaving the fundamental questions alone. That is the inevitable result of the Reformist method.

Communism does not make this mistake. It sets about the task of abolishing Capitalism in a realistic spirit and the first conclusion one must come to when considering the matter in this way is that it is essentially a question of power. The job is not an easy one. It is obvious that the Capitalists will fight with the utmost vigour against it. However objectively necessary Socialism is it is useless to think of persuading the Capitalists of that fact. They must be coerced. And it is obvious that the only power which can coerce them is a revolutionary working class power. The working class has no vested interest in Capitalism but on the contrary will gain by the introduction of Socialism.

Hence the policy adopted by the Communists is to use all means to develop the class struggle which exists in Capitalist society. The conditions of the present period of decay of Capitalism bring about a very great increase in the intensity of the spontaneous revolt of the working class against Capitalism. The Communist view is that it is the fundamental duty of all who want socialism to concentrate on the development and organisation of that struggle up to the point of open conflict with the Capitalist State and a decisive victory for the working class.

The working class will then be in a position to do what is necessary without regard to what the Capitalists think about it. They will expropriate the Capitalists and reorganise production and so on in ways which would be totally impossible without the power which only a military victory can give.

I need not go into the numerous other questions which arise when this position is accepted. Most important of all is the question of the party. It is clear that neither the revolutionary struggle itself nor the work of establishing a social order after the revolution can be carried through unless the working class achieves a high degree of unity, discipline and intelligent leadership and so on. It is here that the party comes in. This question of the nature of the party and its organisation and its relations with the mass of the working class and other classes are of the greatest

importance. But they have been solved theoretically and practically by Lenin and the Russian Communist Party and we have that model to follow.

As I have said this is a realistic approach to the question. Historical events happen in this sort of way-by the struggle of men for their real economic needs. Other projected methods of getting Socialism remain abstract. They depend upon the compelling power of theory and argument which are always far less powerful than the compulsion of hunger. The Communist method is in accordance with the facts of human nature.

Now I want to say something very shortly about the application of this policy in Britain. Contrary to the usual view this policy is most especially applicable to Great Britain. Britain shows at present very markedly those symptoms of decay which Lenin pointed out in Capitalism generally. Even in the best post war years 1928-29 Britain's industrial production hardly recovers from the post-war crisis. Most branches of industry had hardly reached the pre-war level. Since the year 1920 Britain has never had less than one million officially registered unemployed. The bourgeoisie is coming more and more to depend for its income upon the interest on foreign investments and so on. A very striking feature of present day English life is the very large proportion of the population which does no productive work. This proportion is I believe well over one half the active population. I do not mean necessarily that it does no work at all though quite a large number of the middle and upper classes as well as the unemployed workers do none. What I mean is that a large part of the population is engaged in such occupations as Commerce, Finance, Administration, luxury trades, personal and domestic services, interest drawing and so forth which consist in the manipulation of wealth produced by others partly the British workers, partly foreign and of course the colonial workers. The number of people who are economically unproductive increases while the basic industries of the country stagnate or decline—agriculture, mining, iron and steel, engineering, ship-building, textiles in fact all the main industries. Practically the only industries which show good results now-a-days are artificial silk and motor cars. In short British economy as J.A. Hobson the well-known liberal Economist pointed out 30 years ago is becoming to an increasing and already alarming extent a parasitic economy. Instead of the workshop of the world Britain is becoming the world's usurer.

This situation alone would be bad enough and would call for drastic remedy. But it is not all. Britain is no longer able to be even a successful usurer. The enormous parasitic population and the decline of industries bring it about that Britain no longer

has a sufficient surplus of capital to export in order to keep up its position as usurer in chief. Owing to its peculiar position too, British Capital is not able to deal with these difficulties successfully. The predominance of the financial interests and the need for maintaining financial credit and so on prevent any policy such as inflation which would expropriate the bond holding sections and free industry from the burden of what may be called dead capital which has accumulated on it during generations of development. On the other hand while industry is burdened in this way the amount of capital required to renovate and rationalise it is so great that it cannot be afforded. So industry remains backward and declines while rationalisation in Germany and America and so on goes on.

This is the sort of position that British economy has got into. And under Capitalism there is no way out except a desperate and ultimately even more disastrous measure such as war either for new fields for exploitation in Russia or against the rival Imperialist power in America. That is the prospect before the British people at present. No Capitalist policy can deal with the situation. It requires a socialist policy and not a nominally but an actually socialist policy. That means of course the policy proposed by Communism. For only by pursuing a Communist policy will the working class get power enough to deal with the obstructive propertied interests and expropriate them wholesale, to institute a real thorough control of production and distribution, to deal with agriculture, in an energetic socialist manner instead of the present feeble Capitalist manner and if it is found necessary to deal with the population question which no Capitalist Government dares even to think of and so on. And ultimately of course it will establish a world economy in which Britain will have its place. The economy of the world and of Britain in particular have now reached such a position that it obviously and urgently requires centralised planned control.

I have said that Communist theory diagnoses the present as the period when Capitalism is decaying and puts down all the disturbing phenomena I have mentioned to that cause. Two years ago these theses would have required to be defended. After the war and the post war crises some sort of stabilisation had been achieved by 1925 or so. In 1928 and 29 even British industry experienced a boom—a very mild one, but none the less a boom. Now I think no defence is necessary. The economic crisis which began at the end of 1929 and has still apparently not reached its lowest point, has undeceived all those who thought that Capitalism was setting out on a new period of peaceful and uninterrupted prosperity. It has already had serious repercussions in a series of revolutions in South America and now in Spain and Portugal

and it has brought Germany almost to the point of Civil War. But the economic crisis is not the only symptom we can cite. We can point to the continuance of the colonial Revolutionary movement principally in China but also in other colonies and we can point out above all the increasing International tension, the Anglo American crisis and the general arming against the Soviet Union which inspite of the gibes of the Magistrate and others is a reality, the practically continuous disarmament Conferences which strike one as a very suspicious sign and so on. We can claim that the world has in no way recovered its equilibrium after the war. It is heading for a new war which none of the efforts of the Pacifists or of the armament reducers will evade and which may have a most serious effect upon the whole structure of civilisation unless the Communist policy of using the occasion of Imperialist war for the overthrow of the Imperialist Governments is put into effect.

In short I maintain that Socialism is the only policy which can deal with the world as it is today with its enormously developed technique of production and its international economy, especially in view of the acute conditions of instability and crisis which has now set in. Socialism will be able to get rid of the three main sources of instability in the world system of Capitalism, namely the class struggle, the International struggle between Capitalist nations and the conflict between the colonies and the Imperialist powers. It will be able to put into effect a planned economy which will get rid of the chaotic character of Capitalism which contributes to the intensity of all these three main sources of disturbance. Socialism is obviously the only policy. And further the only possible and practical policy for getting Socialism is the Communist policy. That is to say I am trying to show that there is nothing sinister about Communism. It has a political policy like other policies, only more far sighted and more comprehensive in its view and more courageous and is an obviously sensible and practical policy for dealing with the very alarming position the world has got into now-a-days. It is a policy which of course appeals mainly to the working class but can be followed by any person of good will from any class.

It was in this conviction after my dis-illusion with the pseudo socialist policy of the Labour Party that I decided that I must join the Communist Party in Great Britain and did so.

I was also a member of a Trade Union at first of the Workers' Union. Later when I was employed in a bookseller's firm I transferred to the Shop Assistants Union. For the purposes of my work as a Trade Union member it was necessary for me to join the National Minority Movement which I did. But that was not until

I had left the university. The statement that I was a member of the National Minority Movement while at the university is not correct.

The statement of the prosecution that I conducted Communist propaganda among the Colonial students at the university is also incorrect. There is no evidence for it I may say, I should have had no objection to conducting such propaganda but actually I did not do it. And so also their statement that when I was in England my profession was Communism is incorrect. The only paid employment I had in Britain was in the firm of Birrell and Garnett of 30 Gerrard St. The Prosecution always displays some doubt about this firm and my connection with it. Actually it is a bonafide firm well known in the trade and doing business mainly in old and rare books though also to some extent in modern books. And my connection with it was genuine. I was an employee of the firm for some time about six months if I remember before I came to India. The firm gave me a letter to support my application for a passport. That also is bonafide. It was the intention that I should go abroad in Europe for the purposes of the firm. Of course actually I never went. I decided to come to India first.

I came to India with two main purposes in mind. One was to do business for Messrs. Birrell & Garnett. The other was to do work for the Labour Research Department, to collect material for it on the Indian Labour Movement and if possible to initiate work on the same lines in India. I shall deal with Labour Research Department later.

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

The Prosecution have taken the view that the Labour Research Department is a conspiratorial body. They have put it in their list. The Magistrate on page 110 of the Committal order calls it a "subsidiary body" of the Communist Party of Great Britain (C.P.G.B.) and the opening address of the Prosecution described it as "definitely a branch and under the thumb of the Communist Party in Great Britain."

Now I deny this altogether. I say that it is an ordinary Labour body not having definitely Communist views. In fact it is not the main business of the Labour Research Department to express views at all. It is not under the control of the C.P.G.B. It is under no other control than that of its Executive Committee which is elected by its affiliated bodies and normally contains some Communists but a majority of non-Communists. It has no other source of income than the affiliation fees of its affiliated bodies, individual membership fees, receipts from the sale of its publication

and fees for work done. It does no work at all which is not open and legal.

I can cite in support of this the evidence of Mr. Brailsford who was a subscriber to it upto 1926 and did not find it a Communist organisation. He describes it correctly as principally supported by Trade Unions which ask it to make inquiries on their behalf. He also stated that it publishes much valuable material which is used among others by members of his Party, the Independent Labour Party (I.L.P.)

I want to review briefly the evidence on which the Prosecution bases its conclusion about the L.R.D. It is given by the Magistrate on page 77 of the Committal Order. The points are these (1) its Director was R. Page-Arnot who is said to be a well-known Communist. The Prosecution was also careful to bring out in examining Mr. Brailsford that Mr. Emile Burns, Mr. R. P. Dutt and Mr. A.L. Bacharach who are also connected with the L.R.D. are Communists.

I think Mr. Mitra accused has commented on what may be called the Communist phobia shown by the Prosecution. Any organisation containing Communists is considered by them a Communist body or under Communist control. They do not apply the same argument to the L.L.F. for example which has plenty of members connected with the L.R.D. or to the Fabian Society or the Labour Party. I say that the fact that there are Communists connected with the L.R.D. and even on its Executive does not mean that it is in any way under the control or "thumb" of the C.P. G.B. It is worth-while to see what are the facts on which the allegation is based. In the Report of the L.R.D. for the year 1927-28 the Executive Committee is given on page 6. It contains 18 members of which 3 are Communists, so far as the evidence goes and so far as I know. These are Emile Burns, H. Pollitt and A.L. Bacharach. Of the others 2 namely W.T. Kelly and E.C. Wilkinson are Labour M. Ps., 5 at least namely W.H. Hutchinson, A.B. Swales, A.J. Cook, S.O. Davies and G. Hicks, who by the way is also now an M.P., are prominent Trade Unionists and some of them are members of the General Council of the Trade Union Congress and of the rest E.G. Saunders and E. Rickett are I believe members of Fabian Society. The History of the L.R.D. Appendix VI shows on page 52 that one of these Communists A.L. Bacharach has been on the executive of the L.R.D. since the year 1915, 5 years before the C.P. G.B. was formed. Similarly Emile Burns has been on the Executive since 1920 (page 53) and R. P. Arnot was the Secretary of the L.R.D. from the Spring of 1914 (page 5 of the History) to 1923 or so when he resigned. These are the facts about the Communist influence in the L.R.D.

I want to go into the nature and activities of the L.R.D. a little more later. At the moment I will deal with other accusations made by the Prosecution against it.

The next is that it paid my salary. Now the evidence of the Prosecution is to the effect that three people sent me money, namely, Arnot, Rathbone and Mrs. Parsons. The fact that one of these happened also to be a Secretary or Director of the L.R.D. does not mean that that organisation paid me. If I sent requisitions for money and acknowledgments of receipts of money to the secretary of the L.R.D. that was only because it was a convenient address. The L.R.D. did not pay me anything. It could not afford to do so.

The next point is that it shared office buildings with the Workers' Welfare League of India. The situation when I was familiar with the L.R.D. was that it occupied a number of rooms in a large house 162 Buckingham Palace Road which contained about 17 or 18 rooms in all. It had no use for all the rooms and therefore sublet some of them. At that time the Plebs League had 2 or 3 rooms the labour monthly one, the London District Committee of the Union of Post Office Workers had one or two and the Workers' Travel Association had two rooms for sometime also. Subsequently I believe the Plebs League moved away and the Workers' Welfare League may have taken one or more of its rooms. There is an item in the Financial Account showing receipts from sub-letting. But in any case I cannot see what value this accusation has. It seems to me natural that a Labour Body such as the L.R.D. should sublet rooms to other Labour bodies such as Union Branches, Labour Journals or the Workers' Welfare League rather than to ordinary business organisations. But what there is sinister or conspiratorial or significant about it I do not understand.

The next point is that in Dutt's absence Arnot took charge of his work. The Magistrate refers to P 2346 to support this. Now I read through P 2346 but found no reference to anything of the sort. But even if it is so I say what of it? The evidence is that Arnot and Dutt are both members of the C.P.G.B. If so it is not at all surprising that one should do the work of the other in his absence. But it seems to have no relevance whatever to the matter in hand.

Then we are told that the L.R.D. is bracketted by the National Minority Movement with the C.P.G.B. as a source of books for Mirajkar. The reference is P 1350 (2). The C.P.G.B. book-shop is a general book-shop which will get any publication to order. The L.R.D. sells only its own publications. The nature of these publications I shall deal with later. Here it is enough

to say that they are naturally concerned with the Labour Movement and subjects of interest to the Labour Movement. They are therefore suitable for "self-styled Communists" as the magistrate describes Mirajkar, as Communists are members of the Labour Movement and interested in it. That the N.M.M. should recommend its publications is natural as it is affiliated to the L.R.D. and as Mr. Brailsford has said the L.R.D. publishes much valuable information which is used widely in all sections of the Labour Movement in England.

Next the L.R.D. is bracketted with the N.M.M. as a possible address to which Allison's clothing might be sent (P 526(16)) Again it is simply a question of an address. I did not know Allison's home address or I should have given it. I gave addresses where I thought there were people to be found who knew Allison and would see that his clothes were sent on to him. Arnot in the case of the L.R.D.

Next we have the point that Arnot sent me P. 1530, a telegraphic money order for £ 40, with the words "for Representative Manchester Conference." Apart from the truth of that evidence it is the same point as I have already dealt with. Arnot is or was a member of the L.R.D. but he is not identical with the L.R.D. He can do things in his private capacity. With this goes also the last point of the Magistrate, what he calls my voluminous correspondence with Arnot. What it has to do with the L.R.D. I do not know.

Finally there is the fact that the name of the L.R.D. was on the mailing list of Ganavani P 394. I cannot see this is at all surprising as it is one of the principal functions of the L.R.D. to collect documents and facts about the Labour Movement of all countries naturally with a certain emphasis on the British Empire. But if this circumstance is relied upon to convict the L.R.D. I am afraid that there will be convicted with it a large and astonishing list of bodies including the I.F.T.U. Amsterdam, the Fabian Society, the British Trade Union Congress and Labour Party and so forth, all of which are on the mailing list of Ganavani.

These are the charges which the Magistrate makes against the L.R.D. to prove the charge of the Prosecution that it is a conspiratorial body and is "under the thumb" of the C.P.G.B. The charges individually are either false or worthless and their cumulative value is no greater than the individual value.

I must now deal shortly with the history and work of the L.R.D. As its history shows it was founded in 1912 particularly by Mr. & Mrs. Webb as part of the Fabian Society. It became,

established very soon as the accepted research institution of the whole Labour Movement and worked in cooperation with the Trade Union Congress and Labour Party. Its offices were at 33 Eccleston Square the head-quarters of the Labour Party and Trade Union Congress until 1922 (I refer to the Report of the L.R.D. for the year 1921-22 page 13.)

At this time it issued books and did other work in which cooperated Mr. and Mrs. Webb, Mr. G. Bernard Shaw, Mr. L.S. Woolf (the well-known novelist and critic now Literary Editor of the liberal Organ "The Nation") who produced the deeply seditious work "Empire and Commerce in Africa", Mr. E. M. Forster, the eminent novelist who also touched upon the Colonial question, Mr. G.D.H. Cole and Mrs. Cole, the well known economists, J.L. and B. Hammond Miss. Susan Lawrence, Chairman of the Labour Party in 1930, Mr. H.H. Slessor K.C. Who later became Attorney General and so on. This will be found in the History Appendix 6.

But at the same time there were working in the L.R.D. as I have pointed out Arnot and Bacharach and also R.P. Dutt and E. Burns. That is to say that at that time up to 1922 when the L.R.D. was undoubtedly by a recognised Labour Body accepted by the Labour Party and Trade Union Congress as their Research Organisation, it contained both Communists and other Fabians, I.L.P. Members and so on. I have already pointed out that the Executive Committee in the year 1927-28 contained three Communists. This is actually less than the number in 1922 when the Office of the L.R.D. was at 33 Eccleston Square, for Miss. E.C. Wilkinson M.P. who was on the Executive in both these years resigned from the Communist Party in the interval.

In 1922 owing to the pressure on the space at the Head Quarters of the L.P. and T.U.C. I refer to page 13 of the 1921-22 Report. The L.R.D. changed its premises. Since then it has remained essentially the same kind of Body doing essentially the same kind of work and recognised as widely as before as the Labour Research Organisation. For example if the lists of affiliated organisations in 1921-22 and in 1927-28 are compared it will be found that they to a large extent are the same. To take the biggest unions only we find in both lists the amalgamated Engineering Union the National Union of Railway men, and a large number of the biggest Trade Unions in the country. These Unions not only remained affiliated to the L.R.D. but continued to use its services. In 1926 the L.R.D. prepared the case for the Miners Federation of Great Britain which it put before the Coal Commission of that year (History page 35). In 1926-27 it prepared special pamphlets for the National Union of Printing

Workers and the Shop Assistants Union (1926-27 Report, page 2). In 1928 it prepared the case for the United Textile Factory Workers' Association in its dispute with the employers of that year (1927-28 Report pages 2-3). The Report for the year 1927-28 shows that the L.R.D. continued to receive the support of, and to perform minor pieces of work for, such Unions as the National Union of general and Municipal Workers, leading Members of which are Mr. Will Thorne M.P., Right Hon'ble J.R. Clynes M.P. Home Secretary, Miss Margaret Bondfield M. P. etc, the Typographical Association, a leading Member of which is the Right Hon'ble F.O. Roberts M.P. and so forth.

D. 26-5-31.

Next to the work of investigating special subjects for affiliated bodies the most important part of the work of the L. R. D is publication. It will be seen that the publications of the Department continued to receive the co-operation of members of the Labour Party and prominent Trade Unionists whom the Prosecution will not accuse of being conspirators or Communists. Such are A. J. Cook, George Hicks M. P. General Secretary of the Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers, Alfred Barnes M. P. Chairman of the Co-operative Party, R. B. Walker General Secretary of the Agricultural Workers' Union and W. H. Hutchinson chairman of the Amalgamated Engineering Union and Executive member of the National Labour Party (I refer to the 1926-27 report page 2) and Rt. Hon'ble J. Wheatley M. P. Further the nature of the publications of the department continues to be much the same as in its earlier years. The "Colonial series" about which the prosecution no doubt entertain deep suspicion is a fairly recent product. But I have already mentioned the two early excursions into the colonial field namely "Empire and Commerce in Africa" by L. S. Woolf 1919-20 and 'Egypt' by E. M. Forster of 1920. (I refer to appendix 6 of the 'History'). The recent series of booklets in the colonial series contains nothing to equal or approach Mr. Woolf's scathing exposure of the methods whereby the British Empire was extended in Africa. He gives an astonishing but undoubtedly true story of violence, intrigue, trickery and forgery (I should explain that some British Agents forged a treaty with some potentate whereby they were able to secure possession of his territory) and this was published in the days when the L. R. D was still directed by Mr. Sydney Webb who later became Lord Passfield, His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies.

The Prosecution I have no doubt also regard with disfavour the attention which L. R. D has lately paid to Soviet Russia. A number of books, reports and pamphlets have been issued on this

theme from 1925 onwards. Again I will point out that this is not a new departure.

I find from the "History" (appendix 6) that in the years 1921 to 22 it published a volume called 'Trade Unions in Soviet Russia' and in the same year "The Labour International Handbook" which contains a good deal of information about Soviet Russia. And even worse in 1919 to 1920 it published a booklet called "The Two Internationals" (one of the two being of course the Third.) Now about publishing material on Soviet Russia I can not see anything at all sinister or unusual in it, especially on the part of a Labour Body. It has become very clear in the last three or four years that Socialism as it is being established in Russia is an efficient and progressive economic system, while during the same period it has been shown equally, clearly that Capitalism is an extremely inefficient economic system. Anyone who reads the British Capitalist Press now-a-days will see that suggestions are constantly being made to adopt some of the features of the Russian system, its planned economy and so on in order to save British Capitalism from complete ruin. But it is quite natural and proper that a body which seeks to publish material on which the thinking of the Labour Movement can be based should devote more and more attention to the achievements of Socialist construction in Soviet Russia. And if the prosecution want to condemn the L. R. D. as a Communist body on this account they will have to do the same to dozens of Capitalist publishing companies in England because a constant stream of matter about Russia is being poured out by British publishers now-a-days.

This part of my statement is intended to show that the L. R. D up to the year 1921 to 22 was a body of such status that even the Prosecution will not dare to attack it. Though it contained Communists and published what in India would be considered seditious literature it was a perfectly respectable organisation. It was housed in the headquarters of the Trade Union Congress and Labour Party. These worked with a number of persons whose names I have mentioned already, Mr. Sydney Webb and so on. And now or at any rate in the ^{year} 1927-28 it is still essentially the same sort of body. It continues to work in cooperation with Trade Unions and individuals who are bitterly hostile to Communism as such and would not hesitate to oppose and denounce it if they thought that it was in some way or other a disguised Communist organisation. Its publications sources of revenue and to a large extent personnel are still similar to those of the period 1921-22. The conclusion must be I think that the charge made by the prosecution against it is false.

I will add a further point to this. It should not be deduced from what I have said that the L. R. D. is a mere recorder of facts without a political attitude or what is called bias. It is not the purpose of the L. R. D. to express political views and it does not do so. But in its selection and presentation of facts an attitude is revealed in outline at any rate. And I do not deny that the attitude taken up by the L. R. D. is not such as His Majesty's Labour Ministers are likely to agree with. The L. R. D. supports strikers in fact its most important work is the support of strikers by means of propaganda materials and the preparation of the case for Unions as against employers, in disputes. With this activity Messrs. Macdonald and others would not agree. Their only interest in strikes is to bring them to an end as quickly as possible that is in general to sabotage them and secure the defeat of the strikers. Similarly in regard to colonial affairs the L. R. D. is hostile to Imperialist control of the colonies and publishes material which helps the working class to realise more clearly and concretely that its interests are opposed to Imperialist policy. Mr. Mac-Donald is also in disagreement with this attitude. As he is also on the question of the Soviet Union. But on these three main questions and on others the L. R. D. stands with the instincts and outlook of the bulk of the Labour Movement and against it there is only the leading minority of what may be called the Bureaucracy of the Labour Movement represented by Mr. Mac-Donald. Mr. Brailsford's evidence has shown that he, a typical Moderate Socialist would be found in his real feelings and views to be opposed to Mr. Mac-Donald on two of these questions namely the colonies and the Soviet Union and it is possible that he would be on others also.

That is why the Communists are able to cooperate without difficulty or friction in the work of the L. R. D. Except when it comes to the direct concrete statement of policy the bulk of Labour and Socialist people are essentially in agreement with the Communists, the only exceptions being this most corrupt official leading section. But these leading sections are able to lead on concrete questions of policy because of their control of the machinery of the Labour Movement and because the masses of their followers are not yet sufficiently roused, sufficiently clear or sufficiently courageous to draw the obvious conclusions from the whole of their Socialist outlook and convictions. Only the Communists do consistently draw these conclusions. And in order to save their position the leading groups I have spoken of have managed to hunt the Communists out of the Labour Movement to a large extent and isolate them. Only an intensification of the revolutionary crisis in Britain will alter that situation and force more and more people who are at present

content to be misled by Mr. Mac-Donald to realise the inconsistency of their position and alter it.

The situation is then that the L.R.D. supports the workers in the class struggle, supports the Colonial peoples in the anti-Imperialist revolutionary movement and supports the efforts of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. But in this it is simply expressing the real attitude and conviction of the whole Labour Movement. The Prosecution may object to it but it cannot call this evidence that the L.R.D. is a Communist body.

I want to make only one more point. That is that the ideas which I had about Labour Research work in India as shown by D 92 are in accordance with the account I have given of the L.R.D. of London. D. 92 was written by me at Ondal or Asansol and sent to Ghosh in accordance with the promise I had given him. I say there on page one: "A Labour Research Institution will have as its function to give the facts relating to the most important economic and political departments of the life of the country digested and summarised from a labour point of view i.e. in such a manner as to exhibit the class structure of society, to show the distribution of the product of industry between the classes, and to determine the policy and strength of the different social forces, their inter relations and their evolutionary movement, as determined by their economic basis and historical back-ground. This will enable an intelligent policy to be adopted by the Labour Movement both on immediate and on ultimate issues, though the direct statement of policy is not the aim of the institution. In its day to day work the larger aims should be kept in mind otherwise the institution will tend to lose its specifically Labour character and become a mere recorder of facts."

The whole of the document is consistent with this and this is I believe a correct statement of the aims of the L.R.D. London. They are I think obviously aims which could be entertained by any section of the Labour Movement, excluding of course what I have called the most corrupt leading sections who do not believe in the existence of classes in society. If the Prosecution thinks that there is anything specifically Communist about these aims that merely shows that they do not know anything about the Labour Movement.

As for my personal connection with the L.R.D. it dates I think from about 1923. From that time until I left England I used to go to the office of the L.R.D. very often and do work for it. There is a regular system there whereby work is done by voluntary workers. References to this will be found in the Reports of the L.R.D. and in the History.

When I came to India I was given letters of introduction by Arnot and a general letter of introduction to Trade Unionists by W.H. Hutchinson, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the L.R.D. This is D 140 (2).

MONEY.

The evidence is that I received 8 sums of money from England amounting in all to about Rs 13000/-. I was at liberty in India for about 26 months and that gives about Rs 500/- per month. I travelled about a good deal, stayed in Hotels, bought books and so on and it will be seen that if I had received Rs 500/- a month or even a good deal more I should have had very little left for other purposes.

This money is alleged to have been sent by three people Arnot, Rathbone and Mrs. Parsons. Of these 2 Arnot and Rathbone are said to be members of the C.P.G.B., while Mrs. Parsons is the wife of another alleged member of the C.P.G.B. The Prosecution assumes that the money comes from the C.P.G.B. but there is no evidence at all for that. On the other hand there is evidence that Mrs. Parsons is, one can say wealthy (I refer to Ex.P 2350). The same is the case with Rathbone though there is no evidence for it so far as I know.

I want to make some more general remarks about this money business.

As Sohan Singh has pointed out no attack on Communism is complete without the allegation that the money comes from Moscow, and in this case the Prosecution have followed the fashion. But there is no evidence for it.

They started a story also about money coming over the North-West Frontier, but as I shall show there is absolutely no foundation for that either. Nor is there for the Magistrate's suggestion that lascars used to bring money. In fact the whole thing is baseless like so much else in this case.

But the reason why it is done is clear. It is the propaganda value. British Imperialism wants to foster a sort of nationalist prejudice against our policy on the ground that we received money from abroad. Now I think that there should be no prejudice in the matter. We are Internationalists and national boundaries for us are associated with no moral obligations. In fact we believe it is proper for the working class or the revolutionary movement of one country to help that of another and one way in which that can be done is with money. I fail to see any reason why it should be abhorrent. I want to point out to that it is not really abhorrent to the British Bourgeoisie. What they object to is not the fact

that the money comes from another country but the purpose for which it is used. We never heard any outcry against Amsterdam gold for example or money from London when the I.F.T.U. or the British Trade Union Congress sent money to Indian Reformists to help them to corrupt the Trade Union Movement. I have never heard that the British bourgeoisie have had any scruples about taking money from India for example to be used in their own country. Apparently to take money from other countries is objectionable only if it is given voluntarily. If it is taken by force it is all right. I have never heard that the British bourgeoisie have objected to supplying counter revolutionary movements in other countries with money. They have done so in Mexico, in many of the South American States, in China and above all in Russia. We have the authority of Mr. Churchill that the counter revolutionary White Guard Campaigns against the Soviet Government in 1919-21 were financed by the British Government to the extent of £100 millions not to speak of direct support by means of troops and so on. The Government of the Czar was maintained for decades mainly by loans from the British and French bourgeoisie. In fact there is nothing objectionable in International financial transactions for political purposes so long as those purposes are the support of reaction and counter revolution. But if they are for the support of progress and revolution they are most immoral and have to be put down with all the powers of Section 121 A.

This matter of the receipt of money from abroad brings forward the question of Internationalism in the sharpest and most provocative way. Perhaps therefore this is a suitable place for me to say something about the general question which is one of considerable importance in this case.

It is generally the endeavour of the Government to cut off the working class and any revolutionary movement from International contacts. They have shown this by the system of proscription of books and other publications; by the practice of the customs and postal authorities, who are always confiscating material of this sort; by the way in which the Passport Act is operated, and by such things as the Public Safety Bill and Ordinance. You yourself gave expression to the outlook underlying this in your recent order on our bail applications when you said "It is not a revolution originally devised in India.....but one which is the subject of a much wider conspiracy and therefore of a much more serious nature" and "It is from its outside connection that the seriousness of the case to a considerable extent arises." Generally the International aspect has been stressed very much in this case with the object, no doubt among other things of strengthening the legal ~~possession~~^{possession} of the Government by means of

rulings and precedents against working class Internationalism for the future.

Now we of course regard the position taken up by the Government in principle as indefensible. We know of no absolute sanctity connected with national differences and boundaries. But quite apart from this general question I should like to point out the anomalous position of the British bourgeoisie in the matter. They are the people who have interfered in the affairs of other countries probably more than any other class of which history tells. When the British Government claims the right to protect India from what Mr. MacDonald himself a few days ago called "interference by outsiders" namely the Communist International, it is a matter only for laughter.

The position of the British bourgeoisie on this question is typical of the unprincipled and hypocritical attitude of the bourgeoisie generally in which it contrasts very markedly with our attitude. It will be best to explain first what our view is.

We see the world of the present day rapidly becoming,—in fact it has already to a large extent become,—a single economic and cultural unit. The thing is a common place admitted in theory by every body and I need not stress it. In consequence we say that the only possible way of running the world is to have one centralised economic and political direction—International State in fact. That is to say we are Internationalists. The bourgeoisie has also acknowledged this principle in theory by setting up the League of Nations. But unlike the bourgeoisie we do not admit the principle in theory and desert it in practice. We condemn the League of Nations as a means whereby under the guise of Internationalism the nationalistic ambitions and intrigues of 2 big Imperialist powers principally namely France and Britain are furthered and carried on. But as against it we set up our own genuinely International body the Communist International the nucleus as we see it of the International organisation of the future and we respect our International authority although it is yet in parts little more than skeleton, and we obey it and do all we can to strengthen it. That is to say we are not only theoretical but practical Internationalists. But at the same time we support the nationalism of such a country as India, that is we support the true nationalism which genuinely stands for Independence. We do not support the so-called nationalism which is willing to remain within the Empire and therefore abandon all that nationalism stands for. We support the nationalism of a subject country although we claim to be Internationalists. Many people profess to see an inconsistency and abandonment of principle in this. We claim that it is not inconsistent at all. To explain this it is necessary to point out the

differences between the nationalism of an independent country and that of an oppressed country. The former, that is that of an independent country we maintain is an obsolete and wholly a reactionary force. The principle of bourgeois nationalism is, as much national freedom and wealth as possible for one's self and as little as possible for all other countries. Every body remembers the use to which the principle of nationalism was put during the Great European War how in the name of the integrity of small and weak nations a number of colonies were rescued from the oppression of Germany and Turkey and promptly subjected to the oppression of France and Britain. Nationalism is the principal means now a days whereby the bourgeoisie retains control over the ordinary people of its population and induces them to fight against other Imperialist powers and against the colonies. On these and other grounds we condemn the nationalism of independent countries as obsolete and reactionary.

We know of no allegiance to the Bourgeois National state and give allegiance only to the revolutionary working' class international.

It is quite otherwise with the Nationalism of oppressed peoples. In oppressed countries Nationalist sentiment has still a progressive part to play. We deny absolutely the Social Democratic theory that it is possible to socialise the Capitalist Empire en bloc. I may mention that this project remains in the realm of theory. There are of course no signs at all of any attempt on the part of the propounders of the theory now members of His Majesty's Labour Government to carry it out. Their excuse for keeping the Empire together is that they intend to socialise it. They are certainly keeping it together but of socialisation there is no evidence. We believe that the oppressed nations must achieve their independence first and then they will be in a position to enter voluntarily into the world Socialist Federation of the future.

We regard the Nationalism of an oppressed people as having progressive possibilities even from the point of view of our Internationalist aims and therefore we support it and find no inconsistency in doing so. That is our theory and our practical attitude also and I maintain that it is logical and consistent. But the attitude of the Bourgeoisie is quite otherwise. They at times support Internationalism. But their Internationalism is simply a disguise for their Nationalist ambitions. Fundamentally they support Nationalism. But their Nationalism admits ultimately the rights of no body but themselves and constitutes a perpetual danger to the peace of the world and the lives of the unfortunate people who live under their rule. They condemn on nationalist

grounds what they call the interference of the Communist International in their affairs and yet as I have said they continually interfere in the affairs of the people of as many other nations as possible. I have given an instance before, they condemn Moscow gold and yet supply the Russian Whites with a hundred million pounds of British money.

In short the question is a class question. We take up the principles which suit the interests of the working class and stick to them. They dare not profess openly the principles which they take to serve the interests of the Bourgeoisie, so they adopt any principle which is momentarily convenient for deceiving the public and abandon it whenever their interests require it. Consequently we are not disposed to take the slightest notice of what the Bourgeoisie or Bourgeois law or Bourgeois Governments say on the question of Nationalism and Internationalism. Whatever they say is hypocrisy through and through. We have to go on with our work and evade the policemen of the Bourgeois State as best we can. (Asked if he meant to give any explanation about the sums of the money mentioned earlier, accused said that he had given in the preceding portion of his statement all the explanation that he wanted to give.)

CRYPTIC CORRESPONDENCE.

Before I begin what I have to say about the so-called cryptic correspondence I want to make two remarks. First Your Honour rather surprised me when asking the question the other day by adding to the list of what I had understood to be cryptic documents three more namely P 1953, P 1934 and P 526 (42). I have read them all in the meantime. About P 1953 I can see nothing which can be described as cryptic. It might be called sarcastic or ironical but not cryptic. Also about P 1934 I can find nothing in the least mysterious. In P 526 (42) also there is nothing except a mention of Manchester which I suppose Your Honour suggests means Moscow as the Prosecution do. I can only say that there seems to be nothing in this exhibit or in any other to support the Prosecution's suggestion. I should suppose that Manchester means what it says.

The second point is this. I had examined the so-called cryptic documents which the Prosecution had alleged to have been sent by me or to have been intended for me, that is about ten in all. Now in stating this question Your Honour referred to a number of other supposedly cryptic letters not alleged to have been sent either by or to me. In the interval I have looked through them also and I think it is unnecessary for me to deal with them as they do not concern me particularly. The only way in which they do

so is that one or two refer to 'Des' or 'Desmond.' Now if they are genuine documents that might be taken as evidence that there was some one named Des or Desmond about the place. But they do not go to show in any way so far as I noticed that Des or Desmond was a name for me. One or, two of them used the expression 'Herald' I think which the Prosecution suggest refers to me. Again I know nothing about it and it is not for me to deal with.

I am accused of conducting correspondence with C. P. Dutt and H. Howell with what the Magistrate rather strangely calls "all this show of mystery and intrigue". I should have thought that the Prosecution's point was that there was an avoidance of any show.

The principal source of these so-called cryptic documents is the search of my room in the Y. M. C. A. Bombay in 1927. All I can say about this is that I had never seen these documents before they were produced in Court. And I deny all knowledge of them.

I may point out that according to the search-list they were all together in one envelope. At any rate I take it that these are the documents referred to in that item of the search-list. I should point out also that as the search in question is not properly proved there is no guarantee that these documents are those contained in the envelope originally.

Three of them are supposed to be letters addressed to me. They are P 1007, P 1008 and P 1012. But what immediately strikes one on looking at them is that they are not addressed to me. One is addressed to Appa, one to Des and one to Desmond. The Prosecution had said nothing about Appa but they have said that Des and Desmond mean me. I can only say that there is no evidence at all for this. It is a mere assumption. I should point out that another supposedly cryptic letter which purports to be addressed to me and is supposed to come from the same source namely P 1859 is addressed to Philip, though it is signed with a name Douglas which the Prosecution declare to be a false name.

The Prosecution assert also that I wrote P 1009, I deny it and I should point out that though they claim that it is one of the most important exhibits in the case they have not proved it. The hand-writing expert says that my hand-writing is "very characteristic and is easily recognizable and scarcely needs an expert to identify it." But he does not ascribe this document to me and for the very good reason that the writing is not mine and does not resemble mine at all closely.

They claim also that I produced P 1829, P 2328 and P 2329 which are all said to have been intercepted in the post. This also I deny. I may point out that all they claim to prove is that they were typed on my type-writer. And in the two latter cases this is proved by the handwriting expert from photo copies. But I deny that they were typed on my type-writer or at any rate that they were typed by me. The Prosecution also allege that I posted P 1829 at the G. P. O. Bombay. I deny it. And I think that it will be agreed that the story of the P. W. 269 is hard to believe. I went to the G. P. O. Bombay almost every Saturday morning, that is every mail day with one or more letters to my people or other friends in England and occasionally I was late and had to pay a late fee. It is quite possible that P. W. 269 saw me doing so. But it is most unlikely that I should go openly and post a letter which, if it emanated from me, must presumably have been intended to be confidential and not to be read by the Police. It was not signed by me and so on. Especially is this so as I knew quite well and P. W. 269 admits it that I was always followed to the G. P. O. by C. I. D. watchers. It would have been quite easy for example to wait until the following week, to post it in some other post-office when not followed by a watcher and so forth. In this connection I may point out that recovering letters from the G. P. O. Bombay on Saturday morning even after the time limit for posting cannot be a simple matter. P. W. 262 told a story which confirms this.

Now it is difficult to prove that one did not compose any given document especially if it is typed. In these cases I can only call attention to the following points. In the three typed documents P 1829, P 2328 and P 2329 the date is given in the form: name of month and number, or number and name, and in one case there is 5 with 'th', behind it; and in no case is the year given. But the habit shown by all the other letters attributed to me is to put three numbers with points or sometimes sloping lines between them. Next in P 1009 I call attention to the following phrases "is yet absolutely not understood", "actual sending is extremely difficult" I should have said "the actual sending;" "reducing the Bombay organ to smaller size I should have said" to "a smaller size", "if absolutely necessary I should by Musa." I should of course have put some verb before "by". The next quotation "33 1/3 per cent", I should have certainly put "33 1/3", and last "if it is avoided more material would be required". I should have said "will be required". In P 1829 I call attention to the sentence "J worked a dirty trick on us;" I should have said "played a dirty trick" In P 2328 I draw attention to "your sweet self", "illustrate well his character". All these are awkward or affected phrases, false sequences etc., which I think I could not possibly commit.

In these documents there occur certain words which the Prosecution claim are code words and by the exercise of a great deal of ingenuity they have fitted some of them to members of this so-called conspiracy. But in doing so they have had to adopt a sort of principle of indeterminacy. If the first letter that comes will not fit, put another, if it will not fit one man make it fit some one else.

Mr. Horton stated certain rules according to which the letters of these words are to be transposed. He says "I have found that it is a simple transposition cipher i.e. the consonants are put on one consonant in the alphabet and the vowels are similarly advanced e.g. Cunfa becomes Dange. It appears that the last consonant of the first syllable is not transposed but remains the same.....the letter H seems to remain." Now the basis on which these rules are supposed to be established, which, it is claimed, gives a firm foundation for them is P 1009, where certain words occurred with others the supposed transpositions written over them. The cases are as follows (1) What appears to be Upadya is erased and apparently Nuddx is written above it. This the Prosecution bring into line with their rules by supposing that the name Paddy is used instead of Upadya forming a sort of missing link. Paddy would transpose roughly into Nuddx by the rules. I need only say that on that principle, that is assuming the use of some suitable intermediate word, any set of letters could be made to transpose into any other. There is I believe no evidence that our so-called co-conspirator Upadya who is supposed to be the person in question is ever called Paddy. The next case is a word which appears to be Lahore which is scratched out and what appears to be Kalyan is written above it. But this seems to offer no support to the transposition principle except in the first letter. Kalyan is a town a few miles from Bombay. The obvious supposition is that Kalyan is meant if the document has any meaning at all. The third case is Calcutta. This time, however, the name is not scratched out. The word written above it is interpreted by the Prosecution as Bul which would fit according to the rules. But the more obvious and plausible interpretation seems to be that it is "But" and is not meant to be substituted for Calcutta. In that case the sentences read quite sensibly.

These three instances form the basis of the transposition cipher. They seemed to me to be a distinctly shaky basis. Not one of them supports Mr. Horton's rules. When we proceed to try how the supposed transpositions fit the case is not much better. The first thing one notices is that only the first two or three letters of any word ever seem to obey the rules. Hig for example would transpose to Jog, a well known name in certain parts

of India. But the Prosecution make it Joglekar. We are not told what has become of the rest. Lozzie is supposed to be Muzaffar but again only the first 2 or 3 letters seemed to fit. Then Ewan is said to mean Iyengar. But Iyengar should give Exanfu; to get Ewan we want a new rule. But I should like to suggest that we do not need a rule at all as Ewan is itself a name. Then there is Baker, which is supposed to mean Saklatwala; still other rules are required to get this. Again I suggest that rules are really not called for. Then there is the case of Musa. At first we were told that Musa means Muzaffar and this seems plausible, though it requires still another serious modification of Mr. Horton's rules. But then apparently it was thought that it would not do and so Musa became Ajndhia Pershad, on what principle we are not told.

The haphazard method of the Prosecution is also illustrated by the case of Maslim. Instead of assuming that it meant what it said they have to alter the order of the third and fourth letters and transpose it into Nelson though even then it does not fit.

Of course it is theoretically possible to construct a consistent system of explanations and rules in this way but no one can be expected to attach much importance to it. It would theoretically be possible to construct a consistent set of rules whereby for example to transpose all English words into their Urdu equivalents, if one were willing to put up with a sufficiently complicated set of rules. But no one would value them very highly except perhaps the man who framed them and no one would be led to think that the one language was actually derived from the other in that way. The efforts of the Prosecution to turn these words into our names rather remind me of the efforts of those pre Copernican astronomers we were told of at school who tried to describe the motions of the planets about the earth by means of cycles and epicycles and things. It was always possible to explain any discrepancy from predicted motions by introducing a few new epicycles. In the same way any word in these documents can be turned into any of our names or any other desired name by adding suitable ad hoc transposition rules.

But there are difficulties of another type. There are two words in P 1008 which when operated on by suitable rules came according to the Prosecution to Sambamurti and Bharucha the names of two wellknown Congress men. Reference to the texts shows that it is suggested that these two people were to be brought into the methodist which the Prosecution assert means the Workers' and Peasants' Party. I do not understand how these two perfectly orthodox followers of Mr. Gandhi could have been considered

possible members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party which was strongly opposed to Gandhism in all matters of political and social policy. As far as I can see their identification of Victor with Fazal Elahi, David with Allison and so on are equally arbitrary and lacking in any justification.

There are a number of other cases which show still more clearly this lack of any real basis for the assumptions of the Prosecution about these words. Ambrose for example was first said to mean Spratt. But then the Prosecution noticed that it occurred in letters which they wished to ascribe to me in such a way as to make that explanation impossible and untenable. So Ambrose now mean some one unspecified. Mr. Horton told us mysteriously that there was somebody whom he had his eye on but there was no evidence about him.

• In the case of ~~Qam~~ the Prosecution have rather blundered. They ascribed this name to Muzaffar Ahmad's brother but so far as I know Muzaffar has no brother of that name and no brother who takes any part in political affairs any way. They have had to confess their failure in the case of Nelson, however, though again they have been very mysterious about it. They have not even attempted to tell us who Appa is, and they explain Jerse as Sohan Singh by the not very convincing method which I have commented on already of introducing a sort of missing link. Finally the system is reduced to absurdity by the case of C.P. Dutt who is given no fewer than six or seven names.

I conclude that the whole theory of the Prosecution about these names is baseless and cannot be shown to be correct or even plausible. But it is also rather trivial I do not think it would matter particularly to anybody even the Prosecution if it were the fact that people communicated about us in this way. So the Prosecution no doubt feeling this have tried to make the thing seem important. They have in the first place tried to give it a political colour by translating for example Y.M.C.A. into Communist Party and Methodists into W.P.P. and so on. Now again in this case there is only one objective fact on which it is claimed that this translation is based, that is in P 1009, where according to Mr. Horton "C. P. was crossed out and "Y.M.C.A." was substituted". I have examined the original and the enlarged photograph and find no sign of crossing out. It seems rather that the writer was going to put Y.M.C.A. but at the first attempt left out the "M" and then put in the "M" over the "C" and so on. It seems to be simply an ordinary piece of confused writing such as occurs in almost any hastily written document.

But this small basis for what it is worth has given rise to ^{the} whole structure of identification and translation.

D/-2. 6. 31.

I have shown from the case of Samba-murti and Bharucha how the interpretation of "Methodists" as Workers' & Peasants' Party leads to absurdity. The same is the case with another effort of the prosecution in this direction. In P 1829 they translate 'scienccemen and philosophers as workers' and peasants. Now it will be noticed that this letter says that these people, science-men and philosophers, are "hard to get hold of." But the previous sentence runs: "our University men are active to a gratifying extent." If University men are Trade Unionists as the prosecution claim it would be absurd to say that workers are hard to get hold of. There cannot be a Trade Union of Trade Unionist unless there are workers organised in the Trade Union. It seems to me that the other interpretations Welsh church as Madras Congress and rather contradictorily Dundee as Madras and so forth are quite arbitrary and baseless. I might say that if Dundee was supposed to mean Calcutta for example it would seem a little more likely. In short, the whole attempt to give these documents a political meaning seems to me a failure.

Next comes the attempt to read into these documents references to money. Again the principal source relied upon is P 1009. I do not think that a theory based on so illegible, incoherent and obscure a document as this is likely to be very valuable in any case. But the actual passage relied upon and given by Mr. Horton as his proof of the supposed code system in connection with money is very feeble. The passage reads so far as I can make out".....would resolve itself into (some short illegible word) total all space of about a total of nearly two hundred a month." Of this the words "total all space of about" are crossed out. It is this single word, which apparently but not certainly is 'space' and is in any case crossed out, on which the whole theory that M.S.S. means money "words" means pounds (or is it rupees) and so on is based. There is another sentence in which the word "words" occurs, which is cited to support this. But there seems no reason to suppose that money is being spoken of there. Further in order to make this theory seem plausible it has to be added that 'sending' means 'receiving' or something ridiculous of that kind. It reminds me of the pre Copernican astronomers once more.

Then there is the melodramatic story about money coming across the northern frontier of India which depends if possible on an even flimsier foundation but is sufficiently explained by the political necessity from the prosecution point of view of dragging in the Soviet Union. The actual evidence on which this assertion is based is one sentence again from P 1009 which reads "actual sending is

extremely difficult and each time some one has had to travel from Lahore (scratched out and Kalyan written above)." It is not clear that money is being sent at all. It is not clear where the some-one has had to travel to from Lahore or Kalyan. It is mere assumption that money is being sent or that the place someone has to travel to is the frontier. There is of course absolutely no evidence that anything of the kind was ever done.

I would contend that the whole story about money based on these documents and especially on P 1009 is false. The Prosecution claim that they show that a "possibly rather ambitious scheme" was proposed involving the receipt in India of about two hundred pounds per month. And according to the Magistrate this is an increase of only 1/3rd upon previous receipts, so that the amount received previously must have been 1800/- or Rs 2000/- per month. I can simply ask is there any evidence that any of the accused or the organisations in which they were engaged ever possessed funds to anything like this extent. The evidence is rather that the accused and the organisations they were connected with were always short of money. Further it is claimed that these documents show that a decision had been taken to start an English Journal for propaganda. No such paper was ever started. Similarly the continuous propaganda tour of one man mentioned in P 1009 never took place as far as I know.

Finally there is Colombo which is mentioned at the end of P-1009. Mr. Horton astonished us by not assuming that Colombo meant something sinister. At the least he might have made it another of C. P. Dutt's pseudonyms or another name for Moscow. But I can make a better suggestion than that. By the transposition rules Colombo can be made for example into Dublin or near enough by the Prosecution standard in these matters. This would have the advantage of making the conspiracy even wider than it is and of adding even more distinguished names—one can suggest any number—to our list of co-conspirators. I want to point out that there is no evidence that there is or has been any body in Colombo who knows anything of us or is likely to supply us with money or be supplied with money by us. If we had been in contact with any body in Colombo and especially if we had exchanged money with him I am quite sure that evidence would have been brought about it, if the person himself had not been brought here in the dock.

About this group of documents I want to say this. The obvious preliminary assumption of course about such documents is that they mean what they say. The Magistrate says it is obvious that they do not mean what they say. I feel that he is over stating the case, but I am not interested in contradicting him on this point. If that is so then it may be supposed that there is

some hidden meaning. The Prosecution have tried to establish one and the Magistrate is satisfied that there interpretation at any rate makes sense. I think I have shown that the sense it makes is very imperfect to say the least in that part which purports to be systematic, that is obtained by the use of regular rules. In fact it is not merely imperfect but self contradictory, while that part of the interpretation which is not systematic is obtained by the use of a series of arbitrary assumptions which I think necessarily carry little conviction and moreover do not make much better sense. The supposed objective basis or proof of the Prosecution's interpretation, namely P 1009, I think I have shown does not in any way support it. If then there is no superficial or prima facie meaning and no assignable hidden meaning there is only a third possibility namely that there is no meaning at all of any importance. I think that it is either the first or the third or these alternatives which must be accepted and the Court need not bother about these documents any more.

Before I deal with other aspects of these documents, that is to say the so-called invisible writing and so on I want to deal with another group of exhibits which the Prosecution claim to bear a cryptic character. These are P 2431, P 2002 C and P 2189. About P 2431 I have to say that I did receive sums of money from time to time by Telegraphic Money Order and quite possibly I received one about the date given in this exhibit. Naturally I can not remember exactly now. But I certainly do not remember having seen any message like that in P 2431. In any case I did not use money at any time for any purpose of the kind suggested i. e. sending representatives to Manchester or any where else.

About P 2002 I remember again that I did on one occasion at least receive a letter which had been sent to Ghose's address. But I never received a letter like P 2002. It was not found in any of my files I may point out. There are one or two peculiar circumstances about this letter which I should draw attention to. It is rather curious that a letter, which it is claimed is cryptic, should not have been retained by the Police or at any rate photographed. All that the Prosecution have been able to put in is a rather doubtful document which purports to be a typed copy. This is especially remarkable as they have produced a photograph of the envelope. I should draw attention also to the fact that though they claim that the letter came from Dutt the handwriting expert says that the writing on the envelope is that of Glyn Evans, though I very much doubt the value of an identification of such a small specimen of handwriting. It will be remembered that the witness P. W. 97 who proved the interception of this letter betrayed a great deal of confusion about it especially on the question of the inner envelope.

and was caught contradicting himself and so on. Eventually it was admitted that the document which had originally been put in was not a proper copy of the letter and another was found. Then I want to call attention to the contents of this supposed copy. First to the sentence "Are there any others that you know of, for instance, in regard to next month, to what is the general position?" and second to the phrase at the end "Accept my most sincere salutations." I submit that nobody educated in England could have written either of these two sentences. I think one is entitled on these grounds to entertain very serious doubts about P 2002.

Next there is P 2189 which purports to be a telegram sent to me care of Ghose. Again I remember receiving at any rate one telegram and possibly more addressed in that way. But I certainly did not receive this one. There is a point to be noticed about this which also applies to P 2002 and P 2431. That is that they are according to the Prosecution of a cryptic character. They all contain the word Manchester which the Prosecution says means Moscow and other supposedly cryptic expressions and yet it is said that they were sent openly through the ordinary postal or telegraphic channels. The two things rather contradict each other. No conspirator I imagine would broadcast cryptic expressions such as these are supposed to be when he is presumably aware that the Police are carefully watching these channels. The Prosecution have assumed confidently that the word Manchester which occurs in several of these exhibits always means Moscow. So far as I can see this can only be described as a rather improbable surmise.

The Prosecution claim to read the word or words Ormmassel which occurs in this exhibit by means of the transposition rules and get U.S.M., which they further interpret as Usmani, and Nasim. I may point out that the application of the rules as formulated by Mr. Horton does not give that result. If as I rather suspect it is not a genuine telegram some one has been very careless in drafting it. If it is genuine then I can make a suggestion namely that Ormmassel is some word or name which has been distorted in transmission, as sometimes happens with the telegraph. This seems to me far more plausible than the Prosecution theory about it. In any case if I had received a telegram such as this from abroad I could not have supposed that it referred to Usmani as I had seen him only a few weeks before this date when he had stayed with us in Calcutta for a week or so, probably about the middle of June, and had then gone on to Madras.

The Prosecution claim also that I answered this telegram in P 2190 and P 2419. I could not have answered it as I never received it, and my supposed replies are not at all necessarily

replies to this telegram. I can point out the discrepancy which the Prosecution themselves have called attention to that the paragraph in P 2419 which is supposed to be a reply to it speaks of a telegram from Joe whereas P 2189 is signed by John. Then there is the remark in P 2190 "telegram unintelligible." There is nothing particularly unintelligible about P 2189 except the word Ormmassel and according to the Prosecution even that has a meaning, which I presumably was supposed to know. There is a further inconsistency. I could not possibly have written that paragraph in P 2419 about Usmani. I may refer to the book "Peshwar to Moscow" of Usmani, to which I wrote an introduction, which shows that we were on friendly terms, as we have remained ever since. This fact is quite incompatible with the expressions which occur in that paragraph. The prosecution can not succeed in establishing P 2189 by means of these two supposed replies.

They then bring forward P 2402 to prove it. But there is in the first place a difficulty about this letter. It says "I sent a wire away to Des but had a reply saying that the thing was unintelligible and upon further advice I sent it over to Fred." Now the Prosecution theory is I believe that this refers to P 2189 and P 2190 on the assumption that 'Des' means myself. Further they claim that Fred means Bradley. The inference is then that some telegram similar to P 2189 was sent to Bradley sometime between the 10th of August the date of P 2190 and 21st of August the date of P 2402. No such telegram appears in the record however. Previously the Prosecution brought forward P 2186 as a reply to it. I notice now, however, that they have changed their view on that point. It would not fit in of course because it purports to come from Ghate and not from Bradley and its date is about 5 or 6 weeks too early namely 7th of July. Obviously therefore P 2186 is not a

Prosecution say no such suggestion was ever made.

reply to the supposed telegram referred to in P 2402. The absence of any such telegram or reply helps to cast doubt on P2402. Even assuming however that P 2402 is genuine there is nothing in it to connect it definitely with these other exhibits, especially P 2189, except a rather rough coincidence of dates. Finally I should mention that P 2402 is not proved as having been sent either by or to anybody known to what the Prosecution calls this conspiracy. It is signed Alf and is addressed to one Bhaduri who like Howell and a number of others mentioned in the list of co-conspirators are addresses and nothing more having no proved connection with other people or political work or anything of the sort. It seems to me therefore that P 2402 is of very little help in proving the Prosecution theory about P 2819.

I want now to return to the other group of exhibits. I will deal first with the so-called figure cipher. There is only one specimen which the Prosecution allege I am responsible for, i.e. one

contained in P 1009. The meaning they give to it is again highly ingenious and of course I cannot suggest any other. I do not feel called upon to do so as I know nothing about it as I have said. But there is one circumstance I want to mention. It purports to give the name and address of P.W. 264 one Mr. Mudkutti. This gentleman said that he gave his address to Ghate for him to use. But he was careless enough to say that he received letters for Ghate at that address in the first half of 1927. Now the Prosecution theory is I believe that this address was sent abroad in the letter of which P 1009 is a draft (the Magistrate says something of this sort on page 188). If that is so no reply could have come until some time after the date of P 1009 which is the 4th September 1927, not until at least six weeks after if the destination of P 1009 was Europe. That would be towards the end of October 1927. This is far from the first half of 1927. I think the Prosecution coached their man very carelessly.

There is another point. The Prosecution make much of the fact that a copy of the "Golden Treasury" was found with me and that the Poem by which they claim to decipher this cipher is to be found in that book. All I will say is that the Golden Treasury is a very common book for English people to possess. I remember that when I took it from home there were at least half a dozen other copies lying about. Probably 50 per cent. of European in India would be found to possess a copy. There is a further fact to be remembered that no copy of the Golden Treasury was found with Bradley who is accused of producing ciphers of this sort from it. Nor so far as the evidence goes was one found with Fazl Elahi who is alleged to have produced the cipher in P 1829. Further according to the evidence Hutchison had a copy of the Golden Treasury and he is not alleged to have used it for this purpose. I think this shows fairly well that the possession of the Golden Treasury is a fact of no importance in connection with this cipher.

Next there is the question of invisible writing. Much fuss has been made about this especially in connection with me. I deny that I ever used it. I neither wrote it nor developed anything written by other people. I want to review briefly the evidence on which the Prosecution base their assertion that I did.

First I would point out that there is no document on the record even alleged to have been written by me containing any of this more or less invisible writing. Next in regard to P 1009. The Prosecution say that I wrote this, that it is a draft of a letter, and that there are words near the beginning between the main lines of writing which were to be put in in invisible writing. That is

the suggestion as I understand it. Now I deny that I wrote it. But in any case I cannot see that inference that those words were to be put in in invisible writing is at all plausible. There is absolutely nothing to indicate it. Almost any hastily written document especially a draft as this appears to be will be found to contain additions between the lines put in as after thoughts.

The next point is that these words contain some reference to photographs and development, which the Prosecution suggest means that someone had sent to the writer a letter containing invisible writing which he could not develop. I do not know of course what was meant. But the obvious straightforward meaning seems to me more likely. Then the Prosecution attach importance to two words in P 1009 which they state are 'with tinc', which being interpreted means 'with Tincture of Iodine'. These occur immediately after the passage about the photographs. I think it is impossible to say confidently what these words are. They are practically illegible or at any rate the second word is and to make matters worse they are crossed out. They appear to be the beginning of a phrase about which the writer changed his mind after writing only two words and it is impossible to say what they mean. The Prosecution rely upon their assumption as to the meaning of the words because a bottle containing Tincture of Iodine was found with me when I was arrested in Bombay. But as I shall show in a moment the facts and evidence are not in agreement with their assumption that Tincture of Iodine could be used to develop this so-called invisible writing.

When they searched my luggage in Bombay the Police found three bottles which according to P 2520 were labelled Tincture of Iodine, Hydrogen Peroxide, and Vegetable Oil respectively. These I had used for the ordinary purposes for which they are sold, namely Tincture of Iodine for minor medical purposes, Hydrogen Peroxide for the same, especially for washing the ears and the Oil for oiling my typewriter.

There are three documents before the Court which contain this more or less invisible writing. But it is a remarkable fact that no witness has come forward to say or even to give an opinion as to what substance or substances the writing is written with. P W. 215 says that he saw the Deputy Commissioner of Police Bombay applying some substance to P 1859 which made the faintly visible writing on it more visible. But he does not know the nature of the substance. The handwriting expert says he advised the Deputy Commissioner about chemicals for the purpose, but he has forgotten what chemicals he suggested. The Deputy Commissioner of Police has gone on leave. So we do not know what the successful substance was. Surely I suggest this is a very

strange thing. The Police organisation must be far less efficient than we are led to suppose if they have allowed so valuable a secret to be lost. I think it can be assumed that if anything of the kind had actually been found out about P 1859 the Court would have been told of it. I may also recall that the handwriting expert's evidence on this point was very vague. He said that certain substances could be used to write or to develop invisible writing but he did not give even an opinion about the substance actually used for this supposed invisible writing.

I have examined P 1859 and I want to point out that its appearance does not bear out P. W. 215's story. One line of writing has been treated apparently with a pale yellow liquid. But the writing on that line is no darker or better developed than the rest, which seem not to have been treated at all. Then there ^{are} ~~was~~ various patches of colour at the bottom, some marked H₂ O₂ in pencil, but none, or rather only one which is not labelled (I shall come to this in a moment) seems to have made any difference to the writing. I think there are signs of experiments on the other documents also but none seems to have produced any result. It can be assumed safely that these substances found with me were used in the experiments, and I think it can be stated with equal safety that none of them gave a positive result.

I must meet one possible objection. The evidence is that the writing in P 1859 was faintly visible when it was first opened. Now if the writing was originally invisible this fact shows that some kind of chemical change was going on in the ink. It may be suggested that this explains the failure of the experiments which apparently were made. But the handwriting expert says that when he first saw P 1859 it was very faint and has become more visible since then. This seems to show that the change if any was not complete at that time and the experiments ought to have shown some result. Certainly the experiments with the other two which are said to have been captured at the same time as the chemicals ought to have given results. I think therefore that even from the facts so far considered it can be inferred that the three liquids found with me were not such as could develop this writing.

But there are further facts. I will consider Tincture of Iodine first. The handwriting expert says that Tincture of Iodine could not be used for invisible writing because it would be visible. But it could be used for developing an invisible writing written with Starch Solution. That is so. But the drawback of that method namely writing with Starch Solution, is that it is very easily developed merely by heating. No very high temperature is required, some two or three hundred degrees should guess, and I

imagine that the first test an investigator would apply to a suspected document is heat. But it is clear that the actual examples of writing were not done with Starch on two grounds; first that Starch writing would not show at all as that in P 1869 is said to have done merely on exposure to air at ordinary temperatures; and the second is that Starch writing if treated with Iodine would give a blue colour and not brown which appears in all these three documents. There is only one place in the corner of P 1859 where experiments seem to have produced a blue colour. But the substance applied is evidently not Iodine as it has made a purplish stain all round whereas Iodine gives a brown stain.

It might be claimed that these traces are made with Starch but developed with heat first so that the brown appearance is explained. There is no evidence for that of course. But any way it does not get over my first point, namely that a Starch trace would not show up spontaneously at all. Further it must be remembered that the Starch-Iodine reaction is a very sensitive test. If a starched document is heated all the Starch is not likely to be destroyed and on treatment with Iodine the blue colour will still show almost certainly.

Then let us take Hydrogen Peroxide. The hand-writing expert says correctly that Hydrogen Peroxide can not be used for invisible writing but can be used for developing writing done with some substance which on oxidation becomes coloured. My impression is that the more usual result of oxidation with a mild oxidising agent like Hydrogen Peroxide is that colour fades rather than develops. That is only a general statement of course. No doubt suitable substances could be found. The only suggestion of a possible substance made by the hand-writing expert is Potassium Iodide which on oxidation by Hydrogen Peroxide might show a brown colour owing to the release of Iodine. He further states that Potassium Iodide if used as an ink would turn yellow or brown on exposure to air at ordinary temperatures. The idea apparently is to suggest that Potassium Iodide was the substance used in these letters and that the addressee used Hydrogen peroxide to develop it. For this purpose P 1563 is brought in. The hand-writing expert was asked questions about it in connection with this.

Now I very much doubt whether Potassium Iodide would decompose merely on exposure to air at ordinary temperatures but this is a minor point. The main point I made previously that although Hydrogen peroxide was undoubtedly tried on P 1859 particularly there is no evidence that it gave any result. But if Potassium Iodide were the substance in question it should have given results.

There are further points. P 1859 especially but the others also show a very definite thick brown mark. Now I rather doubt whether Potassium Iodide even if oxidised with Hydrogen Peroxide or in any other way would give such a thick mark. The solution originally applied would have to be very concentrated and one would have to apply it very thickly, a thing which no one trying to write invisibly is likely to do. I may say also that the colour does not appear to me to be quite right for Iodine. It is too dark. Then there is to be remembered the stability of these marks. These documents have now been in the Court for nearly two years and we do not know for how long before that they were as they are now. A stain made by Iodine either produced from the oxidation of Potassium Iodide or put on in any other way would almost certainly not be so stable. Elementary Iodine is very active chemically. By this time it would perhaps have attacked some material in the paper or in any case would have sublimed away to an appreciable extent if not entirely. Any way some sort of fading or change would be expected. But none seems to have taken place.

As for P 1563 I do not see that any reliance can be placed upon it. The Prosecution does not say that it was found with me. Its form "apply with (whatever it is)" is not that which would be used in a recipe for an invisible ink. It would obviously be fatal to apply Potassium Iodide Solution with a substance Hydrogen Peroxide for example which would develop it. The form of words rather suggests a medical prescription or that is one's first impression. But the meaningless words "Hydrogen perchlor" or whatever they are at the end incline one to think that it is mere scribble.

Finally there is the oil which is hardly worth considering as a means either of writing invisibly or of developing invisible writing. The hand-writing expert seems to agree with this opinion. It is described as being labelled "Vegetable Oil". I did not remember that but it may be Vegetable Oil of course. I should have expected it to be a fairly pure mixture of medium to light paraffins but in any case such oils as are used for lubrication are very inert chemically and consequently could not be used for these purposes. There is the further fact that any oil applied to paper tends to spread out more or less indefinitely. This alone obviously would render an oil rather unsuitable for use as an ink, apart from other considerations.

Perhaps I had better summarised very briefly the arguments on this invisible writing question. First there is no evidence of any value that I used it myself. The three suspected substances found with me are admittedly not suitable for writing invisibly. At any rate the handwriting expert admits this in case of two (Tincture Iodine and Hydrogen Peroxide) and is non-committal about the third, the oil, which I maintain is obviously not a suitable substance

I had these substances with me for the ordinary purposes for which they are sold.

Then the Prosecution suggest that I developed the invisible writing of others sent to me. They seem to suggest two ways. One is based on P 1009 and its supposed, but actually almost illegible and quite uncertain mention of "Tinc". This would be the development of a Starch trace by means of Tincture of Iodine. The second way based on P 1563 is the development of a Potassium Iodide trace by means of Hydrogen Peroxide. The Prosecution do not indicate which of the two they think is the method actually adopted. I have commented on the absence of evidence of a positive character on this point. But in any case that does not matter as I have shown that the facts are such that it must be concluded that neither of these suggested ways could have been used.

I may say that I do not pretend to be an expert in Chemistry. But I am confident of what I have stated. The substances in question are all common and well known to elementary students and I am fairly sure that an expert would corroborate my statements of fact and agree with my arguments.

D. 4-6-31.

That finishes what I want to say in detail about these documents. I can state my conclusions best as follows:—

In detective stories there are several essential characters, the villain, the detective, the innocent persons to whom the crime is imputed, and so on. In this case my idea is that the villain is the Prosecution, and in accordance with the proper traditional policy of villains they have foisted the crime on to an innocent person, myself. But it may, perhaps, that they play the fourth essential part in the story. They are no more than what I may call the Watson. They may have managed to impute the thing to me not so much out of malice as by mistake. I cannot cast myself in the role of Sherlock Holme. I have not been able to lay my finger confidently on the villain, though I have my suspicions. That is not my job after all. But if the Prosecution are to be regarded as the Watson of the case, I think I have succeeded at any rate in Holmes' secondary task, that of showing what a stupid person Watson is.

I want also to make a few general remarks about these documents. I gather that the Prosecution attach a good deal of importance to them. I rather wonder why. For even if the Court is inclined to agree with the Prosecution that I received and sent cryptic letters, I do not quite see what value that has in itself. Several times in this case reference has been made to open work

and secret work. I have myself claimed that the Labour Research Department, for example, does only open work. For what it is worth I maintain that claim. The Magistrate suggests at one place in the Committal Order that the performance of underground work, in particular secret correspondence is itself prima facie proof of conspiracy.

I am not in a position to contest that from a legal point of view as I know nothing about the law. But I have one or two remarks to make about it in the light of common sense. In the first place it is not itself criminal, or at any rate the Police do not seem to think so, as they claim that they found these supposedly cryptic documents, some of which they confidently attribute to me some 1½ or 2 years before March 1929 and during the interval they allowed me to remain at liberty. The second point is that it seems to afford evidence in regard to association no more valuable than that provided by ordinary correspondence, that is to say if the contents of the correspondence are otherwise similar. It may be said that it affords evidence of what I believe is known to the law as consciousness of guilt. That is not necessarily the case. All that it can be held to show is consciousness of Police surveillance. But Police surveillance is so common in India that I do not think that even the Prosecution will claim that it implies guilt. I think that the reason why the Prosecution have brought in these documents and laid so much stress on them is not their value as evidence which is very weak, or their legal value but their propaganda value. They certainly have conducted a good deal of propaganda about them in the Press. The principal reason why this propaganda is effective is the prevalence in India of that curious outlook or set of prejudices described by the term Gandhism. Mr. Gandhi has spread abroad in India the idea that we should not fight our enemies by any means other than what he calls truth and non-violence. Underground activities are felt to involve an infringement of the former doctrine and consequently are repugnant. But we are not Gandhists. I speak as a Communist and as such I believe as a representative of ordinary sensible humanity. We do not believe in the Gandhian form of truth which seems to involve the duty to be truthful only in relation to one's enemies and to say nothing about one's duty to one's friends.

The records of this case show how closely the Police inquire into any activities which they consider objectionable, how they follow suspects about the streets, take them to the Police-station and search them or arrest them on suspicion (I refer to the evidence of P. W. 247), plant their agents among them, for example J. P. Begerhotts, and so forth, and how they habitually appropriate articles, papers etc., which they intercept in the Postal and Customs offices. This case has shown also if it required to be

shown, that the law in India is already so conveniently framed that people engaged in any public activity or even in no activity can be convicted of conspiracy. Or if they cannot be convicted they can be kept for two or three years in Jail in proving their innocence and that is equally effective. The position in this respect will no doubt be worse when this case is over. In a country with legal and Police systems like those of India I do not think that anybody can be blamed for using underground methods. Unfortunately as I have said the policy and spirit of Gandhism have made people unwilling to use them and have made them to a certain extent distasteful. This is only an instance which nevertheless serves to show the essentially anti-revolutionary character of Gandhism and is one of the reasons why it is so essential for us to combat it.

P. 526 ⁽²⁹⁾ ~~(2)~~ :—There is a remark in this letter "Ghosh is improving" or something which means that. The Magistrate has made much of this. I may say that when this letter was written early in 1928 I had met Ghosh only two or three times, namely at the Cawnpore Trade Union Congress and in Calcutta in December 1927, and could hardly have had time to notice any 'improvement'. The remark probably meant this, (I have forgotten now of course) that at first one would take Ghosh to be an ordinary Reformist of the N. M. Joshi type. But I had found that he was better than that, from my point of view, that is to say, in some respects. He was not anxious to go to Geneva for example; as so many of the Reformist Labour leaders are, though I think he did not oppose the principle of sending Trade Union representatives there. Generally his views though obviously Reformist views were better, I considered from my point of view, than those of many of the Reformists I had come across. This therefore is probably the meaning of my remark.

Then there is another reference to Ghosh in connection with the presentation of an address to the Governor of Bengal by the Kankinarah Labour Union. When I asked him about this he said that he had understood from Mr. K.C. Roy Chaudhri and others that if this was done help might be forthcoming from the Government for the school which the Union was running. So he did not raise much objection to it. But my impression was that he felt that as Secretary of a Federal Organisation like the Bengal Trade Union Federation (B. T. U. F.) containing representatives of various schools of thought he could not have his own way in everything, particularly in those matters which as I understood he regarded as not essential. This is perhaps why I wrote that he does not like to displease people.

P. 527 (1) :—There is a statement in this letter about Desai

in connection with sending news reports to the Sunday Worker. I had met Desai in Bombay in the office of the Bombay Chronicle I think. He told me there that he had some idea of sending news to the British Labour Press. So when I wrote about the proposal to send reports I mentioned Desai in connection with it. When I wrote asking if Dutt had seen Desai's paper I assumed that Dutt had heard of him. Desai had told me that he had acted for some time as the London Correspondent of the Bombay Chronicle and had been an occasional contributor to the London Press and therefore Dutt must have heard of him.

P 2259 C:—This is an article which I sent to the "Sunday Worker" London on the events which had taken place in about 1926-28 in Atia a part of the Mymensingh District in Bengal. I have put in an exhibit D 138 which would go to show that this article is correct in regard to facts. I do not want to go into the peasant question generally. All I want to say is this. The incidents reported in this article are I believe fairly typical of the relations prevailing in India among the peasants, the zamindars and the Government. Briefly the story is that the zamindars of this place perpetrated acts of shameful oppression against the peasants. The peasants protested in a legal and constitutional way. The Government supported the zamindars not in a legal or peaceful way but violently. On appeal to the High Court the ruling was given in favour of the peasants. The Government and the zamindars took no notice but went on with the job. The peasants having exhausted their funds could do nothing more and had to submit.

One of the favourite stories of the British Imperialists in relation to India is that they are protectors of the peasants against their exploiters. I notice actually that some bright person in the House of Commons only a few weeks ago was supporting the continuance of this case by an appeal to the interests of the Indian peasants in the maintenance of law and order. It is the same attitude. I have no wish to deny that the landlords and so on are brutal in relations to the peasants. Of course they are. It is the same all over the world. But I do very strongly deny that the British Government protects the peasants. There is no need to appeal to this small instance. The British Government displays almost complete solidarity with the landlords and actually the British Capitalists are directly and one may say solely responsible for the fact that there is a landlord class or a class of princes in India to-day. They create or maintain artificially the chief oppressors and exploiters of the peasants and yet claim to be the peasants' protectors against those oppressors. I suppose in all the long indictment which one could draw up against the hypocrisy of

the British bourgeois rulers of India, this patronage of the peasants is the most revolting item.

P 2419:—The Magistrate draws the conclusion from this exhibit that Ghosh, Dange and myself acted as a team as he calls it, in connection with labour Research work. This conclusion is quite without foundation. I do not know if either Dange or Ghosh even knew of the other's activities in this matter. Certainly I was aware of no co-ordination or anything of the kind. The proposals to do this work had come from them spontaneously and independently. Actually the proposals were somewhat different as the exhibits will show. But I had hoped that one or both might develop and do useful work. It will be seen from what I have said about the L.R.D. of London that it is not a Communist body and that its work can be carried out by any body with an understanding of what may be called the Labour outlook. I prepared at one time some sort of prospectus on the subject with Ghosh's requirements as I had understood them from discussion with him in mind. It is D 92 I have referred to it in connection with the L.R.D. It contains a statement of aims which would I think be acceptable to any Labour man.

P 1955:—I have nothing to say about this letter as such. I mention it only because the Prosecution the other day suggested that it was taken to its addressee by Ajudhia Prasad. It was not. The reason why they suggest this is presumably that they have no record of its having been intercepted in the post. I am glad if that is so. It is pleasant to think that even one of one's letters got through without the C.I.D. prying into it. But I do not see why simply because they have been careless they need erect a false theory to explain it. Actually I think I can explain why the interception machinery failed. Although the letter is headed Bombay and I say if I remember that I was hurrying off to Delhi and therefore must cut it short nevertheless it was not posted in Bombay. I forgot it and had to post it in Delhi. I suppose the Delhi Police are not so expert as the Bombay Police and missed it.

Generally I corresponded with a number of people in England. The Magistrate says that this correspondence was a valuable means of communication between the conspirators in India and those in Europe or something of the kind. That must mean I suppose that this correspondence furthers the conspiracy or is part of its machinery. All I can say is that whether one agrees with that or not depends upon the meaning attached to the word conspiracy. I think I can leave this correspondence to speak for itself. Its subject matter is clear and I should say completely innocent.

Q. The following exhibits or oral evidence relate to your association with (1) W.P.P. of Bengal (2) W.P.P. of Bombay

(3) W.P.P. of U.P (4) W.P.P. of Punjab and 'Naujawan Bharat Sabha and (5) A.I.W.P.P. (1) P52, 1617, 416 (11), 549(19), 549(21), 544(3), 1302, 2161 (1) P, 2172, 2472 and 16: (2) P 1013, 1373 (2), 526(27), 1355 (7)C, 1353, 1343, 1348(41) & (50), 826, 1344 (entries of 15-3-28 and 8-4-28), 545(7), 546 (11), 818, 1322: (3) P479, 1620, 1619P, 536(6), 526 (8). 1116, 2070P, 549(16), 1457, 2197(414), 2196, 272, 1458, 1459, 431(Krantikari 17-11-28), 311, P.Ws. 126 and 173(4) P 526 (24), 495 (= 344), 1393 (= 451), 549 (17), 549 (10), 526 (5), 497, 2051C (= 549(18)), 1626, 2152C, 481, P.Ws. 164, 165, 170, 171 and 179. (5) P 549 (11) (= 375), 1763, 549 (2) and (3) (= 596), 515, 524, 549(4), 1764, 569 (= 334), 549 (15), 478, 2024C, 1248 (22), 1373(4), 2185, 416(4), 487, 468(2), 2047, 2045, 485, 406, 526 (37), P.Ws. 90 and 254. Have you anything to say in explanation of the above evidence? (Note: All these subjects were included in a single question at accused's request.)

A. The Prosecution claim that I was instrumental in establishing Workers' & Peasants' Party in Bombay. That is not correct. So far as I understood, the Workers' & Peasants' Party was in existence in fact if not in name, and I think actually in name also, before I met any of its members. I joined it fairly soon after I came in contact with it.

The Prosecution also claim that I induced the Workers' & Peasants' Party of Bengal to change its name. That also is incorrect. I was present at the Bhatpara Conference of the Workers' & Peasants' Party of Bengal. But I had only just arrived in Bengal at that time and if I remember it had already been decided to move a resolution to change the name before I went there.

I attended a Conference at Meerut in October or so 1928 and I spoke at two sessions of the Delhi Provincial Political Conference and attended some meetings of Workers' & Peasants' Conference. The Prosecution has depended on P 549 (16) and P 2419 to show that the Workers' & Peasants' Party of U.P. was formed at the Meerut Conference. I do not remember definitely now. It may have been my impression at that time. But I would point out that as I did not know the language at all I could have had only a very vague idea of the proceedings.

About the Punjab Party so far as I remember it did not exist when I was in the Punjab and so I had nothing to do with it. I attended and spoke at a meeting at the Bradlaugh Hall in February or March 1928 which I shall deal with later. But that meeting was not held by the Workers' & Peasants' Party so far as I know.

About the all India Workers' & Peasants' Party I took part in the proceedings of the Conference at Calcutta in December 1928. I shall come to that also later.

I want now to make some remarks about the Workers' & Peasants' Party and my connection with it from my point of view. There is evidence that I associated with the Workers' & Peasants' Party and worked with it. Previous statements by the accused with which I agree have shown that the policy of the Workers' & Peasants' Party was a national revolutionary policy. It was an Independence Party and stood for what may be called the National Democratic Revolution. Now the mere fact that the Indian Communists worked with this party would have compelled me to do so also. But there is more in the matter than that. The question arises how can an Englishman, especially one who claims not to be a mere isolated individual but to stand for the truest interests of the British working class, that is of a large majority of the British people—how can a person in that position work for the complete revolutionary overthrow of British rule in India. I claim that one who represents the real interest of the British working class must take up that position.

To consider the matter in a general way first: the Labour Movement is interested in the progress of civilization. In fact it regards itself as the most progressive force acting in world politics. Moreover it is traditionally strongly International in its outlook. It is concerned to see that all parts of the world take part in the development of civilization and is inclined to feel that any part of the world which is definitely backward as compared with the rest acts as a sort of brake on the general progress. That is the outlook of the Labour Movement which it tends almost instinctively to adopt though it may often not be very clear. I think too that there are very sound reasons to suppose that that outlook is correct.

There is no doubt that India is one of the most backward parts of the world. From almost any point of view India is far behind the level which has been generally attained. This matter has been dealt with fairly fully in a previous statement and I need not repeat it. The substance of the matter is that British Imperialist policy which is directed to two main ends namely exploitation of the country to the maximum and maintenance of its political control, is chiefly responsible for this backwardness. This policy is shown in three or four principal ways. These are (1) the low level of the industrial development of the country. There is no doubt that the British policy in this matter is one of conscious opposition to Industrialisation. (2) The second is the maintenance of a land system and hence of a social structure which is to a large extent feudal in form. (3) The third is the maintenance of an irresponsible Absolutist Government which relies directly and principally upon superior force to keep itself in control. This means among other things that there is practically no good of political Democracy. (4) The fourth consists of miscellaneous measures of a

social and similar character intended to safeguard British rule by keeping the population backward. Such are the encouragements of religion, the cast system and communalism, the control and limitation of education, and the proscription and banning of progressive political thought and so on.

The result of these policies is the really terrible condition in which the country finds itself today. Its standard of living, that is that of the mass of the people, is said to be the lowest in the world. I need quote no more facts to support that. The great majority of the population are still sunk in what has rightly been called rural idiocy. The majority of them are still under the rule of feudal or semi-feudal landlords who exploit them in the usual merciless manner and can practically control their whole lives. Slavery, de facto at any rate, still exists on a considerable scale. Ninety per cent of the population is still illiterate. The general standard of culture is that of centuries ago, or rather it is lower than that of centuries ago for it is debased owing to the fact that it is not and has not been for some generations suited to the prevalent conditions. It has fallen behind the most active and progressive forces in Indian life. Religion, for example, is still almost universal and is fanatically believed. The sanitary conditions and so on are such that India is a sort of by word for unhealthiness. This is a brief but not unjust summary of the position as it is today.

The British Imperialists claim that that they stand for progress in India and that they have been responsible for all that is advanced and progressive in Indian life. They bring forward certain considerations in support of this claim and there is as sufficient basis of fact in these considerations to make the claim plausible at first sight. I must therefore show briefly why we hold that it is false. I may say that I am not concerned in the least with the question often raised in this connection by Indian Nationalists of the intrinsic value of the traditional Indian civilization as opposed to so-called Western Culture. We take an entirely common sense and materialistic view of the nature of civilization.

The situation when the British Bourgeoisie first came to India was that their level of material civilization was definitely in advance of that of India, which was still mainly a feudal country, though Feudalism was already decaying. The British were able therefore to secure political control over the country though it took a century or more to do so, and hence to put an end to the chaotic conditions which necessarily accompanied the decay of Feudalism. This was the first advance in India achieved by the British Bourgeoisie and is still the matter on which they most pride themselves. Being in complete political control of India and

effectively monopolizing its trade and general contact with the outer world the British Capitalists have been the means whereby certain of the technical achievements of the more advanced Capitalist countries have been introduced in to India. I refer to the transport and Irrigation system, Industrial methods and so on. In addition and as a subsidiary to these or to Governmental or trading activities, educational, and legal machinery and the like have also been set up. It may be assumed for the purpose of the present argument advance has been made in all these matters though that is often denied. These are the facts on which the claim of the British Bourgeoisie about their civilizing mission is based.

But it is only one side of the matter. As well as this progressive function the British occupation had from the beginning a definitely reactionary effect. The clearest instance is the land question. Over a very large part of India the effect of the British domination has been to stabilize or even to establish where they did not previously exist, essentially feudal conditions. This sort of development was encouraged by the whole economic policy in the earlier period. The growth of an Independent Capitalist economy and Capitalist class in India was definitely opposed and prevented and the country was drained of so much of its wealth that any kind of Independent development was rendered impossible. With a helpless and impoverished country the British Bourgeoisie could do what they pleased. On this basis they have carried out certain technical advances as I have said but only so far as has been necessary for their purposes. In none of these departments is the degree of advance adequate to the needs of the country; indeed that is a very moderate way of stating the facts.

Now especially in the last few decades classes have developed in India particularly the bourgeois class which have tried to push on the development of the country. But the attitude of the British bourgeoisie and Government has been in almost all aspects hostile to their efforts. The fundamental question one may say is that of Industrialisation and there can be no doubt that the British policy has been generally to prevent Industrial development in India beyond the small amount required for war purposes and the like. There is equally no doubt that the policy on the whole has succeeded.

The record of the British bourgeoisie in India then can be summed up in this way. The earlier period of their rule combined both progressive and reactionary features. But now especially since tendencies economic and political towards advance have begun to develop within Indian society itself, the effect of British rule is almost wholly reactionary. It must be condemned as obstructive to the progress of the Indian people now.

The European Labour Movement has always realised more or less vaguely that something like this was the situation. I do not mean that they all were closely acquainted with Colonial history. Perhaps their real feeling was derived from their personal knowledge of Capitalism and their quite natural and actually correct suspicion that the Capitalism which exploited them was an equal if not more objectionable exploiter in the colonies. They felt also a natural sympathy for those whom they thought to be oppressed by their oppressors. They felt in this vague sort of way that Imperialism was responsible for the actual backwardness of the colonies and therefore as I have explained was indirectly holding back their development also. They felt also on general bourgeois democratic grounds that it was improper for the people of one country to rule over another and deprive them of Democratic rights.

This was the situation up to the period of the Second International, and even today this sort of sentiment is very common among the workers in Europe. But a certain change came about during the 20th Century and specially in the post war period—somewhat earlier in the case of Britain perhaps. A part of the working class did receive certain benefits as a result of the exploitation of the colonies and consequently began to acquiesce in Imperialist policy. This was only one aspect of course of the general process of adaptation of the Labour Movement to Capitalism which has been going on all this time and has resulted in the complete splitting of the Labour Movement in most advanced countries and the winning over of the old leading sections to definite and open support of Capitalism. Now-a-days though it is doubtful if any considerable section of the working class in Britain for example can be said to benefit appreciably from Imperialism, it has now become the accepted policy of the reformist section to support Imperialism as a necessary part of its whole essentially Capitalist policy.

But as I have said this is a relatively recent development. Only a few years before the War Mr. MacDonald visited India and on his return published a book in which he severely criticised Imperialist policy. He is also reported to have said in an interview at that time "Independence must be granted". Now I agree that this is not an expression of what I should call true working class sentiment. It is an expression of liberal sentiment. But it was so far in accordance with the predominating sentiment in the Labour Movement at that time and I think it is evidence of the extent to which the official Labour Movement has become corrupted that it cannot now even attain to the liberal level.

Now in the present period while the sentiment of the workers is still largely anti-Imperialist all the organised parties of the

working class have gone over to more or less open support of Imperialism except the Communists. The Communists are the only organised sections who stick to the traditional and correct working class policy in this matter and whole-heartedly support the colonial revolution. I can quote as an example Mr. C. F. Andrews who says in his letter to the Jharia Sessions of the A. I. T. U. C. (D 145 (12)), "While the right wing of the Labour Party constantly swerved with regard to the vital questions of "Imperialism" and "racial superiority" and "White Labour", the Communists never wavered for a single second with regard to these essential matters. Already in South Africa I had found the same thing. The only Europeans in South Africa who really and honestly were against what is called the White Labour policy and were ready to admit Indians, Cape Coloured and Bantus on equal terms were the Communists." It is however, a question not only of their attitude on these matters of detail but on the fundamental matter, the colonial revolution.

I have given the general reasons why the Labour Movement has traditionally taken this attitude. We do so partly for the same reasons. We do so because we believe that it is for our interests i. e. the interests of, for example the British working class that the Indian people should achieve Independence from British rule. The Labour Party critics are therefore incorrect when they accuse us of returning to an out of date discredited Cobdenism. The principle on which this section of Liberals, the Cobdenites based their opposition to Imperialism was the purely bourgeois Democratic abstract principle that it is improper for one people to restrict the freedom of another and rule over it. We agree with that principle but go beyond it. We have more important reasons than that for supporting the Colonial Revolution. Our difference from Cobdenism will be still more clear when it is realised that the real basis of Cobdenism was not adherence to that admirable Liberal principle but the predominance of British manufactures and especially of the Textile Industry. The British Textile Industry was so far ahead of other competitors at that time that it needed no protected market or Colony. Colonies were a nuisance to it as it could exploit the whole world. Our view is quite different from this.

It is necessary for me to show in rather more detail that our policy is in the interests of the British workers. That I proceed to do (objection raised by ^{Grant} to relevance. Accused said it was his explanation and he thought it relevant.) These propagandists those of the British bourgeois and Labour Parties claim that a very large part of the British national income is derived from the exploitation of India and that if this exploitation was stopped Britain would suffer serious impoverishment and the British

working class would suffer most of all. The more unscrupulous, such as Lord Rothermere, maintain that the exploitation of India represents as much as 20 per cent of the British national income and they do not hesitate to say bluntly to the British workers that if India is lost they will get no unemployment relief, no old age pensions, no free education and so on. These people are apparently carrying on a violent campaign in this way especially among the Lancashire Textile workers, to win them over to their Fascist Imperialist camp. The whole theory which they put forward I believe to be false.

The first point I want to make against it is that this propaganda exaggerates the matter to a considerable extent. A previous statement has shown that the profits of the British bourgeoisie from India can be reckoned at minimum of about 120 millions of pounds per annum. Now the determination of this figure is important and I must pause a moment to justify it. I agree generally with the calculation given in the previous statement already mentioned but I realise that it is difficult to give anything but a very rough estimate by means of a calculation of that type. Many of the relevant figures are uncertain. The objection is made against estimates of this order of magnitude that they are contradicted by the Trade figures. The visible balance of Trade can give a sum which does not on the face of it amount to more than one half of this. I think the discrepancy can be explained in part at least by consideration of the difference of price levels of the goods concerned in India and in Britain or Europe. Goods can be exported from India very cheaply because of the very low level of wages etc. in India, and can then be sold abroad at far higher rates giving a large margin of profit which will not appear in the Trade figures. This is the so-called super profit.

But further I think the order of magnitude of this estimate can be confirmed from another source. According to the report of the Liberal Industrial Inquiry the total "invisible" imports into Britain have been in the post-war years at the level of about 450 millions pounds per annum. In 1927 the figure was 488 million pounds. This report quotes Official Board of Trade estimates. These invisible imports fall under three heads, Shipping, Services and Interest. If we assume, to begin with that ^{the} invisible profit is drawn from foreign countries in proportion to the total British Investments in those countries, which seems fair, ^{we} can estimate the total drawn from India. The total British ~~Government~~ ^{Business} Investments seem to be about 4000 million pounds, for this figure I rely on Lenin's "Imperialism" which quotes a pre-war estimate of 3 to 4 thousand million pounds and on Shah and Khambatta's Book "The Wealth and Taxable Capacity of India" which quotes from Sir George Paish an estimate of 3500 million pounds in 1910.

Since then British foreign investments have been reduced substantially owing to the War and their growth has been hindered since by the reduced exportable surplus of British Capital and the unofficial embargo on foreign investments which was maintained for some time about 1925. We can assume therefore that the total is now about 4000 million pounds.

The total British Capital in India is about 700 million pounds according to Mr. M. C. B. Sayer, Ex-Secretary of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce writing in the 'Statesman' of the 29th January 1930. This may however be a serious underestimate as other no less authoritative persons say 1000 million pounds. Taking 700 million pounds i. e. 17.5 per cent of the total and taking the same proportion of the total invisible imports, we get 80 or 85 million pounds. This being only an "invisible" figure, the total with visible item must be roughly in agreement with the previous estimate, especially if we bear in mind that the invisible return from India is probably larger than the strict proportion of Capital invested, owing to the very heavy Trade between Britain and India, the British monopoly of Indian Overseas and Coastal Traffic and the very large staff of British officials, army men and so on. The figure of 120 million pounds is therefore roughly confirmed.

But for the present purpose as it may be under estimate I shall suppose that it is say 150 million pounds. Now apart from economic exploitation of India itself the British bourgeoisie use India for other purposes principally as a subsidiary military centre for the empire. If India were to achieve complete Independence it is fairly certain that the whole Eastern Colonial Empire of Britain would collapse and profits from other Colonies would cease to come into considerable extent. Let these profits be estimated, very liberally, say at another 150 million pounds. The whole loss to the British bourgeoisie by the Indian National Revolution can then be put at a maximum of 300 million pounds per annum.

D/-5. 6. 31.

The total British National Income at present is about 4000 million pounds per annum for this figure I rely on two sources, the Simon Commission report and the report of the Liberal Industrial Inquiry. Three hundred million pounds is not 20 per cent but 7½ per cent of this. This moreover is not from India alone but from the whole of the eastern colonies, and is further a liberal estimate. From India alone the percentage is 3½ or 4 at most.

The second point is this. I am considering abstractly that this possibly seven or eight per cent is subtracted from the

British National Income, apart from political repercussions and so on. The question is how far would the working class be affected. I should say that the loss would fall immediately and mainly on the class of rentier Capitalists that is those who depend upon investments whether directly in colonial Government or other stocks or in firms working in the colonies or banks etc. which draw profits from the colonies. It would fall next upon the class who draw salaries and pensions and so on from the colonies in question, and third upon the manufacturers, shipping Companies etc. which profit from trade with the colonies. How far this loss would be passed on to the working class is questionable. Losses suffered by manufacturing and shipping firms would be passed on to the workers to a large extent. The decrease in British Government revenue would be felt by workers indirectly to some extent. A decrease in the income of the salary and dividend drawing class would make itself felt to some extent among those workers engaged in luxury industries and such workers as domestic and hotel servants and so on. But even taking it at its worst the British working class would not feel anything like the whole loss. That would be borne mainly by those classes already mentioned, whose relation to the working class is remote and indirect. I do not deny that the loss to the Capitalist class would be heavy. The merely material loss would be great. But I think I am correct in saying that the loss to the working class would be relatively slight.

My third point is that the effect which the Imperialist propagandists predict upon the interests of the British working class as a result of diminution of trade etc. is already occurring to a considerable extent before the revolution takes place and largely because that revolution is resisted by Imperialism. It is questionable how far the Indian Nationalist campaign of boycott of British goods has been effective and how far the diminution of British exports of manufactured goods to India has been brought about by the general economic crisis and other foreign competition. But there cannot be much doubt that the effect of the boycott as such has been substantial especially in relation to British cotton goods. This has had the effect of rendering a substantial number of British workers unemployed. I repeat that this is happening not as a result of the Indian National Revolution but under and as a result of continued Imperialist control of India. To this extent that control of India is actually opposed to the interests of the British working class.

Then for the fourth point I want to refer to the question of the general economic policy of Imperialism in relation to India. It has been shown in a previous statement that it is the deliberate

policy of the British Capitalists to restrict the industrial development of India to the lowest possible limit. It is an incidental result of this policy that even Indian agriculture can make very little progress. The result of both these things is that India's possibilities as a market are severely limited. India is a relatively poor market for machinery and the like because the progress of Industrialisation is very slow, and for consumption goods because of the general backwardness of Indian economy and the consequent intense poverty of the mass of the population. When the Indian National Revolution takes place and India sets about a rapid improvement of its economy there will be for a long time a very big demand for the means of production, machinery and so forth, as is the case with Soviet Russia today. The population of India is about twice that of the U.S.S.R. On the other hand with a rapid rise in the standard of life of the population there will be a big demand for consumption goods. The British working class whether they are still under Capitalism at that time or have overthrown Capitalism will of course for sometime at any rate supply a considerable proportion of this demand. This point therefore is that in this way also the Imperialist control of India by the British Capitalists is contrary to the interests of the British working class and that their interests will be advanced by the Indian National Revolution.

Then the next point is this. Industry Transport systems and so forth have developed in India to certain extent. But it is noticeable that the Indian workers are paid wages which are very much lower than those of the corresponding British workers. Messrs. Purcell & Hallsworth summarise their report by giving an estimate of the average wage of the Indian workers at about one shilling per day. My personal experience confirms that Rs. 20/- per month is about the average wage for industrial workers and employees of all sorts. But the average daily wage of British workers is probably something like 10 shillings. The average Indian workers wage is not much more than 10 per cent or at the most 15 per cent of the average British workers wage. Now this sort of thing reacts adversely upon the British Workers' conditions. There is more or less direct competition between the British and the Indian workers at any rate in four important occupations—Textiles, Jute, Coal Mining and Sea-faring. This competition has definitely had the effect of reducing wages in Britain and to some extent no doubt in other European countries, mainly in these industries but also generally. It is the consciousness of this among the European workers, still however expressing itself in a reformist manner, which accounts mainly for the despatch of the various Trade Union Delegations which have come from Britain or

Europe to India recently. These are Messers. Johnstone and Syme in connection with the Jute Industry, the International Textile Workers' Delegation, Mr. Mardy Jones M.P. in connection with coal, and Messers. Purcell and Hallsworth generally. The same consideration also accounts in part for the support which large sections of the European Workers give to the International Labour Office, which holds out to them the quite illusory hope of removing the menace of this under cutting competition by reformist means. It is clear that while Imperialism continues the situation will remain and the Capitalists will use the traditional disparity between the wage standards of the two sets of workers to profit at the expense of both.

The effect of my argument up to the present is as follows : Considering the matter quite abstractly and in economic terms only it may be expected that the Indian National Revolution will involve a loss to the British which can be estimated roughly at a maximum of 7 to 8 per cent of their national income. But of this loss only a part is likely to be felt by the working class. On the other hand there are considerations, of which I have given three, which show that the policy of Imperialist control of India is opposed to the economic interests of the British workers and that their position will be improved to a corresponding extent if that control is broken. The net result is probably not capable of being calculated but it seems fairly safe to say that on balance the British working class would gain as a result of the Indian National Revolution.

But this is to consider the matter only in a very abstract manner which does not give a complete account of the position. It is an arithmetical approach to the question only. It does not consider the political interactions.

It is because of the policy of Imperialism that the world generally and Great Britain in particular have reached their present position of instability and crisis. It is owing to its possession for a considerable period of a colonial monopoly that British national economy has been allowed to get into its present dangerous ^{position} possession which I have described previously as a parasitic condition. It is the competition and fight for the possession of colonies which is one of the immediate occasions for war in the modern period. It is this which was largely responsible for the European War of 1914.

Its interests in these matters force the working class in Imperialist countries and Britain in particular to take up an attitude in opposition to Imperialism. But the matter goes further than that. Imperialism is not merely a policy which can be opposed while the ruling class and its methods are otherwise supported.

To oppose Imperialism means to oppose Capitalism. The two are indistinguishable. It is to the interests of the British working class to oppose Capitalism and in particular its Imperialist policy and in order to oppose and get rid of it successfully it must overthrow Capitalism which in turn must be done by means of an armed revolution.

Now it is obvious that so far as the British working class is interested in taking up this policy it is interested also in the success of the Indian Revolution which will overthrow the rule of the British Capitalist class in India. It is a matter of elementary strategy. It is obvious that the success of the Indian Revolution would be a great help to the British working class in its struggle. That Revolution would immensely weaken the British Capitalist class by destroying their prestige in the eyes of the middle classes and the backward sections of the working classes in England and in many other ways. But there is a further point. British Capitalist rule in Britain is very firmly established and is still a long way from being overthrown. But that is not the case in India. India is most vulnerable part of the British Empire. It is therefore good tactics for the revolutionary British working class actively to help the progress of the revolution in India.

Finally if we take a rather longer view the same result is seen. It cannot be to the ultimate advantage of civilization generally that one race or set of races should rule over and exploit another set. That is roughly the situation at present. Generally speaking the White Races are dominant and oppress and exploit the other races. The fears of the newspaper propagandists, of race wars and colour wars, are not entirely without foundation. If the European working class were definitely and completely to take the side of the European Capitalist class in this matter the Colonial revolution might take the form of a race war and this could not but have the most disastrous effects upon civilization in general. That section of the White Races, which is in an objective sense the most far sighted and advanced namely the revolutionary working class, realises this and pursues a policy of opposition to Imperialism and colonial exploitation ~~by~~ its own Bourgeois class and of friendship with the oppression nations.

I think I have covered all the essential points though very briefly and shown that both the immediate economic interests and the general political interests of the British working class are such that it must support the Indian National Revolution, and also that that policy is in the highest interests of civilisation itself. I did what I could to carry out that policy in the name of the British working class and the Communist Party, by co-operating with what I thought was the only body actively and effectively working for the National

Revolution in India at that time, that is the Workers' and Peasants' Party.

There is one more matter I must touch upon while dealing with the Workers' and Peasants' Party. P 669, that is a typed report of the Conference of the A. I. W. P. P, says that I moved the Political Resolution at the Conference. There are one or two points connected with this Resolution that I must deal with. The Magistrate cites this Resolution on page 69 of the Committal Order as showing that the policy of the Workers' and Peasants' Party was decided abroad. He quotes from the "Assembly Letter" P 377 which speaks of the necessity of holding an All India Conference of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, of which the Agenda will be first the political situation. Unfortunately he breaks off at that point. If he had referred to the other items on the Agenda proposed in P 377 and to those on the Agenda of the All India Conference he would have found that the parallel was by no means complete. In any case it is obvious that a political party conference must deal as its main subject with the political situation. Further the Magistrate goes on to quote from the Sixth World Congress and the Colonial Thesis to show how the policy of the Communist International in regard to Colonial affairs changed, and that our policy changed in the same way. But again there is a difficulty. I should say of course that as a Communist I have no objection to following the lead given by the Communist International. In fact I regard that as the correct thing to do. But in this case we did not know what the views of the Communist International on the matter were. This is shown by P 1822 which is a copy of the Labour Monthly for March 1929, where the Political Resolution is reprinted with an editorial note which points out that the Resolution deviates from the Communist International policy in two matters. These are the questions of Industrialisation of India and the British policy in regard to it, and the nature of the Workers' and Peasants' Party itself and the desirability of retaining such a party. I think this shows that the argument of the Magistrate in this particular was unsound. The change in the policy of the Workers' and Peasants' Party was due directly to the change in the political situation in the country.

Now the criticism of the Political Resolution was as I said directed against two points. The first is the question of Industrialisation. On this the attitude of the Communist International is roughly that British policy is opposed in general to the Industrial development of India and that the tolerance which the British showed towards Industrial developments during and immediately after the War was only a temporary relaxation of the usual policy. A rather closer examination of the matter since then has convinced me at any rate that this view on the question is correct. I need

not quote much evidence for it, I need only refer to a Government publication "The State and Industry" by A. G. Clow I. C. S. which seems to me to show this very clearly. The most revealing thing in the book is the absence of any record of substantial work done for Industrialisation. But the definite admissions in the book are also clear. In any case the general evidence that we have, the very slow progress which Industry is actually making and also the Government Agricultural and Financial policy, all bear out this conclusion.

The result adds one more item and an important one to the indictment which we bring against Imperialism in connection with its policy in India. But it is also more important than that. A correct decision on the matter will enable us more easily to make correct predictions about the political relations between the British and the Indian Capitalist classes and in particular about the political line of the Bourgeois National Movement.

Now the assumptions of the Political Resolution about the general line of British Economic policy were incorrect. So it was compelled to assume that there was some temporary deviation from the general policy which explained the actual events of the period. In consequence its political line was also to some extent incorrect. The Communist International proved more for-sighted. The political Resolution on the basis of the supposed British policy of tolerating Industrial development, concluded that a more or less complete reconciliation between the British and the Indian Bourgeoisie was a fairly easy matter and that their relations were only temporarily disturbed by such things as the 18 penny ratio and the Reserve Bank proposals and the Simon Commission. Actually at that time and for a year afterwards this seemed to be the case. The Bourgeois Nationalists retreated from independence at the Madras Congress in December 1927 to Dominion Status with safeguards in the Nehru Report in the Autumn of 1928 and the half and half Resolution at the Calcutta Congress in December 1928. Even a year later in December 1929 they were carrying on negotiations with the Viceroy and issued the Delhi Manifesto in favour of peace. But then their policy changed. The attitude of the Government continued to be completely uncompromising so that they were forced to make a show of opposition. This was the re-affirmation of the Independence Resolution at Lahore in December 1929. There after they were offered further provocation by the Government which carried through a decision on Tariffs involving Imperial Preference against their wishes. They were probably also stimulated into opposition by the first effects of the world economic crisis which was then coming on, accentuated in India by the effects of the ratio manipulation. They were encouraged also no doubt by the defeats which the working class had suffered in 1929 which promised them

that an immediate appeal to the masses would not be likely to loose forces beyond their control. Accordingly Civil Disobedience was launched.

Now this course of events confirms the analysis of the Communist International and the Colonial thesis and is contrary to the view of the Political Resolution and shows very clearly that the difference between them was important and that it is unlikely that the one was inspired by the other. The Communist International says that owing to the Imperialist Economic policy there is considerable ground for opposition between the Indian bourgeoisie and the Government and the bourgeoisie will continue to make oppositional demonstrations of this sort until the danger of mass revolution becomes an immediate menace to them.

Of course the Communist International has never supposed that the Bourgeois Nationalists could pursue a revolutionary policy. In this matter the two lines are in agreement. I can not resist the temptation to point out how correct was the criticism which the Political Resolution directed against those of the Bourgeois Nationalists who were trying to pose as revolutionaries, I mean the Independence League. Before my arrest I personally and no doubt others of us were often attacked by orthodox and even by revolutionary nationalists and called agents of British Imperialism and so on for taking this attitude. But this attitude was correct. The Left Wing of the Congress the Independence League as it called itself at that time, in spite of its programme and ostensible policy was not a revolutionary body. When the Congress made gestures of peace and reconciliation as in the Nehru Report this Independence Wing prevented its revolutionary following from leaving the Congress by organising a group of leaders with a pseudo-revolutionary programme, who announced their intention of capturing the Congress for revolution. But when the time for action came, when the crisis was intensifying and Civil Disobedience had been launched, when it was above all the duty of a revolutionary to use the situation for his purposes, and criticise and expose policies which were dangerous to the revolution, at that time the Independence League disappeared. It had done its work. It had kept the revolutionary rank and file loyal to the Congress and now it ceased to maintain any show of opposition but simply followed the non-revolutionary in fact anti-revolutionary, leadership of Mr. Gandhi.

I think it is legitimate to conclude that the line in relation to the Congress and the Independence League which was taken by the Political Resolution was broadly correct. But it was also clearly justified by political events which had taken place up to the time when it was drafted. These events are described sufficiently in the

text of the Political Resolution. It is unnecessary to suppose that in this respect it required any inspiration. About its line for the future the main point was that it insisted more definitely than had been done before that severance from the Congress was necessary. I believe that that policy was sound then and is sound to-day. It is impossible to do revolutionary work through an out-and-out reformist organisation like the Congress which next to the Imperialist State itself is undoubtedly the greatest obstacle in the way of the Indian Revolution. The real revolutionary forces must be organised outside the Congress and in opposition to it. I may point out at this place that the supposed author of P 377 namely M. N. Roy is apparently not in the least in agreement with this policy. He thinks that it is still a sound line for the Indian Communists to work as a wing of the Indian National Congress. But I do not think that it is necessary now to pay much attention to his views. He does his best to split the Indian Communists into two factions. His followers pursue a highly doubtful policy of alliance with the national bourgeoisie which in the end will probably lead them into the same sort of position as the so called Left Congress leaders of the past have got into now. Finally he has been expelled from the Communist International and now does his best to oppose it in all possible ways.

I believe as I have said that a break with the Congress is essential. That sort of spell which the traditions and name of the Congress cast over all its followers, turning even good revolutionaries into ridiculous manufacturers of Salt and Khaddar, must be broken. That can be done not by playing the part of Left Wing however critical within the Congress but building up an opposition platform outside and in open hostility to the Congress.

The other point of criticism brought against the Political Resolution was on the question of the type of organisation to be adopted. Again I believe the criticism is correct. The period when the Workers' and Peasants' Party was a useful type of organisation has passed. The Workers' and Peasants' Party had as its aim to represent as it were the united front of the main classes of the population which could pursue a policy of revolution. In doing this it tended to confuse two different tasks. With its method of organisation, including both individual members and affiliated organisations, it could neither be broad and inclusive enough to fulfil the function of what one may call the united anti-Imperialist front, nor be sufficiently homogeneous and rigidly organised and disciplined to act as the revolutionary party in the strict sense. For these two functions two separate organisations are required, the united anti-imperialists front or federation and the Communist Party.

I have nothing more to say on the subject of the W and P. Parties. Anything else will come in under the head of the speeches etc:

Q. The following evidence relates to your connection with and activities in the Youth Movement e.g. Young Comrades League etc:—P 546 (4), 546 (5), 546 (6) 546 (7), 556, 558, 559, 560, 563, 564, 565, 463 (4), 567, 568, 584, 585, 546, (3), 1915, 1916, 1917, 546 (11), 1111, 1962 (1), 1962 (2), 1962 (3), 1941, 1979, 1689, and 1554. Have you anything to say about this evidence?

A. This raises no new question of principle. My idea in working with the Youth Movement was to promote essentially the same policy as that of the 'Workers and Peasants' Party. So I need not give any answer here. Some small points arising from those speeches and letters I shall refer to under those heads.

Q. The following evidence relates to your activities in connection with the Trade Unions, Strikes and the like:—P 548 (7), 491, 548 (10), 483, 526 (47), 1971, 548 (3) & (4), 2096P, 548 (2), 2044 C, 548 (9), 526 (14), 526 (15), 1322, 526 (19), 501, 526 (12), 1348 (22), 415 (12), 2066 P, 1118, (=1678), 696, 526 (23), 2201, 526 (7), 526 (9), 27, 24, 526 (13), 526 (2), 2175, 2262, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 2508, 2228, 1918, 1924, 2221, 2205, 2173, 1923, 746, 107, 364, P.W.'s 47, 53, 54, 61, 85, 244, 67, 68, 83, 94, 27, 98, 101, 102, 103, 122 and no doubt others. Have you anything to say about this evidence?

Accused says his notes in this connection also cover A.I.T. U.C. for which Court has a separate note. The evidence in this connection is: P 526 (48), 545, (7), 549 (14), 1878C, 479, 1494, 1863P, 2096P, 526 (30), 2046P (=547(3)), 2078P, 2250, 545 (1) to (5), 2076P, and evidence of P.W.'s, 111, 119, 123 & 254.

A. There is a good deal of evidence about my activities in connection with the Trade Union Movement. As a Communist I naturally had to devote attention to it. There are only two or three matters which I want to deal with.

The first is my connection with the Jute Workers' strikes at Chengail and Bauria. The situation was that the Jute Workers' Union at Chengail had been organised principally by Ghosh as the Secretary of the B.T.U.F. with assistance I think from the A.I.T.U.C. Ghosh was an office-bearer of this Union. It will be remembered also that at the Executive Council meeting of the A.I.T.U.C. in February 1928 a resolution had been passed that Ghosh and I should investigate into the work etc: of the Bengal Unions. I went to Calcutta in March 1928 and at once met Ghosh

and discussed with him how to begin the work. Actually nothing of it could be done until about six months later as the strike wave of 1928 engaged practically all my attention for that time. But of course I was in touch with Ghosh in consequence of it.

On the first day of the Chengail strike, towards the end of April so far as I remember, I was requested by Ghosh in a letter which I think he sent through Mitra (P 526(15)) to visit Chengail if I was not otherwise occupied. He asked me to go on behalf of the B.T.U.F. as he could not get away.

He had already told me what his attitude in this matter was. He thought it was possible for Trade Unionists and Communists, whatever might be their differences, to work together in strikes up to a certain point in order to make the strike successful. I agreed in the state of the movement as it was then in Bengal. So I went to Chengail and I stayed there on and off throughout the strike.

At Bauria the Union was also organised principally by Ghosh as Secretary of the B.T.U.F. in the same way and he was again an office-bearer. Actually while I was at Chengail during the strike some meetings were held at Bauria for organisation and so on and these I attended. Bauria is quite near Chengail, three or four miles away, if I remember. Consequently when later on a strike began at Bauria I was asked probably by some workers who remembered me to go to meetings there. I did so on a number of occasions but I was not closely connected with this strike as I had been with the Chengail strike. I might say also that after some time others who were in political agreement with me began to go to Bauria and differences arose between them and Ghosh. These were due partly to political disagreement and partly to the question of the rival Trade Unions.

The next point is this. We including myself have always insisted on the point that the leadership of the Trade Union Movement should be a working class leadership. We adversely criticised the leadership of most of the Indian Trade Unions as middle class. But at the same time many of us including myself are middle class by birth and education and we were willing to assist in and even take the lead in the Trade Union Movement ourselves. I want to show that we are not being inconsistent or merely adopting a demagogic or opportunist attitude in doing this. The reason is not that we are indifferent to the question of class but that we attach a great deal of importance to it. We regard classes not merely as matters of description or statistics but if one may so say as actual entities which act and react in the sphere of social events. Any fairly well defined class will tend to develop its peculiar attitude

to social matters and its characteristic psychology. But it is possible for individual to leave their own natural class and adopt the psychology of another class. In particular it is possible for the rather paradoxical situation to arise that in India certain individuals of the middle class are for a time more characteristically working class in the outlook etc. than most members of the working class itself. We should claim that this does not mean that the conception which we have of class and its importance is false but that this situation arises from quite special circumstances. We consider that we are genuine members of the working class movement. We play the quite important part of being a sort of connecting link. We imbibe the theory and psychology of the advanced working class movement of the rest of the world, which we are able to do because of our education and so on, and are the means whereby this tradition and theory are transmitted to the young and yet backward working class of India. In this way the working class of India may be saved from a long and slow process of learning a new from its own experience what has already been learnt elsewhere. We feel that in this position we are entitled and in fact compelled to criticise and oppose other people of middle class origin who enter the Labour Movement without having first abandoned their own class psychology and adopted that of the working class.

But there is a further point. Although members of other classes are not forced with the same intensity as the workers are to adopt a radically critical attitude towards bourgeois civilisation yet they can do so. It is not uncommon for members of the middle class for example to come to the realisation that Capitalism has to be got rid of and Socialism substituted for it, and then to take the further step and realise that the only practical way to do it is to assist the instinctive revolt of the working class against Capitalism to develop until it achieves the forcible political overthrow of Capitalism. Middle class people can legitimately do that and become useful members of the working class revolutionary movement. The essential point is however that they must realise that the working class is the main thing, the class which will really do the work of the revolution. The middle class ^{people} can only give more or less useful assistance especially in the early stages, to bring a clear understanding of the position to the workers' own leaders and the workers as a whole.

The next subject is the Sub Committee of the Executive Council of the A.I.T.U.C. which was formed to draw up a Labour Constitution for India. The Magistrate refers to this on page 278 but he gives the names of only those members of the Sub Committee who are accused in this case. In fairness to them the other names

should have been given. They are N. M. Joshi, M. Daud G. Sethi and Chaman Lal. Later Rai Sahib Chandrika Prasad was added also. There is plenty of evidence on this point. I have put in some defence exhibits which show this. I ought also to state one or two other facts about it. The Sub Committee never met. That may sound rather odd as the subject with which it had to deal was important, but 1928 was a rather abnormal year for Trade Unionists. I prepared a draft and sent copies to all the Sub-Committee members. But I received only one reply-namely from Chaman Lal, that is P 545 (3). I do not think any other member of the Sub Committee ever mentioned the thing to me. I made an attempt to call a meeting of the Sub Committee at Jhansi itself. But that was found to be impossible. Eventually a short resolution was drafted by Chaman Lal, so far as I know without consulting the other members, and was moved and passed.

The next point is an incident referred to in P 2162. The reporter says that I incited the crowd to assault him or something of the sort. Actually I did not do so. I am not a believer in non-violence but I should not do that as I see no use in it. What I was concerned with was the difference in regard to freedom of speech and freedom of assembly and organisation and so on in India and in England, two countries under the same Government. I was simply repeating what I had heard Mr. Purcell say in a speech in Calcutta. He said that it was a scandal that these police reporters were allowed in working class meetings at all and that they would not be tolerated in England. That is true. But other conditions in regard to the liberties of the working class are even worse. I saw myself in the E. I. R. Strike specially at Asansol and in the Calcutta Scavengers Strike cases of interference and highhandedness on the part of the police which very much surprised me. There was no pretence of impartiality or safeguarding the liberties of all the citizens of the State as the Prosecution put it, on the part of these State Officials. The policemen and officers openly said to the strikers "Go back to work or we beat you" and they did so. There was no question of a breach of the law or provocative action or obstruction or anything of the kind on the part of the strikers. It was sheer open strike breaking. The police forced their way into the workers' houses and beat them there with lathis in the presence of their wives and children. I believe this is referred to also in P 1921 and P 2173. At that time to strike was a crime in India though the I. P. C. did not say so. I gather that the situation has become even worse since then. Even when there is no strike on it is forbidden if necessary by armed force for the workers to hold meetings at any rate in the provinces of Bihar and Bengal. The point of my speech was to show the difference, though I did not know then what I subsequently came to know

about the kind of freedom the Indian workers enjoy under British rule, and to point out what they ought to demand.

D. 6-6-31.

The next point is connected with the last, that is, the question of violence and the attitude which I took up towards it. This matter is referred to in a number of other speeches such as P1918 which is a speech made at Chengail. In that speech I am reported as having asked the workers to be non-violent. In P 1941 again I am reported as having ~~something~~ said about a non-violent atmosphere. These reports I think cannot be correct. I never used the phrase non-violence or if I did it was to ridicule or condemn it. I was usually careful to be consistent and correct in my attitude on this matter as it is a very important one. It is true that sometimes in strikes if the Police were peaceful, I would deprecate for the time any violent manifestations against them or against black-legs, as it was simply not worth while to create trouble. At other times when the Police were behaving in a violent manner, beating people without provocation and so on, I did suggest in meetings that it was proper for the workers to defend themselves and retaliate. If the Police beat them they should not mind beating back. I believe that in view of the way the Police usually behave during strikes in this country that is the only thing that self respecting workers can do.

But there is a more important aspect of the matter than that. I think that even when I suggested that workers should refrain from violent acts I would also indicate that this was for tactical reasons only and was to be regarded as a temporary measure. The Workers' and Peasants' Party "Principles and Policy," puts the thing correctly when it says that we have no objection to non-violence as a matter of tactics but we object strongly to its being raised to the level of a principle. We think that to make non-violence a principle is a most demoralizing thing. It not only acquiesces in our present physical disarmament which is bad enough but seeks to reinforce it by imposing a sort of psychological disarmament also. The correct attitude is to say that even if we cannot use force very effectively now and it is therefore usually though not always wiser not to try it, it is one of our principal duties to see that this situation does not continue and that we are as soon as possible in a position to use force effectively.

I do not think one need apologize for this. I believe again that we are the only people who take up an honest attitude in the matter. For if the Gandhist policy is corrupting and demoralizing, the Imperialist attitude is simply disgusting and hypocritical. The Imperialist Press is always expressing its horror at the occasional

acts of violence of its opponents, the Congress volunteers, the Terrorists and so on, and the Viceroy every now and then gives the public a sort of sermon on the subject, always in the same tone of moral objection to violence as such. Yet of course the whole Imperialist system is dependent on violence. I can cite the cases which have come under my personal notice. I have referred already to the E. I. R. strike and the Calcutta Scavengers' strike. In neither case was there any provocation whatever. Yet the State forces acted in wantonly brutal way. Gangs of policemen used to wander about Asansol at night and any workers whom they saw they would fall upon and beat with their lathis. But these cases are nothing compared to what went on last year in connection with the Civil Disobedience Movement in a number of places at Sholapur and in the Mymensingh and Midnapur Districts in Bengal and many others. Imperialism is brutal enough against the working class. But against the peasants if they get at all restive it excels itself. In these circumstances I think we are right to say to the workers and peasants that they should arm themselves and defend themselves against these attacks. In this I believe we are doing the only honest thing.

It needs no instances of this sort to show that the Imperialist rule over India depends upon violence. It is obvious. It seems then to be a matter of common sense to conclude that if we are going to get rid of this regime it must be done by violence. To encourage any contrary belief is to do the worst possible disservice to the movement.

I may mention that we have our apostles of non-violence in the Labour Movement in England also. On one ground or another they encourage this belief that it is either a mistake or is morally wrong to use violence. They are no different in kind from the Indian believers in non-violence. But they have been exposed rather more. The activities of some of the most prominent of them as His Majesty's Ministers have shown that they do not object to violence at all if it is used by the Capitalist State against a revolutionary movement. At any rate they do not object when they are in office in the Capitalist State. All they object to is the use of violence by the revolutionary workers or the colonial population against the Capitalists. We know now therefore what their non-violence is worth. It is merely another case of the use of this moral principle for counter-revolutionary ends. The Indian Nationalists' Non-violence has not yet been so completely exposed, though I might point out that among the non-violent followers of the Congress there are many landlords and Capitalists who habitually make use of violence against their peasants or workers. But I am sure that when, if ever the situation arises the Indian Nationalist Non-violence will be found to be of the same hypocritical type

as that of the British Labour leaders. It will admit violence for all purposes except revolution.

There is only one more point about this, that is the violence we propose to use. The Magistrate has quoted one of my speeches in which I said something about the brutal and violent side of our policy. I have nothing to retract from that. We admit that we shall have to use violence. A class struggle necessarily involves it. But we should like to make one or two comparisons. We shall certainly not be as violent as our enemies have been and are being. Especially since the phenomenon known as Imperialism began to manifest itself the forces of Capitalism have excelled themselves in blood letting. The continuous series of Colonial wars waged by all the Imperialist powers all over the earth from about 1840 culminated in the European War of 1914 in which about 9 million men were killed as well as many millions more who died of disease and famine in consequence of the War. War has continued much of the time since then and all the principal powers are arming themselves in order to make the next war, as the military experts tell us, for more deadly than the last. Then we have the continued violence of the White Terror whose victims number thousands of people killed every year. This is the record of Imperialism in the matter of violence and it is a record which we shall not be able to approach. Further in contrast to it we say that our violence is temporary. We shall use it to put an end to violence, not in the way that the European States waged what they claimed was a war to end war, but really, because we shall be able to establish a classless and International society and so the principal sources of violence will be got rid of. But the main point is that while this Imperialist violence is reactionary and is used to bolster up decaying and obsolete system of society our violence is progressive and is used to effect a great step forward in human progress.

I should say something about the Ichchapur Ordnanel Workers' Union. The facts about my connection with it are these. I happened to be at Bhatpara one day and was asked by Mr. Kali Das Bhattacharji to go with him to Ichchapur, which is quite near, as a meeting had been arranged there. I went and was asked to take the Chair at the meeting. Among other things the meeting decided to form a union and office bearers were elected on the spot. I was made President probably because I was in the chair and it was thought proper. I pointed out that I could not possibly work in a satisfactory manner as President as I did in the case of a number of other unions. But eventually I agreed. I may say that Banerji was not at the meeting but he was known to some of the men there and was proposed to office and elected. Once or twice after that I wrote letters and so on about the union and if I remember visited the place once or twice. But I confess that I did

practically nothing. I do not know of course what any body else did about it.

So far as I have been able to see the rest of the evidence about my Trade Union work and contact with the A. I. T. U. C. does not require any more explanation than what is implied by what I have already said.

Q. The following evidence relates to your connection with the Communist Party of India : P 1684, 2101C, 2055C, 1312, 1295, 1303, 527 (6) and 527 (9). Have you anything to say about this evidence ?

A. While in India I worked with the C. P. I. I was asked to preside over a meeting to welcome Comrade Usmani back from jail, and on a number of occasions I did various small pieces of work at the decision of the C. P. I. as one is required to do as a Communist in a foreign country. I want briefly to justify from my point of view the activity and policy of the C. P. I. There is an idea abroad which is sedulously spread by Imperialist and Indian bourgeois propagandists that Communism can never grow in India as it is unsuited to Indian conditions and ways of thought. As one of the exhibits points out this illusion is shared by the bourgeoisie in all countries. The fact is that Communism will grow wherever the conditions are such as to produce it. The most favourable condition but not the only type of condition is the existence of an exploited industrial working class. The supposed obstacles to the acceptance of Communism in India are principally the relative backwardness of industry and the predominantly agricultural economy of the country. This is no doubt an obstacle in the early stages. The acceptance of Communist policy by the poor peasants and land workers is a somewhat slower process than its acceptance by the town workers. But it is no final obstacle as Russia and China have shown. Then there is the prevalence of religion which is supposed to be and actually is to some extent a sort of antidote to Communism, and the entirely artificial and largely imaginary passion of the Indian people for non-violence. I need only point out that Russian people especially the peasants were before Revolution probably as deeply sunk in superstition as the Indian people. But that has not prevented them from taking to Communism quite enthusiastically. I do not think that it can be maintained that there is anything specific in the people or atmosphere of India which will prevent its adopting a Communist policy.

Actually I believe that the Communist policy is not only well suited but necessary to India, for two main reasons. In the first place the acceptance of the Communist policy and the organisation of strong Communist party are necessary for the success

of the Indian National Revolution. Except in the event of quite improbable and incalculable events abroad Indian Independence can not be attained without a mass revolutionary movement which only a Communist party that is a working class revolutionary party can organise successfully. There are reasons which I hold to be practically conclusive that the Indian bourgeois class which has hitherto led the national movement will not lead the movement for Independence, and will in fact oppose Independence, in almost any conceivable circumstances. It is almost equally improbable I believe that any section of the middle class will be able to organise and lead a movement for Independence. I need not go into the reasons for these opinions which have been dealt with adequately in a previous statement of Joshi with which I agree. The only alternative then is the mass national revolution which can be carried out only with a Communist policy and under Communist leadership. My first point then is that if the national revolution and Independence are necessary which I take as obvious then the acceptance of Communism and the organisation of a Communist party are necessary.

The second reason is that a Communist party is necessary for the building up of Indian economy and civilisation generally after the revolution. This does not mean of course that we expect to carry through a socialist or proletarian revolution in India like the Revolution of November 1917 in Russia. The Prosecution and the Magistrate credit us with this intention but they are wrong. As previous statements have pointed out the revolution in India cannot immediately go beyond the National or Bourgeois Democratic stage.

The kind of revolution the Communist Party aims at in India as shown by the programme it supports and the Colonial Thesis of the 6th World Congress, is a National Democratic Revolution. This programme and the principal achievements of that revolution I need not go into detail. All I need say is that these steps — the abolition of Feudalism, and the achievement of complete Independence principally—are theoretically compatible with the maintenance of Capitalist relations in the general sense. We are right therefore in describing the revolution as a National or Bourgeois Democratic Revolution.

But the revolution will have to be carried through principally by the workers and peasants and they will be established afterwards as the ruling classes. This gives a situation which may allow of developments subsequently beyond the limits of Capitalist relations in the direction of socialism. That is what we contemplate in fact. We consider that the working class in India is too weak at present and will be in any circumstances under Imperialism to be

able to carry through at once a Proletarian Revolution. But we believe that it is strong enough to be able to maintain an effective leadership of the peasants and to establish with them, what we should call Worker's and Peasants' Dictatorship. Under this regime agriculture will remain under small private ownership as at present at any rate for some long time but owing to the removal of both Imperialist and Feudal exploitation and the rigid control of Capitalistic exploitation, that is, by money-lenders etc., it will be capable of rapid technical progress and will support the peasants at a higher standard of life. In industry, on the other hand, we propose a considerably greater step forward. All foreign enterprises will of course be nationalized. But owing to the almost inevitable resistance of the big Indian Capitalists it will be possible to nationalise their businesses also. It can be assumed that the Workers' and Peasants' State will be in possession of the main services and the big industries and with this basis it will start its policy of rapid industrial development of the country. This will result in the attainment of conditions ultimately in which Socialism can be constructed and finally a Socialist re-organisation of agriculture can be begun. It will be a peaceful transition or as it is called a growing over towards socialism accompanied by no further violent political manifestations but only a gradual growth in the strength and influence of the working class and increase in its political power.

Both the political and economic difficulties of this regime will be great. It will have to contend in the first place with the attempts of Capitalist powers to get it under their influence either by open war or by economic penetration as they have attempted to do with Soviet Russia. The Soviet Union has been able to overcome these attempts successfully because of several factors. The principal point in its favour has been the division of interest among the various powers in the Capitalist world which tends apparently to grow in intensity as time goes on and this has prevented them from coming together for an effective attack upon the Soviet Union. Soviet Russia has also been able to depend upon the support of the working class in the Imperialist countries in Britain in particular, which has checked attacks upon it at various times. The Indian Workers' and Peasants' Republic will be able to depend upon these favourable conditions also. In addition it will have the active support of the U. S. S. R. This being so it can be expected confidently that it will survive. The dangers from the internal growth of Capitalism and the penetration of foreign capital will be greater than in the case of ^{the} Soviet Union which had to begin with a more highly developed Nationalised Industry and a stronger and more advanced working class than India can have. Again in the case of India the support of the U.S.S.R. will be forthcoming.

It will supply capital which has been one of the most difficult problems for the U.S.S.R. itself in the last 13 years and also technical assistance and so on. In this respect also therefore there is good ground to believe that the Indian Workers' & Peasants' Republic will be able to maintain itself.

A prospect of this sort may seem ridiculous even to sympathetic people who know the present position of the Indian working class and peasants. It is hard to think that those who are so ignorant and apparently unconscious of their interests and so on as the Indian masses are now should be able to carry through this very difficult programme of building up an economic system in India which will develop fairly quickly towards Socialism. I can only reply that observers in Russia before the revolution would have expressed the same kind of scepticism. The fact which all these paternal sort of people, Reformists Socialists and Liberals and the like, forget is the immense degree to which the actual experience of the revolutionary struggle itself can bring out the potentialities of a people. It is a well-known principle that you never know what you can do until you try. The ignorant and backward and indolent workers and peasants of Russia would certainly not have been expected before the revolution to be able to do what they have done. But what happened to them was that they were confronted with a situation in which they had to act. They had to take over political power themselves and fight to retain it and then push on with economic development and so on. Having to do it they did it, and incidentally the psychological transformation which this involved enabled them to do many other important things, to escape from the influence of religion and obsolete customs and their traditional slothfulness and so on. I believe that the workers and peasants of India under a similar stimulus will react in a similar way and be able to carry out tasks which now seem absurdly out of range of their abilities. In fact this revolutionary way is the only way to stir them up and put them in a position to make any appreciable progress.

I think it is hardly necessary to point out how beneficial this policy will be to India. In fact it is the only policy which can deal effectively with the mess that India is in at present. The only alternative lines of development, whether the continuance of India as a colony of British Imperialism or even the remotely improbable but possible line of an Independent or partially Independent Indian Capitalism, all involve by definition the preservation of Capitalism in India. I think it is fairly clear that no very substantial development can be expected in India under Capitalism. The continuance of the British connection of course can only mean what it has meant up to the present, the stagnation

of Indian economic and cultural life. But even in the most favourable case, that of independent development of Indian Capitalism the state of things cannot be much better. It is obvious as previous statements have pointed out that the Indian Capitalist class has almost ceased to be a progressive factor in Indian life. It cannot fight for Indian Independence for example. Even if we suppose that by some historical accident it were placed in a position of Independence, it could not be much more progressive than it is now. It might develop the industry of the country to some extent. But the days of the rapid development of Capitalism seem to be gone. With World economic crises and persistent over production of almost all types of industrial goods there is not much chance for a policy of progress under Capitalism. And on the other hand in regard to Agriculture there is no doubt that Independent Indian Capitalism would be reactionary. It would ally itself as it is doing now with Indian Feudalism and allow of no substantial progress.

The policy for which we stand, that is the policy of a Revolutionary Movement for Independence and the abolition of feudal institutions and thereafter rapid development of the industry of the country on a non Capitalist basis with Socialism as the ultimate object; this policy can I believe lead to a rapid improvement in the situation of India. For not being subject to the limitations of Capitalism it could develop Indian Industry in a centralised and planned manner in the way that the Soviet Union has done and attain a rate of development of Industrialisation which is quite beyond the capacity of Capitalism even in its prime let alone now. And it would set in power a Government, which would be a really popular Government, which would set about dealing with the evils from which present day Indian society suffers and applying the revolutionary energy of which I spoke just now to their solution in a way that no other Government can do. We can cite the progress that has been made in the Soviet Union in regard to mass education, health, getting rid of communal differences and other obstacles to advancement, as an example of what could be done under a similar sort of regime in India. The conditions of the Russian people before the revolution were very similar to those of the Indian people now. In Russia these defects are being tackled successfully and I believe by the only possible method. I believe that that method must be used in India also.

There is an essential requirement if a policy of this sort is to be carried through. That is a Communist Party as I have said and as is obvious the party is necessary to lead the fight for power. But the party is no less necessary after the seizure of power for

defending the country and for guiding constructive work along sound lines.

That the Communist Party of India is setting about preparing for this double task in a business like manner is shown by the programme which it has issued which has appeared in the Press recently. This programme deals with the steps necessary before the revolution, namely the political tasks in relation to Bourgeois Nationalism and so on and the organisational tasks, from the organisation of the working class and the poor peasants and their Unions and Committees to the establishment of the armed forces of the workers and peasants and the winning over of the rank and file of the Army and the Police to their side. It deals also in an exhaustive manner with the steps which will have to be taken after the revolution, the establishment of strong workers' and peasants' power organised through what in Russia are called Soviets, the solution of the communal and Minorities question in the same way as it has been solved in the U.S.S.R., the solution of the land question and improvement in the conditions of the working class and many other subjects. I should mention also the elementary democratic steps of real emancipation of the slaves and untouchable castes, the establishment of equality for women and the abolition of the caste system in all its forms and so on. This new programme of the C.P.I. seems to deal with all these questions and shows even now by the issue of such a courageous document that the Communist Party is the only Party which will effectively tackle all these important questions.

But as I have just emphasized a strong party is necessary if these things are to be carried through. The Russians have realised that the party has just as urgent and difficult work now after the revolution as it had before. They have insisted just as strongly on maintaining the unity and discipline of the party after as before the revolution. For this end they have been willing to sacrifice some of their most brilliant men who have tried to lead the people off into tracks some what different from the party policy and thus endanger the unity and strength of the party.

I believe therefore that a Communist Party in India is an absolute necessity now-a-days. The problems whether political or economic, destructive and revolutionary or constructive, of the present day are extremely difficult. Their solution along the only possible lines which involve drawing not merely a few people but the bulk of the whole population into their solution is also extremely difficult. The only way in which these jobs can be done is by means of that peculiar organisation called a Communist Party. That is why I considered it necessary to establish and strengthen the Communist Party in India.

Q. The following evidence relates to your association and connections so far they appear to have anything to do with the alleged conspiracy: P 28, 195, 1961, 1972, 1973, 1965, 1966, 1967, 2133 P, 2134P, 1969, 1970, 1010, 1011 1971, 2137P, 526 (28), 818, 2090, 2091, 2145, 415 (5), 2043C, 2066P, 526 (16), 502, 2114, 2081, P 41, 43, 26, 109, 121, 547 (1), 548(1), 548(6), 638, 1947, 1948, 1251, 1663, 1323, 499, 1873 (1) (2), and 1960 and P.W 247. Have you anything to say about this evidence?

A. About P 38, I had not met Ghosh when I wrote this letter. That is clear from its tone. I knew him only through Allison who had described him as a Reformist Trade Unionist who nevertheless seemed to him somewhat more progressive than most of the reformists and as holding an influential position in the trade Union Movement that is Secretary of the B. T. U. F. Allison had suggested that if he could be induced to go to Canton for the Conference that would be a good thing. He could be considered representative of the Indian Movement as it was at that time, and he knew the Movement well and could give a good deal account of it. The Magistrate lays stress on this letter and in view of the fact that the P.P.T.U.S. is included in the list of conspiring bodies and is considered by the Prosecution a Communist organisation, the suggestion is that we must have desired a Communist or a close sympathiser to go to this Conference. Both steps of the argument are false. The P.P.T.U.S. is not a Communist body. I do not wish to go into that at the moment however. It is a fact that we were anxious that representatives from Indian Trade Unions should go there in order that something of the lessons to be derived from the experiences of the Movement in China, Java and the Philippines etc. could be learnt in India and in order to increase the sense of the International character of the Movement. But we wanted in the first place that the representatives should be people who could claim really to represent the Indian Movement and whose reports both there at the Conference and here on returning would be listened to with attention. At that time none of the Left Wing or Communists could claim to represent anything but a very small section of the Indian Trade Union Movement. Consequently our first proposals were for Trade Unionists of standing who were nevertheless not convinced or notorious reactionaries. Actually Ghosh refused to go and the matter was dropped so far as he was concerned.

P 526 (16): The Magistrate cites this letter and the fact that the address of the Labour Research Department is given with that of the National Minority movement, bracketted with it as he says, as evidence that the L.R.D. is a Communist body. It will be obvious from reading this letter that the two bodies are not bracketted politically so to speak: They are bracketted as addresses to which Allison's goods might be sent. It is merely because some body at the L.R.D. namely Arnot happened to know Allison personally; that that address was suggested as useful, and so also with

the National Minority Movement. I might point out also that in P 1675 the L. R. D. address is omitted and only that of the N.M.M. is given.

P. 1116: This letter is mentioned in connection with Kadam by the Magistrate to show that I regarded the Jhansi Conference as a party affair. I do not remember how I had heard of this Conference. Probably I had received an official invitation or perhaps I had seen it announced in the Press. In any case I should say that I had not heard of Kadam at that time and in fact I never met him so far as I know until we all assembled in Meerut Jail.

P 1251: The Magistrate has attached importance to a sentence in this letter which reads "Muzaffar will no doubt be writing to you as regards sales here". He seems to assume that I meant that Muzaffar was going to organise the sale of the "Spark" in Calcutta. Actually I meant that he would send the address which I could not remember - there is a statement about this in the letter - and possibly other addresses to which the paper might be sent by post. It will be remembered that my letter contains some names of persons to whom I suggested V.P.P.s or specimen copies might be sent and the expression "Sales" refers to these.

It is stated that Ghosh allowed me to use his address. That is not quite correct. I began to use it without asking his permission. The situation was that I met him first at the Cawnpore Session of the A.I.T.U.C. in November 1927. There I told him that I should be going to Calcutta shortly and so he gave me his address. Subsequently while I was still in U.P. I found I should need money. So I wired home for some giving Ghosh's address as I expected to be in Calcutta by the time a reply could arrive but did not know where I should be staying. Of course I should not have done this had he not been Secretary of the B.T.U.F. As I have said I did not take Ghosh's permission, but subsequently on going to Calcutta I told him and he raised no objection.

While in Calcutta I had to visit Ghosh very often as the Executive Council of the A.I.T.U.C. had appointed me a member with Ghosh of a Committee to investigate and report on the work and organisation of the Bengal Unions. As soon as I went to Calcutta I met Ghosh for the purpose of this work. But the series of strikes which took place then occupied the time of both of us so that nothing was done towards the investigation till nearly the end of the year, and actually the thing was never finished. But in consequence of this I was in fairly constant touch with Ghosh through-out the time I was in Calcutta.

D. 8-6-31.

(MORNING 1st PART.)

I had come after a few months to realise that Ghosh, though interested in the study of Communism as a theory, was far from agreeing with it even theoretically while his actual propaganda and practice of Trade Unionism were what I should call definitely Reformist. Nevertheless I continued to visit him frequently and to be on fairly intimate terms with him partly for the reason already given that the Trade Union Congress Enquiry required frequent consultation, partly out of personal friendship and partly because I thought that in the opposition of our movement in Bengal at that time it was correct for us to maintain fairly close relations with the Reformist Trade Union Movement. During our meetings we used to talk about things in general especially of course political and Trade Union matters. But we did not go into the internal affairs of the B. T. U. F. on the one hand or of the Workers' and Peasants' Party on the other. It is quite an exaggeration to say as the Magistrate does that I talked over important events in the life of the W. P. P. with Ghosh. The reference he gives, that is P 43, does not contradict this. At that time, that is, in January or February of 1929 some reports of the differences which had occurred within the Workers' and Peasants' Party had appeared in the Press. Ghosh asked me about the matter and I replied briefly giving him, I think, practically no more than what was already public knowledge.

As for Ghosh deputing me to make enquiries for him as the Magistrate says, it is obvious from the reference given, that is P 24 that the enquiries in question were in pursuance of this work given to Ghosh and myself by the Executive Council of the A. I. T. U. C. Ghosh was sometimes unable to spare time to go and so I went alone. The results of my enquiries were to be assembled and gone over by the two of us together when Ghosh was to seek for any further information he thought necessary before the report was written.

P. 1967—In this exhibit there is only one point about which I want to say anything. That is the sentence at the end referring to the question of religion. It was probably this and perhaps one or two either similar statements which provided the occasion for the propaganda of the Prosecution on this question in the early part of this case. I want to state what I take to be our attitude to the matter very briefly. *We are opposed to religion.* We should reply to the Prosecution and the Bourgeois Propagandist who pretend such horror at it by pointing out their hypocritical attitude in the matter which stands in marked contrast to our straight forward attitude. The propaganda conducted by the Prosecution in this case is an example. They probably

have no more belief in religion than we have. They merely think it is a good way to stir up opposition to us, and in doing so they are acting in a manner in accordance with the general practice of the British Bourgeoisie. I do not deny that a good many members of the British Capitalist class have religious beliefs. They are in many ways rather backward intellectually. But even in this matter they have shown their usual hard-headedness. They have appreciated the material as well as the spiritual value of religion. In particular, they have made very successful use of it in India. I suppose if they had been real believers in their religion they would have had as the Portuguese seem to have done to devote their main energy to converting India to Christianity. But they have shown much better sense. They have remained almost completely indifferent to the fate of Indians in the next world and have concentrated on exploiting them in this. For that purpose they have not scrupled vigorously to make use of ^{the} religious differences among Indians themselves. Everyone knows the result which has its parallel in almost all the British colonies. One can cite Ireland, Iraq, Palestine, Burma and South Africa also. In India the thing is becoming steadily more complicated. Every now and then they find some new group or section which can be incited against the rest. If after seeing this record we say that the Capitalist class or particularly British Imperialists use religion for their own class purposes we are quite justified.

But this is not the whole reason for our opposition to religion. Religion generally has its main source of strength we believe in the class divisions of society and the necessity which the ruling class feels to use these means to keep the subject classes under its lead. But in any case whether it is consciously used for this purpose or not it is bound to have the effect of obscuring class differences, making people contented with bad conditions because they are told that they will be compensated for in the next world, and generally encouraging an unscientific and unclear way of thinking. That is principally what is meant by describing religion as the opium of people. This attitude to the matter makes it necessary for us to carry our opposition to religion further than a mere criticism of religious doctrines. We have to attack the whole religious mode of thought. We have to adopt what the Communist International calls 'militant materialism.' I should explain roughly what this term means. It does not mean I take it in any way that we pre-judge ultimate questions scientific and philosophical problems which are not and take up a dogmatic attitude in regard to yet solved. In preaching a materialist philosophy we stand merely on the ground of ordinary common sense and scientific practice. We point out that the assumptions upon which everybody works in practice in daily life or scientific work or actually

any other activity are materialist assumptions. We should go further and might claim that whether philosophical idealism is tenable theoretically or not people do not believe it in practice. It is something like religion in that respect. There enters into its composition a great deal of fashionable humbug. But we should claim that it is not merely a matter of fashion. There is also to be seen a class purpose behind it, as with religion. It is of course a direct support to religion and it has itself the same sort of effect as religion. It mystifies the ordinary people and creates that impression of superior wisdom which is so valuable to ruling classes. It is this we are inclined to think which accounts principally for the historical fact, for it is a fact, that ruling classes have almost invariably patronised philosophical idealism.

The European ruling classes have found themselves in a very difficult position since the War and consequently the urge in the direction of Idealism has increased. As a result many reputable scientific men have come forward to support Idealism and in some cases directly to support religion also on the basis of the results of physical science especially the relativity theory. A tremendous stir has apparently been created quite recently by Sir James Jeans who pretends to do the same sort of thing on the basis of recent results in atomic physics. It requires some audacity to controvert men of such eminence but fortunately professor Radha-Krishnan, though he is himself one of the obscurantists, has done it for us. He maintains that it is impossible to found an idealistic philosophy on the results of a science the basic assumptions of which are entirely materialistic. We are inclined to think that what is mainly responsible for this outburst of scientific idealism is not so much the results of science, which are probably capable of other interpretations, but rather the prevailing psychology of Bourgeois society in Europe, which is certainly showing a very strong trend towards idealism and even mysticism and spiritualism. The home of this mumbo-jumbo is no longer India but Europe, or the United States.

This is roughly our general attitude on the matter. In practice also we should encourage anti-religious teachings. But it is important to make clear that it is not our principal job. We do not think that religion will be abolished merely by propaganda. That will come about only slowly owing to social changes, principally the establishment of a society which has no ~~caste~~ ^{class} division and also the more complete mechanisation of production both industrial and agricultural. For industrial has a great effect in abolishing superstition. For us the class struggle and the revolution are the important things. Religion is quite a secondary matter. This is the position up to the time of the revolution. After the revolution

conditions change to some extent but the essential principle remains the same. We enforce freedom for religious beliefs and practices. We abolish state assistance or patronage for religion and prohibit the public instruction of children in religion. That is the attitude of the working class state. As there is a good deal of misrepresentation about this I should emphasise that we do not contemplate any persecution of religion as such. The extracts from P 1489 translated by P.W. 274 which are statements by Lenin on the subject will bear this out. They say: "injury to the feelings of religious believers is to be carefully avoided as this leads only to the strengthening of religious fanaticism", and the other "each man must be completely free to follow any religion or to subscribe to no religion."

It is commonly said by Bourgeois Propagandists that there is persecution of religion in Soviet Russia. Many prominent British politicians have been showing a great deal of indignation about it recently.

But we understand that there is no foundation for the charge. I should have thought common sense would have shown that. It is often said that Lenin is worshipped in Russia. That is ridiculous of course. But it is a fact that what he said is generally accepted as sound. If Lenin made a well thought out statement of policy on any subject there would have to be very good reasons indeed for the Communist Party to depart from that policy. Further it is not in the nature or the interests of the Communist Party to profess one policy and follow another. The assumption is that the Communist Party of Russia in this case also would follow the very clear line which Lenin thought to be correct. This is still more clearly the case when that policy is obviously the only practical and sensible policy to adopt. Every body knows that the one way not to get rid of religious belief is to persecute it. This should be enough alone to refute such propaganda. But there is also any amount of evidence. I may conclude by pointing out that this propaganda is typical example of the use by the Bourgeoisie of religion for class purposes.

~~S/5/31~~

~~(Morning Part II)~~

About P 1249: this letter contains some remarks about a pamphlet on class struggle. When I met desai in Calcutta at the time of the Congress in December 1928 I asked him if he could write a pamphlet on that subject. As a journalist and one who had lived in England and knew something of the Labour Movement he would I thought be able to produce something useful. But

he gave no definite reply at that time. Subsequently this letter gave a definite refusal.

I am mentioned in connection with Saigal. It is said that I met him at Chaman Lal's house in July 1927 I do not remember doing so. It is possible of course that he visited Chaman Lal's house while I was there as P.W. 165 says. But I did not see all of Chaman Lal's very numerous visitors and I have no doubt forgotten most of those whom I did see. I spoke at a meeting outside the Bradlaugh Hall in March 1928. But after the meeting I did not go to Saigal's house as P.W. 164 says. In fact I have never been there. I went I think straight from the meeting to the railway station. There I saw several people. It is said that Saigal was one of them. I do not remember that.

About the rest of the letters both those supposed to have been sent by me and those supposed to have been sent to me: there are very many of them and I cannot be sure of having seen all of them before they appeared in evidence. Beyond that I have only the same remark to make as about the foreign correspondence, that it will speak for itself and is I believe quite innocent.

Q: The following items relate to your writing of "Articles" for Ganavani etc etc. or to "Articles" found in your possession or proved to be in your handwriting: P 1959, 1963, 1964, 2125P, 1637, 526 (17), 526 (11), 2077P, 609, 526 (18), 1876, 2147, 526 (3) 526 (4), 1251 (=2005?), 2155P, 1096, 1251, 545 (6), 576 (Ganavani 28, 4, 27 and 2, 6, 27), 415 (13) (14) and (15) 416 (15), 464, 526 (32) (33), (34), (35), (39), (40), (36), (41), 527 (7), 546 (8), 1976, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1985, 1075, 550, 2518 and 545 (10). Have you anything to say about this evidence?

A: There are only two of these that I wish to refer to. The first is P 526 (11). The occasion for the writing of this letter was the publication by the Forward of Calcutta of a message from their London Correspondent in which he claimed that he had found evidence that the B.T.U. Congress are making efforts to influence the Indian Trade Union Movement and bring it under their control. The correspondent described this as a plot. I wrote to the paper to say that whether the details of the correspondents' supposed discoveries were correct or not, he had given a sound idea of the policy and attitude of the official British Labour Movement towards the Indian Labour Movement and India generally. This question of the policy of the Reformist Labour Organisations of Europe towards the Colonies has come up in the case several times and I want to state shortly what I believe to be the truth about it and to show that this letter was correct. As I have already said the traditional attitude of the European

Working Class Movement to the Colonies has been to demand Independence for them and to support them in any conflict with the Imperialist Powers. I have shown further as I should claim that that policy is in the best interests of the European Working Class and it is the policy adopted by the Communist International. In this matter as in most other matters it is the Communist International which is carrying on the traditions of the Labour Movement and it is the Reformists the L.S.I. and the I.F.T.U. and so on who are deserting these traditions. At the time of the Boer War for example the Fabian Society or some of its members supported the War and were condemned by all sections and the official organisations of the Labour Movement for doing so. I have referred already also to the attitude taken by Mr. MacDonald before the War. It was an anti-Imperialist attitude though based no doubt on Liberal rather than Socialist principles. Since those days however and especially since the War the leading sections of the Second International have given way to a rapid process of corruption. The policy of the L.S.I. now-a-days we should regard as a Capitalist policy in every particular and in Colonial matters it pursues an Imperialist policy also.

The Colonial Resolution passed at the Brussels Conference of the L.S.I. in 1928 is in the exhibit. It is D 145 (7). This resolution opens in a militant style which recalls the policy of the Second International on the question in its pre-war days. It says "Colonial policy has been one of the means of the expansion of Capitalism throughout the world native races have been subjected to brutal foreign domination, to shameful exploitation and robbery by foreign Capitalists.....Socialism is opposed to the very principle of the foreign domination of Colonial races".

(EVENING 1st PART)

~~D/8.6.31.~~

But this I should say is only for the consumption of the rank and file followers of the L. S. I. many of whom still cherish these old beliefs of which I spoke, a preference for equality and Democracy and hatred of Capitalism and Imperialism. But the next clause begins to show hesitation. It runs "It (the L. S. I.) therefore supports the efforts towards emancipation of those colonial races who have fulfilled the basic conditions of modern independent civilization and claims on their behalf complete liberation from the foreign yoke." I should like to emphasise these words "who have fulfilled the basic conditions of modern independent civilization." They show that curious conception of the Reformists that subject races can make peaceful progress under Imperialism and eventually attain fitness for Independent existence.

This is obviously the Imperialist theory of guardianship of backward races. We of course should question that theory. We believe that Imperialist rule in general retards the development of subject people and that progress is made by them only through struggle against Imperialism. The attitude is shown still more clearly in the final passage of the resolution where it states its specific demands. Complete Independence is the demand for China and some other colonies but it is only what they can full self determination for India. This of course is not because India is less capable of Independent existence than other colonies but because of the influence of the British Labour Party in the L. S. I. as Dewan Chaman Lal who was present, pointed out in an indignant open letter (D 145 (8) & (9)) The British Labour Party had ministerial ambitions. It could not allow itself to be compromised by a decision of the L. S. I. in favour of complete Independence for India, however actually meaningless that decision might be. So it forced the L. S. I. to put forward the even more meaningless phrase 'full self determination.'

In this way it escaped being committed to any policy beyond that which it had actually announced in its programmes. In "Labour and the New Social Order" that is the 1918 programme of the Labour Party, it had put forward the conception of a kind of liberalised Imperialism essentially in agreement with the theoretical part of the L. S. I. resolution. It wanted to develop the Empire into what it called a Commonwealth of self governing nations. Some of the Labour Party members went so far as to claim that the existing political relations of the Empire could be turned directly into the Socialist relations of the future world Federation of peoples. This is briefly how what may be called the theoretical attitude of the L. S. I. and the British Labour Party developed along the Reformist line from its original anti-Imperialist beginnings. It does not require much knowledge of the world and of Imperialism and its working to know that it is from beginning to end absolute nonsense.

To come to more practical politics it is well-known that the British Labour Party in 1923 also accepted the Commonwealth of India Bill "as its policy for India. Any account of this Bill is contained in D 537" a booklet entitled "the Labour Party and the Empire" by L. Haden Guest. This Bill though it may be in detail not wholly acceptable to Indian Bourgeois Nationalists concedes most of their demands and would certainly represent far bigger concessions to the Indian Bourgeois than for example the decisions of the Round Table Conference. In many other ways also the British Labour Party has pledged itself to the Indian Bourgeois Nationalists to grant them most of what they want.

I need not go into detail about the policy actually pursued by the Labour Party in connection with Indian Bourgeois Nationalism to show that it has not in any way fulfilled even the limited promises that it has given in the past, in its programmes and that of the L. S. I and in private. On the contrary it has simply done exactly what the Imperialists wanted it to do, namely repress and shoot and beat its opponents when that was thought necessary and seduce them with deceptive promises at other times. In 1924 when the Labour Party held office for some time it showed this by assenting to the introduction of the Bengal Ordinance. In 1927 it allowed its members to act on the Simon Commission. In 1929-31 though it has been in a stronger possession as a Government than in 1924 it has gone much further than at that time. I need not do more than mention its treatment of the Bourgeois Nationalists which forced them to take up Civil Disobedience or its methods in relation to the Civil Disobedience Movement. It is worthwhile to say a word or two about the Round Table Conference. While the Civil Disobedience Movement was going on the Labour Government held the round Table Conference where it pretended to be consulting the representatives of India about future constitutional arrangements. There it played the very pretty and apparently effective diplomatic game of getting the princes, the representatives of what is possibly the most obsolete and reactionary social order in existence in the world today, to come forward as its allies and hold the Bourgeoisie in check. It stressed the communal question to the utmost Mr. MacDonald himself presided over the sub-committee on that question. Generally it used all the traditional weapons of Imperialism against the advance of the Indian Bourgeoisie incidentally it may be remarked with the open and hearty support of the Liberal and Conservative Parties.

The decisions of the Round Table Conference can only be described as a master piece of hypocrisy. They purport to be an outline of scheme of responsible Government. But on examining them one is astonished. They grant, one may say, absolutely nothing. Mr. H. N. Brailsford who is a supporter of the Labour Government correctly describes these decisions, using the most uncomplimentary terms, as an ingenious means for preventing all progress.

This is the way in which the Labour Party has kept its pledges to the Bourgeois National Movement in India. It will be remembered that these pledges though limited have been often repeated and are specific. But they have been abandoned and forgotten altogether. The actions of the Labour Government have been in no way at all different from those which are Liberal and Conservative Government would have carried out in the same

conditions. I think therefore that we cannot be held to be exaggerating when we describe the leadership of the British Labour Party as a recognised part of the Imperialist machinery as I did in this letter.

This record of hypocrisy and abandonment of principle by the Labour Party on the Colonial question is only a parallel to its record on other questions. It is perhaps a somewhat clearer exposure of their policy but is not essentially different. I should like to lay emphasis on it, for the results to be derived from study of Social Democratic policy are an important part of what I should call our justifications of our policy. The Social Democrats profess roughly the same aims as ourselves no doubt in many cases quite sincerely, and criticise the existing order in the same sort of way. Yet they fail in practice so hopelessly. It seems to me to help to confirm the soundness of our policy and theory.

The claim is often made that the British Labour Party being a working class party has no sympathy for a Bourgeois Nationalist Movement and consequently it does not feel bound to help it in any way. That does not meet the point of course that it has given pledges to that Bourgeois Movement and broken them at the desire of the British Capitalists. But the claim is also most effectively met by a review of the record of the British Labour Party in relation to the Indian Labour Movement. Again we had the first intimation of its line in 1924 when it allowed the Cawnpore Conspiracy case to be launched and carried through. It also showed itself up very clearly in 1928 when it held an Empire Labour Conference in London which was attended by some very Moderate and Reformist Indian Trade Unionists. The attitude of the British Labour Party representatives was so offensive that the Indian representatives withdrew in disgust. Mr. C. F. Andrews who was one of them explains that it was because the British Labour Party members were "really fighting for Imperialism and racialism in the Conference" (I refer to D 145(2)). During their tenure of office in 1929-31 they have fulfilled the promise given in previous years. They have allowed their agents to smash the big Textile Strike in Bombay in 1929 and the Jute Strike in Bengal in the same year and the G.I.P. Railway Strike in 1930, as well as minor strikes, by imprisoning their leaders, promulgating section 144, and shooting into meetings and so on. They have practically, if not theoretically, declared the Trade Union Movement illegal over large areas of the country. They have used the Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Act and Regulation III of 1818 to imprison Trade Union and Labour leaders. I could name several Labour men who are still in Jail under these laws, men who are not certainly Terrorists. If the decisions of the Round Table Conference are considered one sees how much the British Labour Party cares for the Indian Workers' interests. The Round

Table Conference does not concede universal suffrage. It limits the vote to ten or at the most 25% of the population on a property qualifications so that practically no workers will get a vote. Representation of Labour will be by nomination, if at all. Labour, factories and similar matters are not made central subjects in regard to Legislation. This will make it far more difficult to get Labour Legislation passed as many people have pointed out. Further no provision at all is made to secure representation for the peasants, although the landlords are apparently to be given special representation in addition to that which they would get in the normal course. Representation from the States by the nomination of the princes will clearly not benefit the workers or peasants of those regions. The whole system in fact outlined by the Round Table Conference which is very reactionary even from a Bourgeois point of view is a fortiori reactionary from the Labour point of view. Mr. Brailsford condemns the Round Table Conference decision in regard to Labour as does also Mr. N. M. Joshi. Mr. Joshi describes them as calamitous. I think this disposes very effectively of the claim of the British Labour Party to stand for the interests of the Indian Workers. In this respect as in relation to the Indian Bourgeoisie it is a completely Imperialist Party.

A word or two should be said about the Left Wing of the Labour Party, the I.L.P. and so on. It is claimed that their policy represents a real alternative which sincere Socialists can follow without falling into Communists' position. If the Labour Party is fairly completely exposed the I.L.P. and the left Wing are not. But if their policy is examined it will be found to contain the same fundamental weaknesses as that of the Labour Party. In fact it is the same policy which the Labour Party was pursuing, say ten years ago. Like the Labour Party then the I.L.P. now is not burdened by the cares of office and so can still appear to be radical.

~~8.6.31~~

(Evening Part II)

The function of the Left Wing is to lead that revolt which develops among the rank and file against the betrayals of the Labour Party but to act in such a manner that this revolt leads to nothing, no organisational split and so on. It is a sort of shock-absorber as it were. This Left Wing has played the part in relation both to the Indian bourgeoisie and to the British workers. As long as it was possible they told the Indian bourgeois Nationalists to have confidence in the Labour Party and its consiliatory intentions. They continue to advise going to the Round Table Conference though it is obvious that nothing worth having can be obtained in that way. They advocate nothing in short but the only practical way to get

your demands namely revolution. In relation to the British Working class the Left Wing have consistently tried to create the same illusion that the Labour Government has something up its sleeve and that the repression was a temporary and unpleasant necessity. When peaceful conditions are re-established. The Labour Government will show its Democratic spirit and its generosity. The recent resolution adopted at the I.L.P. Conference for example uses the meaningless or worse than meaningless expression. "Full Self-Government" which leads people to think that it is demanding complete Independence which is a totally different thing. It supports the Round Table Conference procedure while urging that more should be conceded through the Round Table Conference. The effect is to turn any radical sentiments which exist among the British Working Class on the question into the direction of demanding and expecting more from the Labour Government and the Round Table Conference instead of towards the only hopeful policy of open opposition to them and full support for the revolutionary movement in India.

At the same time it has confused the understand of the British Working Class in regard to the Indian situation, by spreading, among other false suggestions the idea that the Congress is a mass organisation supported by the workers and peasants and therefore that a settlement satisfactory to the Congress will really conclude the question and the conscience of the British Working Class will be satisfied. I can quote for example Mr. Fenner Brockway's book "The Indian ^{Class}" in which he says "the Congress under the leadership of Jawahar Lal Nehru has increasingly become a Proletarian Movement." Either Mr. Brockway is very easily taken in or he is a conscious partner in this deception practised by the Congress whereby it represents itself as a Democratic and even Socialist body. For of course it is a deception. The Congress in spite of having some petty bourgeois and peasant following is a completely bourgeois ^{body} today in ideas and policy Mr. Gandhi is no more a Social than Mr. LLYOD GEORGE ^{for}

So much for the so called Left Wing of the Labour Party. I should complete the picture by showing that the British Trade Union Leaders who in some matters pose as more radical than the politicians played the same sort of game in relation to India. When Messrs. Fucell and Hallsworth were in India they made rather violent speeches, distinctly more violent for example than mine. But the substance of their advice to the Indian workers was reactionary. It was to concentrate on economic questions and leave political matters alone, which as I point out in this letter is simply doing the work of Imperialism. In private as is shown by D 145 (30) they worked to get the A.I.T.U.C. affiliated to Amsterdam and break off relations with the W. W. L. I. and soon. In this

perhaps less sensational but no less important way the British Trade Union leadership have played the same part as the Labour Party leaders that is essentially an Imperialist part intended to keep the Indian workers away from revolutionary policies, the only policies which can do them any good. I believe therefore that the expressions I used in this letter are entirely correct.

P 527(7): This is called Communism a Guide for Reading. This exhibit has been given a very impressive character by the court printer. But it will be seen that the original is merely some pages of rough notes. I do not see why they been put in. There is one point in it which I should like to touch upon. There is a note at one place dealing with the conception that the revolution is objectively inevitable. I fancy that the attitude taken there is not very clear and I should like to say briefly what I think our view is. I feel also that it is desirable to do so because Your Honour made some remarks about this question in your recent order on our bail applications when you said that we regard the revolution a philosophical necessity, and gave the impression that we were putting forward this plea in order to absolve ourselves from responsibility in the matter.

I do not want to wander off into a discussion on determinism and so on. All I will say is this. There are the two well-defined and mutually opposed ways of looking at these matters. Like most other people we should not confine ourselves to either but should adopt both. The justification of this in the light of logic does not concern me at present. I should say that the practical effectiveness of the procedure is our justification. We first survey the situation from an objective causal point of view. We find what are the facts and what lines of development are to be distinguished or to be expected and so on. On this basis we can predict of course only in general terms and subject to the usual limitations of human knowledge. In this sense it is possible to say that an event of a certain type will probably or certainly occur. But then we approach the matter from the other point of view subjectively and aimfully. But having taken our objective survey first and accepting it as decisive we have to decide what aims are practical or to define our aims in terms of practical possibilities. Having done that we can mark out practical lines of action for the attainment of these aims, and can achieve economy of effort and so on. This sort of approach to the subject is necessary. A practical scientific discussion of any subject is necessarily done in causal terms. Practically its chief importance is that we avoid the mistake made by almost all socialists up to the time of the Marxists of simply putting our ideal aim before us and setting about attaining it without reference to actualities.

But it is clear that this does not mean that we abandon aims. All we do as I have said is to define our aims and the line of development towards them in terms of what we regard as practical possibilities. There is nothing fatalistic about us. We have our aims and fight for them. I should put it a little more strongly perhaps. We advocate our policy and determine to carry it out not because we consider that the course of development we propose is inevitable or likely but because we think it is a good policy which when put into effect will benefit the public. I think it would be ridiculous to advocate a policy on any other ground. We are in this respect on the same footing as any other party. We claim that our policy will do good, far better than any other policy, and are willing to let it be judged from that point of view and accept full responsibility for it. I think therefore speaking for myself at any rate that we can not put forward any plea of the kind you have suggested to excuse our activities.

About the other articles there are many of them and almost any might be made the subject of a long explanation. But life is short and I have said enough.

Q. The Court has nothing further to put to you.

If there is anything you think is not explained or requires explanation you may say what you have to say now?

A. About the search I want to say what others I fancy.

I have said already that the Police and the Prosecution have behaved in rather a barbarous way in connection with the searches and especially our books. They seized practically everything having any political bearing and good deal which had none. Perhaps the search officers can be excused as they were in a hurry. But the Prosecution has had plenty of time in the last two years and they still refuse to return many of our books which they have not exhibited. I have in particular a list of about 40 books and pamphlets which we have been trying for months to get back. I see no reason why any of them should be retained. But in some cases their anxiety to keep them from us is really inexplicable. There is for example a pamphlet entitled "Scientific Method" by James Johnston who is Professor of Geology in the University of Liverpool. Its connection even with Politics in the most general sense is to say the least remote. Then there is Prince Kropotkin's "History of the French Revolution", a classical book written at least 30 years ago, the author of which was not even a Socialist in the accepted sense, but an anarchist. Then there is Lenin's book "Materialism and Empiric Criticism". Again the connection of this book with Politics is a rather distant. There are a number of others which are almost equally surprising, two pamphlets by theoretical leader of the

Second International, Kautsky; a collection of articles on the Russian Revolution of 1905 by Daniel DeLeon, a classical pamphlet on Economics by Marx two studies of the life of Marx by Max Beer and D. Ryazanov respectively, and a curious sort of by product of the Marxist Movement, some entirely theoretical and obscure pamphlets by an American crank named Waton. I could name more but these are enough. I have brought up this point not because I want to argue anything from it but in order to put the facts before the Prosecution. I think they must either admit that they have kept these books intentionally and that they want to prevent people from learning anything about Marxism or Historical revolutions or any subject of the sort; shall I say also materialist philosophy, even in the most theoretical and abstract way. Or they must admit that they have acted merely bureaucratically and that they have never paid any attention to our repeated applications. I suppose there is a third alternative which may be the actual state of things namely that they do not know anything about the matter at all.

A number of books and publications which are said to be prescribed or otherwise objectionable were taken in this search (of 2/1 European Asylum Lane). They were actually bought in bookshops in the ordinary way in most cases. I have put in some exhibits which will go to show that this is so, some bills and receipts from bookshops. Some also came to us through the post, the newspapers especially.

D. 9.6.31.

~~MORNING 1ST PART.~~

Before I come to the charge there is one other small matter which I want to deal with. I have several times in the statement used the word 'hypocrisy' and similar terms. In fact the hypocrisy of the Capitalists might be said to be the central theme of my statement. I feel that a justification of the use of such terms is necessary especially as we have been accused more than once in this Court of indifference to what may be called moral considerations. Briefly then we are not hostile to these considerations as such. We should regard a moral system as being founded mainly on the needs of a given type of society. It naturally follows that when interests within any society are divided over fundamental questions views will tend to differ as to the validity of the moral principles put forward by any section of the society. In fact a moral system will become in the usual way one of the means adopted by a ruling class for impressing its psychology upon the other classes. An obvious case in point is the ordinary Capitalist objection to Socialism that its realisation would involve the confiscation of property and

therefore a breach of the moral principle that one should not steal. We have therefore to reject ruling class morality. It follows incidentally that if professed champions of the oppressed sections of society begin preaching universal morality or identifying themselves with the ruling class morality as for example Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Gandhi very conspicuously do, we should regard that as an indication that they have given up the struggle and gone over to the other side.]

It can be said that we have regard to moral considerations, of course principally in application to what I may call our side of the struggle. In any case I think we should not regard the details of the traditional moral systems, however generally admirable they may be as, necessarily valid even within those limits. I think we should set up consciously as our fundamental principle that the success of the revolution is the supreme law. But subject to these limitations we do entertain conceptions of this kind for example in the literature discussing Lenin as an individual the idea constantly occurs that he was honest. That can only be called a moral attribute. The same sort of thing is related about other working class leaders, Connolly for example, who was executed by the British Government after the Easter rising in Dublin in 1916. These men had to do underground work and evade the Police and so on, and worse still to engage in the notoriously dirty game of politics but remain uncontaminated. This tribute is constantly paid to them by their followers and they are set up as examples for us to imitate.

Our position in this matter is not of course unique. It is the same as the position adopted for example by the Bourgeoisie. The main difference is as usual that we proclaim it and they do not. They do not regard it as obligatory in practice to observe their principles in relation to other classes or—and here is a limitation which does not affect us—in relation to other nations. The example I have given before clearly shows this also. The Bourgeoisie object to robbery on principle. But they do not object if it is carried out by themselves at the expense of people not of their national class. The same thing applies to the question of violence generally. I have said something on this subject previously, and to the question of truth also. I suppose it would be difficult to find a parallel in History to the mendacity of the section of the Capitalist Press which is intended for the consumption of the working class. One could pursue this subject almost indefinitely. As Mr. Bernard Shaw has pointed out socialism has a tenable moral system but the moral system of Capitalism is so shocking that it is never stated. Those 19th century economists who attempted to state it more or less frankly have earned universal approbrium as preachers of soulless and anarchical immorality. Mr. J.M. Keynes and others have pointed out the superiority of the

moral code which has been established in the Soviet Union and the high degree of co-incident of theory and practice, as opposed to the state of things in the Bourgeois world. What I said I think can be summed up roughly by saying that the essence of Capitalist morality in practice is hypocrisy. And when they accuse us of lack of moral sense they are simply playing their usual game.

The Bourgeoisie generally make a great deal of use of hypocrisy in many matters. But the British Bourgeoisie are especially notorious for it. Their record for example in European diplomacy has earned them the name of perfidious. It is clear that the two qualities are closely allied. It is these qualities that people are really thinking of when they praise the genius for compromise of the British Bourgeoisie or describe them as more experienced, cleverer, and so forth than their neighbours. These qualities are most conspicuously displayed in connection with the colonies. With so little real basis for it, in fact with a record of conquest and intrigue and general reaction to their discredit, the British Bourgeoisie are able fairly successfully to keep up the pretence of a civilising mission and humane intentions and so forth in their dealings with India. I have even met Indians, very few of course, who were taken in by it. They can do this only by the use of their unique faculty of hypocrisy. That in fact I believe is the main content of the famous British colonising genius. The British Bourgeoisie has very obvious drawbacks as colonial conquerors in which they fall behind their rivals. But in this supremely valuable gift they excel. It has taken an interesting form recently in the new theory of Imperialism which I have mentioned already which has become very popular since the War in England. It was found after the upheaval of the war time that it did not pay to boast too much about one's imperial might and the Empire on which the sun never sets. It sounded a bit Prussian and was apt to irritate the subject peoples. So the new theory came along embodied in the new name for the Empire, the Commonwealth of Nations. For the last ten years the Labour Party especially has been busy telling people that Imperialism is an obsolete doctrine, a sort of madness which possessed the British public quite temporarily some thirty years ago and principally due to Mr. Kipling. As I have pointed out the Labour Party in office has maintained the policy quite well. The dirty work of Imperialism is carried on as usual but in the name of universal brotherhood and the Commonwealth of Nations.

Other Imperialist nations do not carry the thing off quite so well. Some conduct their colonial policy with straight forward brutality which is not calculated to deceive. Others do it with an air of cynicism which invites disbelief. Still others try the British

tactics but over do the thing, especially the religious note, and fail to convince.

The result of these tactics are to be seen in British domestic politics also. Mr. Churchill the relatively straightforward champion of class conscious capitalism with an aggressive Imperialist policy is discarded by the Conservative Party. Sir William Joynton Hicks, who frankly denounces what I may call the philanthropic theory of Imperialism as cant, is promoted to harmless 'obscure' in the House of Lords. Mr. Baldwin, the substance of whose policy is exactly the same, but whose speciality is the sympathetic role, the honest man, who does not believe in the class struggle, who calls upon the employing class to stay their hands when he has smashed the general strike—the master hypocrite in short—is the accepted leader of the Bourgeoisie.

It is hardly necessary to follow out the application of ^{the} policy in India. Lord Irwin is hailed on his retirement as the greatest Viceroy for generations. Lord Cutzon and Lord Reading never received such flattery. Probably they were less successful, for though more able and more intelligent men, they had not the supreme gift for poisonous flattery which distinguishes Lord Irwin. His only rival at the business is likely to be his successor whose first public act on coming to India was to get his wife to wear Khaddar. We are expecting that when the next stage of compromise is reached and what is called Purna Swaraj is established. Your Honour will appear in Court to give us our sentences dressed in Khaddar.

About the charge I have a little to say. I suppose I was not surprised at our being arrested and prosecuted, though I had not thought that I had been doing anything illegal. One knows that it is in the nature of Imperialist Governments to do these things. But I think I was rather surprised when I first saw the charge against us. I know that the Government prefer to act in accordance with the law when they can. It looks better. But I felt it was rather rash of them to proceed against us under no better a law than this section 121 A. It seemed to me a distinctly flimsy, one might say ridiculous charge. I soon saw the point. I had been doing the things, or some of them, which I am charged with helping to form a Communist Party, with the ultimate object of bringing about revolution and so on. But one is not accustomed to look upon these things as being illegal. I was to be shown that they are illegal, or if they are not they will be made so.

~~D-9-6-31~~

~~(MORNING PART II)~~

But even now I feel that it is necessary to distort the plain

meaning of the words of the law in order to bring us under it. It may be of course that that distortion is permissible. In fact it seems rather probable that that will be the outcome of the case. If so all I can say is so much the worse for the law.

This is the reason evidently why such care has been taken that the case should not be tried before a jury. I imagine that the idea in the mind of the founders of the jury system was to avoid exactly such cases as this and to protect people against the vindictiveness or the political aims of the Executive and the ingenuity of its legal servants. The jury system sets up some sort of protection against that by bringing in a set of ordinary men who are likely to take the law at its face value and to disregard the interpretations and quibbling of the lawyers. Juries may probably go even further. They may disregard the law altogether if it is definitely contrary to public sentiments as to what is equitable and ought or ought not to be allowed. I think this is in accordance with the principles and the spirit of Bourgeois Democracy, that if the public feels that a law is wrong that law should be disregarded I believe there are many instances in English law for example of laws which have been allowed to become obsolete but have not been repealed, so that it is always possible for an ingenious Prosecution and Court to get people convicted for things which from the common sense point of view have ceased to be offences altogether. Of course Section 121 A, is not exactly in that category. I gather that it was added to the Penal Code only 20 or 25 years ago. But I think it is plainly out of accord with the sentiment which has grown up generally in all countries that political policies as such should not be prosecuted. I gather that the Prosecution deny that they are prosecuting Communist beliefs but I imagine that they will not deny that they are prosecuting Communist policy.

I do not mean by what I have said to attribute any sanctity to the jury system or to hold it up as an infallible protection to the public. It can be used for class purposes as any other part of the machinery of bourgeois Democracy can. But for its successful use for these purposes a certain basis of popular support for the Government and the law are required. It is because of the general withdrawal of such support that the practices and forms of Bourgeois Democracy have suffered such decline and have been altogether superseded by open Bourgeois Dictatorship in so many countries in the last decade or two. But even so it is a rather damning comment on the position of the British Government of India that it dared not try a Communist case before a middle class jury. But of course the application of these Bourgeois Democratic principles to the colonies has always been very limited.

I am sure that in such a case as this almost any jury would take the view that I have expressed. They would feel that we had been doing ordinary straightforward political and Trade Union work which even if it aims ultimately at revolution it is not customary to call conspiring to depriving the king of his sovereignty. I have tried in my statement from various points of view to show what I think is the case, that our policy is what I can call a straightforward political policy like other political policies though as I should claim wiser and better. A jury, would feel further that even if the words of the law can legitimately be twisted as the Prosecution claim they can to include these activities, it ought not to be the intention of the law to penalise activities of this kind. They would feel that the offence if it is one is purely technical one and that what was really happening was that the Government was merely utilising this more or less convenient section of the Penal Code for attacking its political opponents.

In this connection I agree with what various others Mittra, Chakarvarti, Joshi and Sohan Singh have said in their statements. To me also it is obvious that this case was launched not as a consequence of any crime committed by us but as part of a political policy. That is clear on the one hand from the nature of the evidence and from the fact that this evidence was accumulating in the hands of the Prosecution, according to their statements from 1925 or so four years before our arrest. It is shown on the other hand by the political situation at the time of our arrest. We were arrested, and the Prosecution published a tremendous lot of propaganda against us and our policy, in order to warn the Bourgeois Nationalist who were then becoming very restive, of the danger of stirring up the masses against the Government. We were arrested, or at any rate use was made of our arrest for the purpose of the propaganda of the Conservative Party in the General Election of 1929 in Great Britain. But, the most immediately important reason was the situation in the Trade Union Movement. We were arrested primarily for the purpose of breaking the forth coming strikes in the Textile Industry in Bombay and the Jute Industry in Bengal and on the railway. This is in short above all a strike breaking prosecution. These were what I may call the chief immediate objects. The case was in the first place part of a political campaign which was waged at that time in 1929 in consequence of the political and industrial situation which then existed. But the situation has now altered. The principal object for which the case is now being pursued is more general. It is I suppose to establish still more securely the legal resources at the disposal of the Government for the attack on the revolutionary nationalists and Communist movements in future.

The prosecution in this case have had to work under what is at first sight a rather serious disadvantage, that they have not been able to accuse us of having done anything illegal. I imagine that the result of this case will be that in any future cases of the kind they will not have to work under that handicap. I may remark that this result will be secured characteristically not by the straight-forward means of legislation, which creates a lot of stir and propaganda, but by means of court rulings which pass unnoticed. The effect in any case will be that that work of organisation and propaganda which Communists have necessarily to undertake by reason of their beliefs will become in itself illegal. This brings me back to this question of freedom of thought. The Prosecution claim that they are not prosecuting Communist opinions. I will not quibble about words. It may be that they will not trouble to prosecute people merely for holding Communist views theoretically, provided that they do nothing to put those views into effect. But one has not to be a behaviourist to feel that that is not what is meant by holding opinions. If this case succeeds the situation will be apparently that one can hold Communist views but only on condition that one does nothing to propagate those views or to carry out the practical activities, otherwise quite legal, such as Trade Union activities, which Communist theory shows to be necessary. I can not help pointing out once more the hypocrisy of this sort of attitude, of supporting the principle of freedom of thought in theory and doing what amounts to a complete denial of it in practice.

To return to the subject that being the situation I think it is clear why most of us, certainly myself, have found it difficult to take the proceedings of the case very seriously. I do not mean that the case will not have very serious consequences for our movement and for us personally. But we feel that our personal concern in the case is to a large extent irrelevant. The charge as I have said is rather a fantastic one. In fact this is not primarily a legal case in the ordinary sense at all. It is part of a political campaign. The individuals concerned are a secondary matter. We feel that we are here to supply a pretext. The case is being conducted for more important objects than to establish the guilt or innocence of 31 individuals which could have been done in three months.

This feeling of ours that the case is a farce has been confirmed by all the other circumstances, especially the extra-ordinary measures taken to insure conviction. It was obvious from the first that there was going to be no question of what can be called a fair trial. On general grounds of course that was to be expected. But I am bound to say that the actual facts have exceeded even our expectations. We work under the initial—one may say fundamental—disadvantage of being tried by our enemy's court and under our

enemy's law. An almost equally formidable obstacle is the disparity between our opponents' financial resources and ours. These things are to be expected and it is on general grounds such as these that we maintain the impossibility of impartiality or a fair trial in a case between the ruling class and the representatives of its political opponents. But even so I have been surprised at the length to which our opponents have gone and the way in which they have stretched the meaning of their own law in order to deprive us of any possibility of wriggling out. The facts have often been referred to and I need do no more than mention some of them. In the first place the case was launched at Meerut, a proceeding for which there seems to be no justification in common sense or equity even if there is in law. Then we have been refused a jury. As I have already said this was certainly wise from our opponents' point of view though I gather that it is of somewhat doubtful legality. We have been refused bail. We have found that while the Prosecution could bring witnesses from abroad we can not. While the Prosecution have what purports to be a record of our correspondence for years past and can select what items they please from it, we can not have access to any items except those which they care to exhibit. I might add that while they have a more or less unlimited staff of C.I.D. men and other officials and technical experts and so on to assist them, the people who come to assist us turn out to be suspicious characters who have been put away under Regulation III. As I have just said on general grounds one would not expect anything essentially different. But it is somewhat surprising that more effort has not been made to conceal the class character and lack of impartiality of the law and the judicial machinery. But nevertheless the pretence of a fair trial and even handed justice is kept up. The House of Commons is solemnly informed from time to time that this case is in the hands of the Judiciary and the Executive cannot interfere, and all facilities for defence are being given and so on. In this Court itself the good old shibboleths of Judicial impartiality and so on are regularly repeated.

I should like to point out the contrast presented by the political trials which have taken place recently in Soviet Russia. There it is frankly a class court operating a class law. It frankly makes the best possible use of the case for propaganda and inflicts exemplary sentences which, incidentally, are subsequently reduced by the Government. The bourgeoisie are horrified. But it is not difficult to convince oneself after having been through this case that the difference between the Bourgeoisie procedure and the working class procedure is that the working class state is honest about it while the Bourgeoisie cover up their actual legal trickery with their customary veil of hypocrisy. There is another difference not unimportant from the point of view of the accused, that while a Soviet Trial takes at the most two or three weeks, a trial in a Bourgeois Court may take as many years.

A very important part of the system of humbug which forms the ideological defence of Imperialism is the supposed rectitude of its legal and judicial system. I think we the accused can congratulate ourselves on this at any rate that our case which is already on the way to becoming a public scandal is helping appreciably to expose the gigantic fraud of the civilising mission and the impartial justice of British Imperialism in India.

Q. What about your defence witnesses?

A. I have nothing to say until the time comes when an answer has to be given.

Q. You have now read over the whole of your statement above and it has been corrected as and where requested by you. Are you now satisfied that the above is a correct record of it?

A. Yes.

(Sd) R. L. Yorke

(Sd.) P. Spratt.

13-6-31

Certified that the above is a full and true account of the statement of the accused taken down in my presence and hearing by stenographers and corrected as and where requested by the accused and admitted by him to be correct.

(Sd) R. L. Yorke

13-6-31

Corrected by Puran Chandra

Yorke
Ad

Saraswati Machine Printing Press, Meerut (U. P. India)

become free themselves so long as they assisted (or even permitted) another nation to remain in slavery."

"We workers of Great Britain more than any other section of workers must learn this lesson and take an interest ourselves in the question of the struggle of the workers in 'our own' colonial countries and define our attitude in relation to the same, the reason being that the ruling class of Great Britain owns the largest colonial territory in the world, that somewhere about four hundred million human-beings are being forcibly kept under the yoke of British Imperialism, out of which over three hundred millions are existing in India. It is the proud boast of this ruling class and its supporters that the British Empire because of its vastness is the "Glorious Empire upon which the sun never sets" and in regard to India it is described as "the brightest jewel in the English Crown". But only those who have visited such places as India can fully realise and appreciate the true significance of these boasts. One is struck by the stark poverty that is seen every where among the masses, the miserable wages paid for labour, the terrible housing conditions known as coolie lines, or Improvement Trust Chawls, to say nothing of the mud huts and the thousands upon thousands whose only shelter is to be found on the road side. In short the conditions can only be described as hideous. On the other hand the British Empire during the years of its growth provided for the ruling bourgeoisie cheap raw material, markets for their produce and fruitful spheres of investment for their surplus capital, which in turn has provided these British bond-holders and share-holders with enormous profits, and in spite of the world trade depression since 1920 the Board of trade, England, estimated that the income of the British Capitalists from abroad had risen from 180 million pounds to 270 million pounds. Along side this ~~it~~ should be taken into consideration the fall in prices during this period, and at least 60% of this total represents tribute extracted from the "glorious Empire" ~~of~~ for British Capitalist bond-holders. During the years 1915-1924 the share-holders in Indian Jute industry extracted profits and reserve funds totalling three hundred million pounds sterling comparing this amount with the number of workers in the industry which is about three hundred thousands and estimating for these ten years it means that the profit per worker extracted was one thousand pounds and it follows for one year one hundred pounds from each worker, while the average wage paid to the worker is £1-10s per annum. Dividends range in this industry from one hundred to three hundred per cent. In Malaya the Rubber Capitalists make about £ 109 per annum out of every worker, the wages paid to these workers amounts to £15 per annum. The same story can be told about all the parts of the Empire, Africa, Egypt etc., but we are at the moment mostly concerned with India. I may say here that what I have explained

is what I meant when I said in my speech P. 2240 "I have no love for the Empire though I have fought for it... the present Empire is constructed on exploitation".

How does the question of the Indian workers concern the workers in Great Britain? It is not necessary for me to go into detail about how the British came to be in India, but I will just mention that some 200 years ago they came here as merchant adventurers to plunder the country and from this adventure was founded the British East India Company. From the question of ordinary direct plunder came the question of a market for British goods. India was to be plundered both ways from within and from without. Every thing went well for the plans of British Capitalism up till the war, the accumulated loot principally from India provided the basis for the rapid development of industrial capital in Great Britain. British products and manufactured goods were increasingly being imported into India under protective measures to safeguard the market, with the disastrous effect upon the Indian handicraft industries and destroying the village system.

This was followed by another phase of exploitation, the export of British Capital principally as Government loans and also for investment in plantations, mines and industry. Export capital is the basis of Imperialism, during the last quarter of the 19th century colonial expansion went on apace and Imperialism was consolidated. It was during the closing period that the British Bourgeoisie acquired a monopoly of foreign Trade markets and Britain came to be known as the workshop of the world. It was during this period that the upper strata of the workers of Great Britain benefited slightly by this means of exploitation, and on occasions some Trade Unionists even have joined their particular country giving assistance in the exploitation of the colonies. However Great Britain did not have it all its own way, so even before the war the supremacy of Britain was being challenged and the war dealt her almost a death blow.

There was a rapid development of certain industries in India from the period of the war up till 1920. This development was in fact against the policy of Imperialism and allowed only because the war required it. The home country had to turn all its resources to produce war material and munitions. Not only did the bourgeoisie of Great Britain have to turn all their resources to the business of wholesale murder to attempt to maintain their supremacy, but they drew from the colonies much cannon-fodder and munitions also it was during this period that a spurt was made in the development of certain industries in India and the boom period for them began. This boom period however brought no relief to the workers, the boom reached its highest point in 1920 and the highest peak of

wages never even reached the increased cost of living. The boom period of the War was to capitalism simply a period of intensified exploitation, and provided an opportunity for the Indian Bourgeoisie to develop some industry at least; they used this opportunity as much as they could.

In 1920 British Imperialism began to reassert itself. Lancashire wanted back its cotton market; Dundee wanted back its Jute market, Vickers, Armstrong—Whitworth and other engineering concerns wanted back their markets and so on. The British capitalists demanded that the policy towards the colonies should be reviewed and put on a proper Imperialist basis. All the means within the power of British Imperialism were used to prevent further industrialisation and in India after 1920 it has come almost to a standstill. The measures adopted were as follows: —

In 1920 the Imperial Bank was forbidden to give credit to any industrial undertakings. In 1923 Railway construction plans to the extent of 1500 million rupees orders for this were given to an English firm in spite of the demand of the Indian Bourgeoisie that the orders should be placed in India. In 1923 orders for 3132 Railway cars were given to English firms, and we have seen the wholesale retrenchment that has followed in the Indian Railway Workshops. In 1926-27 the export duty fixed at 12% in 1919 on leather and skins (for the purposes of creating a leather industry) has been reduced to 3% in this way the raw material will be exported. During the same year the rupee exchange was set at 1/6 even though the industries in India were against it and demanded an exchange at 1/4. Instead of increasing the Tariff duty on iron and steel, as demanded by the Indian Bourgeoisie, preferential tariffs were fixed for British iron and steel goods. The increase in the coal tariffs demanded by the Indian Bourgeoisie was rejected in order that the South African Coal Industry should be protected. The same year approval is given by the Government on the export of capital from India to Brazil. The Royal Commission on Agriculture in effect advises that Indian capital should be directed to agriculture. In 1930 a bill was introduced in the Legislative Assembly ostensibly to give protection to the Indian Cotton Industry, but in reality as the result of some compact between Lancashire the Government and some Bombay mill-owners. This bill was calculated to deal with two questions, one Japanese competition and the other to give Lancashire a preference in the Indian market. The debate on this Bill in the Assembly was extremely interesting in so far as it exposed the struggle between the British Bourgeoisie and the Indian Bourgeoisie for the monopoly to exploit the Indian market. This new Cotton Tariff Bill was passed in the Legislative Assembly in March 1930 and showed the inner contradiction of Imperialism in the struggle for exploitation.

However, in spite of all this it has not prevented industries already developed in India from entering into frantic competition with the home industries and this has resulted in what we have seen, the vicious attack upon the conditions of the workers. This brought out a sharp contradiction between Imperialist Britain and India.

The power of the British ruling class over their Empire following the war was considerably shaken in spite of its apparent increase in size and the position to-day, 12½ years after the termination of the War is to say, the least, extremely critical. For today not only has she to meet foreign competition but the dominions also challenge British exports in the world market. In the attempt to save their supremacy the capitalists make a drive against the conditions of the workers and after the drive had been successful in Britain it is reflected by a drive against the workers in India and other colonial countries. It is my intention to show that the struggle of British workers is common with the struggle of the workers going on in India to-day, and in doing so I should be able to explain the character and meaning of some of this correspondence that passed between myself and persons in England. To do this I will compare the position of the workers in certain industries in Great Britain with the position of the workers in those industries in India.

Although I am going to draw comparisons between the conditions of workers in certain industries in Great Britain and India it does not mean for one moment that I believe the ruling class of Britain are allowing industrialisation of India to take place. Nowhere in India today do we see any sign of a development of the production of the means of production. Some industrial development is bound to take place in spite of the resistance of Imperialism, but this development is controlled and kept within certain limits by their tariffs etc. India can produce such commodities as cotton goods, boots and shoes or anything for consumption under these conditions, but she must not be allowed according to Imperialism to produce the means of production.

Export of capital to India is turned into such channels that will serve the best interests of British Imperialism, the building of railways and the means of transport, docks, and grandiose schemes of irrigation with the direct object of maintaining India as an agrarian appendage of British Imperialism. To hold before the eyes of the masses of India the perspective of expanding industries under Imperialism, capable of making concessions and raising the standard of life of the masses is sheer humbug. Imperialism's role in India has been and will be to impede the development of Capitalism.

In the first place I would take the Cotton Industry. This being the first and most important of British export industries, that

is of cotton goods, and show how this industry has been affected since the War. While yarn and cloth exports in 1912 formed 21 per cent of the total British exports they only formed 18 per cent in 1927 (Cotton Master Spinners' Report). The raw cotton consumption in the five leading European countries has fallen from 10.3 million bales in 1913 to 8.1 million bales in 1926. The fall of the British consumption during this period being nearly 30 per cent. At the same time the cotton consumption in India and Japan has risen from 3.7 million bales to 4.8 millions. Thus showing that the production of cotton goods was passing to places where cheaper labour was employed.

The reduced standard of the workers quickly affects the cotton industry and it is shown as follows. The decline in the consumption of cotton goods in Great Britain is by 33 per cent as compared with the consumption in 1912. The reason for this reduction by 1/3 in the home consumption, a reduction which still continues, is the continued attacks which have been made by the employers upon the workers wages during the post-war years. Therefore the decline in consumption of cotton goods can not only be attributed to foreign competition. The reduced standard of the British working-class during the last 10 years since 1920 is shown, by the striking figures recently given by Mr. William Graham, the President of the Board of Trade, in which he shows that the annual income of the workers during this period has fallen by 700 million pounds sterling. This land slide in the income of the workers of Great Britain is due entirely to the wage reduction enforced by the employers, it follows that the demands for goods will be reduced by this colossal amount. At the same time the huge army of unemployed must be taken into account.

In respect of exports of cotton goods this argument can be used even more forcibly in relation to the pauperised Indian masses, India being one of Britain's principal markets. Where as Britain supplied India with 85.67 per cent of its requirement of yarn in 1913, it supplied only 30.92 per cent in 1926 (Cotton Master Spinners' Report). Then the department of Overseas Trade in its "Report on the conditions and prospects of British trade in India, 1927," points out that the majority of Indian consumers have only a very small margin of means, and again the Indian Tariff Board's Report of 1927 shows that Indian consumption of cotton piece goods per head has fallen by more than 14 per cent comparing 1913-1914 with 1925-1926. Mr. H. P. Mody Chairman of the Bombay Mill Owners' Association in a statement issued on May 7th, 1931, points out "that the loss of Lancashire Trade was not due altogether to the boycott but it was to a great measure the result of crippled purchasing power of the country". This of course takes into consideration both imported and Indian produced

cotton piece goods, and shows conclusively that the reduced purchasing power of the Indian workers is a fundamental factor in relation to the British export decline. The state that the Lancashire capitalists have got into, is shown by the frantic and continuous press propaganda that is going on to-day.

What "solution" does Capitalism bring forward to solve this state of affairs? Its only "solution" is to further intensify the present contradictions and aggravate the situation as it is already by further reduced wages and longer hours-rationalisation. And this "solution" we have seen applied not only to the workers of Lancashire but also to the workers throughout India. The whole history of the Cotton Textile workers both in India and Lancashire since the War has been one of struggle to prevent worsened conditions. This struggle has been carried on under the name of 'rationalisation'.

To show what is in the minds of the capitalists and the common interests of the workers I would use the words of the Capitalists themselves. The following extract is taken from an article published in the "Manchester Guardian" even as far back as January 1928 and runs as follows:—

"Why then has this trade been lost? There are several main reasons, but the greatest is this—yellow labour and brown have attacked white; 2s. 6d. a day has attacked 10 shillings a day, and has done it wearing the arms and armour of 10 shillings". How do these interesting individuals, the Capitalists, propose to face up to the situation? Why, by reducing the 10 Shillings to 2s. 6d., as the article says in continuation. But if these individuals are in a position to carry through such a proposal, would the 2s. 6d. remain at 2s. 6d.? Of course it would not. Those of us who have been associated with the Cotton Textile workers in India know that the whole history of these workers has been one of struggle to maintain even the meagre 2s. 6d., and to prevent their already miserable conditions from being worsened.

The Bombay Textile workers have borne the brunt of these attacks, and strikes have taken place at one or other of all the textile centres throughout India, every year up to 1930 as I will show. The Ahmedabad Textile workers in 1923 were forced to accept a 15 per cent reduction in wages after a '60 months' strike in an attempt to resist. In 1924 the General Strike took place in Bombay involving over 160 thousand workers and lasting for three months, this was an attempt on the part of the workers to resist a wage reduction that was being enforced by the Bombay Mill Owners' Association, their excuse being trade depression. The workers again in this case were forced back to work suffering the reduction. Not satisfied with this the Bombay Mill-owners decided

to make a further attack on the workers' conditions in 1925; this time they wanted a reduction in the wages of 11½ per cent; the workers again struck work and the strike lasted about for four months. At this time the Government of India came to the assistance of the Mill-owners and suspended the Cotton Excise duty and because of this the 11½ per cent reduction was not enforced. In 1926 and 1927 strikes continued to take place in Bombay, Madras, Cawnpore and other textile centres. At the same time as these attacks were being made on the Indian workers similar attacks were being made on the workers in Lancashire. In 1927 the Federation of Master Cotton Spinners' and the Cotton Spinners' Manufacturers Associations of Lancashire were preparing for their big drive and putting forward the demands for the reduction of wages and lengthening of the standard working week. This was simultaneous with the drive that was being prepared against the Bombay Textile workers. This drive matured in 1928 when Bombay Mill-owners came forward with their rationalisation scheme, further reductions in wages and increased hours of labour. This time the employers wanted to speed up and at the same time reduce the workers' wages by 12½ per cent. It is of interest to note that this attack of the Bombay Mill-owners coincided with the drive of the Lancashire employers against the Lancashire Textile workers and at the same time as the suggestion was made that the 10 shillings of the British workers should be brought down to the 2s. 6d. of the Eastern workers.

14. 27. 6. 31

If the British workers submit to the attack then it does not end there, because the Indian workers are also attacked. Since 1920 the Textile workers of Lancashire have had to face serious unemployment and the workers have been forced to work short time. In 1921 out of 577,710 insured workers, 104,669 were unemployed, in 1926 out of 575,100 insured workers 144,018 were unemployed and in June 1930 there were 234,700 insured persons unemployed in the Cotton industry, that is 42.2 per cent. (Ministry of Labour Gazette figures.) This is typical of the situation that the workers have had to face during the post war years, and at the same time the system of short time is operated, and this is not done with a desire of the employers to save the workers from the horrors of unemployment but to ensure that a sufficient number of skilled workers remain in the industry with the hope that trade will revive. At the same time it is used to break the resistance of the workers in further attacks. In Bombay in the years 1929-30 the position of the unemployed was quite as bad, out of some 160,000 workers in the industry about 60,000 were unemployed and in 1930-31 of the same number of workers about 40,000 were unemployed.

In 1929 after the Fawcett Committee report on the 1928 strike the drive against the Bombay Textile workers was increased

and a general strike took place lasting about three months. As it will be seen by the continued attacks made by the Bombay mill-owners since the war the workers were not in a position to resist and they were forced back to work defeated. In the same year the long talked of attack upon the Lancashire cotton workers matured and on July 29, 1929 the master spinners and Spinners and Manufacturers' Federation locked out over five hundred thousand Lancashire Textile workers. The demand of the employers here was for a direct reduction of the current wages of 12.82 per cent together with an increase of the working hours from 48 to 52½ plus the usual speeding up. This lock-out was one of the most important steps of the employers in the process of rationalisation. The employers' justification of this attack was to cheapen the cost of production and so enable them to re-enter the world market with competitive prices. This justification is easily exploded by the simultaneous attack upon the Indian Cotton workers. In this drive against the Lancashire Cotton workers the Cotton masters received the valuable assistance of the Labour Government, they with the assistance of the Trade Union officials took part in this struggle to betray the workers. The Ministers of Labour of the Labour Government refused to grant unemployment benefit to the locked-out workers, stating that it was against the law to relieve workers who are in dispute. In this way the Labour Government supported the employers against the workers, further, assistance was given by the arbitration machinery which was set up by the Government. The result of arbitration was the forcing of a 6½ per cent cut in the wages of these workers.

The Bombay Textile workers were defeated in their attempt to resist the attack of the mill-owners to worsen their conditions and increase the rate of exploitation during their last General Strike. The argument used by the Bombay mill-owners was that reductions in the cost of production were necessary to meet competition. The Lancashire Textile workers were also defeated and forced to accept worsened conditions and reduced wages, so the position in respect of competition remained unchanged. Is the defeat of the Bombay Textile workers the signal for a new and further attack upon the workers in other countries, especially in Lancashire? If the argument of the Cotton masters of Lancashire is to be used then the reply is 'yes'. And so the vicious circle goes on. The very significance of the position is exposed by the simultaneous attack launched upon the Lancashire workers and the Bombay workers who were resisting still further worsened conditions. It is not a question of competition at all. It is a question of the scramble of profits on the part of the employers, and a frantic attempt to stabilise a system that is crumbling before their eyes. The Cotton workers of Lancashire cannot and will not agree to be condemned to the fate of having their wages and conditions levelled down to those of the

Indian workers, even if the conditions and wages of the Indian workers were to remain stationary. But a defeat for the Lancashire workers is a signal for an attack upon the Indian workers, and a defeat for the Indian workers means a further attack upon the Lancashire workers. This is the logical conclusion, and the vicious circle. By this means it is clear to the workers both British and Indian that their struggle is common against one common enemy and that they stand or fall together.

The above arguments can be applied to many other sections of workers, the Jute workers for instance, I have already indicated the enormous profits made from the Indian Jute Industry. The struggle of the Jute workers is typical, the Jute industry of Bengal was started entirely by British capital, the first mill was registered in 1872, the Fort Gloucester Mill. For many years the Indian Jute industry has had the monopoly on the world market. The two important factors that induced the capitalists to develop the Jute industry in India were, the good supply of raw jute at the door of the factory and the other was the enormous supply of cheap labour. These conditions were pitted against the conditions effecting the Dundee Jute Industry where comparatively better conditions were enjoyed by the workers. Serious rivalry between Dundee and Bengal was felt as early as the year 1894 and this brought a vigorous protest from the Dundee Chamber of Commerce as follows:—

“Against the working of women and young persons twenty-two hours a day and a children fifteen hours a day, as against ten hours a day work in Dundee.” On receiving this protest the Secretary of State for India ordered an enquiry to be made on the spot, but nothing was done. The power of the capitalists was too strong and of course it was British capital. This rivalry naturally continued and after the war several new mills were floated in India, including one, the Cheviot Mill whose plant consists of the machinery brought from Thomson Brothers, Angus Works, Dundee, by Andrew Yule and Co. in the year 1920. The machinery from this Dundee Mill was dismantled, transhipped and re-set up in India to be worked by cheap labour. It is little wonder that the packing and shipping of this machinery caused considerable surprise and resentment among the unemployed Jute workers of Dundee. Here we have a glaring example of Imperialism using cheap labour not only for profit making, but to pit against and keep down the conditions of the workers in Great Britain. In spite of the terrible conditions of the Indian Jute workers the history of their struggle during the post war years has been similar to that of the Cotton workers, and from the owners side it has been one of unscrupulous exploitation. Here again the struggle of the workers of Dundee and Bengal is one.

Perhaps a more striking example of the use of cheap colonial labour to reduce and keep down the conditions of labour and also to replace the comparatively better paid labour of the workers of the metropolis is that shown by the use of such labour as seamen. Under the decision of the National Maritime Board of Great Britain the wage of the merchantile marine seaman is fixed at £9 equivalent to Rs 120/- per month, with free food in addition, as against the average wage paid to the Indian seaman which is Rs 26-8 per month. Because of the cheapness and abundance of Indian labour it is increasingly replacing British labour.

A further example can be given in respect of the workers in the Iron and Steel Industry. In the subsidised Iron and Steel Company of Tatas at Jamshépur the rationalisation drive has been going on for some years now and we have witnessed the resistance put up by the Indian workers there during 1928 and 1929 against worsened conditions. Exactly the same struggle is going on in England to-day owing to the rationalisation policy pursued by the English Steel Corporation, and in consequence of this in February 1930 the Penstone (Yorks) Works of Messrs. Cammell Laird and Company were closed down and one thousand workers were thrown out of work. The plant ~~there~~ had been erected at a cost of one million pounds is being dismantled showing that the closing down of this place is not a temporary measure. Cammell Laird and Co were to-day getting the same production with 3900 workers as they previously had to employ 12,000 workers to produce. Again in July another steel works was closed down. This firm belonged to guest Keen and Nettlefolds, a well-known company at Dowlais the closing down of these works threw out of employment over three thousand workers.

In 1928 over 600,000 railway workers in Great Britain were forced to accept a wage cut of 2½ per cent and again this year the employers are out to enforce a further cut.

During the last six or seven years serious attacks have been made upon the Indian railway workers. In 1930 the workers in the Woollen Industry of Britain had a very severe wage cut imposed upon them. The Mine workers in an industry which used to employ about 1,500,000 workers in Britain are perhaps the hardest hit. The history of these workers since the War "to make England fit for heroes to live in" has been one of continuous struggle, to-day their wages are below starvation level, the poverty, distress and unemployment among these workers is indescribable. While these workers are struggling in Britain the Indian Mine workers are toiling under slave conditions.

The same picture can be applied to the Engineering Industry. The Engineering employers say, if we can reduce the price

of our commodities we may be able to compete once more in the world market. In the ship building industry we have a very striking example, according to the Secretary of the Boiler Makers Society in March 1930 the number of workers employed in ship-building has been reduced by 154,377 workers since 1920 owing to rationalisation, and against this fact the tonnage of shipping in Great Britain has considerably increased during these years. In fact the same story can be told about the workers in all industries the guaranteed hour, day, and week which was won in the struggle of 1919 and 1920 is to be snatched away and wages are to be ruthlessly cut. This is the position in Great Britain to-day after ~~the~~ ten years' of continuous large scale depression in almost all industries. In spite of the continuous wage cuts there ~~is~~ mass unemployment. The Minister of Labour Returns for April 1931 show 2,639,633 registered unemployed in Great Britain. This is the highest figure since the war. Starvation stares these workers and their dependents in the face, there being ~~no~~ hope of their being absorbed within their industry. Is not such state of affairs as I have outlined sufficient to impress the minds of the British working class? Such is the callousness of the capitalists the methods that they adopt to drive down the conditions of the workers which were my bitter experience and which left a profound impression upon my mind.

The whole out line that I have tried to give from a workers view point shows the correctness of the definition of Imperialism, of which the British Empire is a part, as given by Lenin that Imperialism was the period of capitalist decline or dying Capitalism. Although I have only dealt with British Imperialism and directly with Great Britain and India showing the class nature of the struggle in both these countries, the chronic state of trade depression is not only confined to Great Britain and the countries under the domination of British Imperialism. The present economic crisis is directly a crisis of the capitalist system as a whole, in America, Germany, France etc there are huge armies of unemployed workers. In America, the most powerful Imperialist power ~~to-day~~, we find in United States of America in January 1931 there were 6,050,000 unemployed. These figures are given by Mr. Lamont, Secretary of Commerce U. S. A. The capitalists of those countries are making similar drives against the conditions of the workers in those countries. In short the capitalist world as a whole is struggling in the grip of a tremendous world crisis under which the very contradictions of the system itself are being exposed and because of which the system must collapse. It is from this situation that the working class of Britain have got to define their attitude in the class struggle and especially towards the struggle in the colonial countries within the Empire.

The British capitalists use the argument that it is competition from the workers in such countries as India and China with their low wages and their long working hours that is under cutting the British products. But who is it that is keeping down the conditions of the workers in those countries? It is the same British capitalist, who forces these workers to toil under disgusting circumstances for all hours, 52 weeks in the year, in return for a wage that can only be described as a miserable pittance not sufficient to provide them with enough food. It is the same British capitalist who is imposing rationalisation at home and at the same time planning new schemes for further exploitation of India and other colonial countries. British workers who assist or even permit this state of affairs to continue are in reality signing their own death warrants. The task of the British working class is to fight for the liberation of the colonial masses and for the conquest of political power at home. It is for us British workers to consider how best to achieve this. The General Strike of 1926 showed the right direction and also showed that the British workers were just as militant, courageous and determined to fight as any other section of the working class throughout the world, at the same time it exposed the treachery of the reformist Trade Union leaders. These leaders have since been enforcing upon the workers a policy of class collaboration under the name of "Mondism" and Propagating "industrial peace" while Capitalism goes on steadily exploiting the workers.

The British Labour Party have from a policy of deception and reformist illusions gone over to a full blooded and whole-hog support of Imperialism, at the same time propagating such quakery as "Imperial preference" and "Empire marketing". The Labour Party has had sufficient time and opportunity to show its intentions, having operated as His Majesty's Government on two occasions, and on both occasions it has been successful in showing its Imperialist character. In respect of matters directly concerning Great Britain the role of the Labour Government has been one of full-fledged support to all measures that the capitalists have brought forward to reduce the standard of life of the working class, in their attempts to save themselves from the ~~class~~ within which they were being submerged.

The Labour Government has freely used all the capitalist State machinery to prevent resistance on the part of the workers, during the Transport Workers' Strike of 1924 they introduced the Emergency Powers Act, the military were called in as black-legs, and on all other occasions the military and police have been freely used and strikers have been imprisoned. Unemployment relief was refused to workers locked out by employers to enforce wage

reductions. Workers who have been unemployed for a period are refused unemployment insurance benefit with a view to forcing these workers by starvation to accept labour at any wage the employer likes to impose. Further the Labour Government are responsible for imposing task work upon the unemployed. The Government machinery is used to set up arbitration courts through which the wage reductions and rationalisation policy that the employers desire to impose are passed on to the workers. Further, anti-labour legislation such as the Trade Disputes Act remains law and the Labour Government even use it. This class collaboration policy of the ~~Labour~~ Labour Government is endorsed by the Labour Party. In other words, the Labour Party has come forward to save Capitalism from itself, to save Capitalism from this chaos which in reality means saving the super profits for the capitalists. Earlier I gave figures which showed that the annual income of the British workers had been reduced in ten years by 700 million pounds sterling per annum. Mr. William Graham, President of the Board of Trade, supplemented this statement by pointing out that during the same ten years the national income on the other hand has not fallen but it remained stable at 4,000 million pounds a year. By this co-operation with capitalism, and the enforcement of rationalisation upon the workers the Labour Party is enslaving the workers and intensifying the contradictions which are so apparent to-day.

Forced by poverty and unemployment assisted by these Labour Imperialists, British workers are driven into the military forces in preparation for an attack upon U. S. S. R., a new war, and to be used as tools in the hands of this gang of ruthless exploiters to maintain India and other colonial countries in forcible subjection, by the use of machine guns, tanks, poison gas etc. etc.

The policy of the Labour Party in relation to the Empire has been such that even the late Lord Birkenhead was able, when the Tories came back into Government after the first Labour Government of 1924, to say that they were merely carrying on the policy of the last Government. When the Egyptian Nationalists made certain moderate demands from the Labour Government, the reply was the despatch of warships to Egyptian ports. When the tribesmen in Iraq refused to bow to the might of Britain, aeroplanes were sent and they were bombed. The then Labour Minister, the late Lord Thomson took a delight and full responsibility for this affair, saying when referring to the incident that "the effect of our air attack was appalling. 700 tribesmen seized with panic, fled into the desert, where hundreds must have perished from thirst....." Nothing is said of the number of human beings that were killed by the bombs during the raid. In respect of China full support was given by MacDonal Thomas and Co. to the bloody Imperialist

policy followed there, the ruthless repression of the workers' strike movement in 1925, the massacre of workers in 1926 and the British gun-boats and troops that were sent to China in 1927. Even the I. L. P. owing to its subservience to the Labour Party would not co-operate with the C. P. G. B. in its "Hands off China" Campaign. The Imperialist policy followed by the Labour Party in respect of India we know only too well, they were responsible for the introduction of the Bengal Ordinance in 1924, their co-operation on the Simon Commission; their record of ruthless repression from 1929 to 1931, wholesale shooting and arrest of the Indian masses, the shooting down of strikers; the numerous ordinances taking away whatever slight vestige of freedom there was, and finally the part of the Labour Government played in the recent negotiations on behalf of British Imperialism in delivering over the Indian masses to a further period of intensified exploitation, poverty and misery.

4/ 29.6.31

To justify this policy of imperialism the Labour Party talk of establishing a "British Commonwealth of nations" on the basis of the British Empire. They talk of 'socialising' the Empire. How do they propose to carry this out? With bombs, warships and troops or by the murderous policy that they have applied to India. The foundations of the Empire, as I have shown, are based upon ruthless exploitation and it is upon this basis that they propose to build their "British Commonwealth of nations". If this is so then the Labour Party programme for 'socialising' the Empire means in other words socialising exploitation and slavery. Such terms are only used by the Labour party to cover up the fact that they are simply carrying out the policy of the British ruling class in relation to the gathering and rising colonial revolt especially in respect of India. No party truly representing the working class of Britain can be reconciled with such a policy because the workers of Great Britain are equal victims of the same Empire.

The policy of the British Labour Party is the same as the policy of the L. S. I., or perhaps it would be more correct to say that the policy of the L. S. I. is the same as that of the British Labour Party, being the most important factor in this International. As a matter of fact it is hardly correct to call it an International because it is only representative of sections in European countries and has little or no connection with the colonial countries. It is because of this make up that the policy of the L. S. I. in relation to the colonial and semi-colonial peoples bears the mark of a body prepared to carry out the wishes of Imperialism. In other words the L. S. I. is in fact a pro-imperialist body. After the War the Labour Imperialists of European countries felt the need for an International to more effectively assist the capitalists in carrying

out their policy of reconstruction. At the same time it was necessary to supplement the work of the League of Nations and the I.L.O. A more important reason for the bringing into being of the L. S. I. was the necessity of some sort of International to divert the workers' attention and to stem the rising tide of revolutionary up-surge that was threatening to engulf the world. For this reason the L.S. I. with its present constitution was established in 1923.

In respect of the colonial and suppressed nationalities the policy of the L. S. I. has been completely in keeping with the policy of Imperialism. Where the strong hand of imperialism was applied the L. S. I. would justify and support, where the situation necessitated the imperialist power concerned talking of "reforms" or a "measure of self-Government within the Empire," that also could be accommodated. In other words the policy of the L. S. I. is elastic and accommodating, and can be adjusted to fit in with the particular need of the imperialist policy of capitalism at the moment. At the same time through its resolutions it denies the elementary principle of national self determination and shuts its eyes to the relationship between the oppressed colonial countries and the oppressors. Refusing the right of independence and adopting the principle of education towards self-Government (the White Man's burden) which means accepting the position that Imperialist domination is a good thing and denying the fact that the masses in the enslaved countries are in bondage to the imperialist country. It would support the idea of the Indian people having self-Government (but within the Empire). On the other hand it repudiates the demand for complete independence.

It is little wonder that the L. S. I. receives every support from the Imperialist powers and that the Imperialist oppressors give every assistance to member of this International to visit their colonies and to establish connections and carry on propaganda. In recent years several envoys of the L. S. I. have come to India, Purcell, Shaw, Brockway, Brailsford, etc: etc. British Imperialism sees in the L. S. I. a useful ally, a body that will kill two birds with one stone, on the one hand to head the British and other European workers off the revolutionary path and assist the reconstruction of capitalism and worsen conditions for the workers, and on the other hand to propagate to the colonial masses that they would not do better than remain within the Empire. Such a policy is designed only to bind the shackles of Imperialism more firmly on the colonial masses and also upon the workers of the home-country.

I have made it clear in what I have already said that the interest and struggle of the working-class of both Britain and India are common, that the rationalisation drive against the workers in Britain coincided with a similar drive against the workers of India,

and that they both stand or fall together under the attack of British Imperialist capitalism. The maintenance of British Imperialist power depends upon the workers of Britain being held asunder from the workers of India and the other colonies, to prevent them from realising their common interest and common struggle. To talk of building socialism on the basis of Empire exploitation is to propagate an idea as ridiculous as it is mischievous and those who do so and support this idea are the agents of those who desire to perpetuate these loathsome conditions of exploitation, robbery and murder.

As against these organisations which are betraying and handing the workers over to capitalism and Imperialism for further exploitation stand the Communist International and the R.I.L.U. with their unhesitating support for the colonial revolutionary movements. The Communist International stands as the one organisation of the revolutionary working-class of the world linking up the workers on the basis of the class struggle. This position is made quite clear in the theses on the Revolutionary Movement in the colonies and semi-colonies passed at the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International (Section 8): "The revolutionary emancipatory movements of the colonies and semi-colonies more and more rally round the banner of the Soviet Union, convincing themselves by bitter experience that there is no salvation for them except through alliance with the revolutionary Proletariat and through the victory of the world Proletarian revolution over world Imperialism. The Proletariat of the U. S. S. R., and the workers' movement in the capitalist countries, headed by the Communist International, in their turn are supporting and will more and more effectively support in deeds the emancipatory struggle of all colonial and other dependent peoples; they are the only sure bulwark of the colonial peoples in their struggle for final liberation from the yoke of Imperialism."

The above principle has been given effect to on more than one occasion, the assistance rendered to the Chinese in the struggle against World Imperialism: the assistance given to the colonial populations in Syria and Morocco by the French workers under the banner of the Communist Party, the assistance given to the Indian workers during their strikes, and so on.

The only party in Great Britain that realises this and carries on the correct policy in relation to the situation is the Communist Party of Great Britain, whose policy it is to rally the workers of Great Britain on the anti-Imperialist front, whose active propaganda and demonstrations were able to bring the workers of Britain to the true position and so prevent troops and ammunition being sent to murder the Chinese workers and so

drown the gathering Chinese workers' revolution in blood. The vigorous campaign that the C. P. G. B. has carried on to bring pressure to bear upon British Imperialism and to rally the British workers to the support of their fellow workers in India, who are struggling for freedom. (The clear and unequivocal denunciation of the political and economic slavery imposed by British Imperialism upon hundreds of millions of workers in India and throughout the British Empire, and finally the clear cut demand for the withdrawal of troops from India and the colonies and the recognition of their complete Independence) On this basis the C.P.G.B. is forging the link that will unite the struggle of the British Proletariat with the struggle of the colonial masses against Imperialism, and lead them to overthrow this great organisation of exploitation and oppression as represented by the British Empire. It is our aim, the aim of the working class movement to overthrow Capitalism and to substitute in the place of the Dictatorship of the Capitalists the Dictatorship of the workers.

It is under this lead of the Communist Party that we workers in Great Britain are beginning to realise that a defeat of the workers on one front means that the Capitalists will be in a much better position to turn their attention to other fronts. The success of the working class of Great Britain can only be effected by the formation and consolidation of a united front between the Proletariat of Britain and the Proletariat and masses of peasantry of India. The victory of the working class in advanced countries and the liberation of the oppressed nationalities from the yoke of Imperialism depends entirely upon this united front. Imperialism has itself made conflict between exploiters and the exploited international. Marx expressed the position clearly in his Manifesto of the Communist Party when he says, "The workers have no country". They have one common enemy that has imposed the conditions under which they exist today, and which they must unite to destroy.

Whilst at the same time I realise that revolution will not come in India through the advice given either from Great Britain or Moscow, but nevertheless it will surely come and the cause of it will be the object misery and slavery created by the very oppression of British Imperialism itself, which is today steadily impoverishing and worsening the conditions of the masses. But the day of their freedom from these chains of slavery will be hastened by unity of action with workers who are weltering under the whip of the same slave master. By this I mean that the emancipation of the Indian masses from British Imperialism will weaken the capitalist exploiters, who are today battering on us British workers, their freedom, ~~and~~ helps forward the British workers in their struggle for emancipation.

This can only be successfully achieved by the linking up of the revolutionary working class movements of Britain and India along with the revolutionary working class movements throughout the world on the basis of the programme of the Comintern. The Communist International alone is mobilising the wide masses, not only in capitalist countries but throughout the world for the final struggle and overthrow of Imperialism.

In view of the position of the workers of Great Britain an exceptionally heavy responsibility devolves upon their shoulders, a responsibility that they are certainly not going to shirk. The fact that I am in the dock today charged along with my Indian comrades shows that we workers in the metropolis are beginning to realise more and more that it is in our interest to see that the domination of our own bourgeoisie over the workers in the oppressed colonial countries of the Empire within which we live must be abolished once and for all.

In spite of the fact that the watch-dogs of British Imperialism in the intelligence and other organisations, the best trained and most pernicious in the world, are watching all roads leading to India, preventing access to all who might assist in the growth of the class-consciousness of the Indian Proletariat, guarding India with its millions of human beings like some precious sacrifice that has got to be slowly bled white on the altar of the Moloch of capitalist Imperialism, our duty is quite clear. Even the Labour Government has shown that they will not allow militant workers to come to India and have associations with Indian workers. Any worker who is suspected of the "terrible crime" of desiring to help the Indian workers in their struggle is refused a passport as in the case of J. R. Campbell, Tom Mann, etc.

An outstanding instance is given by P. W. 247 Sergeant Littlewood, "A Mr. T. Strudwick came to Bombay. He was detained on board". This was during August 1928 and is the case of a British worker whose passport etc was in order, but British Imperialism feared that he would be of too much assistance to the Indian workers. So in spite of the fact that his passport was in order he was not allowed to land. Another glaring instance is the case of Mr. J. W. Johnstone, who attended the Jharia Session of the T.U.C. as a fraternal delegate representing the L.A.I. In this case Mr. Johnstone was served with an order for deportation, he was subsequently arrested at the T. U. C. Jharia and deported. The above instances took place under the Tory Government. I can also give facts of how the reformist labour leaders of the I.F.T.U., act and show how they are prepared to carry out the orders of their Imperialist masters, and thereby

keep the workers divided. One case is that of J. K. Campbell who desired to come to India to assist the accused in this case, apparently he came under the category of those who would be likely to give assistance to Indian labour. He was therefore refused a passport by Mr. Wedgewood Benn, the Labour Secretary of State for India. The grounds for refusing the passport are given in a letter from the India Office dated 19/12/29 to J. R. Campbell "That undertaking was given, as is clear from the letters of the 11th and 28th September, from this office at a time when, and on the assumption that the Government of India were enabled by the currency of the Public Safety Ordinance to ensure that any breach of these conditions would be followed immediately by the removal of Mr. Campbell from India. The Public Safety Ordinance has, however, ceased to be operative... he must now decline to recommend the grant of a passport valid for India". This shows that in spite of the fact that J. R. Campbell was prepared to give an undertaking, Mr. Benn, the custodian of British Imperialism in India refused to grant a passport to a workers' leader whom he could not have him removed from India at the sweet will of the powers that be. This is a part from the fact that J. R. Campbell would have been of immense value to us in conducting our defence in this case.

A more recent incident is that of William Gallacher, as compared with David Kirkwood; both desired to attend the forthcoming Trade Union Congress, both happened to be engineers and members of the same Trade Union but David Kirkwood is a member of the I. L. P., he is to be allowed to come, William Gallacher is a member of the Communist Party, he is refused a passport.

We have learnt from bitter experience that had the workers bowed down to arbitrary class legislation, designed to keep the workers apart, there would never have been a Labour movement. We are certainly not going to begin now to bow down to this kind of legislation, or dictation from the capitalists, we defy capitalism to prevent us from linking up with the Indian workers in their struggle.

Whilst it is necessary for us to carry on vigorous propaganda and agitation in Great Britain among the workers there to make them understand what British Imperialism really stands for, it is also necessary that this should be accompanied by concrete assistance such as British workers coming to India to work with the Indian workers and in the Indian working-class movement.

I claim that the only way out of the present world economic crisis is the revolutionary way, capitalism must be smashed and

socialism built up from the ruins thereof, upon this must be taken into consideration the position of the British Empire. Either emancipated by the Proletarian revolution in Britain or by the active participation of the British Proletariat the revolution in the colonies is achieved and there will be found in India other countries previously hostile to capitalist Britain, countries converted into loyal allies of Soviet Britain. Such an alliance based upon the workers of these countries will provide a sure bulwark against the bogey of attack from American Dollar Imperialism, to which almost all European countries are heavily mortgaged to-day and which is becoming the night mare of British Imperialism. At the same time it will provide an unsurmountable defence of the Soviet countries against the forces of counter-revolution.

That the working-class of Great Britain are waking to the fact that their struggle to-day is inter-dependent with the masses struggling for freedom in the colonial countries—especially India—and that for success there must be unity of action, this is becoming more apparent day by day. This awakening is being brought about and led by the C. P. G. B. That I am a member of the Communist Party of Great Britain I admit and I am proud of the fact. I stand here today to register the right of the workers of Great Britain to co-operate with the workers of India in the struggle against capitalism and imperialism. In doing so there is no conspiracy, it is open co-operation in the class struggle against our common enemy, and come what may we are determined, ultimately, to march forward together shoulder to shoulder to our emancipation under the banner of the Communist International.

My arrival in India for the second time.

An unsuccessful attempt has been made by the Prosecution to shroud my arrival in India with mystery and to suggest that I came to India under false pretences. The Prosecution (Junior) Counsel said in summing up the case in the Lower Court that "he came like his predecessors or false pretences as an engineer." I do not know why we said this. What they have to support this allegation I do not know. I have been shown several documents, two of which are P. 1008, 1012, which I understand are alleged by the prosecution to announce my coming to India. I do not see anything at all in the document P 1008 that has any connection whatsoever with me, unless of course the Prosecution want to fix on to me the suggestion that 'University fellow' refers to me. I am certainly not a 'University fellow' and I know nothing about the reference. In P 1012 it says that "an engineer who will be going to Glasgow soon." These cryptic letters of the Prosecution have been developed to a high degree. The fact that I am an engineer became common knowledge, and such a fact could be easily incorporated in a letter. As to the word 'Glasgow' meaning Bombay,

this of course can only be mere assumption on the part of the Prosecution; there is certainly no evidence to support it. Had I gone to Karachi it would have had to have read as Karachi. I have seen these two exhibits, they were not sent to me and I understand they have not been properly proved. I think Spratt has given a satisfactory explanation and there is no need for me to say any more. I know nothing about them. All sorts of strange and mysterious stories have been concocted by the Prosecution about the arrival of certain persons in India. One Percy Gladding for instance is mentioned. In the case of this person the Prosecution with all their army of C. I. D. have not been able to produce a scrap of evidence that any-one saw such a person in India. But nevertheless we have been given an elaborate story about him. In respect of my coming to India for the second time I desire to make it quite clear that there was nothing mysterious, and certainly nothing surreptitious about the way I came. I came quite as openly as I came on the first time, my passport which is on record shows this. One of the reasons for which I came to India was to work the agency for a patent tile, an invention of my elder brother. He was also the proprietor of the firm, "The Crab Patent Under Drain Tile Company." At the same time as a Communist of course I owed a duty to my class which I was certainly not going to shirk. An opportunity was offered me during the year 1927 to again return to India by my elder brother who wanted to develop the sale of his tiles and I agreed to come to India and to my best in this respect for him. At the same time I saw an opportunity to render some practical assistance to my fellow workers in India; to further study their conditions, to be in close contact with them, and to participate in their struggle along with them. I seized this opportunity and in September 1927 I came to India on the P and O boat Ranpura using my own name, my own passport and quite openly.

Explanation of Money, Private letters and telegram etc;

Money:— I have already explained how and why I came to India in 1927. The Prosecution have thought fit to put in as evidence a mass of private letters and telegrams purporting to have been either sent by me or received by me. The main point in these exhibits is that they refer to the question of salary, either that I am asking for it to be forwarded or saying that it has not been sent. All these telegrams and letters are to and from my mother and my brother. Now without any reason whatsoever your Honour is asked by the Prosecution to infer that there is something sinister behind these letters and telegrams, here I may mention that my brother has been cited as a co-conspirator while my mother has not, no reason is given for this. In spite of all this and on this flimsy inference a Moscow scare is built up, you are asked to believe that Moscow is intriguing and that my mother and my brother, and in

fact the whole family are involved in this "Moscow plot." In short, it is alleged that they are in league with me and have been transferring "Moscow money" through certain channels to me.

Then the name of the Workers' Welfare League of India is brought in and the Prosecution counsel has said, without any concrete evidence to substantiate the same, that I was being paid "month by month for doing this Communist work of the revolution of India.....", the same allegation is repeated by the Magistrate in his Committal Order. Now as I have already pointed out I was doing business here on behalf of my brother and it is only natural that letters and telegrams dealing with the question of my salary and other business matters should pass between us, that is members of my family. Out of all the amounts mentioned by the Prosecution and alleged to have been received by me all except two were sent either by my mother or my brother. One of these two amounts not sent by them is alleged by the Prosecution to have been sent by one H.P. Rathbone, all that I can say in this respect is that I knew a Mr. Rathbone as a friend of the family and this may be the same Mr. Rathbone. It is quite possible that he was asked by my people to forward this amount to me (P 1504 series).

P. 1514 series with message "Wire receipt league":—

At the time this money was sent my elder brother was travelling in the midlands around Birmingham and as is usual with persons who are travelling an address to which all correspondence should be sent is fixed. I understood this message to mean that I should send the receipt for this money to a certain hotel in Birmingham which was the head quarters of the Commercial Travellers' Association and also of other organisations of which my brother was a member. Correspondence and material in reference to this matter has been lost owing to the fact that I had been moving about from place to place and then of course this was followed by my arrest.

P. 1860: The Prosecution had tried to support their theory that this money was being sent by the Workers' Welfare League and have referred to this letter. The portion which says "I have to thank you for... also for the receipts for the monies the League has been able to collect from the British workers for the strike at Bombay." This is a letter from Potter Wilson to me, now the clue and the explanation to this reference to receipts can be found in P. 1814, a portion of which refers to the fact that the Workers' Welfare League was able to collect from the Amalgamated Society of Dyers, Bleachers, Finishers and Kindred Trades, Lancashire;

the sum of £ 100-0-0. This was only one of several amounts that the Workers' Welfare League was to collect to assist the Bombay Mill Strike of 1928.

Now the position is that in my capacity as one of the treasurers of the Joint Strike Committee, which was conducting that strike, these amounts were sent to me. The total sum that I received from the Workers' Welfare League was Rs 4015-5-0. This amount I received direct and quite openly from the Workers' Welfare League and it was handed over to the Joint Strike Committee and it appears in the balance sheet of the Joint Strike Committee produced after the termination of the Strike. One of the amounts included in the above is £ 100-0-0 received from the A. S. D. B. F. & K. Trades.

The facts are that the whole of this sum was sent by the Trade Union Movement in England to assist the Indian workers on strike, that it was used for this purpose can be shown by the balance sheet of the Joint Strike Committee, but the most important point I want to make is that I received this sum openly direct from the Workers' Welfare League and that no cover at all was necessary. I have never, during the whole of my stay in India, attempted in any way to conceal my connection with the Workers' Welfare League of India. The Correspondence that the Prosecution have put in is a sufficient evidence to this effect. But the Prosecution have thought fit only to put in as evidence the correspondence that passed after a certain date and concocted the story that after a certain date when the Public Safety Bill was being put forward I became bold. Had they put in my earlier correspondence they could not have maintained their theory that my mother and my brother were being used as a cover to send me sums of money. The point I want to emphasise is that I was in continuous correspondence with the Workers Welfare League almost from the time that I arrived in India because I knew the Workers' Welfare League to be the official representative in England of the All India Trade Union Congress, that no attempt on my part or on the part of the Workers' Welfare League was made to conceal anything as shown by the evidence. But these letters only date from 8-9-29 from my side that is P. 1861 and from the Workers' Welfare League 23-8-28 P. 1860. What has happened to the letters that passed before these dates. What has happened to the letter referred to in P. 1860 which contained receipts for the money received for the Joint Strike Committee. The C. I. D. apparently have no record of this correspondence, or if they have, the Prosecution have conveniently not put them on record. Had they done so it would have caused some confusion in respect of the conclusions that they desire the Court to draw.

Now according to the Prosecution I was working in India for 18 months, from September 1927 to March 1929 when I was arrested. If all the amounts which the Prosecution have put on record and which they alleged to have been received by me are reckoned up, it comes to the enormous sum of Rs.5365-10-0 approximately. This includes Rs 1055-0-0 received by me after my arrest while in jail. But even if the total sum of Rs 5365-10-0 is taken and divided by 18 that is the number of months that I was working in India, it come to only Rs 298-1-5 per month. It follows that according to this calculation I was in receipt of Rs.298-1-5 per month and on this huge sum according to the Prosecution you are to believe that I was hired by Moscow to create the machinery and to finance the movement to overthrow the sovereignty of the King Emperor in India. I had to pay my hotel bills and I travelled about India considerably. That I was short of money even to pay for these necessary expenses my letters and telegrams showed and to suggest that I had money to use for other purposes, is sheer nonsense. The whole proposition is as ridiculous as it is fantastic. I emphatically deny the allegation of the Prosecution in reference to the question of money received by me while in India.

P. 2428: The reference on P. 2428 series is a business reference and should follow the explanation already given in P. 1514.

The Workers' Welfare League of India.

A large amount of correspondence alleged to have passed between myself and the Workers' Welfare League as has been put in as evidence. All this correspondence it will be seen dealt with Trade Union activities and strikes. In view of these documents and also in view of the suggestion made by the Prosecution that the W. W. League paid me my salary while I was in India, and that it was a Communist body, I desire to place the Court in full possession of the facts about this body as I have them. Although I have mentioned the numbers of these exhibits here I may find it necessary to refer at a later stage to the contents. In the beginning I should just like to recall how the prosecution introduced this body the Workers' Welfare League as an important "conspiratorial" organisation. The Crown Counsel in his opening Address produced an interesting graph in which certain organisations were placed in relation to each other. The graph, however, did not prove much of a success, perhaps the Prosecution Counsel was not very skilled at the job of producing such a thing, because he apparently found some difficulty in placing certain of the organisations that he wanted to account for and therefore he said in his address, "Then there are other bodies which it is slightly difficult to place." Two of them are the Workers' Welfare League and the Labour Re-

search Department". Little things like this, however, did not deter the Prosecution, the Workers' Welfare League had to be branded as a protege of the Comintern, and this was done in spite of the uncertainty of the Prosecution and their lack of evidence. The Scotland Yard C. I. D. witnesses brought out to India at considerable expense should have at least been able to tell the Court something to substantiate the allegation of the Prosecution. In spite of the fact that the Prosecution tried to draw this information out, only vague inferences were forthcoming such as the Workers' Welfare League was in close touch with the "Sunday Worker" (which according to the evidence of Mr. Brailsford was not a Communist organ) or, that the "Morning Post" had called it a Bolshevik organisation. Those of us who know the "Morning Post" can credit it with manufacturing any wild scare, to satisfy the thirst of its Anglo Indian and empire building readers.

A. 30.6.31

To try to add weight to their story much has been made by the Prosecution about the address of the League. Comrade Spratt has already made some reference to the offices at 162 Buckingham Palace Road. The League during its 13 years of existence has had several addresses as the membership card (D709) will show. During the time while I was in England and a member of the League its meeting place was at Doughty House, 18 Doughty Street. This was the headquarters of the N. A. F. T. A. This is the Furnishing Trade Worker's Union, but it did not mean to say that the W. W. L. had come under the influence of the furnishing trade workers, or that it had become a furnishing trade worker's body. Of course applying the logic of the Prosecution and of the "Morning Post" that because the office of the League was at 162 Buckingham Palace Road for a time it must be a Communist body because another alleged Communist body had an office in the same building. This argument of course of the Prosecution is foundation-less, and at any rate very bad evidence.

Now I should like to say something about the history of the League and its work. The Magistrate in his committal order, page 76 shows a deplorable lack of information in respect of this organisation when he says that:- "it started with the initial advantage of being the representative in England of the A. I. T. U. C.". I cannot let this go without correcting it, the workers' Welfare League was started just three years before the foundation of the A.I.T.U.C.

The facts are that the Workers' Welfare League was founded by Mr. A. G. Field, an individual who desired to assist the Indian workers, in the year 1917. Another point I should like to emphasise is that the date of the foundation of the League shows that it was founded exactly three years before the foundation of the

Comintern and four years before the R. I. L. U. was brought into being and the same year that the Russian revolution took place. This being so it could hardly be an offshoot either of the Comintern or the R. I. L. U., as the Prosecution would lead the Court to believe.

Thus the position is that a few Indian and British subjects in England founded the League in 1917 and were, in a very short time, able to show a substantial organisation. The objects of it were, in short, to safeguard the interests of the workers of India, to lay facts about the conditions of labour etc. before the workers of England, at the same time making it clear that the exploitation of labour in any part of the Empire is detrimental to the general interests of the workers throughout the Empire. This is according to the constitution and rules of the W. W. L. which I tender.

I would just mention briefly some of the work done by the League and its activities since its foundation. In 1919, that is before this alleged conspiracy started, the League sent a memorial to the Secretary of State for India drawing attention to the omission of any reference to the question of improvement of conditions of the workers in the Montague-Chelmsford Report, and urged the need for steps to be taken on behalf of the Indian workers. In 1920, the League was able to persuade the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress to approach the Secretary of State for India, in connection with the strikes that were taking place then in India, and called for the granting of Trade Union rights for Indian workers. Further the first time that an appeal was ever issued for financial help on behalf of the Indian workers on strike was issued by the Workers' Welfare League in 1924 resulting in assistance being sent to the strikers. Again in 1925, the League was successful in getting the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress to make a grant to the Indian workers then in dispute. The League was responsible for general interest being roused in England about the terrible conditions of Indian labour that exist on the tea plantations, and was responsible for the workers' delegation coming to India, one from the British Trade Union Congress and the other directly representing the Workers' Welfare League, Mr. Mardy Jones. These delegates attended the Cownpore Session of the A.I.T.U.C.

Another example of the work of the League is shown in the 10th Annual report for the year 1927 which has been tendered and marked D. 711. The assistance was rendered during the Bengal-Nagpur Railway Strike of 1927 and on this occasion financial help was sent with the cooperation of the British Trade Union Congress. This report shows general co-operation between the League and the

British Trade Union Congress. In one part of the Report it says, "Further correspondence with the General Council followed and finally the League is glad to report that a receipt or letter couched in cordial terms, recording appreciation for the work of the League, and expressing the view of the General Council that any appeals from the A.I.T.U.C to the British T. U. C. should reach the latter directly and not through the medium of the League. The League Council accepted this suggestion and informed the General Council of the T. U. C. that it would also keep them informed of any approach to the British authorities or such action taken by the League in this country."

The League is a non-political body and includes among its members representatives of all working-class organisations, Communist and non-Communist. The membership of the League is mainly by affiliated organisations and in this matter the 10th Annual Report shows a considerable increase in affiliated Trade Unions.

Among the eighty affiliated societies are the Iron and Steel Federation, The London Society of Compositors, the N.A.F.T.A., the National Union of Boot and Shoe operatives, the National Amalgamated Building Trade operatives, etc.

The 11th Annual Report for the year ending December 31st 1928 as presented to the annual meeting held in London on February the 16th, 1929. (It is hereby tendered and marked as D. 712). It deals with the work done during the year, and this is the most important year as far as I am concerned according to the Prosecution, it refers to the tremendous economic upheaval witnessed in India during 1928, and class character of British Imperialism, and the brutal methods used to suppress strikes and the working-class movement, and the need for closer co-operation between the British and Indian workers.

The fact is that the League was able to collect £ 440. 0. 0. to assist the Bombay Textile workers on strike during the year, which was received by the Joint Strike Committee. This is the amount which I referred to earlier and which was sent to me. £ 40. 0. 0. was sent to assist the S. I. Ry. strikers and £ 10 to assist the Jute workers on strike at Bauria. Trade Union Conferences were organised by the League in order to draw the attention of the British workers to the Indian Labour situation.

Considerable importance is sought to be attached by the Prosecution to the reports and correspondence alleged to have been sent by me to Mr. Potter Wilson of the workers' Welfare League which deals with strikes and Trade Union matter. I would draw your honour's attention to the para in the 11th Annual Report which runs as follows :— " During 1928, Mr. N. M. Joshi, General

Secretary of the T. U. C. has week by week forwarded a summary of news on the strikes taking place in India. Full reports were also received from the Joint Strike Committee conducting the Bombay Textile strikes."

Was there anything conspiratorial in these reports sent by Mr. N. M. Joshi? If not, then there was nothing conspiratorial in the reports alleged to have been sent by me also during 1928.

It will be seen by this Report that further affiliations of organisations were made during 1928 from such organisations as A. E. U., S. W. M. F., Trades Councils and Cooperative Guilds etc. Because of the excellent work that the League was doing on behalf of the Indian workers, the A. I. T. U. C. decided to make the League its agent in Great Britain. The foregoing information should be sufficient to explode the canard of the Prosecution that this organisation was a Communist body or that it was a conspiratorial body. With the continued recurrence of labour disputes, the indiscriminate shooting of strikers by the Police and Military, the bad conditions, the long working hours and low wages etc., the need for an organisation that will courageously put forward the position of the Indian working class is great and of immense value to the Indian workers. The Workers' Welfare League of India has worked as an open organisation for the last 13 years, and will continue to do so, giving every assistance to the Indian working class movement. It is the set policy of British Imperialism to prevent the British working class from helping the Indian workers. The attitude of the Prosecution in dragging in the Workers' Welfare League in this case is a part of this set policy. An organisation such as this, that has shown practical results in drawing together in the struggle the workers of India and Britain, has of course become a menace to British Imperialism. The modern method of Imperialism to discredit a body is to broadcast the suggestion that it is under the influence and control of Communists, in this way making it possible for the Government at any time to attach it to some particular "Conspiracy Case" that they may hatch. The workers are not so easily gulled as this, they know the methods of Imperialism, the link once forged between the workers of India and Britain will not be allowed to be so easily broken.

The Prosecution have not put on record any concrete evidence to support their allegation in reference to the League, I desire again to emphatically deny the absurd allegation of the Prosecution that the Workers Welfare League is a Communist body or under the influence of Communists, or that it paid me my salary while I have been in India.

P.2417: I desire at the moment to make some reference to this exhibit. It is one of the many letters written to Potter Wilson. In this case I wish to draw your attention to the postscript, where you will find "enclosed find 'The Spark' a new paper that has just come out, it has got to be improved;" now with regard to this postscript the Magistrate observes, while summing up the evidence against Mr. Desai, "Bradley sent a copy almost at once to Potter Wilson with the remark "it has got to be improved". He obviously regarded it as a vehicle for conspiracy". Unfortunately it is not so obvious to me. I never knew Mr. Desai personally. But when I read in the Bombay papers that a socialist weekly would soon come out, I was naturally interested in the news and was keen to see the paper. I would have been a poor Communist if I did not keep my eyes open to what the Socialists were doing. Further I thought that Mr. Potter Wilson, as Secretary of the Workers' Welfare League, may like to have a look at this paper and perhaps like to order it for himself as there was no other English Socialist paper going at the time.

I could never fancy such a far-fetched meaning could be read into my casual and impersonal remark "it has got to be improved." What was in my mind when this letter was written, was that the paper as such was absurdly small to be of much use to any body, and of course being in English it did not get to the workers. From what I gathered when I saw the paper, especially its first editorial, one having any first hand acquaintance with the labour movement could not possibly have any allusion about its scope and policy. Obviously it could at best be compared with an I. L. P. organ. Apart from the harm such a paper would incidentally do the most we Communists could hope for was to sometime get a carefully written article in its columns on some topical subject, just as similar of my contributions which were occasionally published in the nationalist papers. However, a paper that looked up to the 'Daily Herald' as its ideal could not conceivably be expected to give quarter to communist propaganda as such.

Cryptic Documents.

P 1671, P 1672 and P 1673.

P. 1671P : is a photograph of a letter addressed to "Mac" over the signature of one Leonard, and according to the date was posted a few days after my arrival in India. This letter, containing as it does cryptic figures, has been made much use of by the Prosecution. Like many other documents, and much of the evidence that the Prosecution have put in, this case they have made full use of these exhibits irrespective of whether they have

been proved or they could have proved them satisfactorily or not. Similarly with the Magistrate, he has accepted whatever version the Prosecution have put forward in respect of any exhibit and unscrupulously used it in framing the case against me. What is the story that is told by the Prosecution witness in respect of P. 1671 P? P. W. 262 who deposed to having "intercepted" this letter says that he went to the Mole, Ballard Pier and there picked up a letter addressed to E. J. Horsmen. Further the cover was of the same size and colour as the other letters, which were censored, written by Bradley. On this evidence this letter is to be credited to my account.

It should be a perfectly patent fact known to every sane individual that many thousands of letters are posted every day at the G. P. O. Bombay by thousands of persons who are entire strangers to each other, and the covers of these letters, are in an overwhelming majority of cases exactly of the same size, shape and colour. Nevertheless P. W. 262 says that he obtained a photograph of this interesting letter which is now P 1671P. But we do not see any evidence of a photograph of the very important envelope with the address on it, we have apparently got to accept the word of the C. I. D. that such a thing did exist at all. The Bombay C. I. D. being satisfied that the above was not sufficient evidence and could not be accepted by any one as proof that I was the originator of it, they set to work to put it on a more concrete basis.

It is passing strange that in the case of P 1671 P the Bombay police thought it necessary to prepare a special report and this ^{report} appears as P 1672. Now it is only in this police report that we find the alleged address of the letter P1671, it apparently was not thought of sufficient importance to photograph the envelope upon which so much reliance is placed by the Prosecution. Nevertheless it is upon this police report P 1672 that a story is concocted to substantiate the allegation of the Prosecution. In this exhibit a mysterious Mr. Hill is spoken of as giving information, we do not know who this individual is and he was not called as a witness in this case to give evidence on this matter. The police report goes on to say that another letter was intercepted which was addressed to Asaf of Hyderabad, Deccan, and in this letter there is reference to Mac. This brings me to P 1673P. Again in this instance it was not thought of sufficient importance to produce the photographic copy of this envelope. Perhaps the two envelopes of P 1671 and P ~~1672~~¹⁶⁷³ were not the same.

Before I proceed I would just like to refer to certain remarks passed by the late Mr. Langford James. He says that I write an

excellent hand but found it necessary to print this letter P 1671. On the other hand that I did print this letter has not and can not be satisfactorily proved by the Prosecution, is now apparent, and because they have no proof on this score they try to introduce substantiation from another direction to attempt to prove that I wrote this letter. Necessary Explanation must be given, I would not attempt to keep the Court in the dark over this matter, this is my explanation.

During my travel and voyage from England to India in 1927 I made friends with several individual co-passengers, as one usually does on such a trip. Among these individuals were, two, A. A. Baig of Hyderabad Deccan, and the other was a Mr. M. Ellis who was coming out to India as a sub-editor on the 'Statesman'. As is shown by P. W. 182 Ex. P 672. The three of us Mr. M. Ellis, A. A. Baig and myself had our photographs taken on board the Ranpura and this photo is copied on P 1673. A. A. Baig the individual whom I met on board the Ranpura and to whom the letter P 1673 is addressed comes of a very highly respectable family in Hyderabad, Deccan. It is extremely remarkable that though the Prosecution supplied us with a long list of names of co-conspirators during the Magistrates Court and yet I could not find the name of Asaf Baig among them. On the other hand the Prosecution seek to rely upon this letter P 1673 to Asaf Baig to prove that a certain letter containing cryptic code was written by me, this is according to the police report P 1672. The late Mr. Langford James in his Address says "I have no doubt in time Mr. Bradley may explain who Mac is". I will now proceed to enlighten the Prosecution, if they do not already know who Mac is in P 1673P. The Prosecution claimed that the Mac referred to in P 1673 is the same Mac to whom the letter P 1671 is addressed. Now all this is very interesting and the product of the very fertile imagination which the Prosecution have shown they possess by even carrying on this case. The argument of the Prosecution presupposes that Asaf Baig was a co-conspirator; presupposes that he knew who Mac was; at any rate it is quite within reason to claim that Asaf Baig was in possession of certain facts and if the Prosecution claim is correct that P 1673 P supports their proposition that the same person wrote P 1671P then Asaf Baig is in possession of some very valuable information that should have been secured for the Court. However, he was never called as a Prosecution witness nor was his name put down on the list of co-conspirators, the fact that he was living in Hyderabad does not cut any ice. The Prosecution have been able to produce persons from any where, Great Britain, French India and also from Hyderabad in the form of Liaqat Husain P. W. 193. I claim that the Prosecution have deliberately evaded bringing Asaf

Baig here as a witness. Had he come he would have had to give the lie to the fantastic story concocted by the Prosecution.

The truth about P 1673 is that Asaf Baig and Mr. M. Ellis, as I have said, travelled together on the Ranpura. Mr. Ellis was known to Asaf Baig and myself as "Mac", and he came to India to take up a job on the "Statesman" as a sub-editor. The reference to Mac in P 1673 P is that I wrote to Mr. M. Ellis a few days before this letter was written and sent him some copies of this and other photographs taken during the voyage and I addressed him as Mac. Apparently the Bombay C. I. D seem to have missed that letter very conveniently. There is not the slightest truth in the Prosecution story in relation to this matter. I know nothing about P 1671 P and certainly never wrote it. I wish to state that this document has been put in on the most flimsy evidence and attached to me, the facts that I have put forward can be substantiated by either of the two persons I have mentioned, that is, Mr. Asaf Baig and Mr. M. Ellis. If you look at P 639 written on the back of two of my visiting cards appear the names and addresses of both these persons.

Before I go on with the question of the other exhibits of this character I should like to refer to the question of cryptic figures and my suggested pseudonyms. The Prosecution had an amazing knack of solving these figures and suggested that the key could be found in Palgrave's Golden Treasury. Well I know nothing about this. No copy of Palgrave's Golden Treasury was found with me in spite of the fact that strict instructions were given to the Police to seize any such inflammable material. The Magistrate seems to have no difficulty whatsoever in arranging certain new names for me. He first attaches 'fred' to me and says "his initial 'F' stands for Francis not Frederick". This of course cannot be used to support the contention that 'fred' was a false name used by me. Then I am given the pseudonym of Leonard and against this is to be added another name of Jack, without any apparent reason these names are to be foisted upon me and without any evidence to support such a contention.

Explanation of P 673 and P 674 :—

There are several pieces of evidence put in by the Prosecution in this case which have come rather as a surprise, of course that is to be expected in a case of this character. I suppose P 674 can be put into this category. The late Mr. Langford James in his opening address said he "had no doubt that I would be able to throw considerable light upon this letter". At the same time he gave a long discourse on this exhibit explaining how it is alleged to have come into the hands of the Police and then telling us

what he considered the letter really meant. There is no doubt that fight, considerable or otherwise, is very necessary in respect of this exhibit and because of this I will proceed to give my explanation about this extremely mysterious document. Whether I do this to the satisfaction of your Honour and the Prosecution is a matter that remains to be seen.

In the first place I would deal with the circumstances under which it was 'discovered'. According to the evidence of P.W. 175 Mr. Sandwell this exhibit P 674 was found in one of his cupboards. The story is that on the 24th of April 1929 Sandwell's servant Joseph D' Souza brought this letter to him saying that on the day before he had found it while shifting an almirah following the instructions to do so by Mr. Sandwell. On receiving this from Joseph D' Souza Mr. Sandwell immediately sent it off to Inspector B. Derojinsky of the Bombay C. I. D. Why he should have sent any document to Mr. B. Derojinsky, an individual whom very few people indeed in Bombay can know, is a fact that needs very serious consideration. Now I should explain that I left Bombay on the 6th of March 1929 for an organising tour of the G. I. P. Railway and did not return to Bombay until the 24th of March on which day I was arrested. However the document was not 'discovered' until exactly one month after this according to the evidence of P. W. 175, P. W. 228 and P 673 and that was almost seven weeks after I had left Bombay. Although it is shown that Sandwell was extremely interested in my movements on behalf of the C. I. D still it took him seven weeks to 'find' this document. Mr. Sandwell says that he took over this flat at the beginning of January 1929 and in his cross-examination he could not say which room had been occupied by me as a tenant of Mrs. De Burgh, the individual whom he says he took the flat from, it should be noted that the document P 674 is dated June 6th 1928.

From the evidence of Mr. Sandwell it was shown that he had been acting as an amateur detective and had been working in close cooperation with the Bombay Police since shortly after my arrival in Bombay in 1927. And that enquiries were continuously being made by Sergeant Littlewood (P. W. 247) and other C. I. D officers about me from him. Further in reply to a question put by Mr. Sinha Sandwell said that he met Sergeant Littlewood more than he had Derojinsky. On the other hand Derojinsky (P. W. 182) said that he had never visited Mr. Sandwell. That Mr. Sandwell dabbled in amateur detective is shown by his reply to a question put by me that he had "carried out investigations for private people, industrial thefts and the like". Further this witness P. W. 175 is able to say that the doors of the flat were

invariably kept open day and night and that it was possible for any one to enter the flat at any time. After the alleged finding of such an important document it is very strange that there was no search made where the document was supposed to have been found. I should have thought that after "finding" such a document the Police would have made a thorough search of the place to discover if any more such documents were lying about, according to the evidence of all those who have deposed to this exhibit no such thing was done.

Let me now pass on to the next witness that deposes to this document. P. W. 182 Inspector B. Derojinsky, a Russian by birth, and according to his own statement, was present in Russia during the revolutionary period of 1917. His very name and origin introduces an atmosphere of suspicion. From his evidence it is quite apparent that he is a bitter opponent of the present Soviet system of Government in Russia and that he bore a heavy political bias and personal animosity to the workers' Government there. It is common knowledge now that Russians who are opposed to the workers' rule in Russia and, who have been forced to leave that country on these grounds, have found willing allies in Imperialist countries surrounding, to carry on their intrigues. Every method possible has been used by Imperialism assisted by Russian Whites to smash the workers' State without success. One of these methods has been that of producing forgeries of documents to create an atmosphere of opposition and prejudice against U.S.S.R and to be used in cases of this character.

In the latter part of the year 1920, a group of Russian Whites similar to Derojinsky were active in London, they conceived the idea of printing imitation copies of the Moscow Daily "Pravda" referred to by P. W. 182. These forged newspapers were produced and were to be shipped into Soviet Russia for anti-communist agitational purposes. British Government institutions lent their aid to this project, one of which was the famous Scotland yard, the institution that also kindly assisted Prosecution in this case and provided them with some witnesses. The question of the forgery of this daily paper "Pravda" was brought up in the house of Commons and in a reply to a question the then Home Secretary Mr. Shortt admitted on March the 3rd 1921 that the Director of Intelligence, "assisted them, i. e. the Russian Whites, to the extent of arranging for the removal of the English printers' names from the news sheets and for their being forwarded to an address in one of the countries bordering on Russia." (Hansard).

It is only to be expected that Derojinsky would deny having fabricated any documents for the Government, and further, as the

Crown Counsel says that he is prepared not to object to any argument which the defence may put forward, that this witness has a political bias to the extent that he prefers the old regime to the present one in Russia, the circumstances under which P 674 is produced as evidence lend support to the proposition that it is simply another case such as I have mentioned.

Among the many forgeries of a like nature that have taken place, perhaps, the best known is the "Zinoviev Letter", references to which appear in many of the Prosecution exhibits. I will briefly touch upon this to show the methods and use of forgeries. The "Zinoviev letter" was produced as the bombshell during the General Election Campaign of 1924. That the "Zinoviev Letter" was a forgery none will now deny, and like some of the documents put forward by the Prosecution in this case it was supposed to have been instructions from the Communist International, but of course in this instance to the C. P. G. B. on the tactics that should be employed during the Election and also the need for working within the British Army with a view to paralyse all the military preparations of the bourgeoisie, this is according to the Government Blue Book 1927. An official of the British Foreign Office, a Mr. Gregory was responsible for the publication of this letter in the press and as a result of the fabrication and publication of this letter the Tories were returned to Parliament with an overwhelming majority. The same official of the British Foreign Office has since become involved in the "Francis Case" and was suspected of illegal practices and has had to leave the Foreign Office. Among the many reasons, that go to support the fact that the "Zinoviev letter" was forged is that the original has never been published and as a matter of fact was never seen by any British Official. At the same time several copies were in circulation in Great Britain and they all differed in certain details, had the original if any been produced these mistakes would have been revealed. Like the Ex. P674 the "Zinoviev Letter" contained in itself much internal evidence which supports the fact that it was a forgery. The question as to the authenticity of the "Zinoviev Letter" "has been raised in the House of Commons and off from 1924. The Tory Government refused an enquiry into the matter while on the other hand the Government of U. S. S. R. invited an enquiry. A delegation of the British Trade Union Congress visited Moscow to investigate and came back satisfied that no such letter ever left the Communist International. Not only in Great Britain but in all other countries Russian Whites have been creating their forgeries, some of which have come to light, Druzhelovesky who worked in Berlin, and Orlov and Sumarokov who worked both in New York and Berlin. Similarly in the case of Derojinsky who travelled and remained in Turkey, Egypt and other places and had there connections with the British

Police according to his evidence. In March 1928, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald declared that the letter, that is the "Zinoviev Letter" was a deliberately planned and devised concoction of deceit fitted artfully for the purpose of deceiving the public and to influence the election. That it played a major part in the verdict none will deny, that it was a fraudulent one, few will dare to deny." Mr. MacDonald declared that this was only one of the many forged documents of this character that had been circulated. In the instance of P 674 I consider the authorities have been extremely brazen in their methods. Here is a case of a Russian White, who had carried on exceedingly shady transactions while living in Russia after the Revolution, as shown by cross-examination, travelling around the world without a passport and being received with open arms by the British police at different places. He was welcomed by the Police at Constantinople and taken within their ranks for a period. He was thought to be of more use in another place and travelled to Egypt, and then after a little more meandering he comes to India, where he again is allowed to land apparently without a passport. This is more than even an Englishman or an Indian would attempt to do. A few days after he lands in Bombay, he is called by the Commissioner of Police, not to be questioned about his landing without a passport but to be asked if he would join the Police service, Special Branch, without any apparent reason.

Before closing on this matter I shall just return to the evidence of P. W. 228 who said that "it may be 5 or 7 days" after I had left the Room that the document P 674 was found. Now as I have already stated I left Bombay on 6th of March and did not return again until the 24th of March on which day I was arrested directly I arrived at Grant Road Station, yet the document was not sent to Derojinsky until the 25th of April as P 763 shows. There is a considerable difference between 5 or 7 days which could have made the date of "finding" about the 10th or 12th of March and not the 25th of April. This statement of P. W. 228 throws considerable doubt on the question as to when this exhibit was really "found". Much more can be said about the evidence given by these witnesses that were brought by the Prosecution to prove this document, where the statement of one witness conflicts with another, but sufficient has already been said.

Mr. Stott, the hand writing expert has given his expert opinion that P. 674 was ~~76~~ on the same machine that typed P 345 etc. I can only say that Mr. Stott is the Government of India hand-writing expert and in the pay of the Govt, and work in the office of the Director of the Intelligence Bureau. I was not in a position to bring a hand-writing expert to disprove this opinion. Nevertheless the Government have in the past as events have shown, not

been averse to producing forged documents. They have not been averse to assisting Russian Whites or on the other hand taking assistance from them. I claim that this is another incident of this character and that this document P 674 came to light in a very suspicious manner. The document in itself is an extraordinary concoction containing as it does strange cryptic references and figures, a document that the Prosecution could weave many fantastic stories around, and with a case such as this where there appears no overt illegal act it is necessary to produce such documents to create the correct atmosphere. It is my opinion that this document P 674 was purposely forged to produce evidence against me and to strengthen the case of the Prosecution. I suggest that this document was deliberately placed in the almirah and then De Souza was asked to clean it out. I deny having any knowledge whatsoever of this document.

In respect of P 654 : I may have received such a letter, but I do not know. As regards the other documents P 2404, 2408, 1802, 1809 and also P 2432 (2) I know nothing about these. I should like to say generally as far as the suggestion of the Prosecution is concerned about the transposition code or cipher and figure code etc., which appear in some of these documents I agree with the reply that has been given on this matter by Mr. Spratt.

of 1.7.31

Q With regard to your activities in connection with the A. I. T. U. C. and with T. U's strikes there is the following evidence on the record: P 666, 2249, 661, 1206 (1), 638, 639, 670, P. W's 111, 123, 254; P 958, 944, 967, 2080, P. W's 245, 273, 276, 278, P 2239, 2240(2), 2241(2), 2244, 1703, 1705, 1710 (2), 1721(2), 1725, 1728, 1729(2), 1730, 2226, 1690, 1727, 653, 107, 954, 1035, 1259, 1628, 526(2) and 43. Have you anything to say about this evidence? (Note: Accused did not want the exhibits in this question explained to him. It was therefore omitted).

A. Perhaps the largest portion of evidence against me refers to my Trade Union and strike activities. Both the Prosecution and the Magistrate have stressed the point that my activities in India lay chiefly with Trade Unions. This fact is not strange for a Communist and a Trade Unionist. I should like to state here that I am a member today of one of the largest and oldest Trade Unions in England, the Amalgamated Engineering Union. Workers who are Communist are members of this Trade Union. These Communists contest and take official position in the Union. The Communists are in fact looked to by the workers generally for the lead on almost all occasions. I was myself a member of the London District Committee of the Union until the time I came to India in 1927. I have therefore been rather astounded to hear from the

Prosecution side and also from other quarters the muddled ideas put forward on Trade Unionism. Of course from the Prosecution side a twisted interpretation has got to be placed upon my activities and the activities of the other communists because the Trade Union Movement occupies a very prominent position in this case. The Counsel for the Prosecution has said that our activities in connection with this movement form one of the most important parts of the case, and has gone to some length to describe certain aspects of it. In doing so he has been guilty of much misrepresentation and distortion. It is therefore necessary that our views on the Trade Union Movement be set forth.

We have heard much of 'genuine' Trade Unions and 'genuine' Trade Union activities. Like the exhibits that have been put to me now much of the evidence tendered by the Prosecution to prove this case was obtained from the offices of registered Trade Unions when the searches of the accused took place on March the 20th, 1929. This evidence consists of resolutions, minute books, reports of meetings, speeches and letters to other organisations etc: etc: The Prosecution has also obtained through their organisation, the C. I. D., reports of strikes, strikers' meetings, incidents arising from picketing, organisation of volunteer corps, Trade Union Managing Committee meetings, Trade Union resolutions, Trade Union Congress reports demonstrations, speeches of the accused in Trade Union meetings, in fact all possible activities in connection with the working of the Trade Union Movement as such. At the same time they have stressed the point that the accused were doing their utmost to link up the Indian Trade Union movement with such working-class organisations outside India as the R.I.L.U., the Workers' Welfare League, the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat, the League against Imperialism and so on.

Our crime according to the Prosecution is that our activities in this connection were; "not primarily for the immediate improvement of the workers' lot, but to train them in solidarity and the united action and in this connection to instigate them to strike both for educative purposes and also as a training in strike methods, leading on eventually to a general strike, which is intended to paralyse the Government and create a revolutionary situation.....(C. O., page 6).

This is put forward before a bourgeois court by a member of the bourgeoisie, with little or no knowledge of the terrible conditions under which the workers have to toil and exist, or of the methods of exploitation adopted by the exploiters to grind down the workers and extract their profits, with little or no knowledge of the functions of the Trade Union movement and its International character, or what Trade Unionism stands for. The Prosecution declare

that they are not attacking the Trade Union Movement. They have protested to this effect again and again. The committal order, page 10 says, "It has been alleged at times that the case is an attack upon Trade Unionism. This again is a misconception. The Prosecution has very fairly stated that any of the accused who may be found to be a genuine Trade Unionist and not a communist conspirator should be discharged."

But in order to maintain their claim they have to give their views of what the movement is and should be. The committal order proceeds, "A definition of the term "genuine Trade Unionist" is perhaps difficult. In my opinion a "genuine Trade Unionist" is one who is primarily concerned with the improvement of the existing conditions of the workers with which his Union is concerned: he is connected with politics only in so far as he aims at getting legislation for such improvement; he creates strikes for the same object. A communist on the other hand has a different objective. He hopes to improve the condition of the working-class, not in the immediate future, but in the more distant future, not by the conciliation of the employers or by favourable legislation but by the destruction of the employing class and the abolition of the existing system of Government." The whole position of the Prosecution in relation to this part of the case turns on the question of the nature of the 'genuine' Trade Union Movement. I can readily grant that if the Movement is really as they picture it, and as it is described above, then they need not trouble to attack it. But this is not the Trade Union Movement as it exists, either in India or anywhere else. Even Mr. & Mrs. Sydney Webb in their History of Trade Unionism, page 3, say, "A trade Union as we understand the term, is a continuous association of wage-earners for the purpose of maintaining or improving the conditions of their working lives." Then they give a foot-note: "In the first edition we said "of their employment." This has been objected to as implying that the Trade Unions have always contemplated a perpetual continuance of the capitalist or wage system. No such implication was intended. Trade Unions have at various dates during the past century at any rate, frequently had aspirations towards a revolutionary change in the social and economic relations." Though we are not prepared to accept every statement of the Webbs as correct, we think that they are far nearer the truth in this instance than the Magistrate.

In attempting to give expression to his views about the Trade Union Movement, in the passage quoted, the Magistrate shows clearly the limitations which the bourgeoisie attempt to impose upon the Movement, but I claim that this view point has nothing in common with the Trade Union Movement as it really is. He says in so many words that in order to conform to the interests of the

bourgeoisie the Trade Union Movement should only be concerned with immediate economic conditions. (He adds somewhat naively, but from the bourgeoisie point of view correctly: "of the workers with which his Union is concerned." This falls into line entirely with the atrocious Trade Disputes Act of 1929 which forbids any Union to interest itself in the struggle of the workers of another industry.)

In respect of politics they may enter them only in so far as it is necessary to try and obtain certain remedial legislation. The Trade Union Movement cannot have a policy of its own based upon the re-construction of society. In short the Trade Union Movement should accept these limitations and have no other ambitions. Capitalism and the present state of society with all that it imposes upon the workers must be accepted by them without question.

The Prosecution have shown that this is their view of the matter again and again. Thus the present Senior Counsel of the Prosecution in connection with our proposal to introduce resolutions in Union meetings on the Chinese Revolution etc. (P 1981) said; "what these things have to do with Trade Unionism I do not know." Apparently the workers are not even to discuss political questions in their Unions.

It is a fact that the bourgeoisie have succeeded more or less completely in imposing certain limitations upon the Trade Union Movement. This has happened because the bourgeoisie control the State machinery and have found agents within the Movement. But nevertheless we assert that these limitations are forced upon the Trade Union Movement by an antagonistic class which seeks to crush it. This case in particular can be cited as a classical example of the effort of the bourgeoisie to impose limitations upon the Indian Trade Union Movement, and to attempt to crush it.

I desire here to contradict the position maintained by the Magistrate and the Prosecution as to our relations with the Trade Union Movement. As Communists we do not base our stand on any abstract right. Our view and our stand is born of the actual realities of the class struggle in operation. Any attempt on the part of the bourgeoisie to impose its policy upon the working class movement is met by us with vigorous opposition. Whilst it is the correct policy of the Trade Union Movement to have before itself the programme for the "improvement" of the workers' conditions within the system of Capitalism, by both economic means and by legislation. Nevertheless it is a fact that there can be no real or lasting improvement under Capitalism. Therefore it

is our policy to consider the means for attaining socialism and to this end we work for the mobilisation of the masses of workers for the revolution. In a colonial country this takes the form of the revolutionary fight for Independence and the overthrow of Imperialism. These are the historic tasks of the working class which it is bound to undertake. The bourgeoisie naturally in self-defence try to place these limitations upon its action and consciousness, but the working class cannot recognise them and must break through them in spite of any legal and forcible restraint.

We Communists are accused in our turn of being "outsiders", who are trying to force our point of view upon the working class and the Trade Union Movement, and to lead it in a path which is unnatural to it, (C. O. pages 46 and 47). That a representative of the bourgeoisie should make such a charge against us is ridiculous. The workers certainly do not support this view-point and I can claim to speak as a worker on this subject.

We deny that we are "outsiders". But we assert that the bourgeoisie sends into the unions ten times as many more "outsiders" as we could possibly do. Mr. N. M. Joshi the universally recognised "leader" of Indian Labour, the only "Labour" representative in the Legislative Assembly who has been working for many years in the unions in Bombay is actually a member of the Liberal Party, the Party of the big industrial bourgeoisie Mr. B. Shiva Rao who with Mr. Joshi "represented" Labour on the R. T. C., who has also been working in the unions for many years, is a close follower of Dr. Besant, and brings with him an ideology even more reactionary than that of Mr. Joshi, of the bourgeoisie of Madras. A still more sinister figure is Mr. K. C. Roy Chaudhri, who has worked for many years in the unions in Bengal, and last year visited Geneva, where he "represented" Indian Labour, he must be put down as nothing else than a direct agent of the Imperialist policy in the Labour movement. I would refer to Ex. D 139 (1) which shows how a union, the Kankinara Labour Union, of which he is the President and which he effectively controls, invited the Governor of Bengal to one of the meetings and presented him with an address. It mentions incidentally that another member of this Union, also an "outsider," Mr. Singheswar Prasad Shah was given a certificate by the Police, ostensibly for helping to settle communal disturbances. Also I may deal with D 139 (12) which shows how Mr. K. C. Roy Chaudhri suddenly introduced another "outsider" Mr. B. C. Mondal into the Kanchrapara Railway Workers' Union, had him elected Vice President and charged him at the same meeting to represent the Union before the Simon Commission and to prepare a memorandum for the purpose, supposedly on behalf of the members of the Union.

These three examples are outstanding, but it is clear that the great majority of the non-working class leaders of Labour in India are consciously or unconsciously agents of the bourgeoisie trying to confine the Labour Movement to activities which the bourgeoisie can approve. The situation is similar in Great Britain. There also the bourgeoisie is indignant with the Communists for "interfering" in the Trade Union Movement. Yet that bourgeois class itself, in addition to actually though not directly controlling the Labour Movement through the reformist Labour leaders, openly ruins such organisations as the "Liberal Trade Union League" for the corruption of the workers to the politics of the Liberal Party. We see the same kind of thing going on in India even more openly, and it is therefore comprehensible that we are amused when charged by the bourgeoisie with being outsiders "meddling" in Trade Union affairs which are not our concern.

But the matter is more important than this. It cannot be answered by a mere retort that the bourgeoisie are guilty of that of which we are charged. It may indeed appear strange that the party such as we are connected with in India, which as yet consists to a considerable extent of middle class origin should claim to be the party of the working class, and to assist and lead the working class as a part of itself. (The same criticism is made against Marx, Engels and Lenin, the greatest leaders of the workers, none of whom was himself of working-class origin.)

It is a fact that historically certain members of the middle class intelligensia, such as those named, have been of great significance in the movement, though they are but a minute fraction of all those who are attracted by the power of the movement, or the spoils to be obtained through it, have attempted to patronise or exploit it.

Those who want to serve the working class movement must genuinely accept its programme and ideology and really identify themselves with it in thought. And that is what Marx, Lenin and many others did. For though they are held responsible for the ideology and thought of the working class movement, they derived the material for their classical formulation of this theory from the experiences and struggle of the working-class itself. Marxism would not have come into existence but for the English Chartism, the French working-class movement, with its revolutionary experiences of 1848 and 1871, and the early struggles of the German Proletariat. Leninism is based on what Marx had achieved, and the later experiences of the European working class, the triumphs and weaknesses of social democracy and Trade Unionism, the Russian Revolution of 1905, and the beginnings of the colonial revolutionary movements. Marx stands out as a gigantic figure in the history of

our movement. None the less he was the product of the movement, and the essential ideas for which he stood, and which he enriched and formulated so clearly are to be found in many of his predecessors and contemporaries. It is even more obvious to us that Lenin was the product of the working class movement in the Imperialist period, and the essentials of the policy for which he stood are to be found springing up not only in Russia but in all lands at the same time as he was formulating them.

It is the bourgeois evolution of the individual which raises these men above the movement, and rates them as its creators, when in reality they are a part of it and a product of it. These members of the other classes can enter the working class movement and work as a genuine part of it. And we assert that it is the function in India of the members of the middle-class to form as it were a link between the working-class movement of the world, its traditions and theory, and the young and inexperienced and as yet theoretically ill-equipped working-class of India.

We are not an outside influence 'interfering' with the Proletariat of India, and dragging it from its path. We owe our existence as a party to the existence and struggles of the Indian working-class. We are an organic part of the working class movement, a product jointly of the early spontaneous struggles of the Indian workers, and the more advanced theory and culture of the older sections of the working-class of the world.

It is true that there has always gone on in all national sections of the Labour Movement a struggle between the policy of reformism, or conformity to capitalism, and that of revolution. The working-class develops from capitalism and grows within it. It is influenced by the culture of the bourgeoisie, its interests, its direct pressure by force and corruption. Hence the strength of the reformist section of the working-class is almost all times considerable, and may for long periods be greater than the strength of the revolutionary section.

But this in no way means that revolution is an unnatural or unsound policy for the working-class to follow. So also the fact that traditionally the Socialist parties, and since the foundation of the C. I. the Communist Parties, have stood for the policy of revolution, while the Trade Unions have tended to be more reformist, in no way goes to show as the bourgeoisie argues that the C. P. is the external force trying to draw the workers away from the proper policy. The Communist Party represents the truest interest of the workers, it organises within itself the most advanced and conscious section of the workers, and is an integral part of the working class movement. The Trade Unions

and the Communist Party are mutually inter-dependent. The movement is incomplete without either.

Finally, the Prosecution following all bourgeois and reformist critics, has emphasised the charge that while the Reformists are concerned with activity in improvements in present conditions for the workers, we are not so concerned, or are less anxious than the Reformists for these things. We cannot allow this to pass unchallenged. Experience proves that exactly the reverse is the case. The Reformists are the servants of the Bourgeoisie objectively if not subjectively, and cannot fight the bourgeoisie even for immediate reforms, while we can and do fight the bourgeoisie sectionally or as a whole, for immediate reforms or for political power, without reservation.

Any study of the working class movement, as it has developed historically, will show the truth of these statements. The British Trade Union Movement is the oldest, as in Britain industrialism developed before it appeared in any other country. Though not strong in comparison with later times, it was sufficiently troublesome not merely economically but politically, to be declared illegal in 1799. Thereafter it grew 'underground' for 25 years. On the repeal of the Combination Laws in 1824 it began almost at once to grow rapidly; and developed a definitely revolutionary complexion.

Mr. and Mrs. Sydney Webb who have no predilections in favour of revolution, have described the movement up to 1843, that is the culmination of the biggest wave of Chartism, as 'The Revolutionary Period' (History of Trade Unionism). It is well-known that in this period most of the essentials of the later working-class and socialist theory developed, at any rate in embryo, in the writings and policy of Benbow, Bray, Hodgskin, Thomson, Owen and others. (Reference to this is P. 1782). T. Rothstein in his book 'From Chartism to Labourism' remarks how near some of the leaders of the 'physical force' Wing of the Chartist's, notably Ernest Jones and J. S. Harney, stand to the modern Bolsheviks.

These men were familiar with the ideas of the exploitation of Labour, the class struggle, the Trade Unions as the organs of the economic struggle of the workers, the combination of the economic and political struggles, the general strike, the necessity of the use of violence by the working class, the aim of the movement as not merely political but economic equality, and so on.

Similarly as industrialism sprang up and progressed in other countries in Europe and America, a definitely revolutionary working class movement sprang up also. The French working-class had at least one serious attempt to overthrow the bourgeoisie

(in 1871) and remained predominantly revolutionary at least until the end of that century, while even in the early years of this century and the war time, in the period of the greatest degradation of the world Labour Movement, a substantially large part of the French working-class remained faithful to the revolution.

It is interesting to notice that in France, in contrast to the usual state of things, it was the Unions which were the repositories of the revolutionary spirit among the workers. While the Socialist parties were corrupted more completely by Imperialism, a section of the Unions always remained true. (Reference to this is P 48).

Similarly in Germany, in Italy, and the rest of Europe, the Labour Movement, beginning as Socialist or Anarchist groups and parties, and only later developing into Unions, began as a definitely revolutionary movement. Even in the U.S.A where the American Federation of Labour has been from the beginning in the 80's Predominantly and increasingly reformist, there has always existed side by side with it a Labour revolutionary organisation; in the early days the 'Knights of Labour', and later the I. W. W. And the American Socialist Movement was from its beginning in the 70's revolutionary, only later developing a Reformist Wing.

In those countries also, in which the Labour Movement has developed only relatively recently, in the period of the corruption of the older section of European and American Labour, it has been a revolutionary force, examples are Russia, China, Central and South America and Java. In Russia the working-class was from the beginning revolutionary, so consequently were the Unions, so far as they existed. H. N. Brailsford, a Social Democrat in P 1777, 'How the Soviets work', talks of his surprise at the remark of an old Russian Textile worker that the object of his Union in the early days before 1905 was the overthrow of the Czar.

In P 1230 'Lenin and the Trade Union Movement', page 10 we read (writing of the period 1900-1905) "thus spontaneous movement of the working masses was developing into a struggle against the employers and later against the autocracy. All these spontaneous actions dovetailed with the political line which was being developed both within the working masses and in those organs of the revolutionary intelligentsia who were working side by side and gradually lining up and welding themselves together with the spontaneous movement."

The Unions, such as they were, took a leading place in the 1905 revolution in Russia, when for a time they were able to organise relatively freely. They were suppressed in the period:

of reaction, only to rise again for the overthrow of the Czar in March 1917, which was the work primarily of the industrial workers. The Unions were organised rapidly, and for a time tolerated the Provisional Government. In October 1917 they were predominantly revolutionary, and played a leading part in the Bolshevik Revolution. Thus in "Lenin and the Trade Union Movement" by Lozovsky, (P 1230 Page 19), "In his articles and in his speeches Lenin always considered the Trade Unions as working class organisations destined to play an immense role in the overthrow of the old system and in the creation of a new one..... During the October Revolution itself there was no break between the Party and the Trade Unions which took an active part in the direct struggle in conjunction with shop committees (on page 25): "But why must the Trade Unions in Lenin's opinion come to control the National economy?" "Because," Lenin replies, "The Trade Unions are Mass organisations and the revolution is primarily the creation of the masses itself."

In the cases of China and Java, any account of the revolutionary movements in these places shows the leading part taken in the revolution by the Workers' Trade Unions, and the very great difficulty experienced by the bourgeoisie, even after the suppression of the revolutionary Unions by force and terror, in organising reformist Unions having any strength at all. It is useless to multiply examples. All over the world it is found in practice that the policy which the working class instinctively adopts, as it comes to realise itself as a class, is revolution against capitalism. It organises under various forms, its Unions and its parties. The Unions with primarily economic aims, but not at all excluding political aims; the Party primarily political but assisting the Unions and the workers generally even in their economic struggles; the two forming together as complementary parts of a single movement with one fundamental aim the Socialist revolution.

The bourgeoisie has always shown itself very conscious of the menace to itself which the Labour Movement represents, even in its primitive and weakest forms. Whatever the type of bourgeois state, absolute monarchy, constitutional monarchy, bourgeois republic or any other, it has always met the first efforts of the workers to organise even for the most limited purpose with greater suspicion, and often in spite of the absence of the smallest provocation with open force.

*The British Trade Unions were illegal for 25 years up to 1824. During this period, in 1819, the famous Peterloo Massacre occurred, when troops and police fired into, and cavalry charged a peaceful workers' meeting. During and after that period, upto the 50's the workers suffered innumerable sentences, sometimes even

transportation, at the hands of the bourgeois state. And of course, throughout the period, the less spectacular but hardly less deadly weapon of victimisation and blacklisting has been used by the individual employers and their associations.

Even in the period of the highest status in bourgeois society of the Trade Unions, their formal recognition by the employers, their acceptance of their leaders as His Majesty's Cabinet Ministers and Privy Councillors, this weapon is used against the rank and file by the employers on a tremendous scale. It should not be forgotten that the weapon of open force is never completely laid aside, as shown by the Trade Unions and Trade Dispute Act of 1927 and the attitude of the Government during the General Strike and the Miners' Lockout of 1926 in England.

The same sort of history is found in all other countries. We can refer to the German anti-Socialist Laws of 1878 and 1890 and the still more difficult struggle earlier which led to the permanent exile of Marx and the many other leaders of the 40's.

In France Trade Unionism was forbidden completely for many years, and massacres of the organised workers took place in 1848, and again on a greater scale in 1871, not only in Paris, (where the number of workers killed in the White Terror after the fall of the commune is variously given from 30,000 to 60,000), but also in other industrial centres.

The history of the U. S. A. has been distinguished from its beginning right up to the present day by the peculiar ferocity and disregard for its own laws shown by the bourgeoisie in its attack upon the workers (P48).

In Russia, at first all workers' organisations, and later only those formed by the police (Zubatoff Unions) or organised under very close supervision by the State, were allowed to exist at all, and the savagery with which the workers organisations were suppressed in notorious. Further examples are superfluous.

But open force, though the first weapon used by the bourgeoisie against the workers, and always its last reserve, is not its only weapon. Historically the corruption of the Labour Movement by agents of the bourgeoisie has played a very great part. Already in the period of illegality of the British Trade Unions Francis Place, who may be called the prototype of all Labour reformist was active among the workers. He worked for and was largely instrumental in securing the repeal of the Combination Laws in 1824, as he saw that sheer repression had the effect of increasing the revolutionary temper of the workers, and he had a subtler and more effective method of defending the bourgeoisie. (as stated by Webb, page 109); "Combinations" writes Place to Sir Francis Burdett in 1825, will

soon cease to exist. Men have kept together for long periods only by the oppression of the laws; these being repealed Combinations will lose the matter which cements them into masses and they will fall to pieces. All will be orderly as even a Quaker could desire..... if let alone, Combinations, excepting now and then, and for particular purposes under particular circumstances, will cease to exist."

Later, during the rise of the revolutionary wave of Chartism he formed a party. The London Workmen's Association, which attempted to lead the movement, in order to keep it safely under control, and generally practised all the tricks of the modern reformist. Thus historically reformism began as the work of conscious agents of the bourgeoisie and counter-revolution (as Place undoubtedly was in the working class movement.)

The bourgeoisie has of course not only sent its own men into the movement. It began in that way, and is still mainly dependent on this method in India, but later a much greater part was played in the older movements by the winning over of the working class leaders. This is effected in many ways, from direct bribery, of which there is no doubt a great deal, though specific cases are difficult to cite except in America, to merely ideological corruption. The working class leaders are exposed to bourgeois influence by such means as election or nomination to legislatures, Royal Commissions, Joint Committees with the employers, such as wages boards etc, and the sessions of the Geneva International Labour Office. In these and other ways the bureaucracy of the Trade Union Movement and the leading members of the working-class parties are brought round to acceptance of class collaboration and the revolutionary tendencies of the rank and file are suppressed. The essential historical character of reformism, as Lenin has said, is the influence of the bourgeoisie within the Labour Movement.

None the less it has somewhat deeper roots than the corruption of the leading individuals and bureaucracy of the movement, important though this has been. Francis Place, in spite of his ability and craft, was not successful in keeping the major part of the movement under his control, and the working class of Britain was mainly revolutionary until the middle 40's. Reformism only defeated revolution definitely after 1848. Reformism could not triumph until its economic basis was laid by the expansion of British Capitalism, which began to go forward very rapidly from that time.

Lenin in his Imperialism (P175, page 117) says—"..... Imperialism has thus a tendency to create privileged sections among the workers, and to detach them from the main proletarian masses". "It is worth noticing that in Britain the tendency of Imperialism

to divide the toilers in this way, to encourage opportunism among them, and to give rise to a temporary organic decay in the working class movement showed itself much earlier than the end of the 19th and the beginning of 20th century. For two big distinctive features of Imperialism applied to Britain from midway through the 19th century, vast colonial possessions and the monopolist position in the world markets, "..... Here he (Engels) points out causes and effects. The causes are; (1) Exploitation of the world by this country. (2) Its monopolist position in the world market. (3) Its colonial monopoly. The effects are (1) The transformation of a section of the British working class into the middle class. (2) The opportunity of leading it which part of the working class accords to a section corrupted by the capitalist class, or at least paid by it".

This is undoubtedly the basis of the widespread prevalence of reformism among the workers of the advanced countries. But this factor does not operate automatically. The employers indulge in all kinds of methods, such as Whitley Councils, Profit-sharing Schemes and so called "Welfare Work," in order to persuade the workers of their benevolence and the futility of the class struggle. Even Mr. N. M. Joshi for example in his pamphlet "The Trade Union Movement in India" (D 145) condemns the employer's "Welfare Work" as it is conducted not with the motive which it claims but in order to destroy the workers' solidarity.

Thus reformism or opportunism is the result of first, direct corruption of the agents of bourgeoisie in the working class movement and secondly the "buying off" of the sections of the working class by means of concessions, higher wages, etc., which capitalism in its periods of strength and prosperity is able to do, specially in the Imperialist period. The reformism which has been considered the characteristic feature of British Labour is due to the fact that Britain was able to achieve this kind of position long before other countries. The general rise of opportunism in the working-class movement (from the time of the foundation of the Second International 1889) and its victory (1900 onwards) coincides with the general period of Imperialism and the exploitation of the whole world by a few leading industrial countries.

Reformism has been dominant in the world Labour movement three decades or more but before the War of 1914 it was of a relatively veiled character. Apart from Great Britain, which was as stated, a special case, the reformist leadership had to keep up some appearances of revolutionary devotion, in order to retain its hold on the rank and file. The more open cases of opportunism, such as the entry of Socialists into bourgeois governments, (which is nowadays a common place in the L. S. I.) was then visited by

the formal displeasure of the International, expulsion of the members in question etc. The chief achievements of the pre-war reformism were, (1) in the theoretical field, formulation of a reformist version of Marxism, based on the actual improvement in the position of large sections of European and American working class and, (2) in the political field, the betrayal of the bulk of the European working-class in support of the Imperialist war.

At Conferences of the International shortly before the war it was decided to oppose the war, which was then foreseen, by all possible means, and in the event of the war breaking out "to use the political and economic crisis created by the war to rouse the masses of the people and hasten the fall of Capitalist domination" (from P 48 page 184). The way in which this resolution was ignored, the workers led to the slaughter and their spontaneous resistance to the Imperialist war machine sabotaged by the great majority of the leaders of the pre-war International is now notorious.

cf. 2-7-31

Since the War, international reformism has sunk altogether into new depths of betrayal and has become quite obviously a party supporting the bourgeoisie. The British Labour Party and the Trade Union Congress (Great Britain) leadership are now no longer in any way exceptional. With them stands practically the whole of the L. S. I. in open opposition to revolution, to the U.S.S.R., and the colonial revolutions in open support of the capitalist stabilisation, its rationalisation at the expense of the working class, its preparations, diplomatic and military, for war both against the U. S. S. R. and against rival Imperialist powers. (It is unnecessary to quote details. The actions of the Labour Government in Great Britain are well-known). Yet the Counsel for the Prosecution is surprised that we condemn these men as 'traitors to the cause'. Not more than ten years ago Mr. J.R. Mac Donald and Mr. Snowden were supporting (in words) the 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' and the 'Socialist Revolution'.

This rapid passage of the Social-Democrats to the right and their abandonment of even nominal opposition to capitalism, has necessitated the formation of a 'Left Wing' in the L. S. I. which tries to continue the function of the pre-war Social-Democracy, namely opposition to capitalism in words, but betrayal of the workers to capitalism in deeds. But for this 'Left Wing' the value of the Social-Democrats to the bourgeoisie would be lost to a considerable extent, as large sections of the more advanced and conscious workers, who now support social democracy, would leave it if it were led solely by such open traitors as Mr. Mac Donald.

Thus the history, considered superficially, of the working-class movement though beginning admittedly with a revolutionary period, has led further and further away from revolution. The

present ultra Imperialist, ultra Loyalist position of the Labour and Socialist International and the British Labour Party, this is what gives rise to the conception, which the Prosecution cherishes of the true nature of the working-class movement, i. e., a movement in no way hostile to capitalism. This is supported by the fact of the history of the 19th century which still formed the mental back-ground of the British Bourgeoisie, and which appeared to support the theoretical reformism of the pre-war social Democracy. These are, a rising prosperity of capitalism and a rising standard for a considerable section of the working-class.

But this whole conception is shattered by the facts of the 20th century. Already before the war capitalism in Britain was visibly declining, and with it the standard of life of the British working-class, as shown in L. R. D. pamphlet ("The two Nations"), that by 1914 the level of 1900, and the revolutionisation of the British workers was definitely going on at that time. The war, which was a ~~system~~ a part of the crisis of Imperialism, and the post-war period, have shown still greater decline not only in Britain, but throughout the capitalist world. The position of the working class as a whole is getting worse. The working class as a whole is no longer predominantly reformist and is becoming increasingly revolutionary as the immense and continuing revolutionary ferment since the war shows. The Socialist and Labour parties which occupy the public eye, are not representatives of the movement which they nominally lead. Even with the help of the traditions behind them, the powerful party and Trade Union apparatus, newspaper etc., at their disposal, and the help of the bourgeois propagandists and police, they are steadily losing their hold on the rank and file. Their big votes at elections etc. are more and more supplied by the petty bourgeoisie. The Labour Movement is coming into its own again. It began as a revolutionary movement, it has again become a revolutionary movement. The conception of the Prosecution and the Magistrate (and the bourgeois class as a whole) is 30 years out of date.

International Trade Union Movement :—

P. 666:—This is a copy of some resolutions that were submitted to the Jharia Session of the Trade Union Congress by some of the affiliated Trade Unions. The G.I.P. Railwaymen's Union was one of the organisations that forwarded the resolution on international affiliation. At Jharia I was elected by the E. C. on to a small committee to look through the resolution that had been sent in by affiliated organisations and to prepare and put them forward to the T. U. C. Of course I was in favour of this resolution and I should like to give some explanation about this exhibit. The course of the development of the Labour Movement outlined above is

reflected in its international organisations, which also went through three main stages (1) The 1st International (revolutionary International) (2) The Second International (reformist International) and (3) The Third International (revolutionary International).

The accepted date of the origin of the First International is 1864. Marx had much to do with the founding of this International, and in 1865, Marx brought forward his Address and Rules which were adopted in November of that year. In his Address he lays bare the abject poverty of the British workers and places the theory of the class-struggle forward which would form the basis of International. The International, as it was then, was a Trade Union International and between the years 1865 and 1871 it occupied itself with linking up the working class organisations of Europe, at the same time doing its best to assist the workers who were from time to time struggling to improve their hours, wages and conditions.

In the year 1870 the Franco Prussian War broke out. At this stage the German members of the International vigorously opposed War, although Socialist members of the Reichstag at the same time voted for war credits. However opposition was useless.

The International in France was being vigorously suppressed by the Government, members were persecuted and heavy sentences inflicted, consequently there was little protest against the War. The French armies were smashed and a Republic was proclaimed on September the 4th, 1870 and on January 28th, 1871 the French Government signed an Armistice. Following this the workers attempted to put the revolutionary teachings of the International into operation and on March 26, 1871 the Paris Commune was set up, and the workers held political power for two months, for the first time. It showed the revolutionary attitude of the workers at that early date. One thing especially was proved by the Commune, that was "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes" (Marx, Civil War in France). After a heroic defence of the Commune by the workers of Paris, followed by weeks of terrible barricade and street fighting, the Paris Commune was brought to an end. The bourgeois Government soldiers murdered all the prisoners they could get hold of, they sought throughout Paris for any man, woman or child who had taken part in the defence of the town or who had even attended to the wounded, and they slaughtered them en-masse. This was the class war. The suppression of the Paris Commune is perhaps one of the most brutal incidents in the history of the class struggle. The streets of Paris were literally running with blood, thousands were murdered, the Commune was dead and the First International had received a crushing blow.

After the Commune, efforts were made to save the International, the General Council transferred its Head Quarters to New York, and in 1878 at Philadelphia the last Conference of the International was held.

The second attempt was made to form an International in the year 1889. The two largest French sections held rival Congresses, they were the Marxists and the Reformists. At Brussels a Conference was held in the year 1891 and there these sections were reunited and the Second International was formed and carried on till 1919. In the year 1900 the Central organ or Bureau was set up. At this time the Second International was nothing but a collection of national bodies which never took any notice of the Bureau, as a matter of fact the Bureau had no power at all. This is admitted by Mr. Brailsford in his evidence: "all its job seemed to be was to make arrangements for Congresses and receive correspondence". The Second International had become something like an anti-war organisation, which carried resolutions to prevent war, but when the war did come in 1914, instead of hastening the downfall of capitalism, the leaders of the Second International rushed to the assistance of their individual countries, to fight for Imperialism. The President, Vandevvede, joined the Belgian Government. Every where members of the Second International acted as recruiting sergeants calling upon the workers of their respective countries to go and murder each other. With the War the Second International died.

It is important to notice that this statement is a correct summary of the position of the old International during the War. The Prosecution, in pursuance of its attempt to show the reformist wing of the Labour Movement as the "legitimate" and "genuine" Labour Movement, has tried to maintain that the present reformist L.S.I. is the direct and only descendent of the pre-War Second International. The Prosecution Counsel in his opening Address says "Now I have said that this International existed at the beginning of the War. It was also in existence at the end of the War." This is false. (P 48 "Labour International Hand Book") pages 184-185 show this conclusively "The outbreak of the War broke up the Executive Commission of the Bureau.....".

The nominal seat of the Bureau was transferred to the Hague, and the vacancies caused by the absence of the belligerents were filled up with Dutchmen. The only Conferences held were (1) of the socialists of the neutral countries in January 1915 which appealed for peace (2) the allied socialists in 1915, and some later conferences, all of which emphasised the necessity of continuing the War: (3) of socialists of the Central Powers in April 1915 which apparently did not deal with the War at all; (4) several

unofficial conferences of parties and minority groups opposed to the war.

This is not the activity of an International. It is the activity of the fragments left after the break up of the International.

The Prosecution go further. They represent the International reformist Labour movement as having a continuous history, passing from the Second International to the post-war L. S. I. without a break, and the post-war Third International as an intrusion, foreign to the real Labour Movement, brought about by the Russian Revolution and due solely to it. This is shown into the late Mr. Langford James address which deals at length with this question. (Page 8.)

Now it is true that the Second International was marked very deeply by reformism and nationalism which as we have shown was the dominating influence in the Labour movement of the time. But it is incorrect to maintain that the only current of thought in the working class movement and in the international of the pre-war period was reformism.

As I have pointed out, sections and minorities in practically all countries—majorities in some, such as Italy, some of the Balkan States, and Russia—remained true to the traditional policy of the working class i. e. Revolution. And the International, as a whole, influenced by this active minority, and the vaguely revolutionary sympathies of the working class, could never descend to the depths which the post-war L. S. I. has reached.

Before the War the two wings within the International were in conflict. The War, the complete break up of the International, and the betrayal by the reformist majority, accentuated the fight. Already in 1915 the most far-sighted leader, Lenin, was calling for the break-away of the revolutionary wing and formation of a new International.

The initiative was taken in 1915 by the Italian Party (the majority of which was revolutionary and was opposing the war even after Italy had entered it), which called a conference at Zimmerwald in September, attended by representatives of parties, or minorities in some ten countries, which set up a permanent Executive of Commission (P 48, page 185). This was followed by the Kienthal Conference, at which the call for the revolutionary solution of the war problem was more pronounced. (P 178, page 42): "But at Kienthal, where Lenin was one of the most outstanding figures the atmosphere takes on a different hue. There cannot, it is asserted, be any durable peace under capitalism. The only way thereto lies through the conquest of political power

by the masses, and the ownership of the capital by the people. This can only come as they struggle with increasing intensity against Imperialism and its war so that struggle may be transformed into a contest between capitalism and the proletariat. The Second International is vigorously denounced and the whole tone of this conference suggests that a great event or a great leader will swing its members into the full tide of revolutionary ardour." "The great event was the Russian Revolution and the event that produced the great leader in Lenin."

The Third International was the result of the developments in the whole international working class movement. It was not an exclusively Russian affair, or the product solely of the Russian Revolution. This is shown still more definitely by (P 48, page 155). After the March Revolution of 1917 the Zimmerwald Commission and the Petrograd Soviet called a general conference of the socialist parties at Stockholm. This Conference never met but the Commission held a session in the summer of 1917 at which the decision was taken to found a new International. "The Zimmerwald Commission held a conference at which it was declared that a new international must be formed; but the coming of the Bolshevik revolution prevented any further action till the end of the war."

Even in this matter of historical detail the Prosecution is incorrect. The decision to form the Third International preceded the Bolshevik Revolution.

Actually no steps were taken to form the Communist International until early in 1919, and the first Congress of the Communist International (March 1919), (P 48: page 189) was held simultaneously with the first unofficial conference at Berne, February 1919 which really founded the L. S. I. (P 48, page 196).

Just as the Prosecution are incorrect in regard to the origin of the Communist International, so they are wrong about its nature. The statement already quoted conveys the idea that the Communist International is exclusively dominated and controlled by the Russian Communist Party. Now there is no question that of all the parties in the Comintern, the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. is the most influential. This is natural, and results from its greater revolutionary experience and the fact that it is a party which has achieved the greatest advance along the road which the Comintern sets for it. For exactly the same reason the German Social Democratic Party played a corresponding part in the pre-war Second International; and the British Labour Party, as the most experienced and powerful (and corrupted) Reformist Party, leads the L. S. I. today.

This is as it should be, but none the less the Comintern is an International, and all its constituent parties take their part in the determination of the policy. As early as 1921 Zinoviev was able to report to the Third Congress of the Comintern,—“The leadership of the C.I. during the first two years was not yet entirely satisfactory to be sure, and only during the past year—we can say this with satisfaction—did we succeed in laying the foundation for an institution composed of representatives of at least ten or twelve Parties, and which has at any rate attempted to conduct the Communist Labour Movement along International lines, also with regard to its leadership.....”. (P 1151, Zinoviev Report of the E. C. C. I. 1920-21)

At the Sixth Congress in 1928, a full report of which is on record (P 1204), the participation of representatives of all countries is obvious. Parties in fifty-two countries were represented. The Praesidium for the Congress contained thirty-five members drawn from eighteen countries, (page 76). The E. C. C. I. elected at the Conference contains 59 members and 42 candidates representing at least to 25 countries, as an inspection of the list will show (on page 1547).

The principal items on the Agenda were: (1) Methods of struggle against the dangers of Imperialist war; on this reports were presented by representatives of British, German, Italian, American and French Parties; (2) the programme of the Communist International; on this the report was of a member of the Russian Party; (3) the revolutionary movement in the colonies; on this the reporters were representatives of the Finnish, Italian, Chinese and other colonial countries. A glance through the report will show that the representatives of all parties took part in the debates and sat on the Commissions which elaborated the various resolutions. The leadership of the Comintern lies principally with the Russian, and secondly with the German party, which is, next to Russia, the most experienced in revolutionary action and the best equipped theoretically of the Parties. But the Comintern is an International, and to talk of any one Party having a ‘regulating and controlling influence’ is absurd.

So also is it with the theory and policy of the Comintern. The Prosecution represents it as a specifically Russian policy, introduced into the Labour Movement for the first time in 1917 by the Bolshevik Party. As the Comintern itself declared at its Second Congress (P 2395 “Theses and Statutes of the Second Congress”), it regards itself as the direct descendant of the First International, and bases its doctrines and policy on the traditional accepted doctrines and policy of the socialist working-class Movement, namely Marxism. It claims merely that

it has rescued Marxism from the degradation and distortion which it had suffered at the hands of the Reformists of the Second International, and that it applies the theory and methods of Marxism to the present period of History.

The Prosecution account of the Communist International and its History is therefore false from beginning to end. This account was invented for the purpose of supporting the theory which the Prosecution cherishes, that the Labour Movement is normally and properly a reformist movement which is able and willing to live permanently within the system of capitalism, and in no way threatens its existence. Communism, according to this theory is an external force essentially foreign to the Labour Movement, promoted mainly by a group of malevolent people who for some unexplained reason were able to seize control of the State of Russia in the year 1917, and owing to the powerful support which these people are able to give, contrives to exert a certain influence in other countries.

But not only the facts of the Prosecution, but its theory also, are false. I have shown briefly and I believe satisfactorily that the modern policy of communism is in no way a new thing to the labour movement, but it is on the contrary almost indentially the policy which the working class instinctively begins to practise everywhere it begins to attain consciousness of itself as a class. It is the traditional policy of the Labour Movement, on which it was united and organised in the first place by the First International. The reformism which the prosecution patronise is a deviation from the true and proper path of the working-class.

But now in the present period, the working-class is being forced by historical conditions back to its original correct revolutionary policy, and the expression of this fact is the formation of the Communist International.

The Red International of Labour Unions.

P 666 is a resolution calling for affiliation to the R.I.L.U. Now in connection with this exhibit I should like to refer briefly to the R.I.L.U. which has figured in the case of the prosecution prominently. The Prosecution had taken much delight in proving that the R. I. L. U. was formed at the initiative of the Comintern, has essentially the same principles and policy, and works in close coordination with it. This is admitted. I see nothing objectionable in it. It is in accordance with the practice of the International Labour Movement since its foundation. That movement has never recognised any fundamental distinction between the Trade Union and Socialist Wing. The First International was composed indiscriminately of both types of organisations, there being a majority of Trade Unions.

So also was the Second International until 1901, when a separate International Trade Union Secretariat was formed. After this the two parties continued to act in the closest alliance, and most of the leading members of the Trade Union International belonged to the Second International. It is still the case with the L. S. I and the I. F. T. U. which work closely together, have periodical joint Executive Sessions, issue joint appeals, manifestos etc. The relations between the Comintern and the R. I. L. U. are of the same type.

But while it is correct to say that the R.I.L.U. was founded on the initiative of the Communist International, this is not the whole truth. It is necessary to touch briefly on the history of International Trade Unionism and the policy of the I. F. T. U. in order to understand the reasons for the foundation of the R. I. L. U.

When the Imperialist War of 1914 started the Labour International that existed prior expired, as we have shown. The leaders of the International showed their true colours at the crucial moment of test. Acting against the principles that they professed to uphold, they called upon the workers of their countries to mobilise in defence of their "own" bourgeois State. In doing so they sent one section of workers to slaughter another section of workers in the interest of Imperialism. It is necessary for me to make this reference to get some idea of the present leadership of the I.F.T.U. because they are the same individuals who betrayed the workers in 1944 and destroyed the then existing Socialist and Trade Union International.

The war and these leaders destroyed the old idea, although previous to the war these Reformist leaders associated themselves with the idea of class-collaboration, the result of the War and their support of it made class-collaboration their main plank, and by this it became the very foundation of the future International Federation of Labour.

After the I. F. T. U. was established one of its first jobs was to assist in the signing of the Versailles Treaty, the outcome of this was the establishment of the League of Nations with its I. L. O. It was quite clear from this that the new I. F. T. U. from the beginning had renounced the class-struggle. In the face of this the workers had no alternative but to form a new international that would carry on the class-struggle free from opportunism and reformism, an international that would unify all the militant elements and the Trade Unions that uphold the principle of the class-struggle, true to the traditions of the working-class movement, that is those who considered the class-struggle the basic force in the history of mankind.

Another great factor was the Russian Revolution. Although such an International was not formed until 1920, it was these events that made it a necessity to bring into being an International that would link up all the militant and revolutionary Labour unions throughout the world. In 1920 the representatives of the Trade Union organisations of Great Britain, France, Italy, Spain, Russia etc. met in Moscow, Robert Williams of the Transport and General Workers Union of Great Britain being one of the British representatives, and out of this meeting grew the R. I. L. U. and the following declaration was confirmed; "That in the majority of those countries which took part in the War the greater part of the Trade Unions true believers in neutrality (apologetics) in the course of the terrible years of the war became tools of Imperialism and played a fatal role, thus hampering the final emancipation of the toilers"; "That it is the duty of the working class to gather together all Trade Union organised forces into a powerful revolutionary class association, which, working shoulder to shoulder with the political organisations of the Communist International of the proletariat and in the closest contact with this organisation, would be able to develop all its forces for the final victory of the social revolution and the establishment of a well organised Soviet Republic"; "That the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie must be opposed with the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a transitory and drastic measure, which alone is able to strangle the opposition of the exploiters, and secure and consolidate the gains of the proletarian revolution"; "That the Amsterdam International Federation of Trade Unions is unable, because of its programme and tactics to attain the triumph of the aforementioned principles and secure victory of the proletarian masses in all countries." "World Trade Union Movement" (Losovsky). The setting up of the R. I. L. U. brought a big storm of protest from the I. F. T. U., and along with this storm of protest the voice of the capitalist bourgeoisie of the world could be heard. The leaders of the I. F. T. U. could see that all their efforts to lead the workers along the path of class-collaboration would be undermined by the R. I. L. U., and would expose such bourgeois organisations as the League of Nations and the I. L. O.

I maintain that who ever supports the principles of class-collaboration is a supporter of bourgeois democracy and therefore opposed to the setting up of a workers' state. Furthermore the very individuals who make up the leadership of the Amsterdam International have all supported the Imperialist policy of their country, and in Great Britain, as I have shown, they have carried this policy out through the British Labour Government.

What do the workers want an International for if the component parts of such an International are going to do whatever they like? Mr. H. N. Brailsford makes it quite clear that each

section of the Amsterdam International can do just what it pleases. The sections of the I. F. T. U. have done on several occasions things which militate against the other sections. In the main the I. F. T. U. is a federation of European unions and it cannot claim to have but very little connection outside Europe. While speaking at the 1927 Session of the British Trade Union Congress Mr. A. A. Purcell, the then President of the I. F. T. U., said "They (the leaders) do not think in terms of the world unionism. They have not taken cognisance of the extraordinary rapidity with which the world is becoming industrialised. They think only in terms of Europe" (British Trade Union Congress Report). This is a strong criticism, and further during his speech he exposes the intrigues of the leaders of the I. F. T. U. in making a block against the Russian workers' movement and sabotaging International Trade Union unity.

Attempts have been made to draw in Trade Union organisations of other parts of the world. These attempts have been assisted by the capitalists to bring these unions within the influence of the reformist Amsterdam International, because according to the Prosecution this is the genuine brand of Trade Unionism. Several attempts have been made to draw the Indian Trade Union movement under its influence, one such attempt was made on the visit of Messrs. Purcell and Halsworth in 1927. On the other hand the R. I. L. U. has the affiliation of Labour unions throughout the world, China, Indonesia, Philippines, and Africa etc. And because of this the R. I. L. U. has become the gravitating centre of the Trade Unions fighting against Imperialism, those unions that are carrying on a struggle not only against their own bourgeoisie but also the foreign exploiters. The principle of liberating the exploited colonial peoples has been foremost in this agitation and propaganda; such has never been considered by the I. F. T. U. This is a very important feature of the R. I. L. U. It has carried on an unswerving and constant struggle against Imperialism.

The question of a united front of the International working-class movement which has been made much of by the Prosecution, and on which certain resolutions have been dealt with by the All India Trade Union Congress, is one of much importance to the International working class. Resolutions were brought forward at the Cawnpore and Jharia Trade Union Congresses that the Congress deplores the failure of the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee and urges further that efforts be made to bring about unity between the I. F. T. U. and the R. I. L. U. The R. I. L. U. and its affiliated organisations have proposed the united front because they realised the need for an International united front to check the onslaught of the capitalists and transform the present struggle from the defensive into the offensive. This approach for unity was

turned down by Amsterdam; those who stand for class-collaboration could not possibly unite with those who are working on the basis of the class-struggle. Amsterdam prefers unity with the bourgeoisie through the League of Nations and the I. L. O.

It was not a unity with the leaders of the I. F. T. U. that was wanted, but unity between the revolutionary workers of the R. I. L. U. and those workers still under the influence of the I. F. T. U. The working-class movement needs unity to be in a better position to carry on its activity, unity among the workers is the basis of the class-struggle. This call for unity, the unity of the rank and file will be pursued until it is realised. The refusal to respond to the R. I. L. U. call for unity, for one single Trade Union International, is one of the examples of sabotage on the part of the I. F. T. U.

P 661: Article on Jharia Trade Union Congress. (P.P.T.U.S.)

In this article I have supported the idea of affiliation to the P. P. T. U. S. In support of this I would like to deal with this particular organisation, and to show the need for such an organisation to assist the Indian workers in their struggle. It may be of interest to the Prosecution to know that as early as 1921-1922 the Australian Trade Union Congress carried a resolution calling for a Pan Pacific Conference of workers. It was at this stage that the initiative for some form of concerted action on the part of the workers of the Pacific was taken, and the credit for this must be given to the Australian Trade Union Movement, the P. P. T. U. S. has, since it started working, been a bugbear to Imperialism in the East. An interesting point is the fact that it cut across the pet idea that the bourgeoisie themselves had of forming through their agents, the reformist leaders of the I.F.T.U. and the I.L.O., the Pan Asiatic Trade Union organisation (as shown by P. 2369, of page 32); "In close collaboration with the I. L. O., of the League of Nations, International reformism tried in 1925-1926 to convene a Pan Asiatic Labour Conference in order to split and break up the Chinese Trade Union Movement with the help of the leaders of the Indian and Japanese reformism (Suzuki and Joshi)."

The idea was no doubt taken from that of the Australian Trade Union Movement and to counter this I claim that the above proposal was put forward. The idea of the Pan-Asiatic Conference was to keep the Trade Unions of the East on the "right lines" that is on the lines of reformism and class-collaboration. Every assistance was given to the representatives of the I. F. T. U. to this end when the reformist leaders from the East visited Geneva. On the other hand every hindrance was placed in the way of the setting up of the P. P. T. U. S. by imperialism.

The initiative of setting up of the P. P. T. U. S. was taken finally by the New South Wales Labour Council in conjunction with the Third All Australian Trade Union Congress in February 1926. Invitations were sent out to all Trade Union organisations in the Pacific for a Congress to be held at Sydney, Australia.

As would be expected, owing to the interference few delegates arrived, the delegates present held a preliminary conference and decided to postpone the convening of the Congress proper until May 1st, 1927, to be held at Canton, and a provisional agenda was adopted which was later confirmed by the T. U. C. of Australian and the All-China Labour Federation.

At the same time as the Congress was to be held Canton was in the hands of the counter-revolutionaries, who were ruthlessly murdering workers and labour leaders. It was therefore decided to hold the Congress at Hankow, and in May 1927 the Congress took place in spite of the fact that the Japanese delegates were arrested on their way to attend the Congress and the Indian delegates were prevented from attending by courtesy of British Imperialism. From this Congress was established the P. P. T. U. S. and the foundation was laid for a true militant alliance of the Trade Unions of the Pacific countries, and through the P. P. T. U. S. a link was forged between the workers of the East and the West. The P. P. T. U. S. is certainly not a conspiratorial body. It is a solid international of the Trade Unions drawn from the countries bordering on the Pacific including China, Java, Australia, Korea, Japan, Formosa, Philippines, U. S. S. R. etc. The Hankow Congress was the first time in history that the workers' representatives from such Imperialist countries as Great Britain, U. S. A., Japan and France met in Conference with representatives of organised workers from colonial and semi-colonial countries for the set purpose of devising ways and means of combatting Imperialism, establishing a permanent alliance between the workers of the East and West, and drawing in the workers of the Pacific as an integral part of the world Trade Union Movement; tearing down the barriers of racial prejudices, artificially created by Imperialism, raising the level of the standard of living of the workers of those countries which are oppressed by Imperialism, in this way frustrating the plans of the Imperialists to use one section of the working class against another.

D/- 3. 7. 31.

For some reason or other we have not heard of any sign of life from the conspiracy by the Imperialist agents, Suzuki, Chaman Lal, Joshi, Vonekubo and others to bring into being the proposed Asiatic Labour Congress, perhaps it is because some of these individuals are under other orders such as the R. T. C. and the Whitley Commission etc: The formation of the P. P. T. U. S. had become

a political necessity for the millions of toilers round the Pacific (over four hundred million in China; sixty million in Japan; one hundred and twenty million in U. S. A etc.) to wage the class-struggle successfully, owing to the fact that during the last twenty years the centre of the world economic and commercial activity had changed to the Pacific from the Atlantic area. And, we find the greatest contradictions inherent in capitalism and Imperialism are to be witnessed to-day in the Pacific and in Asia.

After the War the three leading powers of Imperialism; Great Britain, America and Japan were facing each other in the Pacific, between them there is a continuous struggle going on for the domination in China and the Pacific generally. This struggle is for markets, for sources of raw material and cheap labour, and this struggle must lead to war, it is inevitable, unless the workers are prepared to unite against these exploiters. Practically the whole of this vast portion of the world is under the yoke of some foreign Imperialism. China for instance, where millions of workers are attempting to throw off the shackles of native and foreign oppression is today the playground of all Imperialist powers; Indonesia with its sixty million workers, exploited by Dutch Imperialism with the aid and participation of British and American capital. In Korea there are twenty million workers and nearly as many Formosans, who are suffering under the most brutal yoke of Japanese Imperialism. The masses in the Philippines are rotting in the grip of American Imperialism and so on. All these workers have to face the same issue, have to face the same common foe, Imperialism. And the masses of India, (though India is not geographically speaking in the Pacific it is certainly in the same arena), the Indian working-class is suffering under the yoke of the largest Imperialist power and therefore their place is shoulder to shoulder with the exploited millions of the Pacific. Their place is with them in the P.P.T.U.S.

P. 1728:— I am alleged to have said according to translation and the C. I. D. report of the speech delivered to the Bombay Textile strikers, "such housing conditions, their starvation, their low wages, their lack of education, their want of clothes, such conditions of poverty and penury must be removed and for bringing about that state of things, those the owners or the rich who are foisting it upon them must be first thrown in the sea."

Conditions of the Working Class in India.

In order to explain this and also to give the Court some idea of our activities in connection with the Trade Union Movement in India it is necessary for me to explain shortly the position of the working-class in India and its relations to the employing class, both British and Indian, and to the State. This is not out of place at

the moment seeing that the report of the Royal Commission on Indian Labour has just been published and the fact that the workers' "representatives," N. M. Joshi and Chaman Lal were able to sign a unanimous report with such employers of Labour as Sassoon and Birla.

I do not propose to bring forward any abstract theories in relation to this matter, I shall give facts. We have heard much about the class-war from the Prosecution side as something created by us, the facts that I shall give may assist the Court to appreciate the existence of such a thing as the class-war and that it is not of our creation. The Prosecution are concerned about the fact that Marx divided the world into two classes. I have already given some facts about the capitalist side of this system of exploitation, the economic position of the working class is generally fairly well-known but it is necessary for me to give some of the broad facts here. I will therefore deal with the conditions and compare them with conditions obtaining in other countries.

Let us take first what is sometimes termed, 'the aristocracy of Indian Labour,' the Textile workers. The Fawcett Committee Report, page 101, takes the average of monthly earnings of a weaver in Bombay city at Rs 48/- per month on the basis of the Labour Office Enquiry in 1926. They give then a Comparative table page 122, which shows this rate compares as follows with the wages of weavers in some other countries. These rates are for the years 1924-26 and worked out as follows in Rupees per month approximately; Austria Rs 55/-, Belgium Rs 60/-, Poland Rs 48/-, Great Britain Rs 96/-, Canada Rs 185/-, Holland Rs 114/-, U. S. A. Rs. 228/- and Italy Rs 60/-. It will be seen that there is a disparity between the weavers in Belgium, Great Britain, U. S. A. and Italy. The lower wages in Austria, Holland and Poland are due to the weavers being in the main female. I should mention at this juncture that the wages of the workers in the above countries named, are calculated on the basis of the 48 hour week, while the wages of the Indian Textile worker is based on 60 hour week. But this wage applies only to weavers in the island of Bombay, it is definitely an exceptional one. The Report says on page 101 that it is far higher even than that of the spinners in the same mill. The position of the spinners is as follows:—

In July 1926 the Bombay Government through its Labour Office compiled the average daily and monthly earnings of workers in each of 19 representative mills in Bombay city and on page 9 of their report the wages of spinners are given as Rs 27/9/11. This is the average monthly earning of a full time worker. I have taken the Spinners from among the spinners, because they comprise the largest section among them and receive the highest average

wage. By reference to the Fawcett Committee Report you will see that the wages of the Spinners in the countries named are only slightly lower than those of the Weavers, and yet in India there is such a large disparity between the wages of these two sets of workers.

Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth in their "Report on Labour conditions in India" quote the official inquiry and give results (in rupees p. m.) to Rs 39/- as average wage for all other mill-workers in Bombay city. For Ahmedabad it is about Rs 37/8, for Sholapur Rs 26. Even these figures of Bombay city were criticised as too high, by the Bombay Textile Labour Union. Women's wages of course are on a much lower scale, and for Bombay city are about Rs 20.

These wages are for what on the whole are the best paid sections of workers. Now take the workers in the next biggest industry. Messrs. Johnstone M. P. and J. Syme in 1926 visited Bengal and published a report 'Exploitation in India' (D 65) which gives the following as the weekly rates actually found prevailing. Weavers Rs 6/- to Rs 11/- (very few at the latter), Spinners (men) Rs 4/4/-, Bale carriers Rs 5/8/-, Winders Rs. 5/-, Beamers and dressers Rs 4/4/-, Hemmers and Sewers Rs 4/12/- etc. These are the best paid sections, but we also get Repairers (men and women) Rs 2/4/-, Batchers (men and women) Rs. 2/4/-, Rovers (men and women) Rs. 2/12/-, Coolies Rs 3/-, Twisters Rs 3/3/-, while some old men and boys are paid the magnificent sum of Rs 1/8/- per week. The Whitley Commission Report says that the time is ripe for standardisation of wages in the cotton mills, and the Jute industry should examine the possibility of standardisation in the Jute mills. Standardisation on the basis of the above figures means standardisation of poverty.

Now let us take the Mining Industry. Mr. T. I. Mardy Jones himself an ex-miner, visited the Indian Coal fields in 1927-1928 and made a very thorough investigation into all aspects of the industry there. He states in D 116 (1) "There is no official check on wages.....The highest rates I found any where in the three chief coal fields were; surface labour, males 9d a day, females 7d. a day, under-ground labour males 1 s. 4d., females 8d. The average number of shifts worked per week is 5, so that the earnings of a man and his wife at the coal face is about 10 Shillings per week. It is an admitted fact that the run of wages in the coal fields does not exceed these rates."

Thus the working miners get at the best about Rs 28/ per month if man and wife both work. (Colliery Employees' Association Annual Report, 1927, D 142 (17) says, "A man and his wife can seldom earn more than Rs 20/- per month".)

Mr. Mardy Jones the slightly better wages of the Indian clerical and superior staff (Rs 40/- to Rs 70/- per month) and the far higher ones of the European managers etc, and concludes "... there is absolutely no sense or reason in the huge disparity between their standard of life and the masses of the mine workers placed in their charge."

Now take the railways. In P 653, an exhibit put in against me, this is an article "Workers leads Deputation to the Agent," and describes very briefly the conditions of the railway workers and refers to the fact that a deputation including myself waited on the Agent of the G. I. P. Railway to try and obtain some redress for the workers' grievances. The reply of the Agent to this deputation's request was very unsatisfactory. However, the article shows the wages of the workers on the G. I. P. Railway to range from as low as Rs 11/- and Rs 13/- per month. That these conditions are general throughout the railways of India is adequately borne out by many of the defence exhibits. Rai Sahib Chandrika Prasad who is considered an authority on railway matters gives some interesting facts in his Presidential Address to the A. I. T. U. C. March 1927 (D 145 (32)). He states that the average wage of all railway employees, including Europeans, in India is under Rs 40. He gives also an interesting table showing the minimum and maximum rates of pay on railways in various countries, and shows that India gives both the lowest Rs 108 (*per annum*) and the highest (Rs 48,000/- per annum.) The next lowest to India is China, at 300 dollars per annum (that is about Rs 400/- and the next is Japan at Rs 552/- per annum.

These statements are confirmed by such documents or statements as the B. N. R. I. W. U. Annual Report 1926-1928 (D 139 (21)), page 2 reports that it secured a promise of increase of pay for the employees on Rs 11/- per month and under. The minimum wage of the loco staff in general was raised to Rs 13/8/ p. m. and that of the Kharagpur Workshop to Rs 15/-, raised the maximum of the scale of the adult school teachers to Rs 35 p. m., raising the minimum rates of pay of the Loco, Carriage, Shed, and Electric line staff; unskilled staff to Rs 13/8/-, semi-skilled Rs 15/, skilled Rs 18/-; all engineering gangmen on incremental rates—subject to the maximum of Rs 17/-. Similarly D 139 (13) gives certain data about the Kanchrapara Workshop of the E. B. Railway, Khalasis pay is Rs 13/- uniform rate in the shop on 20-1-30. For skilled men Rs 20/- to Rs 28/-, then after 3-5 years wait Rs 30/- to 51/-, then a longer wait (and bribe) and finally Rs 55 to Rs 82/- D 139 (23) Report of the E. B. Railway Indian Employees Association 1928, page 9, states that the employees on this railway 38104 or 70 per cent of the whole staff are paid less than Rs 30/ per month (quoting from Agents Annual Report).

The Whitley Commission has made several recommendations which all seem to be to discover the best kind of Trade Union organisation for railway workers, and they suggest that there should be a Joint Standing Central Board. I shall have something to say later about these things known to us as Whitley Councils. But it is of great interest to know that one of the main signatories of the Whitley Commission Report, Mr. Chaman Lal is to-day a member of a strike committee set up by the All India Railwaymen's Federation which is threatening the Railway Board with a general strike on all railways throughout India. Has Mr. Chaman Lal so soon lost faith in his Whitley Commission? Has Mr. Chaman Lal suddenly become radical? Of course not, Chaman Lal is playing the same role today as he played yesterday and with Mr. S. C. Joshi and others on this strike committee are only there to betray the workers as they have none in the past.

I will just now refer briefly to the conditions of seamen. D 139 (24), Report of 1925-26 of the Indian Seamen's Union, Calcutta, says on page 5, "The Indian seamen are getting very low wages in comparison to English seamen. The wages would be £ 2/-, only (about Rs. 27/-) a month where as the latter got an average wage of £ 9, about Rs. 120/- per month." D 147 (17), Bulletin no. 5 dated 21. 9. 27 of the Bengal Mariners' Union, gives the same rate of pay for various classes of men. Khalassis get as low as Rs. 16/- p. m. while highest paid men apart from the seamen in the Dock department is Head Sukhain Rs. 29/-. In Engineering department similarly rates vary from Rs. 18/- (coal trimmers) to Rs. 31/-. Clerks alone get higher rates: Rs. 35/-. D 147 (2) Bulletin dated 30. 9. 27 gives similar scale for employees of the I. S. N. Company, Rs. 20/- for lascars, up to Rs. 33/- for clerks.

D. 147 (7) Bulletin no. 4 of the Port Trust Mariners' and Workers' Union dated 2. 1. 28 gives rates for Khalassis of tug-boats and launches at Rs 20/-. Lock-gate Khalassis, coal-trimmers and firemen at Rs. 16/8/- to Rs 21/8/-. Jolly-boat Khalassis Rs. 22/- to Rs. 23/-. Heave-up boat Khalassis Rs. 32/- who have to work 30 or 40 feet under water.

Take the tea garden workers. D 142 (20) contains notes quoting from the Government report of the year ending June 1927 for the Assam Valley Division. It gives monthly average earnings calculated on the daily average working strength.

	LEAST	GREATEST	AVERAGE
Men	Rs 10/13/4	Rs 15/8/-	Rs 12/9/9
Women	Rs 8/7/3	Rs 12/0/9	Rs 10/14/7
Children	Rs 4/9/9	Rs 7/6/4	Rs 6/10/8

With this data has to be reckoned the fact that in the tea-gardens the cost of living is very high. Here is given the following as the typical day's food for tea-garden workers; Morning:— tea water with salt and no milk; Mid-day:— food left from previous evening of fried rice with tea water, salt and chillies; Evening:— low quality rice, some with *dal*, some merely with salt and chillies. No decent meal even once a week. This dietary costs Rs 16/- to Rs 18/ per month and females are often not able to earn this amount.

But these conditions were apparently not seen by the Rt. Hon'ble J. H. Whitley, Chairman of the Royal Commission on Indian Labour. He speaking at the annual Assam dinner given in London by the Indian Tea Association on June the 6th said, ".....there was no other place which seemed to be so delightful as Assam. I called it at once the 'Garden province of India'. He was referring to his tour to inspect the conditions of Indian Labour. These remarks brought vigorous applause from the Tea-garden capitalists. He went on to show that he was doing his work properly on the Commission and said, "I believe, over six hundred thousand persons who come as workers to your gardens and, in the course of a few years, have saved sufficient money, leave your garden, take up Government land and become independent cultivators on their own". I should like to contrast this statement with that made by Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth in their report: "our view is that, despite all that has been written, the tea gardens of Assam are virtually slave plantations, and that in Assam tea the sweat, hunger and despair of a million Indians enter year by year."

Municipal Workers. P 548 (5) gives the following figures; in Madras town the majority of the men sweepers are paid Rs. 17/8/- per month and some special section Rs 20/- or Rs 25/-; women Rs 13/8/- and some Rs 17/8/-. In Calcutta the rate for mehtars is Rs 12/- per month, for sweepers and cartmen Rs 14/- and for masons etc. a very small minority Rs 18/- to Rs 30/-. P 802 states that the labourers in the Kirkee Arsenal are paid ~~Rs. 18/-~~ as a day. It is unnecessary to give any more data. Any further facts would merely confirm the same general principle. Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth in their report have surveyed the field fairly completely and their figures merely bear out those quoted above. They give substantially lower figures for the Tea-garden workers, for others, so far as they can be confirmed they agree fairly well. They remark in the General Statement (page 10): "All enquiries go to show that the vast majority of workers in India do not receive more than about one shilling per day. In the light of all the available evidence we feel confident that in submitting as a very rough average the sum of one shilling a day

as the Indian worker's wage, we are not under-estimating the position, especially bearing in mind that in the wages field there is a veritable maze of exaction, deductions and forfeitures. At any rate we are satisfied.....that the average cannot be placed at any higher figure". They proceed; "It must be said with truth that millions and millions of men, women and children get only half, and even often less than half the amount of food needed to maintain the very lowest state of life.It is undeniable that the Indian workers are half starved and badly clothed, as well as horribly housed". In their conclusions they point out the fact that (page 43) ".....having regard to the fact that in most trades, occupations, callings and industries in India it takes 5 to 8 workers to obtain as much wages as one of the lowest paid workers in Great Britain".

So much for wages. I should now like to pass a few remarks on the question of hours. Hours of work are perhaps the next most important matter in determining the lot of the worker, and the position here is fairly clear. According to the Law as it stands at present, the hours of work allowed in factories in British India are limited to 11 per day, and 60 per week (this is a modification, especially made for India, of the hours convention adopted at the Washington Conference, 1921, which made 8 hours per day and 48 hours per week the usual standard).

This limit is usually adhered to so that the workers in factories usually work ten hours per day for a six day week. This is so in the Bombay Cotton industry, except for a small number of workers. Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth state in their report; ".....the whole working-day.....which on the average cannot be less than one of ten hours." But there are many occupations in which this is not the rule, or the law, if it applies, is not observed. In the first place the States are not included in the sphere of operation of the Law. Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth cite the case of Baroda State, where the State Act allows 7 hours instead of six for children, 12 hours instead of 11 for women, and places no limit on the hours of employment of men. The second point to notice is that the Factory Acts apply only to factories as such. In many organised occupations hours seem to be practically unlimited.

Thus Mr. Mardy Jones in D 142 (7 and 8) shows how mine workers have sometimes to stay in the mine for ten to 12 hours or more. Their daily allotted work may be dug in 6 to 8 hours but because of the lack of tubs for conveyors they have to remain. In most civilised countries the hours of work for miners are rigidly limited, sometimes from bank to bank, sometimes at the coal face, it is usually eight hours. In D 116 (17) he refers to "peasant families living in the mines for days on end". D 142(17),

the Indian Cool Employees' Association report, refers to the case of the clerical employees of the mining companies who work ten hours a day and seven day week, with no holidays.

D 139 (2) gives particulars about the workers organised in the Bengal Mariners' Union. Those employed in launches, steamers, barges etc: have a twelve-hour-day daily duty, from six to six. In port it may be 18 to 19 hours work for Engine and Deck department, that is the great majority. The workshop men work from 8 to 5 with a half hour break. Steamer clerks, manifest and tallymen work all hours more or less. D 139 (3) dealing with the same class of workers say that the agency staff work 16 hours per shift.

D 139 (24), the Indian Seamen's Union, Calcutta, Report of 1925-1926 says that there is no regulation of hours of labour of seamen as in England, and no overtime pay D 147 (7) P. T. M. and Dock Workers' Union Bulletin no. 4 dated 2-1-28 states "Men of Heave-Up boats, ~~however~~ boats, anchor vessels and tug and rescue are to work day and night. Kidderpur Dock Khalassis work ~~for~~ for 1½ hours a day and others are to work sometimes more". Further, overtime allowance is reserved for the European and Anglo Indian employees.

D 142 (20) states that there is no limit to the hours of work of labour in the tea factories, "work goes on to midnight or even dawn".

In the report of Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth they refer to conditions on the railways and give cases brought to their notice of men in traffic and loco departments having to work for 28 and 39 hours at stretch, and porters having to work for 36 and 48 hours with a break. They said that memorials and petitions innumerable have been presented relating to the long hours of certain sections, and that all the conferences in the last few years have passed resolutions on this question.

Note:—Passage which follows was not fully revised at this stage and was actually made on 11-7 but is put in here as this is its proper place.

Conditions of Women Labour.

The wages of women are always lower than those of men. I have given some data on this and there is any amount more. The conditions of employment of women are in many cases notoriously bad. In the Bengal Jute Mills for example women are largely employed. (The Statistical Abstract 1930, p 681, gives figures showing that about 62,000 women are employed). There are no arrangements whereby these women have, ~~of~~ absence during pregnancy. Mr. H. N. Brailsford (D 145 (10)) quotes an official

witness who stated that "Inquiries into the records of 132 women workers showed that 102 had borne 338 living children of whom 139 first saw the light of day while mother was working in the factory."

D 142 (20) states that the women in the Tea plantations carry their children to work on their backs and cases have occurred of the death of the child. It remarks that many managers and other officials of the plantations keep the cooly girls as their concubines.

In D142 (1 and 2) Mr. Mardy Jones gives an account of the position of the women workers in the Indian coal mines. He points out in the first place that India is only country in the British Empire where women work in mines at all. About 30,000 were employed when he wrote in 1928.

He states that Government has admitted that:—

"The physical conditions in the majority of Indian coal mines are no longer such as to make it desirable that women should be employed in them. In only a very small percentage of such mines is there any arrangement for ventilation....."

"In 1925, -38 women were killed in mine accidents....."

He concludes his account of the matter:—

"There is nothing on earth outside Dante's inferno to equal the cruelty of women labour in the mines of India."

D 119 is a document which was drawn up by one of us on the basis of personal inquiries into the conditions of the municipal scavengers of Calcutta.

The Conservancy Department does not come under the Factory Act, and employs boys of 6 to 8 years old in dangerous work i.e. going into the gully pits to take out mud etc. accumulated there. They are sometimes rendered unconscious by the poisonous gas. Sometimes death results. The pay of these boys is at the most Rs. 8/8/0 per month.

Housing and Sanitation.

Consider the very important question of housing and sanitation. Opinion is absolutely unanimous on this matter. Messrs. Johnstone and Syme, Mardy Jones, Purcell and Hallsworth are united and emphatic on the point. Purcell and Hallsworth in their report (p. 8) give the general verdict:—

"The housing of the people in our own country is a serious problem, but in India it is far more serious, for disgustingly bad housing conditions prevail generally so far as the working classes are concerned. Wherever one goes in the

different parts of the country, whether it be in the village, in the moderate sized towns, or in the big cities; and whatever may be the design or lay-out of the houses, whether they be the single roomed dwellings built in "lines" or tenements, or the single roomed dwellings dotted about separately in some place, they are all unutterably bad, and can not in any decent sense be regarded as "homes".

We visited the workers' quarters, wherever we stayed, and had we not seen them we could not have believed that such evil places existed.

The proceed to give some specific cases, showing that the rents which the workers have to pay even for these places represent a very substantial part of the workers' income. They quote a table showing the overcrowding in Bombay, which states that 236, 783 persons live in rooms each occupied by 6-9 persons; 115, 731 in rooms each occupied by 10 to 19 persons; and 31,578 in rooms each occupied by 20 persons or more. They state (p.9)

"The overcrowding and insanitary conditions almost everywhere prevailing demonstrated the callousness and wanton neglect of their obvious duties by the authorities concerned."

It is impossible to give any complete or even representative list of the other and minor means of exploitation and oppression which are used against the workers with greater or less intensity all over the country. The authorities already quoted and the exhibits contain a mass of material on the point.

System of Fines.

Purcell and Hallsworth Report (p. 18 notes "that there are no *negotiated* or *agreed rates of pay*. The rates of wages are, in fact, all *imposed* upon the workers." They make this remark in reference to railways. It applies to practically all industries. Even the most advanced and militant section of Indian Labour, who have by their repeated strikes and continual struggle achieved a better position than most workers in India, the Bombay Textile workers have to endure much in this way.

D 145 (37) is an account of the system of fines prevailing in the Bombay Mills, published by the Bombay Textile Labour Union, it shows that the situation is extremely oppressive.

There is no theoretical limit to the amount of fines (p. 13). The nature of the offence for which workers are fined are not specified. It is anything which the management objects to (p. 15).

An employee fined is not usually given information on the matter at the time (p.4—5); rules setting out the conditions of fines are the exception (p.9); rules of a certain mill provide that if a worker is up to ten minutes late he can be fined as the manager thinks fit; if he is absent for one day he is fined two days wages; if absent for more than three days he can be fined, at discretion, all his earnings; etc. etc.

Bribery.

It is common knowledge, and is borne out by the material at our disposal, that the system of bribery is extremely common. Workers have to pay bribes to get and keep their jobs, and through this they get into debt, usually to professional money-lenders, whose habits and rates of interest are notorious. The seamen are especially victims of this abuse, see D 139 (20) and D 139 (24).

Dismissals.

Workers are arbitrarily dismissed, often by minor and irresponsible officials (see the case of the Kanchrapara Railway Workmen D 139 (12), the Bombay Textile Workers D. 145 (37) and the Calcutta Scavengers Union D 119).

Conditions of work.

The conditions of work are extremely and unnecessarily troublesome and unhealthy, for example those of the miners (see Mr. Mardy-Jones articles). He notes in D 142 (7 and 8);—

“Miners often have to work in dangerous places..... the management alleges they are marked as dangerous. But the miners say that the mark is often put up after the accident.....as there are only nine inspectors for the whole of British India, one may have to travel hundreds of miles to get to the scene of an accident, and it is easy to cover up traces.”

Workers on Tea plantations are under conditions practically of slavery. They are kept on the plantations and are watched and prevented by force from leaving (D 142 (20)). D 139 (17) shows that even such workers as those in the Dhakeswari Cotton Mills are practically under slave conditions; if five are absent simultaneously they are treated as strikers, and forfeit fifteen days pay; no speaking is allowed in the mill, not more than five men are allowed to meet in the workers' quarters; workers are beaten, kicked, abused, etc. by the management.

Victimisation for Trade Union or similar activity is universal; a very large proportion of strikes start from this (Bauria, Chengail, Lillooah, Municipal Workers strikes, Bombay, etc.) though there are usually other general causes and grievances.

All kinds of means are adopted by employers to prevent the workers from organising or taking effective action. P. 525 (3) states that the management of the Calcutta Tramway Company stirred up communal trouble between their Bengali and up-country employees, thus preventing the formation of an effective Union. Similarly D 139 (4) states that the management of the Keshoram Cotton Mills tried to excite Hindu-Muslim tension by setting up in rivalry to the existing Textile Union a "Hindu Workers' Union" with the aid of the Hindu Mahasabha. In this case the attempt failed.

P 1565 shows how the Oil Companies of Bombay imported Pathans during the strike of the Oil workers in 1928-1929 to act as blacklegs. This resulted in the communal riots of February, 1929. Other incidents can be cited among the Textile workers of Bombay, the railway workers, etc, etc., where attempts have been made by the employers to stir up communal trouble with a view to break the solidarity of the workers.

LABOUR LEGISLATION.

In my speech to the Bombay Textile strikers, P 1705, according to the C. I. D. report and the translation I am supposed to have said: "We say that these laws are wrong. How can that law which makes people starve be called a law? For this law is in order that they should be able to lead a life of luxury after we die of starvation. In this way they speak of law. But we are prepared to disregard even laws themselves (at the root). We do not respect (or recognise) these laws."

While justifying this speech I would recall that the late Mr. Langford James in his exceedingly lengthy address at one place said when he was dealing with the question of the State that:

" I suppose any ordinary person who thinks about the State regards it as an institution which for better or for worse, well or less well, is here to guard the liberties and rights of all the citizens in the State and see to the best of its ability that they all get fair play and equal treatment..... Now that was not at all the theory of Marx. "

Of course it was not, and no sane individual who had given any thought to what the function of the State is could be under any such illusion. The State is the organ of the ruling class, and as the bourgeoisie are the ruling class today, the State is used only in their interests. But let us get away from theory and let us examine how the State functions in actual practice. To do this I will take legislation in regard to Labour.

The attitude of the employers, both Indian and foreign, towards the workers, is adequately shown by the examples quoted. But what of the State, that supposedly detached and impartial "third party" whose function, in the words of the Counsel for the Prosecution, is "to guard the liberties and rights of all the citizens" and "to see to the best of its ability that they all get fair play"? Surely, seeing such a condition of things, such an unequal struggle between the rich bourgeoisie on the one hand and the mass of poor, illiterate, superstitious, oppressed, deceived, tricked, starved and maltreated workers on the other, surely the State, in its passion for "equal treatment" and "fair play" will rush to the assistance of the workers, will fight the employers, and force them to treat their workers more fairly and more humanly?

But what steps have the Government taken to ascertain the workers' point of view? It is well known that even under the reforms of 1919, the property qualification is so high that practically no workers can vote. Mr. Clow ("The State and Industry" p. 140) states:—

"The reforms provided for the first time for some representation of labour in the Legislatures..... a labour representative has occupied a nominated seat in the Legislative Assembly throughout its existence.....the total number of provincial seats (is now) 10."

I need not go into the character of these nominated representatives, their history shows that they are all subservient to the Government. Further the system of nomination to the legislatures has had a corrupting influence on the middle-class labour leaders.

HOURS.

I have touched upon the question of working hours already. It is stated (e. g. in the Textile Tariff Board Report, 1927) that it was in view of "the special conditions" of India, that the Washington Convention was modified so that instead of 8 hours, 11 hours per day, and instead of 48 hours per week 60 hours were allowed in India. These "special conditions" are not specified, but the only peculiarities of India relevant to the matter, seem to be, that India has a hotter and therefore more exhausting climate than most industrial countries, and that Indian workers are worse fed and in the main of poorer physique than most other workers. Yet, instead of less, these workers are "allowed" to work 3 hours more per day. And, as I have said these rules apply only to factories, that is to a minority of workers even in the organised trades, and only to British India.

Take the case of the 30,000 women miners, who as Mr. Mardy-Jones points out are the only women still working in mines in the

British Empire. In D 142 (1 & 7) he gives an account of the attitude of the Government of India to this question. As early as 1902 the Government was empowered to abolish this evil. The power was not used. In 1921 the matter came to the fore again, and the Viceroy was empowered to abolish it. But in 1922 he concluded that it would be " inexpedient " to do so in view of the fact that women formed more than one third of the total workers. A joint committee of the Indian Legislatures appointed at that time decided in favour of abolition in the course of 5 years. The Government of India circularised the Provincial Governments and interested parties on the matter, and these protested. (Both Indian and British Firms).

Eventually the Government decided on gradual abolition, beginning from July 1st, 1928, and ending by June 30th, 1935 - a period of 7 years. But the matter had been allowed to lapse for some three years, and so the parties interested were circularised once more. Again they protested, and in consequence the Government decided to extend the period of gradual abolition to 1939. (See A. G. Clow, " State and Industry " pp. 152-155, which confirms all these statements).

This is in spite of the Government admission already quoted that " the physical conditions are such that it is undesirable that women should be employed in the mines, " and the fact that (D 142 (3)) the mine managers and inspectors are in favour of the early abolition of women labour and are of the opinion that it could be done in 3 years or even 1. Mr. Mardy-Jones concludes;

" When this failure to act promptly in recent years, and the utter failure of the Government of India to issue any regulations from the Act of 1901 right up to 1927, and the present policy of a further protracted period of 10 years are all borne in mind, the charge of the Government's complicity with the capitalist rapacity is irresistible. "

I have already noted that for the whole of the British India, in which hundreds of mines are scattered over an area many hundreds of miles in length and breadth, the Government maintains only 9 mine inspectors.

SEAMEN

Let us take the case of the seamen. Mr. A. G. Clow (State and Industry p. 143) states that;—

" The consideration by the Legislature of the Draft Convention for establishing facilities for finding employment for seamen led to the appointment of a Seamen's Recruitment

Committee which investigated the conditions under which seamen were recruited at Bombay and Calcutta. The inquiry revealed the existence of serious abuses at Calcutta and was followed by administrative changes which have produced satisfactory results."

This is a typical example of Mr. Clow's method of making much out of nothing. No "satisfactory results" have been produced. The situation in regard to the recruitment of seamen is as bad as it ever was. At the Jharia T. U. C. 1928 the President Mr. Daud, (who is also President of the Indian Seamen's Union, Calcutta) said (Report p. 15) :—

"..... the Government was pressed to improve their system of recruitment and all appeals in that direction have uptill now fallen flat upon the dull cold ear of the Government at the instance of the ship-owners."

The resolution on the question passed at the Cawnpore Session of the A. I. T. U. C. 1927, e. g. (and repeated at the Jharia T. U. C. next year, almost in the same words, Jharia Report, App. p. 54). (P 1381. p. 115) says:—"21 (a) :- This Congress, while disapproving of the action of the Government of India in not enforcing the recommendations of the Seamen's Recruitment Committee of 1922 by introducing a bill for amending the Indian Merchant Shipping Act in the Legislative Assembly, strongly urges upon the Government of India to introduce the same in the next session of the Indian Legislative Assembly without further delay."

"(b) This congress strongly urges upon the Government of India the necessity of setting up an Advisory Committee along with the establishment of the Seamen's Recruitment Committee as recommended by the majority members of the S. R. C. on the lines of the Geneva Inter. Labour Conference. "

Resolution 20 reads :- " This Congress strongly urges upon the Government of India to amend the Ind. Mer. Ship. Act so as to do away with the pernicious system of recruitment of seamen through the licensed brokers as per recommendations of the Seamen's Recruitment Committee and strongly recommends the establishment of a State Employment Bureau at all the ports of India."

It is necessary to state that the Government has not yet introduced the necessary Bills. In fact since 1922 it has done nothing in the matter except to shelve the Recommendations of its own Committee.

¶ The sufferings of the seamen under this system are acute,

not only in Calcutta, but in all ports in India. Purcell and Hallsworth's Report states (p. 41):—

“ For some years the whole question of recruitment and supply of labour has been agitating the minds of the men's representatives, who bitterly complain of existing methods under which the labour force is selected for employment by the agency of Government licensed shipping brokers and *Ghat Serangs*. Under this system bribery and corruption are rife and cause great hardship to the men and their families. The seaman is charged a sum equal to 25 per cent of wages merely for the brokers' recommendation for service, and it is alleged there is collusion between the brokers and the lodging-house keepers by which the latter also make an imposition upon the seaman, over and above rent, for his opportunity of being registered to occupy a few feet of room in exceedingly bad quarters ashore.....”

See also D 139 (24).

LEGISLATION.

It would be possible if time allowed to go into almost all spheres of Labour Legislation and show that the Government has done in effect almost nothing, compared even with the bourgeois Governments of Europe, in this matter. It is only necessary here to take Mr. Clow's account (pp. 137 following) and subject it to a brief examination. He admits that up to the war of 1914-18 the Government attitude was one of *laissez faire*, and goes so far as to say that in the earlier period (1860).

“The main anxiety of the Government seems to have been to protect the social system from the workmen, rather than to protect workmen from the social system.” (P. 134).

So that up to the war time the results of Labour Legislation are admittedly meagre. These results were:—

(1) The Factory Act of 1881-1891 limiting the age of children employed in factories (not mines) to 9 years, and prohibiting night work for women and limiting the hours of work in the day; (2) the Factory Act of 1911 whereby hours for adults in textile mills were limited to 12.

But for the post-war period Mr. Clow gives an imposing list of eleven Conventions proposed by the International Labour Conferences, and ratified by the Government of India. They are:—

(1) Convention limiting the hours of work in industrial undertakings. I have touched upon this and exposed the fraud of it already. But an interesting point is to be observed. On P. 139

Mr. Clow mentions that in March 1920 a memorial was sent to the Viceroy by the Bombay Mill-owners asking for the reduction of hours from 12 to 10, throughout India. We know the reason for this altruism. With their superior labour discipline they could exploit their workers to the full in 10 hours, while their competitors in the up-country mills would lose by the limitation of hours to this extent. So even this much advertised advance (it was limitation only to 11 hours) was effected as the result of pressure from a section of the bourgeoisie themselves.

(2) Convention concerning unemployment. What has this "Convention" and its "ratification" done for the unemployed, who in normal times are not negligible in number, and in times of depression a large army? Has it given them an unemployment relief? Or even poor-law relief? Or even registration? Or fares paid to their homes? It has given them absolutely nothing.

(3) Convention concerning the employment of women during the night.

(4) Convention concerning the night work of young persons employed in industries. This applies to industries but not to any other occupation.

(5) Convention regarding the right of association and combination of agricultural workers. Anybody having any knowledge of the situation in the rural areas will know the value of this Convention.

(6) Convention concerning the application of the weekly rest in industrial undertakings. I have shown that this does not apply in practice or even in theory on the railways or in the mines (clerical or supervisory staff) etc.

(7) Convention fixing the minimum age for the admission of young persons to employment as trimmers and stokers.

(8) Convention concerning the compulsory medical examination of children and young persons employed at sea.

(9) Convention concerning the workmen's compensation for occupational diseases.

(10) Convention concerning equality of treatment for national and foreign workers as regards workers compensation for accidents.

(11) Convention concerning the simplification of the inspection of emigrants on board ship.

Further the main principle has been applied of the convention regarding the minimum age of admission of children to

employment. And the consideration of the Draft Convention for establishing facilities for finding employment for seamen led to the appointment of a Seapens' Recruitment Committee. The result of this has already been dealt with.

The only Act of importance in this period is the Act of 1924 restricting the age (to 17 years) and hours (to 6) at which children may be employed in the mines.

This is the result of the benevolent interest of the Government of India in Labour in the years from the war up to date. Some conventions have been ratified, a few of which in their restricted sphere are undoubtedly useful, but to claim that they do more than touch the fringe of the matter or constitute an appreciable advance towards the state of labour legislation in the countries of Europe is impossible. While in some of these matters for which the Government claims credit (hours, mining and seamen's legislation) its attitude has been definitely obstructive, reactionary and subservient to the interests of capitalism.

TRADE UNION ACT AND TRADES DISPUTE ACT

But the attitude of the Government is seen most clearly in its legislation in regard to the Trade Union and Trades Disputes Acts. After about five years of activity of the A. I. T. U. C. the Trade Union Act was given assent to on March 25th, 1926. A private member's Bill to extend the immunity from criminal liability to unregistered unions was defeated in 1928. (See Clow p. 160). On examination we find that this Act falls much short of the Trade Union Legislation that existed in Great Britain before 1925, and taking into consideration the fact that India is ruled by a foreign Imperialist power, which has imposed upon India many repressive laws, it gave very little or no protection to the trade union movement. It can be seen that it was designed to protect a certain kind of trade unionism that would not be harmful and at the same time to make a show that this was an advance and that the Government was not against the workers organising.

The Act gave some measure of protection to Trade Unions under it, but what was this measure of protection and what was to be given in return for it? It was just a matter of supplying a certain amount of information to a special section of the Police who at some future date would use it to suppress any militant movement on the part of the workers. To the unions that would not register and give this information no "protection" was given, and unregistered trade unions and joint action taken by the workers without forming a registered trade union would still be liable under Section 120 B of the I. P. C. (Criminal Conspiracy.)

Mr. D. P. Sinha and the defence generally in this case have several times raised the question of the evidence that has been put in by the Prosecution in respect to our activities in connection with the registered Trade Unions of which many of us were members and office-bearers. But the Magistrate's Committal Order and your own order of the 30/4/30. show clearly how futile this particular piece of legislation is.

It required an amendment introduced by the Legislative Assembly to the Government Draft to provide that a part of the funds may be used in certain specified ways for political purposes (See Clow P. 160). Even this fund is to be collected on the "contracting in" principle, as opposed to the far more liberal "contracting out" principle in force in Great Britain up till 1927. The Act does not give immunity from attachment of funds, and even restricts the spending of the funds of the trade unions for helping workers generally in their struggle. It is obvious by this that the Government has power to suppress any trade union action on the part of the workers that is likely to be effective.

In clause 22 of the Act it says:— "the Act provides that Local Governments may, by a special or general order, declare that the provisions of this section shall not apply to any trade Union specified in the order." This applies to a section that allow certain outsiders (non-workers) to be officers of a trade union, but the above clause is designed to preserve these positions in the trade unions for those persons who only carry on a policy calculated to keep the workers pacified. And certain other limitations were imposed on the registered unions and they were brought under Government influence to a certain extent.

An example of the effect of this Act against the interests of the working class is provided by the case of the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal (evidence of Hasan Ali, P. W. 245). The Girni Kamgar Mahamandal in May 1928 was as a whole in support of the General Strike in the Textile Industry of Bombay. But the Secretary of the G. K. M., D. R. Mayekar had been bought over by the Millowners, and was working against it. In spite of the fact that he was in a hopeless minority, and did not consult the workers or the Managing Committee of the Mahamandal he was allowed by the T. U. Registrar's Office to register the Mahamandal in his name on the strength of his illegal possession of the G.K.M. records (the facts are that he had already been expelled from the Union, and was no longer the Secretary) and the fact that he would conduct propaganda in its name against the strike.

Nevertheless in spite of these obvious defects, the Act was hailed by the reformist trade union leaders as a great boon to the

workers, and they pointed to it as a sign of good will on the part of the capitalist class. The capitalists have never yet enacted legislation in the interests of the working-class without pressure from the workers as a class, this has been shown by history. In the case of this Act there was no pressure, the Act of 1926 was only enacted because it was expedient and in the interests of the employers.

This Trial is an excellent example of the worth of the Act as such. There is no need to deal further with it because it is followed by the more important Trades Dispute Bill of 1929. Reference has been made by me on many occasions in my writings and in my speeches during my activities in India to the Trades Dispute Act of 1929. In my speech I referred to it when I said, in P. 1710:— "Government has brought a bill in the Legislative Assembly at Simla by means of which our people will suffer greatly by means of which the activities of us people will be stopped. (Here by 'activities' I meant Trade Union activities)..... If any bill whatsoever is passed in it we do not accept that Law. What you people (workers) ought to do is to build up a legislature of your own by starting a big Union." In justification of this I wish to say:—

The Trades Disputes Act of 1929.

It was apparently found, after the Trade Union Act of 1926, had been allowed to work for two years, that it did not sufficiently shackle the working-class movement. In those two years the Trade Union movement of India had made rapid strides forward, the Indian working-class had learned the need for solidarity and unity of action, and during these two years the workers had put up some of the most determined resistances to the onslaught of the capitalists on their already bad conditions.

The foundations were being laid for the building of a militant trade union organisation, this coupled with the growing consciousness of the workers and the fact that the workers were turning the struggle from the defensive to the offensive, made the advent of such repressive measures necessary for capitalism. It was because of the fear of the capitalists that a movement was growing that would challenge their very existence that the Trades Disputes Bill was passed in 1929. This Trades Dispute Act makes strikes illegal unless the employers are given sufficient notice to recruit scabs, forbids sympathetic strikes entirely, preventing even funds being passed from one union to another and aims at placing the unions under Government control.

The Act as such consists of three parts. The first relates to the appointment of Courts of Inquiry and Conciliation Boards in industrial disputes. The second declares illegal withdrawal of

labour from Public Utility Services, i. e. (Railways, Posts, Telegraphs, Telephones, Water, Light supply, Public Conservancy and Royal Marine Service) unless each individual withdrawing obtains permission or gives one month's notice in writing, as shown in Section 15 (1):—

“Any person who, being employed in a public utility service, goes on strike in breach of contract without having given to his employer, within one month before so striking, not less than fourteen day's previous notice in writing of his intention to go on strike or, having given such notice, goes on strike before the expiry thereof, shall be punished with imprisonment which may extend to one month, or with fine which may extend to fifty rupees, or with both.”

By this method the employer is given sufficient time to recruit black-legs who would take the place of the workers who would not submit to the despotic control of the employers.

The third part is the “Danda” part of the Act; Section 16 (a) starts off by declaring illegal strikes which have any object other than or in addition to the furtherance of a trade dispute within the trade or industry in question, or (b) are designed or calculated to coerce the Government either directly or by inflicting hardship upon the community. Section 16 (2) is important and runs as follows:—

“It shall be illegal to commence or continue, or to apply any sums in direct furtherance or support of any such illegal strike or lock-out.”

Thus preventing one section of workers from coming to the assistance of another section.

Section 17 of the Act provides that anybody who declares, instigates, incites others to take part in, or act in furtherance of such a strike shall be liable to 3 months imprisonment and Rs. 400/- fine. Section 18 protects those persons who refuse to take part in such strikes from any action against them on the part of their union. Not only does it do this to protect their scabs, but the Act also places them in a position that even the rules of the union do not apply to them and further they can claim compensation from the Union, Section 18 (2) says:—

“.....in lieu of ordering a person who has been expelled from membership of a trade union or society to be restored to membership, order that he be paid out of the funds of the trade union or society such sum by way of Compensation or damages as the Court thinks fit.”

It is really unnecessary to comment upon the Bill. In short it is a direct and ferocious attack upon the freedom of the workers to organise and fight either for improvements within the present system, or for a change in the system. Any strike of any size can be brought under Sections (2) or (3) and directly smashed by the power of the State. Any strike which is so limited in extent that it can not exactly be brought under one of these sections, can be sabotaged and defeated "peacefully" by the inquiry or conciliatory machinery of part I.

This measure when first put forward in 1928 as a Bill called forth instantly a tremendous protest from the whole labour movement. Mr. N. M. Joshi published a statement in which he criticised it strongly (D 116 (11)). (A cutting from the A. B. P. of 17-8-28). In the course of this statement he says:—

"It introduces modifications of the Draft Bill of 1924 which are disadvantageous to workers. This shows an unfavourable change in the attitude of the Government of India towards labour....."

The Second part of the Bill which deals with strikes and lock-outs in public utility services is the most controversial as well as objectionable.

.....I want to emphasise that the Government of India is attempting to pass a legislation which is more drastic than the old British Legislation of 1875.....

The second and third parts of the Bill are certain to be vehemently opposed by workers. It is true that the Bill also makes lock-outs illegal but is mere eyewash.

"Even eminent judges in England have admitted that although the law regarding the relation between master and servants provides for penalties for master as well as servant, the law has hardly been used against masters. Moreover in a state of society where capitalists dominate the Government the law is bound to be used against workers.....

I shall have to oppose the whole Bill.....reactionary provisions....."

So this is the opinion of Mr. N. M. Joshi the Government nominee to the Legislative Assembly and a reformist labour leader.

The Bengal Trade Union Federation held a special meeting on 2-9-1928. (P. 544 (2)) and condemned the Bill, and proposed to organise a campaign of opposition to it.

The Jharia Session of the A. I. T. U. C. Dec. 1928 passed a strongly worded resolution condemning the Bill in toto and deciding for a general strike against it. (Report of Jharia T. U. C. Appendix C. P. 45) (D. 305). This resolution was put forward by the left-wing but although the right wing had a majority in the Congress and could have thrown out or modified this resolution, they dared not do so. And the President of the Congress, Mr. M. Daud, an individual who is far from being a militant, had to express himself in the following words about the Bill (D. 305 p. 30):—

“By these legal provisions the Government practically intends to stifle all shorts of labour movement that are felt necessary to safeguard its interest. If this reactionary law finds a place in the Statutes Book, the Trade Union Movement instead of developing, would be gradually eradicated to the best bargain of capital. We caution Government in time that they should weigh the equity and injustice of the measure and should be well advised by impartial and unbiased opinions before they would rush into such a nefarious and reactionary law.....”.

The whole labour movement (except the most shameless agents such as Mr. K. C. Roy Choudhry) was vehemently opposed to this Bill, and even the right wing representatives at the Congress had to support the general wish.

Such is the attitude of the Government of India shown in its Legislature. How is it in practice, in its day to day dealings with the movement, in the localities ?

Mr. N. M. Joshi, M. L. A. in his pamphlet “The Trade Union Movement in India” (D 145 (36)) published before the T. D. Bill, writes (p. 21-3) that “the attitude of the Governmentis difficult to define.” And it appears to be one of “deep suspicion” of the labour movement. He cites the espionage upon all leading labour workers by the C. I. D. We can cite more convincing evidence. The Jharia T. U. C. (Report App. C. p. 45) (D 305) passed a resolution protesting strongly against the use of fire-arms by the police against strikers. The Government publication “Industrial Disputes in India” 1921-28, records 5 recent cases of firing (pp. 10-12) (in the Kharagpur strike 1927; Bombay Textile Strike 1928; E. I. Rly. (Lillooah) strike 1928; S. I. Rly. Strike 1928; Fort Gloster Jute Mill (Bauria) strike 1928-29; But actually it is common knowledge that hardly any strike of importance has taken place in recent years in India in which either actual firing or other violence by the police has not been committed.

Public Safety Bill (later, Ordinance).

I have in many of my speeches and writings made references against this repressive measure, I have also supported organisations, etc., protesting against the same.

The Magistrate in his C. O. said that:— "He was garlanded on more than one occasion when his departure for England under the P. S. Bill was confidently expected, and it was said in praise of him that he had taught the labourers Communism." (p. 202). In further justification of P. 1705, how can we possibly respect such legislation as this ?

The position is that an attempt was made in 1929 to add still further repressive measures to those already in the possession of the capitalists. This was by the introduction in the Legislative Assembly of the Public Safety Bill. The Bill was designed to give the Government power to deport "agitators" who are British subjects and to confiscate moneys donated to Indian trade unions from working-class organisations in other countries. Scared by the mass strike movement and political activity of the Indian working-class that took place during 1928, the capitalists hoisted the bogey of the "Communist Menace" and under this attempted to rush through the above measure.

The Bill in reality was meant to isolate the Indian working-class movement from the International revolutionary movement. It was vigorously opposed in the Legislative Assembly and thrown out by the casting vote of the President. Not satisfied with this the representatives of capitalism again introduced it in the Legislative Assembly in 1929. Many strange and violent speeches were made by the captains of Indian industry (Sassoon and others) in the Assembly in support of the Bill, and mysterious documents were unearthed from the archives of the many police departments. It was quite clear by the speeches etc., that the employers in India had been driven into a panic, they spoke of organisations and individuals who were "creating conditions for the overthrow of capitalism and Imperialism, of the creation of "secret and illegal organisations", etc. No small amount of this panic felt by the capitalists has been transferred to this case.

Nevertheless the whole of the trade union movement of India condemned the Bill in no uncertain terms, meetings were held and propaganda carried on against the Bill by the Unions (D 305). And a resolution was passed by the Jharia T. U. C. (D 305 p. 47) protesting against the Bill. As I have said, the Bill was again introduced a second time in 1929, but the President of the Legislative Assembly refused to allow a debate on it, on the grounds that such a debate would adversely affect this Trial.

However the Government were not going to be so easily balked a second time, they were determined to make this Law at all costs. It was therefore certified by the Viceroy as an Ordinance. The Public Safety Ordinance was an expression of the state of panic that the Government had been driven to and was a further attempt to cut off the Indian working-class movement from the rest of the world.

Goonda Act (Bombay) 1929.

Not satisfied with the repressive and anti-labour laws that already existed, the bourgeoisie set about arming themselves with more. Calcutta already had its Act which was known as the "Goonda Act". Under this Act the Commissioner of Police, Calcutta could direct any person whom he considers *about* to commit an act involving a breach of the peace, intimidation or an offence against any persons or property, to remove himself from Calcutta for a period of 1 year or failing this he would be liable to imprisonment for 1 year.

Such an Act as this was not in force in Bombay and in August 1929 a Bill called the Bombay Prevention of Intimidation Act, 1929, was introduced in the Bombay Legislative Council, and it was closely modelled on the "Goonda Act" of Bengal. By the speeches made in the Bombay Legislative Council in support of this Bill it was quite clear why it was being introduced, it was directed entirely against the working class movement. The Mill-owner's representatives, both Indian and British were as one in support of it. Lalji Naranji said that they ".....danger in playing into the hands of those who were responsible..... disastrous to business people.....".

Mr. Addyman said; "He would tell the house that fully 90 per cent of the mill-workers did not desire a strike, but were prevented from working due to the threats which he had quoted. That was the kind of intimidation which had succeeded in arresting almost the entire industrial energy of Bombay."

We did not know before that Mr. Addyman was in the confidence of the Mill-workers. Mr. N. A. Bechar expressed a truth when he said that:—"The representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and the Indian Merchants' Chamber supported the Bill because they were directly or indirectly interested in the mill industry." "And again we hear the voice of capital through Mr. A Greville Bullocks (Bombay Trades Association) he said that he had not met a single business man in Bombay who did not consider that the measure was not only advisable but necessary."

Mr. Hotson in moving the Bill was quite frank in so far as

he advocated the measure for reasons connected with the strike movement. But the attitude of the Congress representatives is interesting. Nariman, Bechar and others, I. N. Congress representatives in the Bombay Legislative Council, tried to get the Bill restricted to emergency arising out of a trade dispute or industrial unrest only. The reason for this was that they feared that the Act would be used against their bourgeois National Congress activities and to save this they were prepared to throw the workers movement to the dogs.

Order of Deportation.

The Act in Clause 5 gives power to the Commissioner of Police or a District Magistrate to deal with any person when he is satisfied that that person is about to commit or is suspected of abetting the commission of a non-cognisable offence against any person or property or the offence or criminal intimidation or any other offence involving a breach of the peace. If any person is considered to be dangerous, the Commissioner of Police or the District Magistrate may direct him to remove himself from the Presidency area within a given time and not to return for a period of six months. Should any person on whom such an order had been served fail to remove himself then Section 9 of the Bill provides that he may be arrested without warrant and may be removed in Police custody, or convicted to six months imprisonment. It will be seen by this that anybody can be brought under the provisions of this Act and removed at the will of the Commissioner of Police.

Now as the speeches and the reason for the introduction of the Bill clearly show, the Bill was brought forward to be used solely against the working class movement. It was placing another weapon in the hands of the capitalists to suppress the Indian trade union movement, and to remove from the midst of the workers those leaders who were making themselves effective and giving the correct lead to the workers. The report of the select Committee that was appointed to consider this Bill was signed by three of the reformist trade union leaders Messrs. S. K. Bole, Syed Munawar and S. C. Joshi, the latter writing a minute of dissent. So we find that the Bill found support from the pseudo-Labour-leaders; from the Indian National Congress— if it is directed only against the labour movement— and from the employers, both Indian and British stand as one, thus the workers have a united front against them.

Along-side this special legislation "for" and against labour, there is always the Indian Penal Code for the capitalist to fall back on and I have shown that in practically all the strikes that have

taken place in India. Section 144 C. P. C. has been applied, in this way the workers are gagged.

I think I have made it abundantly clear that the State exists because of the irreconcilability of classes antagonistic to one another, it exists to keep one class in oppression and to deprive it of its means of struggle. Even Kautsky, and of course the 2nd International, in theory do not deny that the State is the organ of class domination or that the class antagonisms are irreconcilable. I do not know whether our Indian 2nd Internationalists agree with this or not. Nevertheless it is a fact, as is quite clear by what I have said, that the State is the product of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms and it is a power created by the governing class, and as I have shown it is an instrument of exploitation of the oppressed class.

Thus all the forces of the State are arrayed against the working-class movement, the police, the military, the law and the legislatures. The whole of the State machinery is directed to stifling the growth of any militant trade union movement. And how in any dispute between employer and worker the machinery of the State is always there to use against the worker. I think I have shown conclusively that all this machinery is there for one reason only, that is to maintain this system of exploitation, the workers must not be under any delusion that this complicated machinery of Law and Legislation is there for their benefit or that it is possible through that machinery to bring about better conditions. This myth, if it still remains in the minds of the workers must be exploded. The workers must learn to rely on their own resources, through their own organisations alone can they achieve their emancipation.

The Indian Trade Union Movement

I now want to deal with the history of ^{the} Indian Trade Union Movement. The case generally depends to a large extent upon our activities in connection with the trade union movement; and the case against me particularly is concerned very much with these activities. It is necessary for me to show the state the trade union movement was in when we came in contact with it, and that our line of activity was dictated by the need of the workers for better and more militant leadership than they had had for the previous 7 or 8 years.

As the following history will show, the Trade Union Movement in India had been under reformist leadership from the beginning. It had in its early years been supported with great enthusiasm and militancy by the workers. But the result had been

very little. There was no appreciable improvement in the conditions of the workers generally. In consequence a great decline had set in. The energy and enthusiasm of the early years had been largely wasted. Very little organisation existed, and the workers had learned little from their experiences.

The responsibility for this situation we put down mainly to the reformist leaders. We felt that if the workers position was to be improved and a sound trade union movement built up, it was essential to attack and overthrow the leadership of the reformists in the Trade Unions. Therefore if the Court is to fully understand and as a justification for our activities in the Trade Union Movement I should like to briefly cover the early history of the movement.

The Trade Union Movement of India did not take definite shape until the year 1918. Nevertheless, even before this date there were in existence certain Trade Unions in Bombay, Calcutta and Madras. The Warkers in the Ahmedabad cotton mills formed a union in 1917 and the Bombay Postal Union was formed in 1907 and so on. However from the year 1918 onwards there was a steady growth in the number of trade unions. One will know that peculiar circumstances operated at that time which perhaps favoured the growth of the trade union movement. There had for some time past been an unprecedented boom in industry and trade, new factories were springing up everywhere, the cause of this was the war. Industry in Great Britain and the other belligerent countries had been turned to production of war material, a further result of the war was the fact that prices of all commodities including the necessities of life, soared high. It was found necessary that commodities previously produced in Great Britain and imported into India should now be produced in India itself.

This sudden development in industry created a demand for labour greater than had ever been known before. The vast majority of the workers that have been absorbed in industry have been drawn from the agricultural and cultivator class. Because of the illiteracy and backwardness of the workers, there was provided an opportunity for certain interested individuals, who were not slow to seize the opportunity, to step in and champion the cause of Labour. These persons were attracted to the cause of the workers on many grounds, philanthropic, humanitarian, because the movement offered good grounds for exploitation, and so on. The Servants of India Society interested itself in the beginning with workers' conditions, sanitation, etc. and made representations to the Government, and was in turn consulted by the Government on the question of Labour Legislation. It was from such material as this the trade union movement of India got its first impressions of "Trade Unionism".

I have explained the position that accounted to some extent for the sudden development of industry in India, that period it will be understood was abnormal, the cost of living went up by leaps and bounds, as usual under capitalism the wages did not in any way keep pace proportionally with the rising cost of living, real wages of the workers fell rapidly. The result was general discontent among the workers, a period of unrest followed and many strikes took place, some of which were successful. This may be put down to the fact that enormous profits were being made out of the boom by the capitalists. However, the real wages of the workers that were successful, never kept pace with the soaring prices. Nevertheless, the successes gained by the workers taught them as nothing else could the need for organisation. This is the period during which active trade unionism can be considered to have begun. The two years following 1918 were marked by the epidemic of strikes and the climax was reached in 1920.

From this strike activity on the part of the workers many unions that exist to-day were started, although most of the unions were unstable and as a matter of fact only brought into being to conduct the particular strike and were really nothing more than strike committees.

The All-India Trade Union Congress.

So the need for organisation was felt by the workers and the result was the spontaneous development of trade unions, such as they were. Those who had been interesting themselves in the movement made efforts to co-ordinate those unions that had already come into existence. The results of these were the holding of the First Session of the All-India Trade Union Congress in Bombay on October 31st, 1920. This gave an impetus to the movement and several new unions came into being, led by certain interested individuals who could see personal profit and an easy stepping stone to the Councils, Royal Commissions, etc.

At this time an added interest was given to the trade union movement for those seeking to advance their positions at the expense of the movement, for at about this time, the International Labour Conference held its first Session at Washington, and its Constitution gave the rights to workers' organisations to have their delegates nominated by Government in "agreement with their recommendations". Thus Mr. N. M. Joshi says in his pamphlet "The Trade Union Movement in India" (p.10):—"This brought out clearly the necessity of not only starting labour organisations, but also of bringing about some sort of co-ordination amongst them in order that they should be able to make their recommendations with one voice." Hence the motive of Mr. N. M. Joshi and others in starting the All-India Trade Union Congress. We have since

seen year by year the annual scramble to be nominated to the International Labour Conference at Geneva. From the First Congress Session up to the Nagpur Session in 1929 the I. L. O. has been the rallying ground for the reactionary reformist trade union leaders to gather on. This reformist and bourgeois leadership has characterised the Indian trade union movement upto 1929.

However the Indian Trade Union Congress was started on the crest of the wave of the industrial boom. At the first Session 60 Unions were affiliated and about 42 others expressed their intention of supporting.

Early struggle of the Trade Union Movement.

The Trade Union movement spread to the various industries and occupations throughout India. But Trade Unions as known in western countries did not come into existence even after the starting of the T. U. C., as a matter of fact little real organisation as such did exist at all. The obstacles in the way of the development of permanent organisations were many. No definite system for collecting subscriptions was introduced and the fact that industrial Labour in the early stages was to a great extent migratory caused much trouble. This position has to some extent changed during the last decade, and we now have a permanent industrialised proletariat in the large industrial centres. Still, a big percentage of the workers regularly return to their villages, and in this way contact is broken with the Union. Although in this respect the migratory nature of the workers has its good side in so far as the class lessons learned by them in their struggles in the industrial centres are conveyed to the villages. Ignorance and illiteracy, the fact that the workers could not even read was a serious obstacle. The large army of floating unemployed and the vigorous opposition put up by the employers to any sign of organisation among the workers, because of these reasons in the early stages there was little permanent organisation. In spite of these facts and this draw back, we saw that the workers were no longer inclined to tolerate the terrible conditions of labour that had been imposed upon them for so long, and there were many spontaneous strikes. During these strikes the workers showed an understanding of the need for concerted action, but the standard of consciousness was of course low.

The years from 1920 onwards are very important to us because they form part of a whole, the struggle between capital and labour which is continuous, and not something brought about by a few agitators. The boom which I have spoken about was followed by a steady trade depression, with all its attendant attacks upon the conditions of the workers. It was during this period that

the leadership of the trade union movement was put to the test, and the weakness of organisation and bankruptcy of leadership was exposed. The early strikes were directed towards securing a shorter working day, the hours of labour then imposed by the employers were measured by how long it took the worker to become exhausted, there was no limitation. It was not until the year 1922 that the 60 hour week was embodied in the Factories Act.

But this Legislation was not the outcome of any act of kindness towards the workers like the legislation of the years 1881, 1891, and 1911 which were imposed to regulate the conditions of labour, they were brought about rather from pressure from the Lancashire Textile Capitalists and others interested parties in great Britain, to obstruct if possible what they would term "unfair competition."

1921 Congress take an interest in the Trade Unions.

An interesting demonstration of class-consciousness and class-solidarity was given by the workers of the Buckingham and Carnatic Mills of Madras. A remarkable degree of power of an imperfectly organised union was also shown, in so far as the workers were able to sustain such a long stoppage of the work. The workers of the Buckingham Mill were locked out by the employers on the 21st October 1920 on a question of "discipline." When the workers of the Carnatic Mill saw their fellow workers in conflict with the employers they decided to join them, and the struggle lasted until January 27th, 1921. The terms of settlement of this strike led to another strike, this time in the Carnatic Mill on the 20th May. On this occasion the workers of the Buckingham Mill threw in their lot and joined the strike. The strike resulted in a trial of strength between the workers and the employers, lasting until the 21st. October 1921 and ending in failure.

The employers had attempted to starve the workers into submission. Further to break the strike the authorities applied the Law and an interim injunction was issued against the leaders of the Madras Labour Union from the High Court, restraining the union leaders from interfering with the business of the millowners. A further attempt to break the workers' solidarity, was the instigation of communal dispute, which resulted in a sustained outbreak of violence. Police protection was afforded to black-legs, but in spite of all this the strike lasted for nearly 10 months.

During the year 1921 the Congress leaders and lawyers who had given up their practices began to take an interest in the labour movement, with the object of using the workers to further their political aims. The fact that many employers of labour were British was used to intensify the atmosphere in industrial strife.

This was looked upon as a useful field by the exponents of non-co-operation, and the Congress leaders for a short while used the workers to this end.

The late C. R. Das who took part in the Assam-Bengal Railway strike of 1921 (Industrial Disputes in India p. 5.) says—

“Not really a case of labour strike but of actual temporary non-co-operation.”

Political funds etc. were used during this strike, but the strike ended in complete failure.

However this was only a temporary phase and the organisation of rank and file workers on a trade union basis has never seriously been taken up by the Indian National Congress. Neither has mass action or strikes of workers been encouraged by the Congress, either for the workers or to further the aims of the Congress. The reason for this is that the Congress is a bourgeois organisation, the interests of which are those of the bourgeoisie alone. Wherever the Congress leaders have interested themselves in trade union organisation, we find that it has always been to prevent any action on the part of the workers (the cult of non-violence), and to bring the workers under the direct control of the employers. A good instance of where the Congress influence has been steady is in the Textile Labour Association of Ahmedabad, which is under the benevolent control of such leaders as M.K. Gandhi and Vallabhi Patel. It has been the object of these leaders of this union to keep the textile workers of Ahmedabad isolated from the other textile workers of India. In pursuance of this their policy has been the refusal to join the T. U. C. thus weakening the position of the textile workers as a whole and playing into the hands of the millowners.

A serious outbreak of strikes took place during 1921 and the Government report describes these strikes as follows:—

“The short-lived, amicable and successful strikes of 1920 had become less frequent, more bitter in their character and less effective in their results”.

Thus describing the growing development of the class-struggle very clearly, and the failure of the workers to be able to conduct their struggle successfully. The largest strike was that carried on by the mine workers and this ended in defeat for the workers. The T. U. C. was held this year at Jharia in the mining district.

97% of the strikes that ended in 1922 were completely unsuccessful for the workers. In this loose way the trade union

movement went along a prey to all sorts of adventures and opportunists.

Activities during 1923-26, A period of reaction.

This year began a period of reaction, the number of strikes that took place during 1923 showed a considerable decrease, although it had become apparent that the strike weapon was being used more regularly by the workers to attempt to ~~to~~ their conditions or at least to try and prevent them from being worsened. From the strike committees and small loose unions the work was begun to establish permanent trade unions. The work of building these unions was slow and difficult. As I have pointed out the workers did not take the initiative, they allowed lawyer politicians and social workers to take the lead. These persons imposed upon the unions their ideas, the unions were kept small for the benefit of those who had started them, their aims were restricted and their activities localised. It was in this way that the seeds of reformism were sown and the rise and influence of Joshi and others took place. Almost every year a big strike took place in one or other of the textile centres, but I shall deal with the textile industry generally when I deal with the Bombay textile workers' strike of 1928.

The trade depression continued during 1924, further attacks were made upon the worker's conditions and the strikes that took place assumed a much wider and more determined character than ever before. This year the Fourth Session of the T. U. C. was held at Calcutta under the Presidentship of the late C. R. Das. The resolutions that were passed at this session were definitely of a reformist character and no lead was given to the workers to rally them against the worsening of their conditions. At the same time a substantial increase was shown in the number of trade unions throughout India.

The idea of Provincial Conferences of trade unions was going and the Provincial Conference of Bombay Trade Unions was held in January 1926. The majority of the resolutions put forward at this conference were calling for legislation, including that for the establishment of machinery for conciliation and arbitration. This conference was dominated by reformist trade union leaders and their attitude in the face of the determined attacks of capitalism was sheer treachery. (D 395).

The tempo of the industrial struggle showed a slackening during 1926, there was no very important strike during the year.

The sixth Session of the A. I. T. U. C. was held in Madras under the Presidentship of V. V. Giri and differed very little from its predecessors. (D. 367).

This year is important for the passing of the Trade Union Act. I have dealt with it under a separate head but in passing I should like to emphasise this fact that the Act was not introduced for the use and protection of the workers. The capitalists at this stage feared, that with the growing trade depression, the worsened conditions of the workers and the need for the introduction of rationalisation in industry, the passive philanthropic reformist trade union leaders would not be able to control the growing revolt of the workers. The aim of this Act was therefore to ensure some measure of control.

THE DELHI SESSION OF THE A. I. T. U. C. 1927. A NEW CRISIS THE STRUGGLE REVIVED.

The Delhi Session of the All-India Trade Union Congress was held under the Presidentship of Rai Saheb Chandrika Prasad. This was its Seventh Session and was held on March 12th and 13th. At this Congress the General Secretary, Mr. N. M. Joshi is pleased to report that the T. U. C. has had no occasion to order any strike. (D 399). Such a report as this can be applied to the whole history of the T. U. C. One would imagine that the conditions of the workers were very satisfactory, and that they were ignorant of the class-struggle that was going on around them. Nevertheless, the T. U. C. carried out the job that it apparently was brought into being for, that is it elected its representatives to the International Labour Conference. The number of trade unions affiliated to the T. U. C. at this session was 57, an increase of three on the last year. Shapurji Saklatwala attended this session of the Trade Union Congress.

The year 1927 saw the end of the period of reaction that had characterised the trade union movement between the years 1923-26. The same type of struggle that we had witnessed during the years 1918-20 began to reappear. This was very marked on the railways where the railway employers had started a campaign of retrenchment, and there were widespread strikes among the railway workers during this year. There were also many strikes among the textile workers, who were also being attacked, it was during this year that the initial scenes of the General Strike of textile workers of Bombay 1928 took place. All these struggles showed a much higher level of class-consciousness. In Bombay the First of May was celebrated for the first time as labour day.

The Trade Unions were taking on a more permanent shape, and many new unions came into existence. Another sign that the trade union movement was developing in a healthy way, was the attempts that were made to amalgamate the parallel unions that had been brought into existence, a general attempt to co-ordinate the strength of the workers.

(Conclusion of portion inserted on 11/7.)

CAWNPORE SESSION A. I. T. U. C.

P. W. 114 The first session of the A. I. T. U. C. that I attended was the Cawnpore Session in 1927. As I have already pointed out being a Trade Unionist I was very keen to get into direct contact with the Indian Trade Union Movement and to see how the Indian Trade Union Congress functioned. Therefore I wrote to the late Ganesh Shankar Vidyarthi who was the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Cawnpore Session of the T. U. C. and asked him for permission to attend this session of the T. U. C. This I did shortly after I arrived in India. I received a reply from him with the permission to attend. It was at this Session of the T. U. C. that I came in contact with many of the accused in the dock and made friends with many of them and also with many others of the Trade Union leaders in India for the first time. This session of the T. U. C. was attended also by Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth as fraternal delegates from the British T. U. C. There was also another fraternal delegate at this session that was Mr. Mardy Jones who was attending on behalf of Worker's Welfare League. The President of this session was the exceedingly bourgeois labour leader D. Chaman Lal. In his Presidential Address he gave his opinion of the Labour Government, which is true to-day as it was then. In P. 1381 he says; "I must warn the British Labour Party that in the eyes of intelligent Indians to-day that Party stands thoroughly discredited.....the Labour Party as a whole betrayed confidence we had placed in it. We have more right than the Russians to criticise them. They are part and parcel of the Government which governs us. And I say that no Indian can forget the indignity of the Bengal Ordinance. I wonder how Mr. Ramsay MacDonald would relish the hospitality of an Indian prison for an indefinite period without trial or charge with almost certainty that when (if ever he does) he comes out of prison he will be a physical and mental wreck for the rest of his days. And it is Mr. MacDonald and his Government who are responsible for resorting to Star Chamber methods and have acted worse than the Bourbons in giving the Indian Government a carte blanche for the issue of lettres de cachet at his sweet will against its opponents."

Within twelve months Chaman Lal was able to forget this and joined the Whitley Commission, a Commission, issued by the Government that acts in the way described above by Chaman Lal. His memory is very short.

The All-Russian Trade Union Council had named a delegate to attend this congress, but unlike Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth the British Government thought it would be better to refuse to allow this delegate to travel in India and they even stopped the

telegraphic message sent by the Russian T. U. C. British Imperialism knows the harmless British Trade Union leaders and only they may be allowed to enter India.

4.4.7.31

Nevertheless, the feeling of the Congress was shown by the passing of the following resolutions:—

“ This Congress congratulates the U. S. S. R. on having attained the 10th anniversary of the first Workers' Republic in spite of the Imperialist intervention. ” (P. 1381. Page 110.)

Mr. Chaman Lal again broke out on the resolution put forward to define the attitude of the Congress to the Simon Commission as follows; “ From this platform I call upon the British Labour Party to withdraw the two representatives from the Commission. As self-respecting men they should tender their resignation voluntarily. India does not want them, and their own principles should prevent them from acting as the common hangmen of a nation in distress. ” (P. 1381. Page 108.)

However this did not prevent Mr. Chaman Lal from co-operating with these hangmen of the Indian workers on the Whitley Commission, and associating with the very individuals that he was condemning just twelve months before.

An attempt has been made by the Prosecution to show that we are only in the Trade Union Movement to capture it and to use it for our own ends. Then it has been suggested for instance that the resolution for affiliation to the League against Imperialism at Jharia was only carried because of the arrest of J. W. Johnstone, this is not correct as the resolutions of the previous Congresses will show. I want to show that the gradual growth of the consciousness of the movement goes on in spite of the attempts of the reformists to hold it back, it goes forward to take its place as a part of the revolutionary movement.

The attitude of the Cawnpore Congress was defined towards the Simon Commission. Already in many parts of the country Trade Unions had defined their position and were prepared to take a prominent part in the struggle against the Simon Commission, which was then the latest expression of British Imperialism. Political consciousness in the working class movement was beginning to take a definite shape at this time in spite of the fact that the bourgeois nationalist leaders were publicly advising Trade Unions to keep out of politics and stick strictly to economic questions such as wages, hours etc. The reason for this was they feared the mass revolt of the workers even at this moment and took up a definitely counter revolutionary attitude.

However the Trade Union Congress came out against this and declared clearly their position. The resolution carried by the Congress, after declaring for the boycott of the Commission, called upon the traitorous British Labour Party to withdraw its members from it. And this resolution called for the election of a sub-committee to draw up a project for establishing a working-class Government in India. The boycott of the Commission was carried out and received splendid support from the working class throughout India.

Other resolutions showing that the Congress was on the correct lines, one was a resolution on China in which lessons were drawn from the experiences of China, namely that the national bourgeoisie will surely betray the struggle for national independence, and that they will surrender to the Imperialists and will slaughter and suppress the workers and peasants who will attempt their emancipation. They must aim at the leadership of the workers in the national struggle for freedom, and be prepared for the inevitable betrayal by the Indian bourgeoisie. Only the workers and peasants, in India as in China, will finally prove steadfast and loyal in the struggle for freedom from Imperialism.

Another resolution which supports what I have said in reference to the League against Imperialism, is the resolution on Imperialism. There were many other resolutions put forward detailing the grievances of the workers generally. A pious resolution was passed about the B. N. Railway Strike at Kharagpur, but no call for action. It was at this Congress that the Council of action was elected and a large plan of organisation was set out but apparently there was no intention on the part of those who had sponsored this Council of Action to carry it out.

The General Secretary's report shows a general attack upon the conditions of Labour and he says in (P1381) "during the period under report no strike was authorised by the Executive Council, but owing to very acute industrial conditions obtaining in different trades and in different parts of India there occurred some strikes and lock-outs in which officials of the Congress had to interest themselves." It also reports that "during October 1927,—Rs. ~~23025~~ were received from the C. C. of the Trade Unions of the U.S. S. R. which assisted the Kharagpur strikers, and also a sum of Rs667/13/3 received from International Transport Workers' Federation, Amsterdam".

But in the report I could not see that any consideration had been paid to the immediate cause of the successive wave of strikes that had taken place throughout India during 1927 and leading up to the biggest year of struggle between Capital and Labour in India during 1928. The whole of these strikes under review had been purely defensive, the resolution and persistence with which the

workers tried to repulse these attacks, and the sacrifice and the class-solidarity that the workers showed was outstanding. The position is that on no occasion did the T. U. C., E. C. attempt to direct this class-solidarity into channels for an offensive movement, and therefore the workers were being forced to retreat.

P 569 is an article by me 'T. U. C. must call for action.' This article deals with the general drive against the conditions of the workers and the part that the T. U. C. played. It was an attempt on my part to show that the T. U. C. and the E. C. were not really functioning then as they should in view of the resolutions passed at Cawnpore and in view of the fact that the year 1928 had opened up a period of most determined attacks of the capitalists as a class upon the workers. The trade depression which started about 1920 had steadily continued and had now reached an acute stage in India. This state of affairs affected the most important industries such as Iron and Steel, Cotton, Jute, etc. This condition of trade depression in India was a part of the world trade depression. These conditions of trade had their repercussions on other sections of workers connected with Railways, Transport, Shipping, etc. Another important feature that affected the industrial position in India was Great Britain's industrial policy towards this country, which was directed to stultify the industrial development of India.

As a result of the world trade depression the capitalists throughout the world were racking their brains to find a way out, to save themselves from catastrophe and ruin, to attempt to save themselves from the chaos which is the natural result and product of the operation of the system. This condition of world affairs as I have said was extremely aggravated by the war.

Capitalism in its frantic efforts to re-establish its industry to save its profits etc. resorted to what we now know as rationalisation and retrenchment. This weapon of rationalisation was ruthlessly used against the conditions of the workers in India and became the spear head of the attack of capitalism in spite of the already rotten conditions of the workers. Kharagpur in 1927 was a direct result of this attack, and the attack was being developed in the Textile Industry of Bombay, Jute industry of Bengal and the Iron and Steel industry of Jamshedpur. These were only some of the open examples. This state of affairs was the direct cause of the year 1928 seeing the biggest wave of strikes ever witnessed in the history of the Indian Labour Movement. The wave of revolt of the workers against the attack of capitalism began during 1927 and developed with ever increasing frequency, with the result that the whole of India at some time or other during 1928 had become affected.

Here I just want to make it clear that this industrial Labour unrest, these strikes are a natural result of the operation of capitalism and Imperialism. And the strikes were a justifiable revolt of the workers against the demnable conditions imposed upon them by the very operation of the system of capitalism. The crime, if it can be so called, is not on the part of the workers who revolt, but on the part of those who maintain such a system which imposes such conditions upon the workers.

At the same time as we were witnessing during 1928 the open struggle between Capital and Labour, the capitalists through their machinery were considering two things which they calculated would act as measures to aid them to put down the worker and keep him in his place. Number one was the Trade Disputes Bill, which was a repressive measure and No. 2 was the Royal Commission on Indian Labour, better known as the Whitley Commission. By this meandering show it was expected to take the sting out of the growing revolt. Both these measures have been dealt with elsewhere.

It is claimed for the Prosecution, that we played a very prominent part in this strike wave, in this revolt of the workers during 1928. Well, we did, and we intend to justify the part that we played. The whole history of the Trade Union Movement up till to-day has shown a bankruptcy and lack of leadership and the part that we played was to assist the workers in their struggle and to try and give them a correct lead.

The resolution of the Cawnpore Session of the T. U. C. to boycott the Simon Commission was perhaps most effectively and best carried out by the Bombay Trade Unions. This action introduced a new political colour into the Trade Union Movement. A well organised demonstration was arranged by the Left-wing trade Union leaders and W. & P. Party to boycott the Simon Commission when it landed in Bombay on February 3rd, 1928. The G. I. P. Railway Workshop workers struck work along with the Municipal workers and the mill workers. A demonstration was taken through the streets of Bombay and a huge meeting was held, and the position of the workers under Imperialism was explained. The response of the workers to this demonstration was rather a shock both to the reformist Trade Union leaders and also to the National Congress, who had done their best to throw cold water on the idea. For participating in this demonstration many of the Municipal workers were victimised and discharged. This resulted in a further strike of the Municipal workers with the result that those workers who had been discharged were re-engaged. The general participation of the workers in this demonstration

resulted in their understanding the true nature of Imperialism and what the Simon Commission stood for.

The E. C. of the T. U. C. met only twice during 1928, one occasion was on the 6th of February at Delhi. At this meeting an attempt was made by the reformist leaders (Joshi & Co.) to get the T. U. C. affiliated to the I. F. T. U. and of course Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth assisted to this end. It appears that they did not want to go back to Europe without doing their job, however they failed, a strong stand was taken against this by the Left Wing element and the leaflet P. 545 (6) and (7) was issued stating the exact position of the R. I. L. U. and the I. F. T. U., and showing how the I. F. T. U. as an organisation was the right hand of Imperialism. The decision of the E. C. on this matter was that it be postponed, the T. U. C. asking what steps that were taking to bring about a united workers' International. They did not know that the I. F. T. U. was sabotaging this unity. It was at this Executive Committee meeting that the decision which elected the Workers' Welfare League of India as its representative in England was arbitrarily rescinded. Against this the Left Wing did not take a strong stand, this of course was bad because the Workers' Welfare League had done excellent work in England and was a body that should have been supported. It was at this E. C. meeting that Messrs. Spratt and Kishori Lal Ghosh were elected to inquire into the conditions of Trade Unions in Bengal.

• . That the workers were prepared to take action in defence of their conditions, had been clearly shown, at the same time they were realising the need for organisation. During this year a considerable improvement took place in the state of Trade Union organisations, many new Trade Unions came into being and the older unions showed a substantial increase in their membership and they took a permanent shape. For instance amalgamation took place between the G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union and the G. I. P. Railway Workshop Union, and by the end of the year they showed a membership of over 40,000 according to the Labour Gazette. The Textile workers had developed their organisation under the name of the Girni Kamgar Union (Red Flag.) This Union started during the year with a membership of only 324, the December issue of the Labour Gazette gives its membership as 54,000 and by January 1929 the membership had risen to over 65,000.

According to the Labour Gazette giving the official figures of the Bombay Presidency showed that the number of workers' organised in Trade Unions during the last quarter of 1928 rose from 117,000 to 198,000 i. e. by approximately 69 per cent. This

membership had been attracted to the Left Wing and militant Trade Unions, the new unions that were coming into existence under the control of the Left Wing Trade Union leaders. And this was in face of the fact that the employers had done every-thing to support the reformist Trade Unions, refusing to "recognise" the strikes or approaches unless they were headed by such leaders as Joshi, Chaman Lal and others. The most important fact to take into consideration was that these unions had grown out of the struggle of the workers. This development of the Trade Union movement that I have shown in Bombay is an example of what was taking place all over India.

P. W s. 123 & 254.

Jharia Session A. I. T. U. C.

I attended the Jharia Session of the A. I. T. U. C. as a delegate representing the G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union of Bombay and I participated in all its sittings. This was the 9th Session of the A. I. T. U. C. and it was the second occasion that it had held at this place. This Congress was held under the Presidentship of the reformist Seamen's leader Mr. M. Daud. After the open Session on the first day the fraternal delegate from the League against Imperialism comrade J. W. Johnstone was arrested while leaving the Pandal.

This Congress should have been the most outstanding one in the history of the organised working class of India, the fact is however that it failed to rise to the occasion, although it had met while the workers of India were in the throes of conflict with Capitalism. The main reason for this was the fact that the reformists were there in majority, unfortunately several of the new militant Trade Unions were unable to affiliate to the Congress owing to the rule that a union had to be in existence for one year. Under this rule unions like the Girni Kamgar Union were unable to send delegates. Because of this we did not get a true expression of the feeling of the workers at the Congress.

Nevertheless a very clear division was shown among the delegates at the Congress, the Left-Wing were more conscious of what they wanted as a united whole. It was clear that a definite policy against the reformist leadership was crystalising, concrete resolutions were put forward and amendments to reformist propositions were moved and fought out on the floor of the E. C., although I must admit that our position was not sufficiently effective.

Perhaps the only radical gesture made by the Congress was the resolution to affiliate to the League against Imperialism but this could not very well be opposed in the face of the arrest of

J. W. Johnstone, and was only in keeping with the resolutions against Imperialism that had been passed unanimously by the Congress in previous years.

The most important resolution was that on the question of the Trade Dispute Bill (D 305). It called for a campaign of meetings, demonstrations etc. and for the preparation of a general strike with the demands for the rescinding of the bill, a minimum wage, 8 hours day, etc. Unfortunately this resolution was never acted upon by the T. U. C. It was only supported by reformists as a kind of window dressing.

The attitude of the Government towards the Trade Union Movement at the time was aptly described by the President in his Address:— "The use of Police in the B. N. R. Kharagpur Strike, E. I. R. Lillooah Strike, and Bauria Strike, in the name of law and order, are instances of such stern measures..... The Government looks upon the Labour Movement with suspicion and its organisations and the active workers of every Trade Union are closely watched by a section of the branch of the C. I. D. police, and the waste public money by engaging special police officers reporting the meetings of Trade Unions". The above statement is made abundantly clear by this case. A resolution protesting against the employment of police and military against the workers on strike was carried. This resolution also talked of a general strike. The resolution on Imperialism carried at the Cawnpore Session was re-affirmed by this Congress as also was the resolution on the Simon Commission.

The Congress considered the question of establishment of Trade Councils and a resolution was passed to this effect. The establishment of Trade Councils would assist very much in the development of the Trade Union Movement and in co-ordinating its activities.

The question of the Pan Pacific Trade Union Secretariat, and the reformists' proposition of an Asiatic Labour Conference under the control of the Imperialist agents such as Yunekoleo, Suzuki and Joshi was considered. A keen fight on this question took place but the reformists were in a majority and the question of affiliating to the P. P. T. U. S. was postponed for one year. At the same time the idea of the Asiatic Labour Conference was supported.

On the question of the I. L. O. another fight took place. Delegates like Chaman Lal and Mahbulul Haq etc., supported by the representative of the I. L. O. in India Dr. Pillai were out to maintain connections between this Imperialist body and the Indian Trade Union Movement. The Left Wing leaders made it clear

that the I. L. O. was purely an appendage of Imperialism, the control of the office being in the hands of the particular capitalists and Governments concerned. Darely do the findings of the I. L. O. Conference either get ratified or operated by the employers or the Government, if the findings are in favour of the workers. Further, on more than one occasion the Government has even ignored the nominees of the T. U. C., proving that they only want a certain type of representation there. However, the Left wing delegates were not strong enough to break through the connections between the I. L. O. and the Indian working class movement.

Two of the largest Unions affiliated to the A. I. T. U. C., the G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union and the B. B. C. I. Workmen's Union had tabled resolutions calling for the affiliation of the T. U. C. to the R. I. L. U. At the same time a letter was sent from the I. F. T. U. Amsterdam asking the T. U. C. to affiliate to it. In view of this the Congress ignored the resolutions of the Unions and a resolution shelving the whole thing was passed, leaving the Indian Trade Union Movement cut off from the International Trade Union Movement for another year.

Fraternal greetings were received by this Congress from the Workers' Welfare League, League against Imperialism, National Minority Movement, Great Britain, and P. P. T. U. S. A message from the C. C., Trade Union, U. S. S. R. was sent but this was suppressed by the Government.

The affiliated membership of the T. U. C. at the session was 98,621, but this does not give a true picture of the Trade Union movement because the new Trade Unions were not affiliated. I certainly spoke at the open Session of the T. U. C., a brief report has been put in, (P 2249), calling for a militant policy for the Trade Union Movement. At this session I was elected a member of the E. C.

The number of strikes during 1928 was 203 out of which only 27 were successful. The number of workers involved reached the highest point in the history of the movement, in all 506,851 workers had been involved in strikes during the year. This was perhaps the most important year up to date in the struggle between Capital and Labour. Strikes took place in almost all industries; Bombay Textile; Bengal Jute, the E. I. Railway; S. I. Railway; N. G. S. Railway Sholapur, Nagpur, Cawnpore and Madras Textile; Steel Workers at Jamshedpur, Calcutta Dock Workers and Scavengers, Bombay Oil Workers etc; etc:

The total number of disputes that had taken place between the years 1921-28 was 1598, out of which only 254 were successful

for the workers, if compromise is to be taken as a success for the workers, then the figures given may be understood in that way. Taking the figures as they are it shows that only 1/6th of the disputes brought anything to the workers (Industrial Disputes in India).

The Jharia T. U. C. showed that a solid Left-wing group was taking shape, conscious of the needs of the class struggle, but at the moment not prepared to force the issue. The fact of the heavy economic struggle that had gone on during the past year and the mass support that was behind them was not fully realised. The Left-wing only retained their position as the opposition and did not press the struggle to the offensive. The Trade Union machine was left in the hands of the Reformists to sabotage the future struggle. The duty of Left Wing at this Congress should have been to unmask the treachery of the Reformist leaders in the eyes of the workers. In view of the charge the Prosecution has brought against us these mistakes should be clearly understood.

Our criticism of the reformists in the face of their sabotaging tactics is certainly justified and our mistake is that we did not carry it further. The allegation of the Prosecution that we were 'fomenting' strikes is ridiculous on the face of it, as also is their allegation that we prolonged the strikes. Whatever we did was definitely in the interest of the workers. This contention can be supported by the fact of the development of Trade Union organisation during the year 1928 which was phenomenal, and the most important fact about this development is that the workers were flocking, not to the Reformist Trade Unions but on the other hand joining the Left-wing militant Trade Unions. The Left-wing Trade Unions had been built directly out of the struggle of the workers during the previous 18 months. Workers themselves were taking a very keen interest in the building of their Unions and were stepping directly into the leadership. This position naturally caused much concern both to Reformist Trade Union leaders and to the Government and employers.

P 107, 43, 1628, 983, P 2226, and P958:- At the Jharia Session of the T. U. C. I renewed my acquaintance with Mr. Kishori Lal Ghosh, whom I had met at Cawnpore. It was from him and the other Trade Union delegates from Bengal that I got some idea of the struggle of the Bauria Jute workers that had been going on for some months. It was forcibly brought to my notice and to the notice of the other delegates at the T. U. C. that certain Union, the Kankinara Labour Union, under the control of K.C. Roy Chaudhri and Latafat Husain was carrying on strike-breaking activities. This Union was affiliated to the T. U. C. and Latafat Husain was present at the Session of the T. U. C. The Bengal

delegates who had been conducting the Bauria strike, that is Radha Raman Mittra, Chakravarty and others, brought a vigorous protest forward at the E. C. which was even supported by Kishori Lal Ghosh against this strike breaking activity and demanded the expulsion of this Union. The result of this was that a committee was set up to inquire into this allegation.

In a discussion with me Mr. Kishori Lal disclosed the terrible plight of the Jute workers who were on strike, and asked me if it was possible to obtain some financial help from Bombay. The matter was raised at the E. C. and I made a promise that I would get this question raised in the Trade Unions of Bombay when I returned. I also said that I thought that it would be possible to get at least Rs 100 from the G. K. U. To continue this story I might say that I was myself very keen to see the conditions of the Jute workers of Bengal and especially to see the strikers who had been putting up such a splendid fight. In the mean time I went to Calcutta where I attended the A. I. W. P. P. Conference, and in the Conference hall while the Conference was in progress I again saw Kishori Lal Ghosh and he asked me if I could go to Bauria with him that day to address a meeting of the strikers. I told him that I was sorry that I could not go on that day as I was too busy with the Conference, I also informed him at the same time that I promised Bankim Mukerji, Radha Ramán Mittra, Chakravarty and others who were actually conducting the Bauria strike that I was prepared to go to Bauria with them. Nevertheless I fixed up a date with Kishori Lal and at the appointed time I went to Howrah station to meet him but to my disappointment he failed to come.

The next day Kishori Lal Ghosh came to the offices of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, 2/1 European Asylum Lane and apologised for not keeping his appointment on the previous day and then and there made another appointment with me. This time he kept it and Jawahar Lal Nehru, Bankim Mukerjee, Kishori Lal and myself went to Bauria. On that day I visited the workers' quarters and addressed a meeting of the strikers (P 2226). A few days afterwards I returned to Bombay and on my arrival I immediately tried to get the matter of assistance for the Bauria Jute workers raised. I got the matter raised in the B. B. C. I. Railway workmen's Union and the G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union. Some days afterwards I was called by Mr. N. M. Joshi who was very ill at the time; on visiting him he told me that he had received some reports from Bengal about the Jute workers' strike that was going on which he was unable to understand. He said he would like some up-to-date information and as he had heard that I had visited Bauria, he asked me for some information about the strike and the position of the workers. I gave him whatever information

I had and my opinion as to how things stood there. • This of course was gathered by me while there on the spot.

The strike had entered a critical phase in the beginning of November 1928 and there was a complaint from those who were leading the strike about the lack of support from the Bengal Trade Union Federation. Of course the Secretary of the B. T. U. F. was himself much too pre-occupied and it was too much to expect of him to do more than occasionally address a meeting of the strikers. The crisis was however overcome by the timely assistance rendered by the B. J. W. A. who at the request of Mitra and Mukherjee had come to their assistance. It was only because of this support rendered by the B. J. W. A. and by members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party that the workers were able to continue the strike.

I pointed out to Mr. N. M. Joshi that the present position of the strikers was critical and that they needed financial help at once. Also that the Kankinara Labour Union was doing its best to import black-legs into the mills.

At the first available managing committee meeting of the G. K. U., that was on 16-1-29, I explained the position of the Bauria strikers and moved a resolution that Rs 1000 be sanctioned by the Union to assist the Bauria Jute strikers, Rs 500 to be sent at once and the balance would be sent later on if required (P 958). It was on my advice, having visited Bauria and having first hand knowledge of the situation there, that the money was despatched to Muzaffar Ahmad. It was my opinion that if this money was sent to Muzaffar Ahmed it would reach the persons directly conducting the strike, of course there were lawyers' fees to be met because of the Police terrorism and the cases had been started against many of the strikers. Of course the G. K. U. was not affiliated to the T. U. C. at that date and was not bound to send this money through official channels.

The B. J. W. A. was the original Trade Union for the jute workers. This was known to us, but however in spite of this small oppositional unions were being started, even by the B. T. U. F. and of course this was against the resolution of the T. U. C. It can not be suggested in any way that the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bengal was trying to be a rival to the B. T. U. F. to say this is to talk nonsense, one glance at the T. U. resolution of the Workers' and Peasants' Party will explode this theory, as also will any actual knowledge of the work done by its members.

"Disruptionists in the T. U. C."

P 1206 (1): This is an article on the disruptions in the Trade

Union Congress. This article of mine has been fully justified by the events that have taken place. In the year 1929 we witnessed the most determined attack of the employing class to smash the quickly developing militant Trade Union Movement and in this attack they received the assistance of the reformist leaders (Kirk, Shiva Rao, etc.). The year began with the workers of several industries being in open conflict with the employers, the textile and oil workers of Bombay, the Jute workers of Bengal and so on. These attacks were in direct continuation in 1928. The continued attacks upon the workers by the employers, their efforts to introduce rationalisation into Indian industries, their methods to suppress the workers' movement and any resistance to the imposition of worsened conditions had the effect of consolidating and educating the workers. The G. K. U. had become one of the most important factors in the lives of the Bombay textile workers and a factor that the mill-owners had to reckon with. In view of this the mill owners were carrying on a vicious campaign of victimisation of any worker who made himself prominent on behalf of the G. K. U. in particular, or who was elected by the workers as a member of the Mill Committee or even attempted to make members for the Union, found himself to be a marked man and in many cases immediately sacked.

At 11.7.31

The cases of this type of victimisation were extremely numerous and began shortly after the resumption of work after the 1928 strike and continued up to the 1929 strike. The facts about this systematic victimisation which was being pursued by the mill owners were brought continuously to the notice of the Fawcett Committee which was then conducting an enquiry into the Mill-strike of 1928. However, victimisation continued and many strikes resulted, the workers nevertheless were determined to build their Union and were not going to allow themselves to be browbeaten by the employers. This position was brought to a head by the victimisation of prominent G. K. U. workers in the Wadia mills resulting in over six thousand workers in these mills coming out on strike to demand the reinstatement of their victimised comrades. This demand the employers refused to comply with and instead began to recruit new workers (black legs), to the mill.

In the face of this and the fact that this kind of victimisation had been going for some time past in nearly all the mills, the G. K. U. called a general strike on the 28th of April 1929. The response to this call for a general strike was splendid, within two days over one lac of workers had struck work. On the one hand the workers were fighting for the very existence of their organisation and they realised it, on the other hand the employers were out to smash the workers' militant organisation and to introduce their system of rationalisation. As usual for this strike all the forces of the Government were brought to play on the side of

the mill owners, the use of armed police and troops, the prohibition of meetings, the introduction of the curfew order and later the passing of the Intimidation Act (Bombay) to prevent picketing, etc.

At the same time the employers hired a large crowd of hooligans and imported them into the mills as black-legs. With these hooligans the employers started their own 'Trade Union' and called it the Blue Union; the sole object of these hired hooligans under the guise of the Blue Union was to intimidate the pickets of the G. K. U. It was at this stage that the Reformist Union, the B. T. L. U. came out openly to play the role of a black-leg organisation. Not to be out done by the employers with their Blue Union, the B. T. L. U. selected the colour of green because the majority of its members happened to be Mohammedans and they also set pickets to the mills. The job of the pickets of the Green Union (B. T. L. U.) was the same as that of the Blue Union pickets, that was to assist black-legs to go to work for the mill-owners. From the disruptive propaganda that I spoke of in P 1206 (1) they had gone a step further and had become openly the agents of the employers. At the same time the B. P. C. C. carried on a vigorous propaganda against the strike, voting money to this end.

These were the forces ranged against the workers' struggle and against the G. K. U. as such. For the last ten years the workers had been maintaining a continuous struggle in defence of their rotten conditions, during the previous year they had put up a fight lasting for six months and following this there had been strikes in almost every mill. In view of this, and in view of the odds that they had to combat, it is not surprising that the workers should be forced back to work.

The G. K. U. had become the object of attack both of the reformist B. T. L. U., and the mill-owners and the Government. The former realised that they had now no influence among the Textile workers of Bombay, and the latter realised that the G. K. U. was a mass union of workers class-conscious and militant, and that it was carrying on on the basis of the class-struggle.

In July the Government appointed a Court of Inquiry under the T. D. Act, in reality this Court was to serve as a means of further attacking the G. K. U. This was shown by the report of the Court of Inquiry, and the fact that much more consideration was given by the Court to the G. K. U. itself, its organisation, structure, policy and administration etc. than to the actual strike and its causes. This Court of Inquiry in its report exposed the concern of the Government at being confronted with the problem of dealing with the growing revolutionary Trade Union Movement. Reformists were showing that they were unable to control the workers on behalf of the employers. The passing of the Trade Disputes

Act etc. seemed to be of no avail, the workers went forward building their own militant organisation. The examination of the G. K. U. by this Court, went on to some length and with the assistance of Mr. Mody, the Chairman of the Bombay Mill-owners' Association, they tried to show that the G. K. U. was not really a 'genuine' Trade Union the type of Trade Union that the mill-owners desired. The report of the Enquiry Committee laid the whole blame for the general strike and the general state of affairs in the mill area on the G. K. U., at the same time the Court made a separate and confidential report to the Government, a very useful piece of machinery for them.

Several strikes took place during the year, such as the Bombay Oil workers' strike. The workers in the Jute industry struck work in their attempt to resist the policy of the Jute mill-owners which was to increase the working hours from 45 to 60 per week without any corresponding increase in the wages of these workers. At one time there were well over two lacs of workers on strikes, unfortunately there was no proper organisation and no proper lead.

The next most important strike was that of the Tinplate Workers' at Tata's Golmuri, the conditions of these workers are extremely bad. This strike lasted for over 6 months and some three thousand workers were involved. Unlike the Bombay mill-owners, Tata and Co. refused a Board of conciliation or a Court of Enquiry under the Trade Disputes Act, this was because there was no effective Trade Union organisation at Golmuri to deal with and the workers were at the mercy of the employers. After much suffering and privation the workers were forced back to work by starvation. Further strikes took place among the Textile workers of Sholapur, Barst, Bangalore and Madras. In the latter case the employers demanded an unconditional surrender and undertaking from workers that they would not go on strike in the future.

NAGPUR SESSION A. I. T. U. / C.

In my article P 1206 (1) I have said, "But I am not as much concerned with the abuse of the Capitalist Press, or repression by the Government as I am about individuals within the Trade Union Movement advocating, as Kirk is made to advocate in these organs of capitalism, that there should be a split in the Trade Union Movement. Mr. Kirk apparently is not prepared, it seems, by his statement to abide by a majority decision." My estimation as to what these disrupters intended to do has already been clearly shown.

This brings us to one of the most important landmarks in the history of the Trade Union Movement in India, this is the 10th

Session of the A. I. T. U. C. which took place in December 1929 at Nagpur. During the ten years of the existence of the T. U. C. the workers had gradually ^{begun} to assert themselves and the movement was taking proper shape. Within the T.U.C. there had crystallised a definite Left-wing element with its roots well down among the workers. Trade Unions had come into existence which accepted the principles of and were born out of the class-struggle. Further the general situation was characterised by an ever sharpening of the class-struggle as a result of the appalling conditions of the workers and the wide-spread unemployment caused by the intensified exploitation by both British and Indian Capital. Against these conditions the workers had put up a struggle more vigorous and more determined than ever before, and during the recent years the struggle was characterised by several important features. The fact is that the Strike Committees which were elected, were by and from the rank and file of the striking workers, and it was these that gave birth to the militant Trade Unions, inspiring the workers with class-consciousness and urging the workers on to independent working-class action. Apart from the great sacrifices and privations that the workers underwent during these determined struggles, the differentiation in the Labour Movement was accelerated. It was this that was given expression to the Nagpur Session of the T.U.C.

The largest number of organised workers ever represented at any session of the A. I. T. U. C. were represented at this Session. 50 Unions with a membership of 188, 436 were represented, out of which a majority were organised in militant Left Wing Trade Unions, including the G. K. U. and the G. I. P. Railway men's Union. It was at this Congress that a real effort was made to end the policy of vacillation which had been followed in the past, and to give a definite working class lead. The following were some of the resolutions that were put forward at the Congress and supported by a majority; affiliation to the P. P. T. U. S., boycott of the Royal Whitley Commission, affiliation to the League against Imperialism, reappointing the Workers' Welfare League of India as its agent in Great Britain; no nominations to the Government for the I. L. O., condemnation of the R. T. C. etc.

The above programme of resolutions coupled with the knowledge that the Left-wing element had a majority threw the Reformists Joshi and Co. into a panic. In the E. C. meeting the whole of these resolutions were carried, the policy of class-collaboration was ended, the leaders who had been carrying on a policy of compromise and sabotage of the workers' struggle were thrown over board. Thus the history of the Indian Trade Union Movement entered on another phase. As a result of the passing by the E. C. of these resolutions which were binding the Trade Union Movement to a militant and forward policy, the refusal to send delegates to the I. L. O., the

boycott of the Whitley Commission and the R.T.C. meant a refusal to participate in a policy of class-collaboration with capitalism. The affiliation to the P. P. T. U. S., and the E. A. I. etc. meant collaboration with the revolutionary working class throughout the world on an Anti-imperialist front. In view of this policy Messrs. Chaman Lal, N. M. Joshi, V. V. Giri, Shiva Rao, S. C. Joshi and others seceded from the T. U. C. with their Unions. Thus the reformist leaders were guilty of a further crime against the working-class of definitely splitting and wrecking the working class movement in the face of the enemy, and of setting up a rival All-India Trade Union Movement.

The seceders issued a statement to the Congress in which they explained their action. The reasons for seceding, however, were soon shown at a meeting hurriedly held by them at Nagpur to establish their rival organisation which was named the Indian Trade Union Federation. The resolutions passed at this meeting exposed thoroughly their reasons for seceding. Out of 8 resolutions carried at this meeting four dealt with the formation of the Federation, the other four are as follows:—

(1) Resolved that no Union or man with communistic tendencies be affiliated to the Federation, (2) Decision to cooperate with the Royal Commission on Indian Labour, (3) Welcomes the statement of H. E. the Viceroy regarding the R. T. C. and asks for representation thereon. (4) Last but not least, names are recommended for the annual joyride to attend the I. L. O. Conference at Geneva. The founders of the Federation had no time to give for the consideration of the workers' struggle, but of course they are not a part of it. Thus my prediction in P. 1206 had come true, the reformist disruptionists had been successful in splitting the T. U. C.

In the meantime the T. U. C. with its new leadership prepared for action, which however was cramped owing to the Congress influence remaining therein, Jawahar Lal Nehru the outgoing President and Subhas Bose the incoming President. Subhas Bose, whose attitude had been made sufficiently clear even before he had been elected as President, had been propagating the idea of suppression of the differences between the revolutionary and the reformist elements in the Labour Movement, and his liking for Fascism.

The Congress influence remained in the T. U. C. along side the militant section because it had no other alternative owing to the political situation in the country, the boycott of the Whitley Commission and the Round Table Conference had to be supported, and it was only for this reason that they remained with the militant element as was shown by the fact that they would not support the

resolution in respect of affiliation to the P. P. T. U. S. in the open session and this had to be postponed for one year.

Apart from the other resolutions which included those already mentioned and which were passed, a manifesto was issued in answer to the splitting policy of the reformist agents of Capitalism. This manifesto pointed out the forces that were ranged against the workers' struggle, the united efforts of Indian Capitalism and British Imperialism. How the workers had failed in the past to maintain even their miserable standard owing to the lack of united organisation, concentrated action and militant leadership. That the reformists were opposed to this kind of organisation and action which forced them to secede from the Congress, but still they wanted to fool the workers with the Whitley Commission and the Round Table Conference appointed by British Imperialism.

The reformist split the T. U. C. in order to weaken the economic and political struggle of the Indian workers, and in so doing help British Imperialism and the Indian capitalists. The Nagpur Session showed more clearly than ever the necessity of developing the militant working class leadership from the rank and file of the workers themselves who alone will stand true to the interests of the working class. The betrayal of the workers by the reformists who wanted the workers to pin their faith to Geneva, the Legislative Assembly and Royal Commissions, was clear. On the other hand the growing class-consciousness of the workers gave at this Congress a definite lead to the workers to build their own militant class organisations ready to face up this struggle. •

THE G. I. P. RAILWAY WORKERS' STRIKE 1930.

The workers had not to wait long before another test was made, the G. I. P. Railway workers gave the lead in February 1930. On the 14th of February a general strike was declared on the G.I.P. Railway, at first this was understood to be only a one day strike but at the last moment it was decided to continue it, thus confusion was caused from the beginning. I should like to say here that I admit what ever evidence there is connecting me with the G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union, I was the Vice President of this organisation at the time of my arrest. The intention of the Union before our arrest when a Strike Committee had been elected was to prepare for a general strike on the railways. The response to the call of the G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union for this general strike in February was satisfactory, over 40,000 workers came out.

There is no need to go into the causes of the strike, for over three years the workers had made numerous attempts to get their grievances redressed and to obtain better conditions, both through their Union to the Agent of the Railway and through the All-India

Railwaymen's Federation to the Railway Board, but no satisfaction could be got. On several occasions between September 1928 and September 1929 deputations of the A. I. R. F. waited upon the Railway Board. At the meeting of the General Council of the Federation on September 29th, 1929, the reply of Sir George Rainny, the Railway Member of the Government of India, was characterised as "unsatisfactory and highly insulting and provocative". The General Council therefore called upon the Railwaymen of India and the affiliated unions "to prepare themselves for direct action". The General Council further appointed a Propaganda Committee and gave an ultimatum to the Government of India and the Railway Board that failure to grant the demands of the railway workers within three months would compel the Railwaymen "to declare a general strike on all the railways in India".

It will be seen that by deciding on the general strike on the G. I. P. Railway, the Union had given the Government and the Railway Board five months to make up their minds. It also shows that the leaders of the A. I. R. F. were not serious when they gave the ultimatum in September 1929 and had no intention of calling a general strike at all. They wanted to carry on further negotiations and eventually betray the workers.

The reformist splitters at work.

When the strike was declared on the G. I. P. Railway, N. M. Joshi, Bakhale, Jamna-Das Metha, S. C. Joshi, etc. began their strike-breaking tactics through the small G. I. P. Staff Union. The cause of the failure of the previous strikes of railway workers, B. N. R. Kharagpur 1927, E. I. R. Lillooah 1928, and S. I. R. were in the main due to the fact that the reformist leaders had worked to keep these strikes localised, in other words they had prevented other workers coming to the assistance of these workers who were on strike. Had other workers on the railways, all of which had exactly the same grievances, been allowed to join in the struggle, greater pressure could have been brought to bear. However in the case of the G. I. P. Railway strike they went one step further and carried on a vigorous propaganda among the workers to get them to remain loyal to the employers and remain at work. They joined hands with the capitalists in declaring that the strike was not a genuine Trade dispute. (All the above mentioned are members of the Federation). With their hands strengthened by this betrayal by the reformists within the ranks of the workers, the Government and the Railway Board stiffened their attitude and set about the task of defeating the workers once and for all, and breaking the G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union. The Government stepped in and railway workers and their leaders were arrested at almost all the railway centres. With the help of the Staff Union and the recruitment of new blacklegs certain of the services were maintained.

On March 1st Messrs. Joshi, Giri and Chaman Lal approached the Railway Board, over the heads of the strikers, for a settlement. What sort of settlement could these people who were breaking the strike obtain? At the same time confusion was caused by the President of the Union agreeing to certain terms. At the meeting of the strikers held in Bombay on the 7th of April to discuss the situation the Police opened fire and seven strikers were injured, two very seriously. On the 16th of April representatives from all centres were called to Bombay and at that meeting a decision was taken to call off the strike unconditionally, and so ended another valiant fight of the workers, defeated but not subdued by the joint efforts of the reformist Trade Union leaders and the employers. Thousands of workers were victimised, thrown out of employment and out of their homes, and dozens of workers and their leaders were in jail. Jawahar Lal Nehru, the President of that T. U. C. at the time and the President of the Indian National Congress, did nothing to bring assistance to the G. I. P. Railway workers.

The position of the railway workers has gone steadily from bad to worse, apart from the thousands of workers that were victimised last year owing to the betrayal of the G. I. P. Railway workers, thirty five thousand more were retrenched up to May this year. The Railway Board now announces that they intend to retrench another thirty thousand. On top of this the A. I. R. F. could not obtain any redress for the grievances of the railway workers. In desperation the Federation appointed a Committee of Action with among others the following members on it, Giri, Jamna Das Metha, S. C. Joshi, Chaman Lal, all of whom assisted in the betrayal of the G. I. P. railway workers last year and were responsible for the heavy victimisation. Now the position is that we support the call for a general strike today as we did then, but the above persons are not honest in their call for a general strike. They are only using such militant phraseology to maintain their leadership over the workers and to ultimately betray them, as they have done before. In this case we have not had to wait long for the results, the first steps towards this betrayal were taken on the 7th of June when this Committee of Action headed by Jamnadas Metha met the Railway Board and agreed to terms which mean that victimised and retrenched workers on the G. I. P. will remain unemployed, workers already under notice will be retrenched and even a suggestion for a wage reduction is accepted and in fact general retrenchment will go on.

During this year a fight was put up by the Bengal Jute workers and over one lac were on strike. Section 144 was applied and the workers' meetings were prevented. Strikes also occurred on the N. G. S. Railway, the B. N. R. Workshop, the E. I. R. Workshops etc. etc. Disruptive activities were carried on during the

year among the Bombay textile workers by a small group of opportunists who were connected with G. K. U., Khandalkar, Shaikh, Kabadi and others. In the first place their object seemed to be to tie the workers' organisation to the tail of the Indian National Congress and its Civil Disobedience Campaign, from this was developed disruptive and splitting tactics. The unfortunate state of organisation among the Bombay textile workers today must be in the main laid at the door of these disrupters.

As I have said in P. 1206 "they concentrated on making the T. U. movement of India a live body, an active body. Their object was to make the Congress reflect the feelings and wishes of the workers who were today living in slavery". This idea was put into operation at a meeting of the E. C. of the T. U. C held in Calcutta which considered the effect of the worsening conditions of the workers and the wide-spread unemployment, and the facts that the workers had shown that they were prepared to take action by the continuous strikes which had taken place. The E. C. decided to prepare the workers for a general strike. In pursuance of this a programme of demands and organisation etc. was put forward and accepted by the E. C.

This brought the reformists in the movement to their feet, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta who had recently been showing a certain interest in the Trade Union Movement, protested against the call for a general strike by the E. C. and pointed out the illegality of the same under the Trade Disputes Act of 1929. This was of course before he went on to the Committee of Action for the railway workers to prepare them for a general strike. Such legal luminaries are a definite harm to the workers. He said that he wanted to hear more about unity and was anxiously waiting to hear what was to be done about the healing of the split which took place at Nagpur. This concern of the reformists was to recapture the T. U. C.

The need for unity among the workers on a Class basis.

The desire for unity was mutual from all sides in the movement but for different reasons. The reformists wanted unity of the leaders and not of the rank and file, to prevent any decisive action on the part of the workers, on the other hand the militant Left Wing wanted unity of the rank and file to be able to take some decisive action for the betterment of the conditions of the workers. The struggle between the reformists and the Left Wing sections began to take a concrete form at Jharia and I expressed certain opinions in reference to the same in P 1896. (The Communists in the Trade Union Movement). This was the position in 1928 and which led up to the Nagpur split, the position could be foreseen then.

The important influences in the Trade Union Movement today come under three heads:—

(1) The Congress influence dominated by Subhas Bose, Ruikar, Shaikh, Jamnadas Mehta and others who have obtained a position in the movement for some of its members on the basis of the use of Left phrases in the political field (Independence, full-blooded socialism, etc). In reality they represent in the workers' movement the influence of the Indian capitalists and merchants and they play the role of reformists in the movement on behalf of these people.

During the 11th Session of the A.I.T.U.C. recently held in Calcutta this group thoroughly exposed itself. Mr. Subhas Bose in his Presidential Address called upon the T.U.C. to retreat to a position even worse than that which was held before Nagpur, and to allow delegates to be nominated to the Imperialist I.L.O. Geneva—perhaps he was even considering himself as a nominee. In so many words he supported the Gandhi-Irwin Pact and appeared to be angling after a seat on the Round Table Conference. Having supported the betrayal of the national struggle against British Imperialism at Karachi, he was now trying to lead the T.U.C. into the same trap. The veneer of Subhas Bose is too thin, the workers know that the R.T.C. means co-operation with British Imperialism and they have nothing to gain by this. Therefore they are not going to allow the T.U.C. to be so easily betrayed.

He then brings out in his speech the strange theory that the T.U.C. is "public property". This is sheer nonsense. The T.U.C. is an organisation of the workers and belongs to them alone. There was a clear attempt at this session to bring the T.U.C. under the wing of the Indian National Congress but this fortunately has been foiled. It must have been very interesting however to hear Mr. Subhas Bose trying to define his exact stand, and in a speech he makes the following feeble effort "There is on the one hand the Right Wing who stand for a reformist programme, above everything else. On the other side there are our Communist friends who, if I understood them aright, are close adherents and followers of Moscow. Between these two groups, stands another group which stands for socialism—full-blooded socialism—but which desires that India should evolve her own form of socialism as well as her own methods. To this group I humbly claim to belong".

I have never heard such undiluted humbug given out to define one's position, and gull the workers. I say quite definitely that there is no middle course for the workers, Subhas Bose's "full-blooded socialism" is simply a definition of his type of Fascism, nothing more and nothing less. Then he says "India will have to evolve her own methods", there is only one method for the

workers the world over and that is the class struggle. It has become very cheap for persons in India now-a-days to say they are socialists without even caring or wanting to know what socialism really is. Again I say that this talk of socialism from Subhas Bose is undiluted humbug and such terms are only used to mislead the workers. All those persons that followed Subhas Bose in his disruptive tactics at the recent T.U.C. and who have set up a rival "T. U. C." come into the same category. Their "T.U.C." will no doubt, as Mr. Bose said, be able to understand the difficulties of the employers.

(2) In the T. U. Federation we have the influence of the Liberal Federation which dominates, some Congress influence there is in some of the unions affiliated to the Federation but this plays second fiddle of the influence from the Liberal Federation dominated by N. M. Joshi, Bakhale, Shiv Rao etc. This influence represents that of the Indian bourgeoisie, big industrialists etc., who are always prepared to co-operate with British Imperialism, and their role is to obtain a few minor reforms and at the same time the price for this is that they are there to betray the working class struggle. The Trade Unionism of this leadership has been aptly defined in the Indian Industries Association Bulletin No. 21 which is based upon the suppression of any communistic principles and the bringing about of "friendly relations between the employers and the employees", in fact educating the workers to be satisfied with their lot.

I will here just mention another influence not definite enough to be placed in any particular group, floating from one section to another, supporting one day the reformist view point and another day the revolutionary view point, an element that is most uncertain and most dangerous, and which is always apparent where there is the petty bourgeois influence in the working-class movement. The element that I refer to now is that which, when it suits their purpose, will use revolutionary slogans and phrases to attract the workers, and would say that the communists have now got the monopoly of this theory or that slogan. This element that desires to play with militant slogans and use militant phraseology as a means to rally the workers round them is not sincere because they do not believe in the slogans that they use, and they do not believe in the class-struggle. This element is most dangerous because at the crucial moment it is this element that betrays the workers in the most flagrant manner.

(3) The most important influence however in the Trade Union Movement is that of the Communists, whose programme is based on the class-struggle. This is the leadership truly representative of the working-class and is the influence of the workers themselves.

The question of unity after Nagpur, and now after Calcutta, is not merely a matter of obtaining some measure of agreement between the leaders of the above groups because in the first place, the first two groups are both reformists and there is little or no difference between them. On the other hand the latter cannot in any way allow its platform to be watered down for the sake of unity at the top between themselves and a group of reformist leaders. The unity that the communists must work for from now on, is the unity of the rank and file of the workers on the basis of the class-struggle.

The Workers' struggle in the Textile (Cotton) Industry.

A larger number of exhibits have been put in by the prosecution to prove my connection with the 1928 textile workers' strike in Bombay and with the Girni Kamgar Union. The Magistrate in his Committal Order (page 154) has used an article alleged to have been written by me, P 1035, to show that propoganda was being carried on by the W. and P. Party among the mill workers of Bombay, and he quotes thus:— "that the only effective method to stop this attack (viz of the employers) was by the united stand of the workers i. e. a general strike, although some prominent T. U. leaders were opposing this (P 1035), and in their speeches they took credit to themselves for prolonging the strike". Then he says that they held meetings, they organised a strike fund and arranged the conveyance of strikers back to their villages. Then he asks two questions. "What then was the meaning of their activity? Was it merely an attempt to carry out a strike on ordinary Trade Union lines or was it something deeper?"

Now, I want to try and reply to these questions. The Magistrate suggests that it is not necessary to argue that the workers had real grievances. He says that this argument misunderstands the line taken by the prosecution. Now I quite understand the line taken by the prosecution after these 28 months as an undertrial, but I cannot state my case unless I am allowed to put forward the full facts. In other words it is of no use taking the mustard without the beef.

It is absolutely necessary if I am to reply to the above questions, and to put the Court in possession of the full facts and to justify my activities in one of the biggest strikes that have taken place in India, the Bombay mill-workers strike of 1928, that I should place before the Court briefly the causes that led up to this strike. On my return from the Cawnpore T.U.C. in November 1927, I naturally kept in touch with the trade union leaders that I had met there and also took an interest in the trade unions. Besides the exhibits put in of my speeches in Bombay there are, P. 967, 958, 960, 944, 949, 657, 971, 972 etc.

The textile industry began a very prosperous period in the year 1916. Indian manufacturers found their markets expanding in Persia, Mesopotamia, East Africa, etc; about the same time the import of piece-goods fell by about 50 per cent, leaving a big margin of the home market to be supplied. The post-war boom in the cotton industry lasted much longer than the boom in other industries in India, there was a genuinely increased demand for cloth. Further, cloth prices mounted up with the prices of other goods. And we find the annual average prices of cotton manufacture for the three years 1918 to 1920 were three times as much as the prices of 1914. In spite of this state of industry we find that the wages of the workers lagged behind seriously, of course we do not expect any more from capitalism. It was not until 1920 that any increase was obtained by the workers.

Another point of fact is that the cotton industry enjoyed abounding prosperity during the years 1919 to 1921, the level of profits was extraordinarily high during these years as follows:— 99.69 per cent on capital invested in 1919:— 102.68 per cent on capital invested in 1920, and 92.73 per cent on capital invested in 1921. And this profit it must be remembered was being made on inflated capital.

During the year 1920 several strikes took place in the textile industry, Bombay, Madras and else-where on the question of hours and wages. In 1921 there occurred 148 disputes in the Cotton industry in India ('I. D. in I', p. 81) involving 162, 203 workers. At this time there was practically no organisation among the textile workers. The two most prominent perhaps were the Madras Labour Union, and the Textile Labour Association of Ahmedabad under the control of M. K. Gandhi. In 1922 the position remained about the same, there were 135 disputes between the textile workers and the employers involving 168,005 workers, (I. D. in I. p. 32) one of which took place in Bombay involving 60,000 workers.

Workers face attack.

From this time the position began to change, the reaction of the boom period was being felt by the employers and an organised attack was being prepared by them on the conditions of the workers. During the year 99 disputes took place, involving 111, 447 workers (I. D. in I. p. 33) these disputes were on a larger scale than before and were of a different character than the strikes of the preceding years. The early strikes were to attempt to improve the conditions of the workers, increase wages and decrease hours. The strikes of 1923 were the beginning of an attack by the employers on conditions, and the strikes in the main were defensive.

The most important strike that took place during the year was caused by the Ahmedabad Mill-owners' Association attempting to reduce the wages of the workers by 20 per cent from the 1st of April. The workers of the 56 mills in Ahmedabad went on strike against this reduction, 43,000 workers were involved. The strike ended on the 4th June after two months on the leaders agreeing to a reduction of the wages of the workers to the extent of 15.625 per cent. The workers at Ahmedabad are under the influence of the Ahmedabad Textile Labour Union, which is in turn influenced by M. K. Gandhi and Vallabhi Patel and of course many of the mill-owners of Ahmedabad who are supporters of the I. N. Congress.

The year 1924 was marked out for one of the most important and determined struggles of the Textile workers of Bombay. The number of disputes that took place in the cotton industry of India during this year were 55, involving 200,347 workers (I. D. in I. p. 34). The most important of these was in Bombay and this was an attempt to resist the encroachments of the mill-owners on the already bad conditions. The trouble arose over the Bombay Mill-owners' Association deciding to with-hold the annual bonus of the workers, owing as they said to trade depression. This annual bonus had been paid to the workers for the last five years and they had come to regard it as part of their wages, it should also be noted that there had not been any reduction in the cost of living.

This decision of the mill-owners resulted in a general strike of the mill-workers of Bombay City. The strike began on the 17th January and affected all the mills involving over 160,000 workers, and accounting for the loss of 7½ million working days (I. D. in I. p. 7). The local Government thought it of sufficient importance to interfere and they appointed a Committee of Enquiry which had terms of reference to report whether the workers had any customary, legal or equitable claim to the bonus which was capable of enforcement, and whether, as contended by the millowners, the grant of the bonus was not justified by the profits of the preceding year over the industry as a whole. A Chief Justice of the Bombay High Court and two "independent" persons made the Committee, and they reported on the 11th March, unanimously in favour of the millowners on both the questions. Of course nobody expected any other verdict from these representatives of the employers.

This strike was one of the biggest and most determined defensive fights that the workers had put up, so far, against a reduction of their wages. In spite of bad organisation the workers showed a splendid sense of class consciousness and class-solidarity. Nevertheless the strike collapsed on the 25th March, the workers

resuming work on the employers' terms. During this year another textile strike took place at Cawnpore, this also ended in defeat for the workers.

Textile Employers Attack Again.

Encouraged by their success in 1924 the mill-owners of Bombay decided to make another attack in 1925. The number of disputes in the textile industry of India during this year was 68, involving 173,339 workers and a loss of over 11 million days. (I. D. in L. p. 35). It will be seen by these that the number of disputes decreases, but those disputes that did take place are on a larger scale than ever.

The most important strike during the year was that of the Bombay textile workers and it was this dispute that led up to the General Strike of those workers in 1928.

Was the attack on the workers justified?

The Cotton Industry of India had reached a period of severe depression and the millowners true to their class looked to the workers to relieve the burden of expenditure, and reduce the cost of production. In spite of the fact that at this time the industry was ridiculously over-capitalised, a legacy from the boom and war period, nevertheless the Millowners' association of Bombay decided to reduce the wages, through the dearness of food allowance, by 20 per cent, of the textile workers. This reduction was to take effect from the 1st September 1925. This decision of the mill-owners meant a direct reduction of 11½ per cent in the wages of the workers.

We seem to hear in this announcement of the Bombay Mill owners an echo of that astounding statement, made inadvertently, by the then Prime Minister Mr. Baldwin, during the same year, "The wages of all workers must come down." This from the mouthpiece of capitalism expressed admirably the intention of the capitalists, and what they were determined to do in their attempt to stabilise capitalism, not only in Great Britain but in India and elsewhere.

The Position of the Industry.

It will be of interest to note that the Cotton Industry of India was carrying a capital of Rs. 26, 23, 25, 598 in the year 1918-19, and in the year 1925-26 it carried a capital of Rs. 46, 43, 22, 971. (Paid-up and Debenture) (from the Statistical Abstract 1928). This capital is for British Indian only. This shows that the industry was carrying twice as much capital in 1925-26 than it had in 1918-19. The total number of workers employed in Mills

in British India in 1918-19 was 267, 869, and in 1925-26 there were 330, 225. (Statistical Abstract). The increase of the number of workers is not shown to be very much. So while the total capital had increased by double, the number of workers to produce profit on that capital remained almost the same.

I shall now deal here with the unscrupulous manipulation of the millowner brigands. I have dealt with the conditions that led up to the position of the textile industry in 1925 and the unsatisfactory condition that the industry was in. But in this connection I might add that the position was further aggravated by the continuously rising exchange, during 1920 it was then 2/- to the Rupee, this phenomenon stimulated imports. New companies and agencies were floated, and much speculative placing of orders took place, especially from Great Britain for machinery, mill apparatus, etc. Very large orders were placed abroad for piece-goods, and with the expectation of a favourable exchange these began to arrive in large quantities during this year. However the position changed, many of these mushroom agencies and companies failed, leaving an unsatisfactory state of affairs to be cleared up by the industry.

Among the reasons that rendered the situation of the Bombay cotton industry worse than that of other centres was the reckless methods used to exploit the industry during the boom period, this was done especially by the method of over-capitalisation. While in other centres there was over-capitalisation, it was done in a different manner, and used for the extensions of plant and new erections at inflated prices, while in Bombay this was a manipulation of the managing agencies, and of direct inflation of capital.

A classical example of this manipulation was the sale of the Sassoon Group of Mills, whose book value was computed at Rs. 2.75 crores, to a syndicate formed for the purpose at 6 crores. (Report of the Bombay Stock Exchange Committee of 1924.)

The result of this manipulation was that the same number of workers in these Mills, working with the same number of Spindles and the same number of Looms, had to get on with the task of producing profit on Rs. 6 crores instead of on Rs. 2.75 crores. Nevertheless in spite of this history of brigandry the Bombay Mill-owners had the hard-neck to ask from the Government protection for the industry, and the result of this was the establishment of the Special Tariff Board (Cotton Textile Industry Enquiry.) by the Government of India and the suspension of the Cotton Excise Duty in December 1925. The Cotton Excise Duty was subsequently abolished.

WORKERS STAVE OFF ATTACK FOR THE TIME BEING.

In the mean time however the workers had been on strike against the proposed reduction of 11½ per cent in their wages. It was the most serious strike that the textile industry had so far faced, involving over 160,000 workers and resulting in the loss of over 11 million working days. (I. D. in I. p. 8). This struggle cost the workers almost as much as the struggle of the last year. Nevertheless the workers on this occasion again put up a stubborn resistance against the attack upon their wages and in spite of the inadequate organisation they showed that they understood the need for concerted action on their part. Very little or no assistance was given them by the new reformist union, the Bombay Textile Labour Union.

From the Report of the Communist Party of Great Britain for 1926 we find that the C. P. G. B. took the lead in the campaign of support for the Indian Textile Strike in Bombay 1925, and succeeded in securing the opening of a lock-out fund by the General Council of the British T. U. C., the first of its kind in the history of the British labour movement to support the Indian working class struggle. This realised £ 1,250.

The employers maintained their position until the Government announced the decision to suspend the Cotton Excise Duty, this was a concession to the employers. They then decided not to enforce the 11½ per cent cut, and after a long and bitter struggle the workers resumed work having for the time being staved off the attack.

The suspension of the Cotton Excise Duty gave the same benefit to the mill-owners of Ahmedabad as it did to the mill-owners of Bombay City. In view of this and in view of the victory of the Bombay workers, the workers of Ahmedabad should have made an attempt to recover that which had been taken away from them in 1923. However, no effort was made or has since been made to recover the 15 per cent. M. K. Gandhi through the Ahmedabad Textile Labour were not prepared to lead the workers on this issue. The sooner the workers are liberated from this treacherous influence the better.

STRIKE OF THE MADRAS TEXTILE WORKERS.

During this year there were other attacks made upon another section of the Indian Textile workers this was in the Coimbatore Spinning and Weaving Mills, Madras. Here 800 workers struck work against a proposed reduction of 20 per cent of their piece work rates. Arbitration was forced upon them and the local Collector acted as arbitrator. The result was that the workers were forced

to accept a 15 per cent reduction for Weavers working two looms and a 12½ per cent for Weavers working single loom. The Madras Labour Union has done nothing in this matter to alter the position.

THE COTTON EXCISE DUTY AND THE SPECIAL TARIFF BOARD.

The cotton Excise Duty was imposed in the early stages of the Indian industry, following an agitation and at the dictation of the Lancashire Cotton capitalists, to stifle competition in India. This duty has been a burden on the industry for many years and is an excellent example of foreign domination. For years an agitation has been carried on for its removal, however it was not until after the Bombay Mill-owners Association had carried on a vigorous campaign, and then the Bombay strike of 1925, that the duty was removed.

This was followed by a demand for an enquiry into the conditions of the industry, which resulted in the Government accepting the proposal for an enquiry and on the 10th June 1926 a Special Tariff Board was appointed. The report of this Tariff Board was published on the 7th June 1928, it was much delayed. Nevertheless, this delay did not prevent the Bombay Mill-owners from acting on the recommendations (at least those that referred to the workers). They knew them, and it was this report that provided the mill-owners with the excuse to launch another and more determined attack upon the textile worker in 1928.

TEXTILE WORKERS DURING 1926.

There was a distinct lull in the struggle of the textile workers during 1926. The I. D. in I. p. 36 only reports 57 disputes, involving 22,713 workers. This was really the lull before the storm. During the whole of this period no real effective trade union had as yet established itself, in Bombay we had the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal, and the Bombay Textile Labour Union which was under the influence of the reformist leaders R. R. Bakhale and N. M. Joshi. The report of the Bombay Textile Labour Union is instructive for the year 1926 and shows what a reformist union can do. The report says that during the year 1926 it received 260 complaints from the workers about their conditions, out of these complaints 89 only became successful—successful in the eyes of the B. T. L. U. During the period under report the union is proud of the fact that it did not authorise any strike. However in spite of this the Union has to report that they dealt with five strikes in four mills. One was a reduction of wages which the Khataw Mill imposed upon the Weavers in April and [maintained, the Union accepted the position. At the same Mill the manage-

ment imposed a cut in the wages of the Spinners. True to their idea of trade unionism Bakhale and Co. dealt with it, and on an assurance of the employers that they would look into the grievances and a promise to stop further unemployment (nothing about the wage reduction), the Union says that it persuaded the Spinners to resume work. Another case, 15 workers struck at the Swadeshi Mill, Bombay, the Union officials went along and found that they had no real complaint ! (T. U. C. Bulletin for June 1927, D. 390)

This is the record of the Union to which R. R. Bakhale is the Secretary, another candidate for the I. L. O. Here again was complete bankruptcy shown, no contact with the worker, and no attempt to defend the already bad conditions of the workers, or no attempt to prepare the workers for the general attack that was being prepared by mill-owners.

THE ATTACK OF THE MILL-OWNERS.

The number of disputes that took place during 1927, as reported in the I. D. in I. p. 37, Cotton Mills was 60. In the main these were minor disputes, the most important of which were caused by the resentment of the workers in the Bombay mills to the attempts of the millowners to introduce their Rational system, and this was what led up to the General Strike of 1928. Very little advance was made in organisation among the textile workers during the year 1927.

"Industrial Disputes in India" (p. 38) shows 1928 to be the most important year for the textile workers, there were 110 disputes in all involving 323, 484 workers and causing a loss of 24,51,274 working days.

Since the year 1925 after the attempt to reduce the wages of the workers by 11½ per cent had failed, the Bombay millowners carried on large scale retrenchment in this way creating the necessary army of unemployed to use in their attack that was coming. In 1926 the employers after putting their heads together decided that what they wanted was more output, more efficiency and of course more profit. How were they to get this?

The biggest item of costs always is the wages of the worker, and therefore the millowners looked to the workers to see how they could reduce costs. They came to the conclusion that they must introduce "Rationalisation", this they called "Fordising". But it was not until 1927 that the millowners were ready to make their experiment and it was then that rationalisation was resorted to in an organised manner.

It is necessary for us to go back to the year 1927 because as I have pointed out earlier it is not possible to show a line of demarcation between one strike and another, strikes are all inter-connected and are all a part of the class-struggle. Therefore in dealing with the 1928 mill strike it is necessary for us to refer to earlier stages to show how the struggle developed.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE "NEW SYSTEM"

(RATIONALISATION)

The first attempt at rationalisation was made by Sassoon in his group, using the Manchester Mill in January 1927. This was a mill that had been fitted out and reopened by Sassoon specially to make this experiment. And in this mill the rational system was applied to the Spinning Department. However we have some earlier examples of the attempt to introduce the "New System" in other mills belonging to the Sassoon group as early as September 1926. In the Blow room of the David Mill rationalisation was introduced, we then find that Sassoon began applying it to certain Departments of nearly all his mills. The introduction of rationalisation at the Apollo Mill, another of the Sassoon group, led to a strike on August 1st 1927. Here it was introduced in the Weaving Department. This was followed by a strike in the Manchester Mill for the same reason, on 5th August. After this strike lasting for a month the workers had to resume work in both the mills and the new system was continued.

The rationalisation scheme was briefly as follows, to get the Spinner who was up to then working only one side to work two sides, and the Weavers who had only been working two Looms up to this time, to work on three Looms, of course this does not go into detail of the different departments. In the first place the new scheme was introduced on an optional basis, and then made compulsory the workers who would not work it being sacked. The workers claimed that they could not work the new scheme, they also found that there was no equivalent increase in the wages, all this naturally resulted in strikes. After these strikes, on the man resuming work, the management began to victimise those workers who had taken a prominent part in the strikes. On removing them the employers thought that it would be easier to introduce the new scheme. All this was so far experimental on the part of Sassoon's for the Millowners' Association.

The year 1928 opened with the offensive of the Bombay Millowners on January 2nd, this was the main attempt of the employers to force their scheme of rationalisation. Here again Sassoon led the attack, introducing the new scheme in nearly all

his mills. On January 2nd the workers struck work and in a very short space of time the whole Sassoon group was involved, over 12,000 workers being on strike. At the same time an attempt was made in the Spring Mill of N. M. Wadia and Co. to introduce the new system in both the Spinning and Weaving Departments, this resulted in 4,200 workers going on strike. (Report of the B. S. E. C. 1928-29 p. 5.) I was in Bombay at this time and taking a keen interest in the development of this struggle of the mill workers.

It is interesting to note that Sassoon's should be the company to lead the attack, as Sassoon, it will be remembered, was the firm most prominent during the boom period to manipulate their capital and inflate it out of all proportion. The cry of the Bombay Millowners' Association was that they could not meet the competition from Japan, England, and China.

It was quite obvious that Sassoon's were acting as the spear-head for a concerted attack planned by the Bombay Mill owner's Association on the conditions of the workers to reduce costs. And to justify their attack they said that they were only carrying out *one* of the recommendations of the Special (Cotton) Tariff Board. That was the need for the introduction of more efficient methods of work in the Mills, in other words rationalisation. It is rather strange, though, that Sassoon started introducing new system in 1926 and the Special Tariff Board was also appointed in 1926. So on the face of it, the excuse made by the millowners was definitely false. Because I have shown that Sassoon was attempting to introduce the new scheme even before the Cotton Tariff Board began its work, and the Bombay Millowner's Association had decided to introduce rationalisation even before this.

The intention of the millowners was to gradually increase the number of spindles looked after by *one* Spinner, and the number of looms looked after by each Weaver at the same time introducing new piece-work rates. The introduction of the new piece-work rates meant a direct cut in the wages of the workers as I will show later.

Of course the employers dare not introduce these drastic changes in all mills in Bombay simultaneously, the reason is quite obvious, they feared a General Strike of the workers. So our "friend" Sassoon, the leading brigand, was to make the experiment and see how the workers would take it, also at the same time to divide the workers and force the scheme on them mill by mill.

THE REFORMIST TEXTILE UNION AT WORK.

Encouraged by the failure of the mill workers to resist the new scheme of rationalisation in the Sassoon mills, as in the case of the strike of the workers in these mills which started on 2nd January, the workers were forced back to work on 25th Feb., the strike ending in favour of the employers:- other millowners started the attack on the workers in their particular mills, the workers in these individual mills began to resent this and several strikes were started. The attack differed in different mills, some introduced rationalisation, some new wage rates, others making the workers clean machines during their own time, the introduction of the ticket system and so on.

Here I will give a brief outline containing the general attack leading up to the general strike of 1928. Following the Manchester and Apollo Mills 1927 and the whole Sassoon group 1928, the Wadia group introduced rationalisation in their Spring Mill in January, the workers struck work but resumed again on a compromise worked out by the Bombay Textile Labour Union, no attempt was made to link up the struggle. Again on the 31st January the employers of the same mill reduced the rates of wages of the workers, the workers struck work again and were forced to resume work of February 7th defeated.

The employers of the Kohinoor Mill increased the working hours of their workers, the men struck from 2nd February to the 8th February. The Madhowji Dharamsi Mill reduced the rates of the wages of the workers, they struck work from the 20th February to the 5th March. The Textile Mill withdrew the grants for railway passes, the workers struck from 21st February to 25th February. The Rachel Sassoon Mill increased the working hours, a one day trike took place here. The Pearl Mill and the Morarji Gokuldas Mill reduced the rates of wages, a strike took place here between 12th and 20th March. The Textile Mill stopped the system of "Badli" the workers struck work from the 17th March to the 3rd April. The Simplex Mill reduced rates of wages and the workers struck work on the 25th March until 11th April. All this happened between the 1st January and April, and in each case ^{the} workers struck work for different periods, and also in each case they were forced back to work defeated, assisted by the B. T. L. U. (Joshi, Bakhale and Co.).

In the face of this general attack the Bombay Textile Labour Union stepped in to play its historical role, betrayal, and did vigorous propaganda to prevent the other mill workers coming to the rescue of those who were being attacked, thereby doing

exactly what the millowners wanted, that was to prevent a general strike while they introduced their new scheme (rationalisation).

The immediate effect of the new scheme of the employers would be to double the work and the output while only increasing the wages by considerably less than 50 percent, (that is of course if the workers could operate the Scheme), and at the same time creating a large army of unemployed workers.

WORKERS TAKE THE OFFENSIVE.

As against the policy of Messrs. Joshi, Bakhale and Ginwala and the Textile Labour Union who were doing their best to keep the workers at work by leaflets etc: the Left-wing and Workers' and Peasants' Party trade union leaders who understood the manoeuvre of the mill-owners, called upon the workers to make a stand against this attack. Torn between this conflicting advice the workers who were on strike resumed work again, in some cases after 1½ months' struggle. Dis-satisfaction continued and when the workers received their wages at the end of March they ^{then} saw what drastic cuts had been made in the rates, the full effect of these cuts was then realised.

In the Kastoorchand Mill, one of the Currimbhoy group, a direct cut was introduced in the rates of the wages of the weavers and these workers struck work on 3rd of April. It was about this time that I addressed my first meeting of the Bombay Textile workers in relation to their conditions. In the Findley group of Mills the employers also attempted to introduce the rationalisation scheme, the result was that disaffection spread from mill to mill. Textile at the beginning of April and these workers merged themselves into the general strike. The workers in all other mills began to understand the tactics of the employers and to realise that the attack was general. This understanding was certainly assisted by leaflets and meetings held by the Workers' and Peasants' Party and Left-wing trade union leaders. From this time onwards I made it my business to go to the mill area almost every day.

On the 16th of April the whole of the workers in the Currimbhoy group of the mills struck work, and strange enough the leaders of the Textile Labour Union (Messrs. Ginwala, Parulekar and Syed Monawwar) on the 18th of April attended Delisle Road to see the workers and hear their grievances. The Textile Labour Union apparently did not know what the mill owners were doing. At the same time a meeting of the strikers which I attended was being held at Nagu Sayaji's Wadi. At this meeting a strike Committee was elected.

A demonstration of workers was then taken from Nagu Sayaji's Wadi numbering about 15000 and they confronted Ginwala

and Co. at Delisle Road, Cement Chawl, with the intention of informing the leaders of the Textile Labour Union of the trouble that existed among them. A huge meeting was held at which I was one of the speakers and the workers at this meeting declared a general strike. At this meeting another strike Committee was elected which included the names of the above gentlemen, along with the workers and the Left-wing leaders.

When these three officials of the B. T. L. U. returned to their headquarters at Sandhurst Road and reported what had happened to their leader, Mr. N. M. Joshi, they were taken to task. Mr. N. M. Joshi was against the calling of the General Strike, quite naturally, and he was not concerned about the wishes of the workers; the Strike Committee which had been elected by the workers in the morning could not be endorsed by him. Further a statement was issued over the names of Joshi, Ginwalla and Bakhale opposing the idea of a General Strike, in this way they still did their best to betray the workers. To attempt to further sabotage the strike they appointed a committee of their own.

THE GENERAL STRIKE.

It was claimed by the Bombay Mill-owners association and others interested in misrepresenting the situation that the strike was commenced without any warning, but it will be seen by what has already been said that there is no foundation in this claim at all. It was further claimed from certain quarters that no demands were put forward by the workers before going on strike, however, sufficient has already been said here about the conditions of workers and I have also shown what was the intention of the employers. And this is supported by the Committee set up to enquire into the strike (B. S. E. C. Report page 2). "Had it been otherwise, it would not have been possible for a handful of men to keep so many workers on strike for a period amounting very nearly to six months".

The fact is that certain Trade Union leaders and workers who understood the intentions of the mill-owners, and were not prepared to stand by and see the workers crushed mill by mill, and made to submit to the rationalisation scheme and wage cuts of the employers carried on a strenuous campaign of propaganda in favour of a general strike. Was not the general strike the very thing the mill owners wanted to avoid? Was not their attack so arranged to take mill by mill and so impose their scheme? This being so were we not prepared to stand by and watch the workers being beaten, we were not prepared to play the game of the employers.

A general strike was the only effective reply to the mill owners' attack. The only logical way to meet this attack that threatened the already bad conditions, to prevent further defeats of the workers, was to respond with the whole force of the workers, and in support of this, mass meetings of the workers were held all of which I tried to attend. The response of the workers to this lead was magnificent, they realised in spite of the reformist leaders who tried to keep them at work, that it was their conditions that were being attacked and the only way to resist this attack was to fight, and fight they did. (D 404 T.)

Mr. D. R. Mayekar the Secretary of the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal who had now become an agent of the mill-owners was carrying on propaganda, as D 403 T will show, against the strike.

The number of mills that closed down began to increase steadily from the 16th of April, and on the morning of the 23rd of April some workers were leaving their mills and going to the homes they had come from the Gold Mohar mill, when they reached Sewri, a place about half a mile from any mill they were met by a posse of police. The police attempted to disperse them, in doing so they started trouble and followed this up by opening fire on the mill-workers. As a result of this one worker Parasram Jadao was shot dead on the spot and another seriously wounded (P 1035 and P. W. 245). I arrived on the spot shortly after this incident and saw the dead body of the worker. A large crowd of strikers who were standing around were naturally in a very agitated state. In defence of this murder, the police officer who gave the order to fire claimed that the workers were going to attack the New City Mill, but this mill was at least a mile away from where the workers were attacked by the police and from this position ~~it~~ a mill could be seen.

On the 26th of April every cotton mill in the city of Bombay was closed down with the exception of one at Colaba. The general strike was complete and over 150,000 workers were on strike and these workers stood solid for over six months.

THE JOINT STRIKE COMMITTEE.

The Left-wing trade union leaders and Workers and Peasants Party, had given the lead, it was the correct lead and the workers realised it. In the earlier stages a Strike Committee was elected from the workers and included in this were the Left-wing leaders and the members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party and this Committee carried on the strike. At the beginning of the strike three demonstrations of the mill-workers were organised and

attempts were made by the police to prevent them. On the 19th of April one was organised from Nagu Sayaji's Wadi and on approaching the Koh-i-Noor Mill, Dadar, for no reason at all the police dispersed it by indiscriminate battoning (P.W. 245). Throughout the strike the police harassed the workers in an organised manner, even entering the workers chawls and beating them and in this way attempting to intimidate them.

During this time much trouble was created by the B. T. L. U which as I have said was against the strike and trying to break it; even press statements were issued by them condemning it. On the 28th of April two deputations were taken to the Governor of Bombay, one was led by Mr. N. M. Joshi and the other by D. R. Mayekar. Both claimed to speak on behalf of the textile workers, in reality the position was that neither of them represented the workers nor were they given any mandate to approach the Governor, but this is the usual way that these persons imposed themselves upon the workers.

On April the 29th at a meeting held in Nagu Sayaji's Wadi the workers were called upon to form a Volunteer Corps and to be disciplined, a programme of demands was also submitted at this meeting by the Strike Committee (D 405 T), which later formed the basis of the seventeen demands of the Joint Strike Committee. The workers were told at this meeting that they had got to face a stiff fight and that their job was ultimately to bring into being a workers Raj, like the one that exists in Russia today. The spirit of the workers was splendid and they were not slow in coming forward as volunteers.

At this stage it was considered necessary to bring about unity between the workers under the influence of the B. T. L. U and the Strike Committee formed of members of the Girai Kamgar Mahamadall and Left-wing trade unionists, further it was necessary to draw the workers connected with the B. T. L. U. actively into the struggle. In this matter we were not concerned about persons like Joshi or Bakhale, but what we were concerned about was drawing the few workers that they had away from their influence. To put this into effect a Joint Strike Committee was formed consisting of 30 members, 15 elected from the Strike Committee already working and 15 from the B. T. L. U. Those from the B. T. L. U. included N. M. Joshi, Syed Munawwar, Ginwala and Parulekar. Although these individuals were there, they did not influence the workers, the reason for this being that at so many previous occasions they had betrayed the cause of the workers. The Joint Strike Committee was established on May the 2nd and on May the 3rd the demands of the workers were again formulated and

those which had already been put forward were incorporated in what became known as the 17 demands, and are shown in the Fawcett Committee Report (pp. 175-177) the reply of the mill-owners to these demands is also included on these pages.

The Joint Strike Committee elected Joint Secretaries, these were R. S. Nimbkar and Syed Munawar, and Joint Treasurers, these were Mr Parulekar and myself. Several leaflets and communiques were issued in the name of the Joint Strike Committee, many of which have been put in as defence exhibits. One such communique was issued on the 6th of May, which showed the attitude of the mill-owners to the workers, and their refusal to treat with the Joint Strike Committee. To avoid dealing with the workers they put forward the pious plea, after asking what the personnel of the J. S. C. was, that they were only prepared to meet representatives of the registered Trade Union. They only wanted to meet some of their old friends again who would see "reason". The Joint Strike committee represented the workers and was too militant for them.

Girni Kamgar (Red Flag) Union started.

In the meantime the union that had started the idea of the general Strike got involved in some trouble. The Secretary of the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal, D. R. Mayekar, had misappropriated funds of the Union, and in consequence of this had been expelled from the Union. It seems that he must have got in touch with the police and the Bombay Mill-owners' Association, and received their advice. He first came out with propaganda against the strike. The owners also apparently advised him to register the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal under the Trade Unions Act; which up to then had not been registered. He therefore registered the Union in his name, although at the time he had no legal connection with it, and although he had no support and did not represent the Union. He was given every assistance and protection by the Registrar of Trade Unions, and the Union was registered in his name. This is an open case of where the authorities have assisted an individual who had misappropriated money from a body to register that body under his name without making any inquiry if he really represented that organisation. The authorities thought by doing this they would cause confusion among the mill-workers. A hand-bill was issued by the Workers' and Peasants' Party warning the workers against Mayekar and informing them that Mayekar had misappropriated the funds of the Union. This hand-bill is dated January 28th (P. 1016).

Another warning leaflet was issued over the signatures of the Managing Committee of the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal. Further P. 1463 was issued making it clear to the public that Mr. D. R. Mayekar had no connection with the G. K. M. In spite of all this the Registrar registered the Union in his name. However I am glad to say that the workers were not misled in this matter and were not confused.

A meeting of the workers and members of the G. K. M. was held on the 22nd of May 1928 in Nagu Sayaji's Wadi and at this meeting it was decided to establish the Girni Kamgar Union. The premises of the old Union were taken over. I attended this meeting with others of ~~the~~^{the} accused and was elected one of the Vice-Presidents of the new Union (P.958T). On May the 23rd the G. K. U. was registered under the Trade Union Act and officially began work, and became known to the workers as the 'Red Flag Union'.

Activities of the G. K. U.

Meetings were held of the workers at least once or twice a day throughout the strike. The strike was taken up with unprecedented enthusiasm, numerous workers coming forward as volunteers and pickets, the main activities of the strike were carried on by the G. K. U. During the period that the strike lasted the Joint Strike Committee of which the G. K. U. was most important part, organised assistance and relief for the strikers. Street collections were made and funds raised from other working-class organisations in India and abroad. The total amount received by the Joint Strike Committee was as follows:—

Total amount received from all sources: Rs. ~~15,711.~~^{6,527/6/11.}
This included among other amounts Rs. 34,496-12-9 from the U. S. S. R., Trade Union Movement; Rs. 25405-5-8 from the International Federation of Textile Workers' Association Rs 4668-8-0 from the Workers' Welfare League of India, London etc: etc.

On the 12th of May the Mill-owners' Association issued a statement in reply to the seventeen demands put forward by the Joint Strike Committee, and on the 17th of May they published a further statement to the effect that they would only reopen the mills and readmit the workers to work on the following terms, this of course turned the strike into a lock-out:—

The terms were as follows:—

- (1) Standardised rates of wages;
- (2) Revised and standardised muster-rolls;
- (3) Full ten hours for all male operatives in all departments, without extra remuneration to those who had been doing work for less time previously;

- (4) Standardised rules and regulations for enforcing discipline;
- (5) Uniform system of calculating wages; and
- (6) Fines to be credited to a welfare fund and unclaimed wages to be made available at any time on sufficient identification.

The above statement made the position of the mill-owners quite clear; they now wanted to take the opportunity to standardise their rationalisation scheme with the reduced wage rates for all their mills in Bombay, and to do this the employers had turned the strike into a lock-out. But we are charged, and this is the Prosecution case,—with prolonging the strike; it is quite clear from the above that the Party to blame here is none other than the mill-owners themselves. However at a later stage attempts were made by the mill-owners to open the mills on these terms but the workers refused to resume work.

Workers resumed work.

Several attempts were made by interested persons to try and end the strike, but it was not until October the 4th that representatives of the Joint Strike Committee met the representatives of the mill-owners, and at this meeting it was agreed that work should be resumed on the following terms:—

(1) That a Committee of three members be appointed by the Government of Bombay, with terms of reference to cover the question of the 17 demands of the workers, the standardisation scheme of the owners and their standing orders.

(2) Work to be resumed on the basis that for the period between the calling off the strike and the publication of the report of the Committee of Enquiry, the rates and wages of March 1927 should be paid provided that in those mills of the Sassoon group, the Findley group and the Kohinoor Mill which now worked on the revised system, the rates and the wages of March 1928, shall be paid in the Spinning Department only, and in the following mills the rates of March 1928 be paid in the Weaving Department:—the Manchester, the Appollo and Mayer Sassoon Mills. The question of muster-rolls shall not arise. Certain scales of advance were given on the workers resuming work. Work to be resumed on Saturday, October the 6th of 1928. This was in brief, the terms of the resumption of work and how one of the biggest strikes that Bombay city had ever seen came to an end.

Two months earlier an attempt was made by N. M. Joshi and other leaders to get the workers to capitulate. The workers were informed that relief was running short, but they themselves replied at all the mass meetings that they were not on strike

for relief, and that they would carry on the strike until they had won. (C. I. D. and Police Reports show this). They carried it on however until the above terms were arrived at which were certainly not in the interests of the workers. The prosecution have said time and again that all we were concerned about was prolonging the strike, the workers themselves would be able to answer this allegation. They were, of course, not satisfied even with these terms of resumption and were prepared to carry on the strike even after October the 6th.

Work of the G. K. U. after the strike.

I have given the causes that led up to the strike, and a brief account of the strike and shown how again after one of the most determined fights on the part of the workers, showing splendid courage and class-solidarity, the workers were forced to resume work without gaining their point, rationalisation was to continue. But the struggle itself had not been a wasted effort, the morale of the workers was as good at the end of the fight as it was at the beginning. The workers had learnt the need for militant organisation and they set about the task of building a militant Trade Union. Perhaps the most important point of all was that the workers had decided to throw over board the reactionary and reformist Trade Union leaders. After the strike Mr. N. M. Joshi and his friends could not hold a meeting in the mill area, the workers did not want to hear these individuals.

A practical programme was at once decided upon to build the G. K. Union, mill committees were started in all mills and the workers set about the task of building a fighting fund and developing a defence corps (P 967 T. P 929T shows the attack that was carried on by the Police upon unarmed workers who were marching in procession on the 12th of December 1928 and was one of the ~~persons~~^{reasons} for calling for 5000 drilled volunteers. The workers had learnt that the class-struggle was a bitter struggle in which all the forces of the superior organisation of the capitalists, coupled with the forces of the State, the Police and the Army, were arrayed against them. They ~~also~~^{had} learnt that the struggle could not be ~~conducted~~^{conducted} in an office in Sandhurst Road or by negotiations with the Governor etc, but only by their own strength and by their own organisation led by themselves could they achieve success.

Seven centres of the G. K. U. were at once opened in different positions throughout the Mill area in Bombay and the membership of the Union began to grow by leaps and bounds, by the end of 1928 its membership was at least 70,000. All this was achieved during 1928. At the beginning of the year they were not more than 5000 organised mill-workers in Bombay in all the Textile

Unions. P 792T, meeting file shows the attempt of the mill-owners to crush the Union almost immediately after the general strike. It also demolishes the claim of the Prosecution that the G. K. U. was not working to better the immediate conditions of the workers. The hand-bills etc. show my attendance at the numerous meetings of the workers of the different mills held to build the Union and to inaugurate the mill committees. The reason for this outstanding development in Trade Union organisation was the fact that the leaders of the G. K. U. put forward a militant policy, the fact that the workers were not satisfied with the terms on which they had been forced to resume work, the fact that the mill-owners were not respecting the terms on which the workers had resumed the works in spite of the fact that it was in their favour, and the fact that the mill-owners were still carrying on their attack even while the Enquiry Committee was sitting. In support of this we have a mass of evidence, D 411, 412, 432 to 434, 456, 465, 470 etc. etc. and the Fawcett Committee's Report. These reasons should be sufficient. But on top of this the G. K. U. was preparing the workers for the attack of the employers that was to be launched when the Fawcett Committee gave its report, the result of this we saw in 1929.

The G. K. U. was the reply of workers to Messrs. Joshi, Bakhale and others of the B. T. L. U. who were against the general strike and who had tried to betray them, and who had told the workers that the strike weapon was useless. This fact is amply borne out by the report of the Royal Commission on Labour in India of which Mr. N. M. Joshi is one of the signatories, page 339, where it says, "The subsequent arrest of leaders of the G. K. U. deprived the workers of these representatives, and the leaders of the older Unions were unable to regain the confidence of the men." The Textile workers of Bombay were completely disillusioned, the reformist leaders who advocated conciliation and arbitration were exposed, the workers were out to form a Union that would not wait for the employers to attack but would take up the offensive. Too long had the Textile workers waited to be attacked by the capitalists, the fight was now to be changed from defensive of their beastly conditions to the offensive for better. Because of this we saw the beginning of the largest Trade Union that had ever come into existence in India, a Union which was a militant and Left-wing one because it was born from the struggle of the workers. The roots of this organisation were in the workers, the G. K. U. was not formed from above by come-over lawyers and politicians whose job used to be just to negotiate with the employers on behalf of the workers. This Union was not formed by individuals who were seeking a trip to Geneva at the expense of the workers, or seats in the Councils. This Union,

the G. K. U. was an expression of the growing revolutionary mass movement among the workers.

It was not something that had been hatched ^{out} overnight by a few revolutionary agitators, it was the result of the past struggle of the workers; the exposure of the self-seeking pseudo Trade Union leaders who had foisted themselves upon the movement; and it was the sign of the preparation for the struggle that is to come. The Bombay textile workers through G. K. U. had given the lead to the workers of India to throw off the reformists, and organise on militant lines recognising the class struggle.

To show that the struggle of the textile workers was not something peculiar to Bombay, I will just refer to some of the other centres. A dispute arose in the Sholapur Spinning and Weaving Mills on the 21st of May 1928 leading ultimately to a lock-out involving 8,000 workers. It should be noted that many of the mills in Sholapur are owned by the same owners as the Bombay mills. This strike spread to other mills in Sholapur, but some representatives of the B. T. L. U. interfered and were successful in getting some of the workers to return to work. But the grievances of the workers were not redressed and at least 13,000 workers remained on strike. It was my good fortune to be able to investigate the conditions of the workers at Sholapur at this time and I was able to address the strikers there for a few days during August 1928.

The mill-owners were able to get the Government machinery to operate and many of the workers were arrested and imprisoned. In this strike new stunt was tried, civil suits for damages were filed against the strike leaders and injunctions prohibiting the holding of the meetings was granted (D390). The result of the strike was, as in other places, owing to the fact that the action of these workers was not co-ordinated with the strikes in other places, and because of the advice of certain leaders, the workers were forced to resume work without any satisfaction.

Strikes took place in many other centres in India, in the Lalimli Mills, Cawnpore a strike of workers took place involving some 1750. The reasons for the strike were that 800 workers were put on three months' compulsory leave. The strike ended unsuccessfully. Here we have an example of the employer treating the worker like a part of the machinery, to be put on or taken off at will. Starvation wages are paid while workers are employed and it is impossible for any provision to be made by the worker while he is working for periods of unemployment. But of course this is no concern of the employer (D. 390 T.U.C Bulletin).

The workers of the Choolai Mills at Madras struck work against the introduction of the double loom system on 16th August,

on similar reasons for which the workers were on strike in Bombay. The Madras Labour Union under the influence of Shiva Rao came to the assistance of the employers and the strike was called off pending the report of some committees of experts that had been set up by the employers. In this way the workers were betrayed. While the Bombay workers were fighting a life and death struggle on the same question, these individuals like Shiv Rao and Kirk were carrying on propaganda against them on behalf of the employers. When at this moment the workers all over India were offering a struggle against the attacks of capitalism at the moment when the struggle ought to have been unified, these alleged representatives of Labour were sabotaging the fight.

Almost at every textile centre in India during 1928 some sort of strike took place. At Dacca in the Dakeshwari Cotton Mills a strike took place, here the strike lasted only a few days and the workers were got back to work with a promise that their grievances would be referred to a committee of inquiry, the management promising to redress their grievances in the light of the recommendations of this committee. Again at Ahmedabad the textile workers wanted to get their grievances redressed and to fight for better conditions, this position was "amicably" sabotaged by the intervention of the Secretary of the Labour Union and Mr. M. K Gandhi. At the same time representatives of the textile workers who were on strike in Bombay went to Ahmedabad to get assistance from their fellow workers there. But Mr. Gandhi even went to the extent of advising the Ahmedabad workers not to subscribe to the Relief Fund of the Bombay strikes. But in spite of this advice the workers of Ahmedabad did subscribe several thousand rupees from their wages by small contributions. But the more important assistance of the active participation of the Ahmedabad workers in the struggle was sabotaged by Mr. Gandhi and Co.

I have dealt with the struggle of the textile workers in India, elsewhere I have dealt with wages and conditions, but I will just emphasise here again by giving a comparison of the wages received by the textile workers in Great Britain in India. A weaver working in Lancashire receives for a 48 hours' week the some of Rs. 94-0-0 per month, for the spinners Rs. 94-2-0 per month for the same number of hours. In Bombay for 60 hours' week the wages received are Rs 49-9-11 per month for a weaver, and Rs. 27-9-11 per month for a spinner, approximately. This shows that the wages of the workers in India even for a 60 hours week are far below those of the British workers.

In dealing with industry in general there are many things that I could have touched on, for instance the parasitical system of

Managing Agents and so on. To deal fully with all these things I have not the time here, nevertheless, it is a fact that the Indian textile worker is ruthlessly exploited. The strikes that I have described and the strikes that we have participated in and have led, were all fought to prevent the conditions of the Indian textile workers which are already nothing short of rotten from being worsened. The same terrible conditions of Labour are today being used as a lever to worsen the conditions of the workers in Great Britain. The Indian worker is today being used to bring down the wages and lengthen the hours of the textile workers in Lancashire. It is for this reason that the workers in Great Britain send financial assistance, it is for this reason that we workers are prepared to come from England to assist our Indian comrades in their struggle, and it is for the same reason that the struggle of the workers is one against Imperialism, that assistance is sent from the Russian workers.

I have shown how the employers have attempted to force wage reductions and rationalisation upon the workers. The only rationalisation that the textile employers have in view is a rationalisation based on greater exploitation of the workers. By this I mean, labour costs are to be cut down and the workers' conditions are to be made more miserable in order to secure for the employers the maintenance of excessive capital charges and excessive profits.

It is by this that I justify our attitude during the textile strikes, our agitation among the workers for class consciousness and solidarity, our support to the general strike policy, the attempt to bring the whole weight of the workers into the struggle at once. It is for the reason that we set about the task of building a militant Trade Union, the Girni Kamgar (Red Flag) Union, an organisation that was prepared to recognise the class struggle, a fighting organisation, by this means alone can the workers stave off the attack of the employers and obtain for themselves proper conditions of labour.

TRADE UNION MOVEMENT CONCLUSION

I have stated the case in relation to the working class movement at some length, because one of the most important purpose which Imperialism has in mind in prosecuting it is the attack upon that movement. I want to emphasise the point that it is an attack upon the Indian Trade Union Movement. I do so because of the continued campaign of distortion and misrepresentation carried on by the Government. It has come to our notice that at least two memoranda dealing with this case have been issued from the India Office and distributed freely in the House of Commons

and elsewhere. One was issued some time last November and the latest one was issued on the 25th of June 1931 by Mr. Wedgwood Benn, Secretary of State for India. Both these documents appear to be attempts on the part of Mr. Wedgwood Benn to apologise on behalf of the Labour Government for having to continue this trial.

This apologist for British Imperialism tells us in his latest memorandum that it is not a fact that the Meerut Case is directed against Indian Trade Unionists. He follows this up by telling us that unlike the workers of the west the workers of India are, mainly, illiterate and have to depend almost entirely upon persons other than workers like themselves to assist in the organisation of Trade Unions. ".....and it is therefore the duty of any government or authority in India to see that persons are not using the workers for their own political ends."

What humbug, what hypocrisy! Who is going to believe this sudden outburst of paternal interest on the part of British Imperialism for the slaves in India that it has so long been robbing, even if it does come from the mouth of a Labour Secretary of State for India. He then goes on to describe the strike wave of 1928 and the Bombay Textile Strike, and by his own words shows that this case is an attack upon the Indian Trade Union Movement. I have no need to say anything further about this as I have fully dealt with this matter in the body of my statement, as also I have dealt with the part we Communists played in the Trade Union Movements. He praises N. M. Joshi, Giri, Chaman Lal, Shiv Rao, Bakhale & Co., we do not grudge them this praise, on the other hand we do not expect to receive the praise of the Imperialist bureaucrats or the agents of Imperialism, if we got it we would not be worthy of the confidence of the workers.

He then in his memorandum, goes on to talk about the deplorable and wretched conditions of the workers in India. This matter also I have adequately dealt with in my statement. Of course we do not expect to hear from him that these deplorable and wretched conditions should be altered. Our crime is that some of us are Communists and that we have been sincerely working in the Indian Trade Union Movement to alter this terrible state of affairs. Mr. Wedgwood Benn joins hands with the Bureaucracy and the Prosecution here to suppress us and drive us out of the Trade Union Movement, but at the same time he has not got the face to advocate the same policy or a similar prosecution of Communist in the British Trade Union Movement.

I do not know in what position the Secretary of State stands in respect of contempt of Court, but clearly this memorandum issued and broadcasted by the India Office is contempt of Court.

As a matter of fact apart from the lying misrepresentation to justify the continuance of this trial he has taken the matter out of the hands of this Court and delivered a premature judgment of our guilt, thus saving the trouble of your Honour, it only remains now for you to pass the sentences. Of course, after all he is only the mouthpiece, the material that he has put across in his memorandum is supplied by the Intelligence Bureau at Simla with the help of the Prosecution. But nevertheless he is a willing mouthpiece and apologist of British Imperialism.

4-15-31

In my concluding remarks here I would try to reply to the above allegation.

The Prosecution began by selecting for arrest in this case principally those who were connected with the militant Trade Union Movement. Of the 31 accused only 5, according to the Prosecution, were not Trade Unionist. The time for the arrest was chosen just at the moment when further big struggles were imminent in the industries with which the accused were concerned. There can be no doubt that the case was decided upon largely at the instance of the cotton-bosses of Bombay and the jute-bosses of Bengal combined, with the anxiety of the Government about its Railways.

The Prosecution then proceeded to bring forward against us evidence, a large portion of which consists of particulars about our Trade Union activities. At the same time they stated in Court and broadcasted throughout the country, their theory of the nature of the 'legitimate' Labour Movement and the type of activity in which it should indulge, while accusing us of 'fomenting' and 'prolonging' strikes, of conducting 'fraction' work, 'wire-pulling' and 'capturing' and other sinister activities in connection with the Trade Union Movement. At the same time the Prosecution and the Labour Government have held up to the admiration of India the 'rational views' of the Reformists on the 'Labour question', and applauded the fight which the reformists conduct against the working-class revolutionary movement, and their lulling the workers into a sense of false security that the Whitley Commission which has recently been touring India, will bring them better conditions, and their advocacy of Boards of Conciliation and Arbitrations.

They have denied that they are attacking the Trade Union Movement. But their actions in this case constitute a complete disproof of this denial. This case is among other things, a direct attack upon the Indian Trade Union Movement, conducted with the object of restraining the militant activities of the organised workers, and forcing them to remain subject to their present economic conditions, and the system of political oppression which rules them.

In reply to this I have to point out the falsity of the Prosecution theory. I have shown that the 'genuine' Labour Movement which the Prosecution praises, is a false Labour Movement, led astray by the agents of the Bourgeoisie (the Reformists and the Second Internationalists); the really genuine Labour Movement is the militant movement which fights capitalism consistently for the improvement of its position, and whose historical destiny it is to overthrow capitalism, to destroy the colonial dominance of Imperialism, and to lead the struggle for socialism.

I have given facts (which are more than supported by the Whitley Commission Report) which show the appalling exploitation of the Indian workers; the ridiculously small wages (it takes an average Indian worker about 4½ years to earn the equivalent to a day's wage of the Senior Counsel for the Prosecution), the long hours, the insecurity of employment; the persecution and maltreatment; the bad conditions of work, the insanitation and bad housing, the long-drawn-out series of attacks on even these conditions and wages (Textile, Jute, Railways etc. etc.). I have shown how the employers treat the workers not 'as parties to a contract', as their economists preach, but as slaves to be dictated to and exploited until they have become useless and die.

I have shown how the Imperialist State treats the workers, the backward and barbarous state of Labour Legislation, the up-to-date and efficient Anti-Labour Legislation; the lack of education, the spying and the persecution of the workers' Trade Union Movement; the lathis and bullets whenever the workers come out on strike. That our Policy was correct has been amply shown by events that have followed our arrest, the vicious attacks that have taken place upon the Textile, Jute, Railway and other workers.

I have followed the history of the Labour Movement briefly. Almost as soon as the industrial working-class is formed in India it begins to struggle for better conditions. Its efforts at first are naturally chaotic and feeble. But, the capitalists and the Government recognise their historical enemy, and at once begin, on the one hand to suppress it, and on the other to corrupt it with reformism. I have shown by actual instances the function of the reformists in the Indian Labour Movement;— to keep the workers at work when they want to fight; to sabotage their fight; if it cannot be prevented, by keeping the workers divided and localising strikes; to take the lead in their protest against Imperialist policy (e. g. the Trade Disputes Bill, etc.) so that that protest comes to nothing; to preach class-collaboration and the acceptance of the reactionary policy of Imperialism (the Simon Commission; the R. T. C.; and the I. L. O.) and to incite the workers against the

revolution and the militant leaders, so that their suppression and arrest is made easier.

|| In spite however of the efforts of the Government, the employers, the Congress and the reformists, the workers' movement has gone on developing. Its organisations, in the first stages, nothing more than strike committees, are now becoming permanent, stable Trade Unions, extending over large areas, and embracing an ever increasing proportion of the workers. From the vague, ill formulated demands of the early stages they have progressed to clear, systematic programmes. From merely local, sectional, solidarity they have grown to the consciousness of the unity of interest of the workers as a class nationally, and even internationally. The workers, instead of following blindly the leaders from outside their class begin taking an increasingly active part in organisation, meetings, demonstrations, picketing, etc. marking a step forward in the growth of the workers' movement as an independent force in India. And the most advanced sections of the workers are coming to realise that their aims cannot be confined to economic questions, but must become political also. They are acquiring the social and political revolutionary consciousness of the working-class.

So much progress has been made in a period, since the movement began, of less than 15 years. Though discouraged and suppressed in all ways by the employers and the Government, misled by the reformists; although without education, and almost completely cut off from the more advanced sections of the working-class of the world by the action of the Government, the Indian working-class has made this very notable progress in so short a time. This appears to me to be a complete confirmation of our theory as to the nature of the working-class movement and its place in history. The Indian working-class is within sight of the position which our theory marks out for it, the leadership of the mass revolutionary movement for the overthrow of Imperialism, and the leadership in the subsequent struggle for the organisation of a Socialist Society.

Our activities (speeches, Trade Union meetings, etc.) in connection with the movement have been in accordance with our theory. That is a sufficient defence for them. The Prosecution, speaking for the bourgeoisie, finds them objectionable (though it is not ventured to condemn them as illegal). We have worked, not in the interests of the bourgeoisie, but in the interests of the workers, laying bare the mechanism of the capitalist system, the causes of the strikes, the workers' poverty and the methods which the workers must adopt to end such a system of exploitation.

We always and consistently advocated preparation for action. When we considered action not to be in the interests of the workers, we did not advocate it. When we did consider it in their interest, we did advocate it, without reference to what the employers thought. This is how we 'fomented' strikes. When the workers struck work, we did not advise surrender at the first opportunity, but fought for the continuance of the strike until the sacrifice and suffering of the workers involved in it brought some recompense in the shape of concessions. Unless the workers come out of the struggle with added knowledge much of their suffering is in vain. I have justified the right of the Indian workers to receive assistance, both financial and moral, from their fellow workers in Russia, Great Britain and elsewhere in their struggles.

This is how we have 'prolonged' strikes. When we found Trade Unions being misled by reformist strike-breaking leadership, we conducted propaganda in favour of our policy. This is 'wire-pulling' and 'capturing'. We advocated a militant policy of strikes rather than submission and servility. We advocated 'solidarity' and 'class-consciousness'. We are not ashamed of these activities. We are, on the contrary, proud that the workers approved of them and that the employers found them so inconvenient that they had to 'pull wires' and get us arrested.

The position is the same today as it was before our arrest, the need is there for the workers to have their well-organised and centralised militant industrial Trade Unions, based upon the theory of the class-struggle. It is essential to organise the widest masses of the working-class, to defend the day to day interest of the workers and to maintain the general revolutionary struggle of the masses of India, this alone can be done by the Communist Party.

I maintain that all class-conscious workers must concentrate every effort on the creation of an independent revolutionary Trade Union Movement. For this it is essential to organise militant industrial Trade Unions based upon factory committees, with the leadership elected directly by the workers and consisting of the most advanced militant workers. It is most important that every effort should be made to expose and isolate the reformists of all shades, from the open agents of British Imperialism such as N. M. Joshi, Shiva Rao, Chaman Lal, S. C. Joshi etc; to the sham 'Left' national reformists such as Jamna Das Mehta, Bose, Ruikar and all other agents of the Indian bourgeoisie who form a reactionary block against the revolutionary Wing of the Trade Union Movement. It is also most important in my opinion that the principles of conciliation Boards and arbitration Courts must be

vigorously opposed; the only means of winning 'concessions' from the exploiters is by resolute class-struggle, by strikes and mass revolutionary action. The T. U. C must be transformed and built up into a militant centre of the All-India Labour Movement on a class basis, able to prepare and lead the economic struggles of the workers.

The success of the Indian revolutionary struggle is dependent on a strong well organised working class, to lead the Indian masses in their struggle for independence and emancipation. Such an organisation must be linked up with the revolutionary International working-class movement, helping forward the world revolution, the fight against Imperialism, the common enemy of the workers, and the world victory of the working-class as a whole.

Q. With regard to your connection with the C. P. of India the evidence is P 1295, and P 1303. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. I know nothing about these exhibits. Nevertheless as I was a member of the C. P. G. B. in India I worked with the members of the C. P. I., and this of course naturally follows being a member of the same organisation.

As regards to an explanation of my connection with the C. P. I. I agree with what Spratt has already said in reference to this matter.

Q. With regard to your connection with W. P. P.'s and A.I.W.P.P. there is the following evidence: W.P.P. of Bombay: P 1344, 1326, 1373 (2), 1348 (7), 1373 (1); W. P. P. of Bengal: P 644, 1616; W. P. P. of the Punjab: P 1337 (P 451), 2051C, 1626, 549 (18), 1641, 1642; A.I.W.P.P.: P 468 (2), 668, 1763, 1764, 669, 638, P. Ws. 36, 90, and 254. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. I have nothing to say about these exhibits but I worked with the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay and I attended the All India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference at Calcutta in December 1928. I also agree with what Spratt has said in reference to this organisation.

Q. The following evidence may be said to relate to your associations and connections: P 502, 2114, 2081, 930 Kranti of 29. 7. 28 (photograph), 667, 459, 611, 639, 658, P.Wf. 1937, P 1029, 645, 662, 665, 670, 797, 1261, 1280, 526 (10), 873, 971, P.Wf. 182, P 643, 646, 647, 648, 649. Have you anything to say about this evidence ?

A. In respect of my connection with Hutchinson I have to say that I met Hutchinson for the first time at one of the sittings of the Bombay Strike Inquiry Committee which was being held at the Secretariat, Bombay. I think it was some time during October 1928. I should explain here that the sittings of the Strike Enquiry Committee were public and possibly Hutchinson had read in one of the newspapers that these sittings were being held in public and he attended. During the lunch interval he came and spoke to me with some of the other Labour leaders there and he told me that he was interested in Labour affairs and also that he was a journalist. I met him once or twice after this and he asked me if I could give him a brief outline of the recent strike. I think I gave him a copy of the brief history that I prepared. The visiting cards can be accounted for by the fact that we had very seldom met and there was no pre-arranged meeting. //

P 1029: In respect of this exhibit I cannot say anything because I never knew of the existence of such things, either a circle or a book or anything else which may be connected with it.

I have replied I think to the question of those exhibits put to me which refer to Desai when I gave reply in regard to the European correspondence.

In respect of the other exhibits I have nothing to say.

Q. If there are any exhibits or evidence which I have omitted or any other point on which you have to say anything in this statement you can say it now.

A. I have to make a few remarks as a reply to this question; these remarks that I shall make should not be taken in the nature of a complaint because I hold no illusions on the question of justice under Imperialism. I understand what capitalist class-justice is. What I have to say here therefore will be more in the nature of an exposure of the hypocrisy of this farce of a trial. I would say therefore that many of the things that have happened during the course of this trial have not come exactly as a surprise to me. I have explained what I considered were the reasons for our arrests during my reply to the question in relation to my Trade Union activities. Our arrests especially those which took place in Bombay and Calcutta, were carried out with an imposing military display. The idea I suppose was to put fear into the workers with whom we had been connected. I can only say that Capitalism does not appreciate the forces that it has got to deal with. However we were brought to Meerut, and in Meerut Jail many of us were kept isolated from one another for a

long period, no reason was given for this. I personally on several occasions asked to be allowed to see comrade Spratt, but this was refused for some time. Later it came to light that the person responsible for this method of dealing with us was none other than Mr. R. A. Horton, the complainant in this case. This person seemed to be the all-powerful authority in Meerut at that time on the "Red Menace".

So ^{we} were brought to Meerut, a place that I had never visited before in my life, to stand a charge under section 121 A. The grounds for ever bringing us to Meerut to stand such a charge are non-existent or at the most extremely flimsy. The conference that it is alleged by the Prosecution was held here has been magnified out of all proportion to its actual importance. The majority of our activities, as the evidence shows, were carried out either at Bombay or Calcutta. The main reasons of course for the Prosecution selecting this out-of-the-way place are quite obvious. Their object was to inconvenience us as much as possible and thereby make their task much easier, to isolate us from the movement with which we were connected, and from our friends or relatives who may have assisted us, and to bring us under the most subservient and illiberal judiciary in the country. Even within the structure of bourgeois society there are degrees to which certain persons and departments are prepared to cringe at the behest of the powers that be. I mean that some are prepared to go much further to serve their masters.

Then there was the question of Jury, had we been tried in either of the two places where the majority of us were arrested and where the majority of our activities took place we would have had to be given a trial by Jury. A trial of this character under those circumstances would have been too much of an uncertainty for the Prosecution with the flimsy evidence that they have brought forward. Hence, another reason for the selection of Meerut by the Prosecution to launch this trial. Many other reasons could be given but I think this sufficient to support my contention.

At a very early stage we went through the formality of applying for a transfer to a Presidency town, Bombay or Calcutta, where our activities had taken place and where we would have been in a better position to obtain more facilities. But strange to say for putting into operation this ordinary legal right, for which there was overwhelming justification, (referring back to the memorandum from the India Office of the 25th of June 1931) we find Mr. Wedgwood Benn using it as an argument that we were prolonging the trial. It is a fact that only a few of us had ever seen Meerut before we were brought here under arrest. This application was naturally dismissed by the Allahabad High Court. While I am

dealing with the allegation of our prolonging the trial I will just refer to this memorandum of Mr. Wedgwood Benn again, "..... and by various other means, including a brief hunger-strike, they obstructed the proceedings and caused delay." This lying allegation was also made in a previous memorandum and which was replied to by us, in respect of this I should like to say in the first place that after being brought to Meerut and lodged in Jail we were kept waiting by the Prosecution for nearly three solid months on the excuse that the Prosecution were preparing their case, i. e. from March the 20th to June the 12th when the Magistrate's Court began. On the question of our hunger-strike which in all lasted for four days, I should like to reiterate that we attended the Court on all days during this hunger-strike and were not responsible for the holding up of the Court as alleged by Mr. Wedgwood Benn. I would only say here that such despicable allegations, which were, according to Mr. Wedgwood Benn, the result of an 'official enquiry', are only an attempt on the part of Prosecution to cover up their own incompetence.

The next important step which followed this was an application for transfer of the case to Allahabad for the Sessions Trial and a Jury Trial. It is important to note however that the Executive had already made up its mind what was to happen, and before the High Court could decide our application for transfer and Jury, an Extraordinary Gazette was issued by the Government on Monday the 13th of January announcing the appointment of the Additional Sessions Judge who was to try this case. It follows of course that our application for a Jury Trial was naturally turned down.

Interviews with our friends and Counsel in Jail and elsewhere have been systematically hampered, as is shown by our application for proper facilities, interviews etc. to conduct our Defence (10.2.30). Throughout the whole period from the time that we were brought to Meerut a heavy censorship of our correspondence has been carried on. This question of censorship especially applies to the correspondence between myself and my relatives, and our Defence Committee in London. I have ample evidence in my possession of letters half and two-thirds scored out, and further evidence of letters that have been suppressed altogether. That this systematic examination and censorship has been carried on by the Prosecution is amply borne out by the evidence of Abdul Aziz P. W. 138, ex-Jailer, District Jail, Meerut, and Lieutenant-Colonel M. A. Rahman P. W. 133, ex-Superintendent, District Jail, Meerut. This is a part from the evidence which I have got of registered letters being sent from the Garden House. I am not going to quibble here whether this is fair or unfair, whether the Prosecution have an undue advantage over us or not, because after all, I have already said I have no illusion

about class justice, and at any rate the whole of the bourgeois state machinery is on the side of the Prosecution and naturally they are going to use it, especially in a political case of this character.

Referring again to the memorandum Mr. Wedgwood Benn after his "official enquiry" expresses himself satisfied that all legitimate facilities are being given. Of course we can appreciate the irony of the situation, knowing that this pseudo-Labour-apologist for Imperialism is only repeating parrot-like what the bureaucracy and the Prosecution want him to say.

Among the many interesting incidents that have happened during the case we have the incident of the arrest of one of the members of our Defence Committee in this very Court compound, and this arrest was carried out under the orders of none other than Mr. R. A. Horton, the complainant in this case. Another case of harassment of our friends was given when one friend of ours Fazl Elahi came from the Punjab, on his first visit to Meerut, to assist us in Defence matters, the room in which he was staying was raided by the Meerut Police, he was bound at the point of the revolver and a search took place, after which he was released. We naturally raised a protest about this continual harassment of our friends and in explanation of the above incident, the Superintendent of Police said that he was sorry, some mistake had been made. It was not a mistake however, this same friend of ours, on his return to the Punjab in July 1930 after the second visit to us, was arrested under Regulation III of 1818, and has not yet been released. I suppose he ought to have taken warning when the Meerut Police raided him on the first occasion and not visited us again.

Another incident of a like nature is that of another friend of ours, Abani Chaudhri, from Calcutta this time, who while on a visit to see us was arrested in Meerut and taken back to Calcutta, kept in a lock-up for some time and then later released.

Another matter I should like to refer to is that of the question of bail. On numerous occasions we have applied for bail, in some cases on the question of ill health as in the case of Muzaffar Ahmad and Spratt, and on other occasions asking for bail as a right. In some quarters the illusion is still held that a person should be assumed innocent until he is proved guilty. In this case we have been held in Jail now for two years and four months. Now apart from the disadvantage, inconvenience and difficulty that we are put to in conducting a defence while being kept in Jail, I think we have successfully exploded the myth, if it still remains, about a person being considered innocent until

he has been proved guilty. As far as I am concerned our applications for bail have at least served the purpose of exposing this fraud of bourgeois justice. The granting of bail to a few after they have spent two years in Jail and after some have explained their position does not alter my argument.

This case has shown that a constant watch has been kept by the C. I. D. on workers' meetings, Trade Union meetings etc.; and a mass of material has been submitted which refers almost entirely to open activities of Trade Unions and the working class movement in general. For the 'unearthing' by the C. I. D. of these open activities, this court, as was the case in the Lower Court, will no doubt have to congratulate the C. I. D. on their alertness in detecting this 'crime'. In respect of this Court I hold no illusions, any point that has been made by the Defence has usually been brushed aside with the help of the C. P. C. On the other hand any point that has come up that may be useful to the Prosecution or to assist the Court in coming to a 'true' finding in this case has usually been saved. I repeat again that the judiciary in this country plays a second part to the Executive which is the deciding factor.

There is not a more glaring example of the disadvantage to which the accused are put than that of the case of defence witnesses. At the end of the Magistrate's enquiry a general list of Defence witnesses was submitted at the same time I submitted a list of Defence witnesses on my own behalf. The names in my list included a number of persons in the main resident in England. In the early stages of the Trial in this Court I submitted an application to the District Magistrate asking that the persons named residing outside British India should be summoned by the District Magistrate to come to India as my defence witnesses. The District Magistrate refused to issue summonses to these persons on the ground that he had no authority to summon witnesses not to be found in British India or that he had no means of getting such summonses executed. (District Magistrate's order dated 9. 3. 30.)

Following this an application was made to the Governor General on the 22nd of March 1930 requesting that the authorities in Meerut be directed to issue summonses to these witnesses residing outside British India; that provision be made so that they may be allowed to enter the country and leave it again without being arrested; and that while in India they should not be subject to annoyance by police, etc. The latter points were essential as in some cases these persons have been named by the Prosecution as co-conspirators. A reply was received to this application from the Government on May the 17th, 1930, which said (1) they had no power to summon witnesses from outside India, or directed that

they be so summoned; (2) that if such persons wish to come as witnesses the Government of India could not give any undertaking that passports would be granted to them, or that if they enter India they would not be arrested, "if they had done anything which rendered them liable under the law."

In view of this a further attempt was made to get these defence witnesses. An application was made to this Court on the 30th of May 1930, requesting it either (1) to summon these witnesses or (2) to direct the Prosecution to bring them before the Court or (3) issue a commission to record their evidence in England. All these requests were rejected by this Court by an order on the 4th of August 1930. Thus the position was that while the Prosecution with their unlimited resources could bring eight witnesses from England, several from French possessions in India and one from an Indian State, the defence could not even get summonses issued for their defence witnesses.

In my statement I have dealt almost entirely with the workers' struggle, not in the abstract but dealing with the actual facts and incidents that have taken place, such as strikes, the workers' conditions, the building of their organisations, the Trade Unions etc. I have tried to give a picture of bourgeois society as it is, based upon exploitation, suffering and misery, and I have also tried to show the workers' struggle against this state of society.

I have shown conclusively I think that this trial is an attack upon the working class movement and specially the militant Trade Union Movement. The trial as such is a political trial, and a political trial of this character only marks the state of panic that the bourgeoisie have got into, and it has also registered the fact that they are going along the path to their own destruction. In my opinion there is no evidence before the Court to support the particular charge of the Prosecution. Nevertheless I do not shirk the responsibility of anything that I have done while I have been in India. On the other hand, as a Communist, I am proud of the fact that I have been afforded an opportunity of participating in the class struggle with my Indian comrades.

Communism is a general, political policy which is being more and more supported by millions of workers, and which is spreading throughout the world today cannot be stopped by persecution and repression. The Communist Party is the vanguard of the working class movement, it is the only Party which is capable of leading the workers to their goal, the overthrow of capitalism and Imperialism, and the establishment of a socialist state of society. I believe that the proletarian revolution will come and that Communism will triumph. As a worker, if I did not

think this it would be hardly worth while continuing to live in a system of society such as I have described, that exists today.

I am confident that this trial will have the very opposite effect to that which the Prosecution desire, it will awaken the consciousness of the masses of India and at the same time will focus the attention of the workers of Great Britain on the struggle of the exploited colonial masses, and will undoubtedly be responsible for rousing the workers of Great Britain to take a more active part in the fight against Imperialism and for the freedom of the colonial slaves.

Fortunately, the Government being that of representatives of the Labour Party, the workers will surely be disillusioned as to the role that this Party is playing in acting as the lackey of Imperialism, and out-doing even the diehard Tory Party in carrying on a reign of terror in India, and throughout the Empire.

This trial as such marks the fact that the working class of India is emerging as a powerful political factor and as a challenge to British Imperialism. It is for the workers now to rally, to organise and to carry on the struggle to a successful conclusion, the final overthrow of Imperialism and the setting up of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

P. 638. As I have said I met Hutchinson on one or two occasions and I did visit Khar on one Sunday evening and I had dinner with Hutchinson. The only persons present on that occasion were Mrs. Subasini Nambar, Hutchinson and myself.

The age I have given in this Court is my correct age. If there is anything different in my passport it is a mistake.

Q. What about your defence witnesses, that is those to whom the Magistrate can issue summonses?

A. I will let the Court know later about this.

Q. You have read over your statement more than once and it has been corrected and amended as requested by you. Are you now satisfied that the above is a correct account of your statement to the Court?

A. Yes.

Sd/- R. L. Yorke

22-7-31

Sd/- B. F. Bradley

22-7-31.

Certified that the above is a full and true account of the statement made by accused, taken down in my presence by stenographers, and transcribed by them, and corrected and amended as and where requested by accused and admitted by him to be a correct record of his statement.

Sd/- R. L. Yorke

22-7-31

Corrected by Duran Choudhary

*Witnessed by
A. S. S. S.
H. C.*

Saraswati Machine Printing Press, Meerut, U. P. (India)

In the Court of R.L. Yorke I.C.S. Addl. Sess. Judge Meerut

In the case of King-Emperor versus P. Spratt and others.

Examination of Shaukat Usmani

accused under section 342 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, made before me R.L. Yorke A.S.J at Meerut on the 26th day of August 1931.

My name is Shaukat Usmani; my father's name is Ghulam Bahauddin; I am by caste No Caste; about 30 years of age; by occupation Journalist; my home is at Bikaner, Police-station Bikaner, District Bikaner, I reside at Bombay.

Q You have heard your statement in the Lower Court P. 2607 read over on 16th March 1931. Is that statement correct?

A. Yes.

SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S
BRANCH LIBRARY

Q. The following evidence relates to your connection with the C.P.I: P 1287 (II), 737 (I), 1324, 1684, 1287 (5), 1287 (2), 2055C, 1295, 1303, 1305, 1296, 1297 and 1171. Have you anything to say about this evidence?

A. I am a Communist, a Communist in no other than the Marxist-Leninist sense. I joined the Communist ranks as early as March 1921. It was in Soviet Russia.

Before proceeding any further, I deem it necessary to give here my previous political views and the circumstances which led me in this direction. It is no exaggeration to say that I was driven in this direction by sheer logic of events, by the grasp of the fact that Communism and Communism alone could solve the problems of social, economic and political inequality, and that it alone could put an end to the exploitation of man by man and rescue the colonial slaves from the Imperialist oppression. The grasp of this fundamental truth effected a revolution in my political outlook.

I quote here some extracts from P. 995, a letter from me to Dange, to give a perspective over my past:— "The Great War in 1914 opened a new chapter in my life. The ideas of political freedom began to take shape. In 1918 I wrote an essay against India joining the War.... (and for this) instead of encouragement I was severely reprimanded by the Educational authorities..... By this time the news about the Russian Revolution had penetrated the barriers of censor, the newspapers were ringing with their (Bolshévik) success. (I thought of going away to Russia). But the first attempt was foiled by my uncles,"

"In the year 1919 the Indian Nationalist Movement commenced, I thought of joining it, and was actually working for it when a rude shock in the shape of Non-Violent Non-Cooperation upset me. Gandhi's programme had no attraction for me."

"At last the right moment came in the guise of Hijrat Movement. Although by this time my ideas of Pan-Islamism had undergone a considerable change, I hastened to join the army of Hijrat. Here I met several men like myself who were disgusted with impotent Gandhian philosophy. All the radical elements remained united in Afghanistan and went away to Russia."

Coming from the land of barbaric oppression, India, and passing through the feudal regime of Afghanistan, to us this change was very outstanding. The whole of the Russian society was undergoing a transformation. All the means of production were being rapidly socialised. There was a definite contrast between the conditions in India and Soviet Russia. There were no Rajas or Nawabs, landlords or money-lenders, capitalists or big merchants. These blood suckers of human organism had been washed away from the Soviet soil. The working and peasant masses of Tartars and Turkomans, Uzbeks and Tajaks, Bashkars and Cossacks, Kirghiz and Kalmook, Armenians and Georgians, Daghanis and Azerbaijanis,

Ukrainians and Great Russians organised in their Soviets were the masters of their destinies, and this vast land covering one sixth of the best of the earth's dry surface. Having destroyed the main foundations of the old bourgeois order these different races numbering more than fifty (and at daggers drawn against one another before the revolution), with totally different cultures, blended into one now, and were set on building in co-operation a new order of society. They were confronting indefinite difficulties, famine, blockade, intervention in this task, yet by their zeal and perseverance they were pushing forward undaunted and were shaping with the zeal of crusaders a new order, a socialist order of things.

* This was the ideal which appealed to me. The programme these people had adopted was after my heart. I observed everything unbiassed and pondered. Although I did not join ~~any~~ educational institution there, yet immense opportunities for practical study were thrown open to me. I studied and pondered. After a study of full six months I joined the Communist Movement. It was at this time that I came in touch with the Communist International. I should say a word or two about this Comintern here. What is this body which is so much on the nerves and brains of the world

bourgeoisie? What is this apparition which is haunting the Chancelleries of Europe? Is it some yet undiscovered wave of Ether which is stealthily permeating the whole of the Universe, or is it some secret conspiratorial organisation furnished with the latest technique mechanically converting the people from their sober political outlooks to the creed of revolution?

I assert that none of these descriptions apply. Comintern in simple terms is the Vanguard of the World Proletarian Movement. It is an open body composed of all the advanced class-conscious intelligent fighters for the cause of the Proletariat towards the establishment of socialism. Comintern is not a secret conspiratorial body, neither is it a mere propaganda organisation. It is a potent political organisation of action at a time when the growth of objective conditions of the world revolution are making themselves manifest. The functions of the Comintern are to advise and devise the best methods of Proletarian fight against the increasing oppression of the world bourgeoisie. The Communist International presents the world Communist Party as the amalgamation of the will and strength of the proletariat.

This is the factor which every Communist represents. These are the politics and principles for which we are being prosecuted.

The intelligent Prosecution and their allies in the dock could not go beyond the Russian Revolution in tracing the origin of an international revolutionary organisation. As a matter of common knowledge, Marx, Engels and their colleagues were striving to bring about such an organisation even from the middle of the last century. Their efforts to a small scale fructified when in 1864 they laid the foundation of the International Working Class Association, commonly known as the First International. Their aim was to bring this organisation into conformity with the Communist Manifesto, 1848. Before it could take any definite shape it broke down as a consequence of the Franco-Prussian War. Therefore the Second International came into existence in 1889. This also could not keep to the principles on which it was built, and soon degenerated into an organisation of the vacillating petty-bourgeoisie.

During the world war, it failed to give a clear lead to the International proletariat. Its national sections incited the proletariat of the respective countries to take part in the war. As a matter of fact it became an instrument of the war policy of the pseudo-democratic bourgeoisie, which aimed at the mystification of the proletariat. One section became a hostage of the Entente, another of the Central Powers.

This state of affairs therefore united together ^{all} ~~of~~ the Left elements of the Second International. The war forced into the forefront in an acute form the issues and divisions that had been latent in the Socialist Movement. It was no longer possible for the great national movements to maintain their dual allegiance at once to the existing national state which they hoped to control some day, and to the International class war which they had still continued to proclaim in their resolutions. So after all came the division of forces, the division of majority and minority which manifested in every belligerent country.

The small Minority sections of the British Socialist Party, I. L. P. and Socialist Labour Party in Britain, groups of Syndicalists and Socialist revolutionaries in France, the Spartacist group under Liebknecht in Germany and at a late stage the Independents and Socialist Party in Italy and the Russian Bolsheviks headed by Lenin drew together in opposition to war. These groups met at an unofficial Conference at Zimmerwald in September 1915. This Conference reassembled at Kienthal in April 1916. A Manifesto was drawn up which proclaimed the solidarity of the proletariat in face of the horrors of war let loose by capitalist Imperialism, denouncing the action of the Socialists who had put themselves in line with their governments and taken on responsibility for the conduct of the war.

The Stockholm Conference of September 12, 1917, came to a decision to break away and enter into independent revolutionary action owing to the failure of the International Socialist Bureau—the Second International.

The success of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 laid the basis for the Third International. In January 1919 the Russian Communist Party and the Parties of Poland, Hungary, Germany, Austria, Latvia, Finland and Balkan Revolutionary Federation issued a Manifesto calling for the First Congress of the Communist International. Thirty-nine organisations and groups were represented in the Manifesto.

The organisation which thus came into existence is an organisation of the most active and class-conscious elements of the working class. It is organised for the purpose of actively leading the working class in the struggle against their class enemy, the capitalist class. This involves the active struggle with the existing state which is but the class organ of the capitalist class.

The more the contradictions of Capitalism multiply the more does the class struggle intensify, the more does the White Terror increase. But the period of capitalist decay will not be checked

either by the past restoration of the regime by resort to Terror, nor would the contradictions within it be brought to a stop by keeping in check the development of productive forces, every fresh development of capitalism at the same time develops its contradictions revealing the inevitability of even greater conflicts between the competing capitalist states. This competition and the struggle for the redistribution of the colonies, brings about unheard-of, colossal economic and political crises, leading to wars menacing the existence of the human society. It is here that the hitherto oppressed proletariat would resist against its being used as cannon-fodder. It is here that the way to the world revolution will open. Here comes in the role of the Comintern to lead the proletariat to a successful battle, culminating in the establishment of the Proletarian State.

I take up now the remarks of the learned Magistrate about me which weighed so heavily with him in committing me to the Sessions. He cites one of the grounds for this as:—"In September 1927, when the C. P. I. welcomed him in Bombay on his release from jail, Usmani modestly acknowledged their greetings and said that he was still a Communist, as he was before, and would give his life to the cause of Communism (P. 1684)."

I totally fail to understand the learned Magistrate. Did he expect me to renounce my views and principles? Is it not known even by this time to the representatives of the Bourgeoisie that several thousands of the Communists fell into the hands of the bourgeois brigands at the time of intervention in Russia and that they at the point of bayonets declared themselves true to their creed. They were stood against wall and shot. They stood fast by their convictions rather than renounce them. These are the communist traditions, the revolutionary traditions and it is to them that every Communist looks with pride.

I said in that meeting the sentence quoted by the learned Magistrate, I have stuck fast to that statement of mine, and I reiterate that today with greater vigour and emphasis.

I know it perfectly well that my views have been unsavoury to British Imperialism in India. It was absolutely because of these distasteful views of mine that I had to suffer imprisonment for a period extending from May 1923 to August 1927. I was awarded this severe vindictive punishment because punishment in the Imperialist courts to the victims of White Terror the world over is determined by the strength of their convictions. It is no mere allegation, it is an admitted fact. Sacco-Vanzetti and Gastonia Trials in America, the Trial of Comrade Raccocci in Hungary

bear witness to this. The Cawnpore verdict was one of the many glaring examples of the class justice of British Imperialism in India. Nobody can calculate how many times more the Cawnpore history is going to repeat itself and with what vigour, as the forces of revolution are better developed today than at any time during the last one decade. British Imperialism is in panic today. It is working havoc throughout its colonial world.

Mention here ought to be made of my role in the Cawnpore Case. It was in 1923 that my Communism began to pinch the British Government in India. I was not only arrested but subjected to torture. The Reuter Agency flashed sensational messages to the British Press and startled the British public with the arrest of a big Bolshevik agent (Horton's File, Inprecorr File no. 249). With flaring headlines this message appeared in almost all the sensation-mongering papers in Britain. Tremendous revelations about the Bolshevik propaganda were broadcasted. Of course all this was necessary to justify Lord Curzon's ultimatum to the Soviet Union."

Thereafter "the Bolshevik Agent" was taken in state to the obscure north, fettered at Peshawar and moved from one Thana to another. I was kept for several days out of the Peshawar Jail and subjected to brutal treatment by the Frontier Intelligence Department. There is too much to say about this treatment and therefore I leave it for the present. I sincerely hope that it will one day form the subject matter of a judicial inquiry. After 10 months I was brought back to Cawnpore and was tried and sentenced along with other three accused for four years R. I. My political stand in that case was deplorable. Through the bad advice of our Defence counsels and because of the puzzling way the judge put the questions I had to deny that I was a Communist. Our political statement, which would have formed a historic demarcation in the Indian political struggle, was ruled out of order by our novice lawyers in that case. But for the stupidity of these wise counsels the Cawnpore Case would have been a historic case in the Communist annals of India.

I have shared the responsibility of this blunder, but have not repeated it. Since then I have always stood by my convictions. I have declared from within prison four walls to the British working class in my Election Manifesto (when the brave class-conscious workers of Spen Valley selected me as their candidate) that I am a Communist standing full-fledged by the Communist programme. A Communist can not conceal his views and aims. My aims and views are the aims and views of the Communist International. The aim of the Communist International is the

establishment of a Communist order of society throughout the world. Enough has been said about Communist programme by some of my fellow accused and more will still be said in future. I need not therefore repeat it.

However, before going further, I must answer one charge which is so often hurled at us from all sides, that is our criticism of our political opponents. There is a tendency to regard and misinterpret our criticism against the reactionary reformist national and Trade Union leadership as personal and malicious. We wish to assure these gentlemen that there is nothing personal or malicious in our attacks. We do not degenerate to that extent. But to call a spade a spade and a fool a fool is no attack at all. When we call Gandhi a policeman of British Imperialism or a lackey of the Indian bourgeoisie we only translate his own expressions about himself. There is no greater owner for that miserable specimen of humanity, that incarnation of hypocrisy and reaction, than to call him what he really is.

This healthy criticism of ours the agents of the British bourgeoisie advertise, ostensibly 'to widen the gulf' between us and these so called leaders of the Indian nation. Let me assure these knavish agents that there is not a gulf but a wide sea between us and these 'leaders' and which we have no intention bridge.

In this connection take the astounding statement of the late Mr. Langford James, the Crown Counsel. On the very first page of his address before the Magistrate's court he says [that we are opposed to the leaders of the nationalist thought because "they are striving or at present are accredited with striving for independence in India." I wish Mr. James were alive to go through the confusion of the Civil Disobedience Movement. Then he would have seen with his own eyes that his friends of the Congress were not striving for Independence, not even for the shadow of it.

Unfortunately he is dead but the charge is there. We are opposed to the Congress leadership and their ilk (who in this court are openly abusing us and thereby flattering British Imperialism to procure their release), not because these gentlemen advocate independence, but because they do not advocate independence or if they do advocate it they have shown themselves to be thoroughly insincere in it, they have betrayed the Independence Movement.

With regard to this Congress leadership we point out that the fundamental demand of the so-called 'national leaders' is not for independence at all, but for "Dominion Status", which we have

often shown means no greater degree of freedom or improvement for three hundred million masses of the population of India. We point out that the rallying cry of the 'national leaders' since 1924 has been 'the Round Table Conference', which cannot be a revolutionary slogan but is obviously a lead in the direction of compromise with British Imperialism. All the conduct of the 'nationalist leaders' since that time has shown the same thing.

The latest example is the treacherous surrender of the 'nationalist leaders' to British Imperialism on the 4th of March this year. The treachery of 1922 and 1931 justifies entirely our criticism of these black-guards who masquerade under the name of national leaders. After the capitulation of this year no more proof is required to show that these 'national leaders', these Pandits and Maulanas, Mahatmas and Ulemas cannot and do not want to fight for national independence. The Congress is headed by a clique of moral cowards. They hide their cowardice under the slogan "Non-Violence is our Sheét Anchor". And I add "Cowardice is their Religion."

We point out that the "national leaders" whom we criticise are neither desirous nor capable of attaining complete independence. This is the significance of the statement made from time to time by the Prosecution that they have no complaint against 'genuine nationalists'. This is because these so-called 'genuine nationalists' like the 'genuine Trade Unionists' are harmless creatures. Let the Prosecution be a little bit more honest and admit that these genuine people are objectively and ultimately open allies of British Imperialism. This is quite evident from the statements of at least two of such genuine men preceding me, who elected to abuse the Soviet Union and the Communists in the same strain as the Prosecution. We know the significance of such abuses. This is not only flattering Imperialism but much more. It is to get "Release, Reward and Happiness." Our political stand is not a sentimental one. We are neither the loin Cloth Maniacs nor the Mourning Dress Martyrs. We do not base our activities on analysis of flimsy sentimental grounds. Our explanation of this situation is supplied by its analysis according to Marxian theory. The national reformist leaders are representatives of the Indian bourgeois class. This explains their opposition to the existing Government which represents the British bourgeoisie, since the British bourgeoisie competes with the Indian and uses its control of the Government to hamper the development of the Indian bourgeoisie in many ways. It also explains their opposition to the mass movement in India since the class interest of the Indian bourgeoisie prevents them from increasing the organisation or consciousness or fighting ability

of the masses especially of the workers. The vacillating position of the Indian bourgeoisie and their representatives is therefore determined by the class interests. Though normally in opposition to the Government they are afraid to push their opposition to effective lengths, since this means rousing the masses which they dare not do. And at any time, when the Government because of some special reasons such as the danger of war, or internal disturbance, or the economic breakdown, wishes to strengthen its position in India, it can win the support of the bourgeoisie and their representatives by some slight or nominal economic concessions to their political or economic demands.

We have just seen such a development. The revolutionary wave in India was seriously developing, and the bourgeoisie by boycotting the Simon Commission and the first stage of the R.T.C. was unwillingly but objectively helping the revolutionary movement. The bourgeoisie saw the danger of their policy. They lost no time in directing the revolutionary energy in futile and pacifist channels. It was directed into salt-making and foreign cloth and liquor-picketing channels. The Government used colossal repression; a mountain was moved to crush the non-violent mole. The Civil Disobedience Movement naturally began to dwindle but at the same time this intensified repression drove the revolutionary elements into segregated revolutionary actions such as Sholapur, Chittagong, Peshawar and Chirner etc. Along with it the individual heroism of the terrorists' activities assumed a gigantic form. Terrorism was ~~made~~ by counter-terrorism. This state of affairs, the repression and the revolutionary outbreaks brought the Congress to its knees. Terrorism drove the Government to desperation. As a counter, wholesale terrorism against all the oppositional elements, the Government threatened the Congress with a repression never heard of. Coercion worked. The Congress begged for truce. Under the camouflage of truce it was a rank betrayal of India's fight for independence. A compromise was arrived at. The Congress heralded it as 'victory for both.' Although this ~~mystified~~ ^{stagnated} the people for some time but the Government's statement issued by Lord Irwin, which ends with a threat, made it abundantly clear that the victory was a victory for one side the Government.

This is our criticism of the leaders. They cannot be relied upon to lead the movement to its logical conclusion, but will always hamper its development and go over to the other side on the slightest show of compromise by the British Imperialism, on the slightest sign of a real revolutionary development among the masses. It may be said in passing that the same thing applies to

our criticism of the Right Wing leaders of the Trade Union Movement. The betrayal and sabotage of the revolutionary Proletarian movement during the last two years justifies our criticism. Mr. Mitter, the Junior Prosecution Counsel, while summing up in the Lower Court, said that the Prosecution had no objection to 'genuine Trade Unionists'. This means as before harmless Trade Unionists, who wish to help the Trade Union Movement within the frame-work of the present system.

The Right Wing leaders are objectively the representatives of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement and they must act in the same treacherous way as the bourgeois leaders of the National Movement. So much for our alleged anti-nationalism. We claim that we are the better vanguard of the Indian National Revolution than the leaders we criticise. But at the same time we as Communists are Internationalists. We consider that in subject countries such as India, Indonesia and Indo-China revolutionary nationalism can be a progressive force, unlike nationalism in an independent country, where it is always a reactionary force constituting a means whereby the masses are kept under the ideological and political influence of the bourgeoisie.

Nationalism in a subject country can be progressive (when) it does not tend to objectionable developments, such as cultural (isolation) and takes the form of a genuine desire to destroy Imperialism. But at the same time we realise that the ultimate aims of the revolutionaries even ~~of~~ a subject country cannot be national, but must be towards the attainment of a united world socialist organisation. The Soviet system is the model for such a State. The level which economic and technical developments have reached at present time render this essential that we proceed through nationalism to Internationalism, and we claim that although Internationalists our immediate objective is the Indian National Revolution and as such there is no comparison between us and the vacillating leadership whom the Prosecution has selected to praise from time to time.

Note:— So far I have finished the explanation of Exhibits P. 1684, P. 1287 (5), P. 1287 (2), P. 1287 (11), P. 1171, P. 1295, P. 1296, P. 1303 and P. 1305. I now take up the explanation of some minor Prosecution exhibits put against me.

P. 1287 (2):— I have absolutely no knowledge of this document nor its contents nor do I know the author of it. I saw it for the first time in this Court.

P. 1287(5):— I cannot say anything about this exhibit also. It is absurd to suggest that I joined the Communist

Party in 1927. I have already explained that I joined the Communist Party in 1921. Once one joins a Communist Party, whether of India, Syria or Massopotamia he is always a member, there is no need for him to apply again for the membership of a Communist Party unless of course he has resigned in the mean while. I did never resign. Once admitted one is always a member wherever he may be, whether in prison or in Honolulu or Timbuctoo.

P. 1287 (11):— I do not know anything about this at all as I was in prison at that time.

P. 1171:— I know nothing about such a meeting. I never attended it.

P. 1295 and P. 1296. I know nothing about them.

P. 1305 and P. 1305:— Nor do I know anything about these.

P. 1559 is a piece of paper on which I had written down these notes to be expanded later in an article form and to appear in a subsequent issue of 'Paiyam-i-mazdur.' In these few lines I had written that Communist Party is a party of the advanced section of the working class. I have also mentioned that its members come mostly from the miners, engineers, railwaymen, printers, clerks and workers of every trade, both male and female. Landlords and factory owners have no place in this Party. This is what I wanted to explain in an article for the benefit of the workers, but I did not get any opportunity to do so as the arrest put a stop to all my activities.

P. 1560. is another skeleton of an article. In this I meant to explain the significance of the Nehru Report. I do not really understand the mentality of the Prosecution by putting such a small bit of paper as exhibit.

P. 1561 and P. 1563:— I emphatically deny any knowledge of these two exhibits. Nothing has surprised me more in this case than the allegation that these were found in my possession. There is absolutely no suggestion from the prosecution or the hand-writing expert that these are in my handwriting.

P. 1561 speaks for itself. The Marathi script on it makes it abundantly clear that whomsoever it might belong it cannot belong to me. I do not know a single word of Marathi.

P. 1563:— The Prosecution says it is a prescription for invisible ink. I do not know really where that invisible ink was

applied. There is alleged no correspondence to me or from me in this mysterious and fantastic prescription. It might be an ink, it might be a liniment, it might be a compound for bed kills; whatever it be, I know nothing about it. The allegation of its having been recovered from my possession is simply astounding. I will not be surprised after this if the Prosecution next charges me with the possession of the invisible cap of Prophet Solomon who used to become invisible after putting it on as the legend goes.

P.W. 262 who carried out my search and arrest had admitted that I did not search him or the search witnesses. Not only I did not search them but I did not pay any attention to the search list under preparation. I remained indifferent and occupied with putting my other things in order.

P. 1566:— No explanation is necessary for a Communist about the possession of the Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx and Engels.

P. 1567:— This is a publication of C.P.G.B. I accept full responsibility for possessing it.

P. 1568:— These are the issues of the *Paiyam-i-mazdur* dated 3/3/29; 10/3/29; and 17/3/29 respectively. I shall explain them in extenso when I come to my activities as editor and author.

P. 1569, P. 1570, P. 1571, P. 1572, & P. 1573:— I accept full responsibility for possessing them.

P. 1574:— It is a typescript "A page from the Russian Revolution." This is a true concentrated abridged account of the Russian Revolution. I shall explain it fully when I come to my activities as editor and author.

P. 1575 (1-6) and (8), 1576, 1577 and 1578:— I take full responsibility for possessing them.

P. 1575 (7):— It is another funny document which the Prosecution suggest was found in my possession. I do not really understand what use could it have for me specially when I do not know a single word of Marathi.

P. 1578 (2):— It is the funniest piece of evidence put by the Prosecution against me. This is a cutting from a local newspaper in Bombay containing the pictures of Comrades Stalin and Kalinin I accept the responsibility for its possession, but what about Comrade Krupskaya? Why did the Prosecution drop her picture? Has she grown 'moderate' since then?

P. 1579 & P. 1580:— I take full responsibility for possessing them.

Q: The following evidence relates to your connection with W. & P. Parties including the A.I.W.P.P. Bengal: P. 1569, 1570, 1575 (5). Punjab: P. 1409, 749, 750, 746 & 747, A.I.W.P.P. : P. 1373 (2), 1575 (1) to (4) & (6). And Bombay: P. 1344, 1373 (14), 1575 (7) & (8), 1690 & 1170. Have you anything to say about these?

A: P. 1344, 1373 (2), 1373 (14):— According to these exhibits the Prosecution allege and Magistrate accepts that Usmani was a member of the W.P.P. I neither joined the W.P.P. nor had any intention of doing so. I emphatically deny any knowledge of any of these meetings. I could not be expected to attend the private meetings of a body of which I was not a member. The same applies to P. 1170.

P. 826:— In this exhibit there is mention of welcoming me. I do not see how a public welcome by this body entitles me to its membership. I do not know anything about this particular report. Further I wish to emphasise that the C.P.I. compared to W.P.P. is an extremist body. I have not only admitted but on the other hand justified my membership of the C.P.I., how then could I deny the membership of a milder body if I were its member? I deny it because I was never a member of the W.P.P.

P. 474:— The writer of this letter is the right person to explain it.

P. 727:— I do not know how this reached the Mehnat-Kash Office. The only thing I have to say about this is that it is a crude copy of P. 1574 which I am going to explain when I come to my activities as editor and author.

P. 737 (1):— I know nothing about it.

P. 749, 750:— Establish my association with Kirti. Yes I received these two money-orders for my contributions in that paper.

P. 756:— Mr. Sahgal has explained it.

P. 866:— It was for Mr. Thengdi to explain it. I have nothing to add if he has already explained.

P. 957:— The letter speaks for itself, however I shall explain its contents later on.

P. 992:— I have nothing to say. The photo is self-explanatory.

Q. The following exhibits relate to what may be called your history. P. 1324, 2518, 1970, 1971, 2138P, 1624, 995, 996, 1625C, 2041C, 2042, 415 (5)=2031C, 2043C, 1607, 674, 1348 (34), 2408P, 2189, 1174, 957, 337, 1336, 1303, 474, 2002, 1891 and 1865. Have you anything to say about these? .

Reply for tomorrow.

D/-27.8.31

P. 995:— This is the most important exhibit against me according to the Prosecution. Every now and then they have made much of this letter of mine to Dange. They feel almost triumphant when they come to the particular portion in this letter where I have mentioned: "at the age of five I was sent to a *maktad* where I learnt nothing except absconding." What a comedy! What a secret the clever Prosecution have unearthed!

Just imagine the fate of a five years' boy who is made to learn without understanding Arabic or Latin or Sanskrit, or a ten years' boy made to cram the Arithmetical problems. Let Mr. Kemp imagine that embarrassment.

However, I do not think your Honour will be justified in taking cognizance of my absconding propensities at the age of 5.

Next I come to another thing in this exhibit which requires explanation. This is about my writing an essay against India's joining the Great War. I do not think it for a moment that I committed any crime in writing it. War is a bad thing. No sane man likes it. Of course I do not include in this category Poincare, Pilsudsky, Churchill and Moonje (the future Fascist War Lord of India). Although I had no Communist outlook at that time, yet there was a sincere feeling of repugnance in me towards War. I could not see humanity bleeding for the benefit of the Governing class. Nobody benefitted from this mad craze except a few war profiteers and capitalists.

Strange and shocking to find that there were no prosecutions for promoting and continuing this carnage. But who should try whom? A criminal does not try himself. The entire capitalist system was guilty of this crime. It is a matter of common knowledge that the history of capitalism is the history of bloody wars--now fought under the banner of religion, now under the banner of civilisation. Under one pretence or other wars have been fought, and in the same old way the new ones are under preparation.

The third point to be explained in this letter is the letter-head. According to this letter-head the Magistrate has remarked in his Committal Order that I transferred my activities to Delhi where I opened an "Oriental Information and Publicity Bureau." Although there is absolutely no evidence regarding the activities of this Bureau I do not want to hide that I opened this Bureau for the purposes of gathering all the available information about the Oriental countries and disseminating it by bulletins in the Indian Press.

There is no limit to the barriers put in India about the conditions in the Orient. Whereas the latest developments in Europe can be known here within a few hours of happening, absolutely nothing is known and about our next door neighbours - Persia, Afghanistan and China. How very ~~low~~ ^{bourgeois} bourgeois press agencies conceal from us the ruthless oppression and the growth of the revolutionary movements in these countries.

To bring out this fact prominently as well as to make the Indian Proletarian Movement aware of the dimensions of the revolutionary potentialities in the colonies and semi-colonies of the East that I started this Bureau.

I collected a lot of information about the atrocities of Chang-kai-shek gang in China, Raza Shah in Persia and the colossal repression in Indonesia and Indo-China. I disseminated this information in the form of articles to several newspapers but with the exception of a few all were detained or taken away by the Intelligence Branch from the Post-office.

Having been so embarrassingly hampered in my work by the all pervading C. I. D. I had to liquidate this Bureau and shift my activities to other spheres.

P 996: There is nothing to explain about this.

P 1000: I shall explain the book 'Peshawar to Moscow' when I come to other relevant exhibits in this direction.

P 1085: I accept its possession.

P 1086: These are typed addresses for despatching 'Paiyam-i-mazdur.'

P 1302 and P 1335: I am not the proper person to explain them.

P 1348 (34): I know nothing about this letter of Comrade Dutt to Comrade Ghate.

P 1373 (15): I did send this telegram congratulating Comrade Spratt on his release.

P 1409: Comrade S. S. Josh has already explained this exhibit.

P 1615: Muzaffer Ahmed has already explained it.

P 1624 and P 1625: I accept responsibility.

P 1865: I have no knowledge of this letter.

P 1894C: I never received this letter.

P 1895: There is nothing mysterious about this letter. In this letter I wrote to Comrade S. S. Josh that my negotiations with M. A. Khan of the N. W. Railway Union had failed, i. e. I had failed in persuading him to let me work in his Union and that I had left the Punjab without seeing Comrade Josh.

~~*P 2055C*~~ and *P 2408.* There is nothing in these two exhibits for me to explain. I know nothing about them.

P 2138 (P). I sent this letter to Muzaffar Ahmed. There is a mention in it about my suffering from intestinal disease.

Meetings.

P. W. 180. Yes, I presided over the Lenin-Day meeting in Bombay, but this (*P. 1690*) is not the correct report of that. This speech as reported by *P. W. 180* is an absolute distortion. He has represented me in this report as a hopeless confounder; whereas I said: "Lenin is dead not Leninism, Leninism lives although Lenin is no more", the reporter has put "Lenin has survived. Lenin is dead but Leninism has survived."

Even after going carefully through this report I cannot make head or tail. The more I read this the more I find myself in a pool of confusion. However, I do not run away from the facts of this speech. Whatever ideologically correct can be sifted from this report, I take full responsibility; whatever ideological mis-statements and bad formulations are there, they be credited to the competence of the Bombay Intelligence Branch, which has sent this report as an exhibit against me.

P 1694. Yes I presided over this meeting. As regards the report what is true of *P 1690* is also true of *P 1694.* This report is a hopeless jumble. I accept only those portions of this exhibit which are ideologically sound.

P. W. s 111 and 119. After my release from jail in 1927 I took up my residence at Cawnpore because I had my old ties with the heroic workers of Cawnpore. I was arrested working amongst them in 1923. Now that I was back I wanted to serve them and rescue them from the petty bourgeois reactionary leadership, which in

the absence of any revolutionary elements there had disorganised and mystified the workers for their own selfish ends. Although my sojourn in Cawnpore was very short for various reasons, yet I set on working and contributed my mite in their day to day economic struggle. I was pained to see the Cawnpore Muzdur Sabha, which fought so valiantly against the masters in 1924 and which numbered some several thousands then, had dwindled now to some hundreds.

After two months there came the T. U. C. Session. I was elected one of the numerous Vice-Chairmans of the Reception Committee. In this capacity I helped in the preparations for the Congress. I took part in the strenuous efforts of the brave workers in hoisting up the red flag with hammer and sickle in spite of the the opposition of the reactionary elements. The credit of this victory does not belong to me. It belongs to the class-conscious workers of Cawnpore themselves.

ACTIVITIES AS EDITOR AND AUTHOR.

P. 1568: are issues of *Paiyam-i-mazdur* of 3/3/29, 10/3/29 and 17/3/29 respectively. I take all the responsibility for editing this paper and for all that appeared in its columns up to the date of my arrest. It was necessary to start this paper to propagate the principles of the workers' movement. Whereas the cities of India were resounding with the capitalist papers the working class had almost none. This paper was only one step in this direction, to augment this deficiency in the workers' movement. The first aim of this paper was to give publicity to the grievances of the working class of India in general and Bombay in particular. This paper was a genuine effort towards inculcating class-consciousness in the working class which was so very lacking in it because of the various and numerous barriers, mental as well as physical, placed by British Imperialism. It was lacking this class consciousness because of the poisonous mystifying propaganda of the leaders of the Second International and the gallant heroes of Geneva. I belonged to that active group of persons who were persistently trying to save the working class from the clutches of these gentlemen and teach the working class the lessons of the working class history. If promoting of class-consciousness and class solidarity are crimes I plead guilty to that charge. I plead guilty to that charge and to the charge that I did not create sufficient of them.

The first article in the first issue of the paper begins with "The condition of working class." The article deals with the realities of working class life. There is absolutely no exaggeration,

on the contrary the article is too scrappy and is not exhaustive. Any casual observer would have given more about the condition of the exploited masses of India whose vitality is daily being sapped by this system of blood and chaos. The first editorial deals with the necessity of giving publicity to workers' movement. The second editorial deals with the Hindu-Muslim riots of February 1929. In this my main drive is against the Indian bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie. The Imperialist bourgeoisie, and the one actually guilty of promoting these pogroms, was left out in this article to be dealt with in a subsequent issue. This particular article from my own view-point lacks much. It only casually touches the role of the bourgeoisie in promoting these pogroms. These riots were organised goondaism. It was a well thought out offensive of the bourgeoisie against the growing working class movement. It was a definite provocation to drag the working class in these riots.

The working class of Bombay understood this move perfectly well and refused to fall into this trap. Whereas Null Bazar, Bhindi Bazar, Doongri and Kamatipura areas were the hot-beds of these riots there was relative calm in Parel and Dadar.

The Riots Inquiry Committee has unjustly blamed the G. K. U. Communist and radical leadership for promoting these riots. Shaikat Ali, the gallant goonda chieftain, has openly charged them of stirring up these riots. Nothing is more grotesque, ridiculous and dishonest than to associate the Communists with this sort of things.

The fomenting directly or indirectly of Hindu-Muslim riots can as much be assigned to the Communists as the creation of earthquakes to the authorities in Tokio, or the eruption of Mount Vesuvius to the authorities in Naples.

It should be thoroughly understood that communalism in India is the creation of British Imperialism. In India it is promoted as Hindu-Muslim problem, in Iraq it is Sunni-Shia, and in Palestine it is Arab-Jew. This bogey of communalism is very vital for the existence of Imperialism. It affords Imperialism a justification for oppression. How else can it remove people like Ganesh Shankar from the political arena? No doubts should be entertained that the conflicts of different communities are mainly due to the activities of Imperialism. It must divide, in order to rule. It must find allies to assist it in its hard task. Communal leaders of the type of Shaikat Ali and Dr. Moonje are the direct agents and the chief functionaries of Imperialism. With impunity they lead the inarticulate Hindu-Muslim petty bourgeoisie and

hooligan populace in this warfare. Whereas the speakers against the State are speedily punished, no cognizance is taken by Imperialism of the fiery and blood-thirsty speeches these functionaries make to incite different communities of India. No punishment is awarded to them even if they are caught red-handed. This only shows the open and naked role of Imperialism in promoting this sort of strife.

However the class-conscious working class is not concerned with communalism. It is absolutely a foreign cult to the workers.

Before closing this topic I feel duty bound to sound a note of warning to all those sincere persons who want to abolish communalism. All remedies they are unearthing in getting rid of this demon are grandiose. The theories they are advancing are attractive but let me tell them that there is nothing scientific in them. The path they are pursuing leads to a wrong direction. As the Persian saying goes that traveller bound for Mecca is wrongly travelling towards Turkistan. In other words cause and effect are inter-related. The effect cannot be removed without removing the cause. Communalism cannot be abolished without abolishing Imperialism. This is the position pure and simple. Look at Russia. Where are the pogroms now ?

10-3-29: The first article in this issue is the translation of a certain portion from Karl Kautsky's book "The Working Class". That friend and comrade of Mr. Mac Donald will surely feel flattered to find that his articles and books are regarded as seditious by the Indian Government.

On page 3 of this issue is an article "the temporary defeat of Amanullah". In this article I described Amanullah as the leader of a movement, the object of which was to develop Afghanistan as an Independent political as well as economic unit, without subjecting that country directly or indirectly to any sort of Imperialist domination.

With this in view Amanullah went to Europe in 1927-28, and procured a great many concessions in Europe. He specially negotiated economic and commercial treaties with the Governments of Italy and Germany who were sympathetic towards his ambitions and who could not dominate his country politically, being so far away from Afghanistan. In return Amanullah granted them a great many concessions. He did not grant any concessions to the British bourgeoisie because of its past interference in Afghanistan and because of its being dangerously close to that country; to France because of her entente with Britain and because of her overtures to

Amanullah through the Afghan Ambassador General Nadir Khan to join in the anti-Soviet bloc. The conduct of Amanullah enraged the British bourgeoisie. Amanullah's going to Soviet Union in spite of the warnings of Downing Street increased the hostile attitude of the British bourgeoisie. The friendly attitude of Amanullah towards the Soviet was always an eyesore to Downing Street. The great influence the Soviet Ambassador Raskolnikoff wielded at Amanullah's court was always an object of jealousy to Lord Curzon. The Hon'ble Lord did not forget to mention Raskolnikoff's role in Afghanistan when he issued that notorious ultimatum to the Soviet in 1923.

I can fully demonstrate how the consolidation of Amanullah's regime had been viewed with awe and suspicion by British Imperialism, but for the purposes of this case I shall be brief. Suffice it to say that Amanullah was a thorn in the side of British interests in the East. He had to be removed by hook or crook. He was to be removed because he proved uncompromising to the solicitation of Anglo-French entente to join in the anti-Soviet combination. He was to be removed because he refused to be dominated by the Whitehall. A Colonel Lawrence had to find out a Baccha Saqqau to create chaos and thereby make way for a consistent slave of Anglo-French entente. Mohammad Nadir was that slave, waiting and intriguing from Paris in this direction.

The position today is that British Imperialism is openly consolidating the Nadir regime. The recent loan of 23 lacs of rupees without interest, a present of several thousands of rifles and an immense quantity of ammunition and the last but not the least important the recent Ordinance no. 4 of 1931 and the prosecution under this Ordinance, go to show Britain's interest in Afghanistan.

Nadir is a British protege, and Afghanistan a vassal State, which furnishes Great Britain with a base of operations against the Soviet. This is how the Afghan affairs stand today and that is why I have written in this article of mine in *Paiyam-i-mazdur* that all this is a temporary phase because, with all the British forces, Nadir cannot ensure Afghanistan's subordination to British Imperialism. The cause for which Amanullah stood is deep-rooted among the brave people of Afghanistan and they will soon send Nadir to his proper place to enjoy and revel like other deposed kings on the French Riviera. But if he tenaciously sticks to the throne that he will soon find himself fastened to the mouth of a cannon from where no power on earth would be able to save him. And this is what Mr. Louis Fisher has to say in this connection in his book "The Soviets in world affairs" :- "If Amanullah does not return . . . some other

Amanullah will. For the ideas of new freedom, of rights of women, of western culture and Latin alphabet and anti-Imperialism, which under the Soviet sun are being germinated in Uzbekistan and Turkomanistan, in the Tartar Republic and in the Crimea, have already infected Turkey, Afghanistan and Persia, and independent of the march of political events, they will never respect the arbitrary boundaries of map-makers."

P 2518: "Peshawar to Moscow." This book was not meant and does not add anything to the Communist literature. This was originally intended for the newspaper articles, purely for the consumption of the petty bourgeoisie. Much care was taken to make it agreeable to this class by cutting off most of the material. Parts I and II are mainly describing the journey from Peshawar to Moscow and the hardships the Muhajirin had to face. Part III deals in a scrappy manner with Soviet institutions as I saw them. Had I originally intended to bring it out in a book form, I would really have made it worthy of a communist and it would have claimed a place amongst the best books of travels and an authority on Soviet Union. A little farsight in writing the manuscript and the book would have been a classical work to be placed with the works of Messrs. Phillips Price, Rhys Williams etc. The British Trade Union Delegation which visited the Soviet Union in 1924 and was not composed of Communists has presented a better and exhaustive report about the achievements of the Soviet Union and the institutions.

However by these comparisons I do not wish to shirk the responsibility. The book is there, I wrote it and I accept full responsibility.

My object in writing this book was twofold. Firstly I wanted to demonstrate the fallacy of Pan-Islamism of which Indian Muslims are so much enamoured. Secondly I wanted to place before the Indian public the true state of things in Soviet Union, about which there were so many lies in circulation. Fantastic and ridiculous canards were spread by the bourgeois press and the romance-loving populace devoured them quite credulously, never questioning the authenticity of these stories. My object was to bring out the true significance of the great Russian Revolution.

On page 3 of the book I have written something in praise of Nadir Khan now King of Afghanistan. I have changed my opinion considerably about this man since I wrote these few lines. I changed my opinion because of his treacherous role. That man with "thin silvery voice" who once "inspired confidence and command" is today a hypocrite, importor and underling of the Anglo-

French bourgeoisie. The free Afghanistan of yesterday is a vassal state of British Empire today under the kingship of this ex-general of Amanullah.

Before terminating the explanation about this book I want to add here that the book is full of printing mistakes and that the publishers have altered in some cases and cut down totally in many cases much of the valuable material. By referring to this I do not propose to launch a complaint in this Court against the publishers nor do I suggest that they have made the book more radical but on the contrary I wish to emphasise that the cutting down and the alteration of the material have made the book ridiculous and disjointed. For illustration purposes I take page 106. The publishers in their zeal to advertise Mr. Gandhi out of the mouth of a Communist have substituted a word which fundamentally changes what actually was the case. The sentence in dispute runs like this:— "One of these Sardis who had just returned from Germany spoke very highly of the Hindu nationalists in Berlin and of Mr. Gandhi's work in East Africa, while his reproaches about Khare Brothers and Abdul Rab had no limits." The original sentence in the manuscript ran like this: "One of the Sardis who had just returned from Germany, spoke very disparagingly of the Hindu nationalists in Berlin and of Mr. Gandhi's works in East Africa while his reproaches of Khare Brothers and Abdul Rab had no limit." What a mockery? How can one possibly expect a class-conscious citizen of U. S. S. R. to praise the stretcher bearer of British Imperialism, Mr. Gandhi, who by his own confession in his autobiography took part in the armed suppression of Zulu peasants in Africa and who recruited Indian peasants and workers into the British army and sent to their deaths hundreds and thousands of Indian workers and peasants in the interests of his masters, the British Imperialism.

P 906 is a Hindi Version of my book. It is a translation of "Peshawar to Moscow." I did not write the book in or translate it into Hindi.

P 1574:— This is a concentrated account of that great revolution which shook the foundations of the entire capitalist fabric. It is a bird's-eye view of the Russian revolution and the subsequent episodes connected with it. The most important in this account are the lines dealing with blockade and intervention. No sooner the October Revolution took place the Allies and Associated Powers rushed their divisions on the Russian territory, on the territory of their former ally, and for a period of more than three years they devastated and pillaged this land in an unwarranted and undeclared war. They armed to the teeth the dragoons and bandits of Kolchak, Petlura and the Whites of all shades including the Czechs. Armistice

having been concluded with the Central Powers huge war materials were transferred to the Russian front and freely and generously distributed by the Allies to all those who stood against the Soviet. I have said just above that this was an unwarranted and undeclared war. This, as a matter of fact, is originally not my expression but that of Hon'ble Winston Churchill. In his book, "The World Crisis: The After Math," page 235 he says: "Were they (the Allies) at war with Soviet Russia? Certainly not; but they shot Soviet Russians at sight. They stood as invaders on Russian soil. They armed the enemies of the Soviet Government. They blockaded its ports and sunk its battle-ships. They earnestly desired and schemed its downfall."

I have described in this exhibit to some extent the part Britain played in this pillage. I have quoted some figures to denote the expenditure His Majesty's Exchequer had to incur. I have mentioned £ 100,000,000 as the maximum sum. As a matter of fact these figures fall much short of the actual expenditure by great Britain on this mad adventure. Before a voice of protest is raised by the other side about exaggeration of the figures or before they are denounced as mere propaganda let me call Mr. Winston Churchill to my rescue. On page 256 of this book he says: "I wrote on September 15, 1919 :- Large sums of money and considerable forces have been employed by the Allies against the Bolsheviks during this year. Britain has contributed the nominal value of nearly one hundred million pounds, France between 30 and 40 million, the United States have maintained and are still maintaining over eight thousand troops in Siberia, Japan has an army of between thirty and forty thousand strong in Eastern Siberia which she is now in process of reinforcing. Admiral Kolchak's army equipped with mainly British ammunition reached in May a total of three hundred thousand men." Then at another place he says (page 275) :-

"But to Denikin we gave substantial assistance. We provided him with the means of arming and equipping nearly a quarter of a million men."

Somewhere in this exhibit I have written about the formation by the Imperialist powers of an iron chain round the Soviet consisting of the border States. Here is what Mr. Churchill has to say in this connection; (page 169) :- "We then urged the measures ... to discharge our pledges faithfully and fully by arming and equipping the anti-Bolshevik forces from our own immense surplus of munitions and helping them with expert officers and instructors to train efficient armies of their own." Naturally it follows that we should try to combine all the border States hostile to the Bolsheviks into

one system of war and diplomacy and get everyone to do as much as possible. Such was the policy we consistently pursued."

This also supports my charge about Allies sending Generals to organise counter-revolution against the Soviet.

One more quotation about the British help to the counter-revolutionaries and White guards and I have finished the explanation. On page 250 of the same book we come across the following:-

"The military effort of Denikin was more serious and sustained. In accordance with the advice of the general staff the main British assistance from June onward was concentrated upon him. A quarter of a million rifles, two hundred guns, thirty tanks and a large mass of munitions and equipments were sent through the Dardanelles and the Black Sea to the port of Novorossisk and several hundred British officers and non-commissioned officers as advisers, instructors, store-keepers and even a few aviators, furthered the organisation of the army."

It is therefore proved quite conclusively that whatever charges I have made against Britain and her Allies are correct and corroborated by their own high-placed writers.

My last charge against the Imperialist bourgeoisie in this exhibit is about their consistently fostering a war psychology against the Soviet. I leave this for the present. I shall substantiate it when I come to the relevant exhibits about the preparation of war against this Soviet Union.

But before closing the Russian Revolution I should make a few observations more in view of Mr. Ghosh's complex diatribe on the 10th of this month. Although it was shocking to hear so many lies about the Soviet Union from one of the fellow accused, yet on second thoughts I find nothing in Mr. Ghosh's statement which the leaders of the Second International have not said from time to time against the Soviet Union.

It is a matter of common knowledge that, when the heroic workers of the Soviet were putting up a strong resistance against the Imperialist aggression and combating counter-revolution, the flunkeys of the Second International were by their speeches and writings helping their respective Governments in their drive against the Soviet. The attitude of these miserable wretches has consistently been opposed to the Soviet Union. In one form or other they have continued their malignant propaganda against the workers' State.

Not a voice was raised by these gentlemen when the Entente Powers were pillaging the Russian territory, not a protest was made when the allied armies were shooting on sight the Soviet citizens. These gentlemen were nowhere to be seen when the Whites were freely murdering the Communists. But as soon as the Soviet started reprisals, as soon as counter-offensive was initiated, these 'honest' humanitarians were shocked 'tremendously'. They issued shamelessly long Manifestoes, they organised demonstrations and rallies against the so-called Red Terror, they broadcasted appeals to the workers of the world against the supposed atrocities of the Soviet Government. In short, ever since the coming into existence of Soviet system in the former Empire of the Romanovs, it has become an article of faith for the parties of the Second International to support any and every tirade started by the bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union.

Therefore it is not surprising to find Mr. Ghosh seeking support and drawing inspiration from that shamelessly bourgeois body, the L. S. I, the body which did not even raise a single word of effective protest against the Lathi Raj of Messrs. MacDonald, Benn & Co. in India. The treachery of the parties of the Second International, their betrayal of the Proletarian Movement in Europe and the Independence movement in the colonial world is no mere a myth. It is no more a point of false propaganda. All this is writ large on the pages of history. Their record is too black to need any more evidence to expose them. Look at 1914. How mercilessly they dragged the Proletariat of European countries into a war for the benefit of the bourgeoisie! How very shamelessly they mounted the war ministries and gloated over the carnage! These dirty criminals, these Noskes and Vanderveld's, Kautskys and Hilferdings, Macdonalds and Thomas'es and Hendersons are no other than the open unashamed agents of the bourgeoisie, and compared to them Mr. Ghosh is only one of the small fries. These blackguards and their supporters have the affrontery to point to us the Red Terror in the Soviet Union while closing their eyes to the perpetration of heart-rending atrocities on the unarmed, helpless populace of India. These lackeys of Imperialism have the audacity to point to us the trials of the counter-revolutionaries, interventionists and saboteurs in Soviet Union while completely closing their eyes to the reign of terror in Germany, the wholesale massacre of the Ukrainians and the upper Silesians by the brigands of Marshal Pilsudsky.

Mr. Ghosh has surpassed even the Conservatives in telling lies against the Soviet Union. His reference to the Proletariat in Soviet as "a flock of sheep or a herd of cattle who know not what

is good for them and are led to the salvation by the 'elect' " betrays his utter ignorance of the actualities of life in the Soviet Unions.

A lot can be quoted in this connection from those who have travelled extensively in the Soviet union and have written about it in quite an unbiassed manner, but I will leave all Communists out and rely on the British bourgeoisie in exposing Mr. Ghosh's lies about the Soviets.

Here are some extracts from the 'Manchester Guardian,' the London 'Observer' and the 'Sunday Times,' the organs of the British bourgeoisie. Here is the answer to Mr. Ghosh and to all who call Soviet Proletariat a herd of cattle or a flock of sheep. Here is an answer to all those who say that the workers have no hand in the Soviet Legislation! Leave the male workers aside, see how the femal workers are treated. "Manchester Guardian" dated 10. 10. 30, some extracts from an article, "in the land of the Soviets" by one Harry Sacher:-

"Unemployed are little evident in the towns, beggers are fewwages, measured in paper currency, are not Low for workmen. They earn from one to five roubles a day, although to increase output the Soviet Government pays according to skill, there are no very marked disparities. The specialist in charge of a plant employing thousands will not get more than six hundred roubles a month, and if he is a member of the Communist party he is limited to three hundred roubles.....rent is further in fixed percentage of income. Medical service is assured by the State, the public creches for children are available to all workers, there are various forms of social insurance free to all workers and all are equally eligible for a change in a ^{convenient} ~~convenient~~ home or for the benefits of the clubs, associations, recreations and the like. There are no class distinctions.....the Government strives hard to mitigate the hardship of the worker. He and his children have the first claim on such supplies as there are, and an extensive though necessarily inadequate building programme is principally for his benefitand in Russia the worker is made to feel that he belongs to a ruling class. He has his heel on the neck of the bourgeoisie who once dominated and that is gratifying to the sadistic instinct common to humanity. The avenues of advancement are wide open to him. From October elementary education will be compulsory throughout Russia. Higher education becoming a monopoly for peasants and workers, and is made really accessible by a system of maintenance allowances and of forcing devices designed to make good the deficiencies of earlier years. The factory organisations give him some powers to determine the conditions under which he labours. Increasingly, the highest industrial, political and administrative positions are being thrown open to him

by a deliberate policy aimed at reducing the influence of the "intelligentsia; however pure its Communist history, and increasing that of the manual workers. The officers of Army and Navy are being recruited from peasants and workers especially trained. Every instrument of propaganda is brought to bear to persuade them that they are the principal architects of the new Russia and that the new Russia is the chosen people for the creation of a new society which is to emancipate humanity."

So much for male worker. Now take something for the female one. I am quoting here a very small extract from the observer and another such one from the Sunday Times. The Observer dated 8. 2. 31, from its correspondent Moscow, says:—

Lenin once declared that every serving maid must be able to administrate the State, and a marked feature of Soviet policy has been the promotion of women of the masses to posts of political and economic responsibility. Not only have all the legal restrictions which formerly barred women from certain posts and occupations been swept away but there is a positive and concerted effort to draw a minimum percentage of women into the work of such organisations as Soviets, Trade Unions, Councils, courts etc:

"At the recent Session of the Tsik or Soviet Central Executive Committee which meeting two or three times of a year fulfils the formal functions of Soviet Parliament, one was struck by the number of women, who at a rough estimate seemed to constitute about a third of the delegates; there was something austere and puritanical about these women legislators, the great majority of whom were of working-class or peasants origin, who set in the gilded former throne-room of the Czar in the Kremblin palace where the Tsik holds its Session."

Next I take the Sunday Times dated 28. 9. 30.

"The largest item in the huge Budget for social insurance here is represented by payment of wages to mothers. Every working woman is entitled to two months' holiday before the birth of a child and two months after the birth with full pay.

The subsidy has now been extended to the peasant women on the collective forms. It has to be remembered that Russian peasant women worked in the fields until the very last day and often gave birth to their children right on the work fields, to realise the magnitude of the innovation."

This is how the working class to the utter disappointment of Mr. Ghosh is being treated in the Soviet Union. I can quote a lot more in favour of the Soviet from the bourgeois writers, eminent persons like Lord Lothian, and the journalists of England and America, but I think it will be wasting time of court in emphasising the obvious. However I am quoting here few lines from Mr. G. B. Shaw, the well-known British dramatist and a writer who recently visited the Soviet Union. He says: "Russia," as he told a reporter in London, "is putting her house in order. All the other nations are playing the fool. I cannot speak to you in detail about the great experiment I have seen. What I have to say must be clearly thought and written. I am making arrangements to do this. Meanwhile all I can add is this—we had better follow Russia's example..... My last word for the moment at any rate is this, on the whole I should advise every young man to go to Russia and settle there." Asked about the conditions in Russia Mr. Shaw declared: "There is plenty of food in Russia..... It is torture to get back again after being in Soviet land. After you have seen Bolshevism on the spot there can be no doubt but that capitalism is doomed. (Leader 26th August 1931)."

As to the other charges of Mr. Ghosh they will be met in due time. Nevertheless I must meet his one charge more "What is the justification for iron hand against the counter-revolutionaries etc, at this period of peace and tranquillity," asks Mr. Ghosh more or less in these words. The answer to this question is quite simple. Ever since the birth of Sovietism the world bourgeoisie has desired and schemed and used all the methods conceivable to bring about the fall of this system. They have failed so far but they have not given up their designs. The Soviet Union is surrounded all round by a combination of hostile states who would mobilise and dash their forces against the Soviet any time a chaos is created by the counter-revolutionaries or disruptive forces—let it be even a Trotskyite disruption. If Mr. Ghosh knew one-tenth of the world situation as it is today he would not have knavishly put this question. If he believes in "ignorance is bliss" then let Bhagwan bless him.

WAR DANGER

Now I come to the most important exhibits put against me and against many of the accused collectively. They deal with War Danger. The late Crown Counsel has ridiculed us for pointing out that war danger is imminent. Referring to comrade Sohan Singh Josh's address to the All India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference he says: "Then on page 17 he comes to that slogan so dear to the heart of a Bolshevik, 'the coming war.' They

wish you to believe that capitalist states are arming against them for war....." (Page 23 Opening Address).

In all our literature, in all our Congresses and conferences the war danger has been discussed, and the means to combat it has also been discussed. It is no mere Communist propaganda that war is in preparation. The war is in preparation and even the liberal pacifist bourgeoisie believes in its inevitability. From Mr. Henderson to Lord Cecil, from Leon Blum to M. Vandervelde, from Hoover to MacDonald and Lloyd George to Baldwin, in short every bourgeois pacifist admits that there is danger of war in the near future. There is danger of war within the Imperialist fold but we Communists assert that the International bourgeoisie is turning this danger against the U. S. S. R.

The relevant exhibits about the war danger are as follows:— P 1574, 911 May, June, July 1928 issues of Kirti, P 1568 last issue, P 897, P467 (5), P1574 runs: "This conference protests against the policy of encirclement and preparation for war pursued with increased vigour by the British Government against the U.S.S.R. and warns the working class against the disastrous consequences, economic and political, to India and also to workers of the Soviet Republic throughout the world."

WAR DANGER.

Objective factors: Before making the assertion that war is inevitable and that war danger is real and very acute against the Soviet Union, let us make some examination of the objective factors that are before us.

Every sane man should understand that wars are inevitable under capitalism. Wars are manifestations of the contradictions of the capitalist order of things.

The growth of productive forces under capitalism leads to the struggle for markets. The struggle for markets leads to wars—this prospect is inevitable and without any evasion.

In simpler terms, the causes of wars are to be found in the Imperialist rivalries for new markets, for reshuffling of old, for exploring new and cheap sources of raw material and extensive secure fields for investments. Exactly these were the causes which led to the onslaught of 1914-18. The bourgeoisie of the warring sections hid its real character and each called it a "war to end war", war for the preservation of civilisation. This war of course everybody knows now did not end war, it on the contrary ended all peace. It led to new contradictions in capitalist developments

and thereby opened gates for further catastrophes, more terrible and more stupendous than the last one.

The pre-war situation can be summed up like this: The industrial development of Germany with the improved and new means of production was a menace to Britain. Her efficient and superior land and naval armaments were a challenge to the existence and supremacy of England and France. This lay at the root of the last war.

With her up to date methods of production and excellent organisation Germany was able to undersell Britain in her very markets and colonies. It wrested one market after another from the British bourgeoisie. The British bourgeoisie retaliated by other methods more ingenious and subtle. A campaign of dumping scare was started. German brutalities in her colonies and her inhuman conditions of production were broadcasted.

Along with the trade competition the competition in land and naval armaments developed with tremendous speed. The rivalry showed itself in the diplomatic sphere also. German diplomacy was making a headway everywhere and was discrediting Britain in all zones of her influence in the East. By the construction of the Berlin-Baghdad Railway German Imperialism was threatening Britain's hold on India. Having strengthened alliances in Central Europe German Imperialism proceeded to strangle Turkey and the Near East.

John Bull did not tolerate this sort of disturbing of balance of power; Britain's counter move was the linking up in its chain of Russia by the bait of Constantinople. France was bound to Britain by commonities against a common enemy. The sore of Alsace-Lorraine was still fresh. Last of all British diplomacy triumphed in detaching Italy from the Central Powers; Anatolian plateau was offered to her as the price of deserting the Triple Alliance and adhering to the Entente Cordiale.

When all the preparations were complete it did not require much time for the war to break out.

It is significant to note that all along this period, when the rival Imperialist Powers were harnessing for war, they were talking glibly of peace. Under the camouflage of peace and pacifism the war was prepared. The peace sermon went a long way in deceiving the masses of these countries. While every other man was thus deceived, the leaders of the working class had no such illusions. They persistently unmasked this hypocritical talk of peace. Frederick Engels wrote on the imminence of world war as early as 1887,

In a preface to Siegmund Borham's pamphlet he writes: "For Prussian Germany no other war is possible except a world war and this world war will be of a power and magnitude hitherto unparalleled. From eight to nine million soldiers will be hurled against each other, and Europe will be laid desolate to a degree that no swarm of locusts has ever desolated a land. It will be the desolation caused by the Thirty Years' War compressed into three or four years, and over the whole continent of Europe will rage famine and starvation, the brutalisation by the troops of the general population, acute poverty caused by the helpless chaos in the artificial mechanisation of trade, industry and credit; all this will end in universal bankruptcy, in the collapse of old states and their routine political wisdom, a collapse so complete that Crowns will roll in the gutter in dozens, and no one can foresee how all this will end."

How all this ended, we all have seen. These were the prospects then and so are they now. Contradictions of capitalism will go on multiplying; every new improvement in capitalist production will breed new and more complicated contradictions and thus open the way for a much more gigantic collapse than foreseen by any one.

THE ANGLO-AMERICAN ANTAGONISM.

The economic sphere: The things are not different today than they were in pre-war period. The basis of present crisis is again the problem of new markets—the reshuffling of the old ones. The naval and land armaments rivalries, the regrouping of forces, constant shifting of balance of power, alliances and counter-alliances, diplomatic moves and counter-moves, the colossal intrigues of all the rival powers against one another, are no different from the period preceding the last Armageddon of 1914-18. The only difference between now and then is that now these forces are operating more furiously and on a larger scale.

The war of 1914-18 ended the supremacy and domination of German Imperialism, but it brought into the arena another power which had by this time consolidated itself considerably. As a matter of fact this was the only power which reaped the benefits of this war by advancing loans to the warring factions. The power was the United States of America—the world Shylock.

The entire post war period is covered by the Anglo-American antagonism. The Anglo-American rivalry is the rivalry for world domination, for the capture of world markets. This should not be confused with re-shuffling of

markets or with redistribution. It is definitely the right of only one to live—the survival of the fitter one. The Anglo-American rivalry is developing in all its spheres of life. The American ambition for the capture of world markets will be clear if I mention here how very wide are the ramifications of the American finance-capital.

Take the American investments during the year 1930. They were to the extent of 1,550,050,000 dollars (Liberty D/-11/2/31 Berlin Correspondent). Out of this over 30 per cent entered Europe namely 665, 210,000 dollars, 446,460,000 Dollars went to Canada, 341,680,000 dollars to South America, and 88,470,000 dollars to Australia.

The following figures, all in thousands of dollars, illustrate the distribution of American capital in various countries and the position beginning of 1931 and 1914:-

D/-29. 8. 31	Beginning 1931	Beginning 1914
EUROPE	5,607,332	350,000
CANADA	4,436,011	750,000
SOUTH AMERICA	3,013,935	100,000
CENTRAL AMERICA	2,985,135	1,200,000
AUSTRALIA	995,051	175,000
OTHER COUNTRIES	490,790	50,000
TOTAL	17, 528, 254	2, 625, 000

What do these figures denote? Any casual observer can infer that they denote American interest in the export not only of finished goods, but also of capital.

In other words these American investments coupled with American concern for world market are at the root of the Anglo-American rivalry.

As I have already stated the Anglo-American antagonism has got a world aspect. Let me illustrate it a bit more elaborately. Let me demonstrate how feverishly the two are trying to oust one another from their hold on different markets. From almost every corner of the earth the wail is heard that America has penetrated in such and such a country or that Britain has recaptured such and such a market. Let me quote here the wail of the special correspondent of the London Observer writing under date 28. 9. 30 about South American countries:-

"Britain was once the banker, but has lost her place. An American bank statement before me shows that in 1913 the value of the United States investments in South America alone was only £40,000,000. At the end of 1923 the figures had risen to £ 440,000,000 mainly in loans commonly enough on the security of national assets or in return for concession to the exploitation of which exacting conditions were attached.....". Then proceeding further he gloats over the chances for British capital as a result of revolutions in that continent:—

"In the present state of public opinion in Latin America no Government will remain popular if it does not make at least a show of resisting the United States. If there must be a cultivation of a closer relationship for financial and economic reasons then the feeling of Latin America, as a whole is for turning to Britain. When Dr. Justo declares in reference to the prohibitory tariff of the United States that it can only mean "the strengthening of the ties between Argentine and Great Britain" the question of our commercial and political contacts with Latin America becomes one of urgent importance."

After reading this one should not be surprised at the visit of the Prince of Wales and Prince George to these parts of the world. It was admittedly an economic mission for pushing the British trade. The United States could not view with pleasure at the reconnoitres of these 'ambassadors of British commerce.'

Writing with undisguised glee at the happenings in Brazil the Manchester Guardian under date 17. 10. 30 writes:—"The United States is none too popular just now in South America whose economic fortunes it so largely controls so that the Brazilian rebels will be able to count on sympathy and perhaps on active support from those who dislike North America."

Whose Sympathy and support for the rebels? And who are those who dislike North America? Of course there are many who dislike their creditor and Britain is one. Britain has excellent reasons to dislike North America who is not only her creditor but also the chief competitor, and therefore nobody should be surprised if she actively supports and sympathises with the enemies of North America.

If I quote a bit more it will be absolutely clear as to who reaps the benefits of the upheavals in the Latin American countries. A special correspondent of Observer dated 9. 11. 30 writes about the benefits of the so-called revolution in Brazil:—

"Little harm has been done by the revolution and much good may come out of it. Britain is a big investor in Brazil both in railways

and other public undertakings and also in estates and industries. These investments have not had a happy time during the past two years." Then further on, "It would be foolish for British manufacturers and traders not to appreciate at once that Brazil is likely to prove immediately a better place in which to operate actively than it has been for years."

The Latin American 'revolution' as I have shown sufficiently, have been very favourably commented on by the entire British Press; on the top of this came the visit of the Princes to these parts. Yankee Imperialism, according to the Berlin correspondent of the Liberty of 11. 2. 31, did not hide its feelings about it.

"American Press viewed these visits as a plan of pushing British Trade with Latin America. It was viewed with close attention and 'with noticeable concern' in the United States. This concern might contribute to a deterioration of the relations between London and Washington." The intensification of the Anglo-American rivalry may either culminate soon in a war or a temporary suspension of hostilities on all fronts and a joint action against the Soviet Union—the standard-bearer of the socialist economy as opposed to capitalism.

As for the last mentioned possibility I shall come to it latter on. At present I concentrate only on Anglo-American relations. I proceed with the analysis of these countries in world affairs. I continue South America.

The shiftings in these Latin American countries are so very constant and rapid, swinging first towards Britain, then towards pan-Americanism and then again towards Britain, that it is difficult to determine which part will adhere to Britain and which to America. But this much can be asserted without any fear of contradiction that the struggle between these two Imperialist powers is going to be more deadly over this part of the world than anywhere else and that only one power's suzerainty will remain here. It is a question of one sheath and two swords. Which will it be? If we consider the potentiality, superior means and resources of the two then there remains no doubt that it will be the United States whose supremacy will persist here. But if we look to the diplomacy then perhaps Britain might come successful.

To describe the extent to which the American finance capital has penetrated all over the world it requires several thousands of pages to give full comprehensive description, but I can only casually state that there is no country of note where the American finance capital has not reached. American finance

is visible even in Indian cotton, steel and motor works. Central Europe owes much of its post war revival to American capital. Germany's rejuvenation would not have taken place so rapidly had it not been for the American finance.

I think I have said sufficient to illustrate the Anglo-American economic rivalry. With the addition of the following data this chapter would be complete.

On the day that the London Naval Conference commenced, the moderate Conservative Berlin Daily, 'Deutsch Allgemeinezeitung,' an important organ of German industry, published a long article on Anglo-American Trade rivalry with charts and figures.

According to this paper, "in 1913 England's share in the import trade of Canada was 21.3 per cent and in 1928 it was 15.6 per cent. In 1913 America's share in Canada in the import trade was already 64 per cent and in 1927 as much as 69 per cent, that is more than 2/3rd. The curve is still in its upward course. In 1913 South Africa's trade from Britain amounted in value to 22.2 million pounds and that from U. S. A. only three million. In 1924 the corresponding figures were 30.4 million and 8.1 million and in 1928 31.6 and 12.2 million. In the total import trade of South Africa in 1928 England's share had fallen by 50 per cent. India's imports from Britain in 1913 stood in value at 70.3 million pounds, in 1927 90.5 millions and in 1928 only 83 millions. The figures representing the value of Indian imports from the United States for the corresponding years read 2.2 millions, 7.9 millions and 11 millions. In 1913 American exports to China represented in value 6.5 millions of pounds, Great Britain's total being 19.2 millions. In 1929 they were valued at 32.7 millions against the British figure of 21.1 millions. The British percentage of Argentine imports in 1913 was 31 per cent and in 1926 it was 19.3 per cent. America's percentage of Argentine import in 1913 was 14.7 per cent and in 1926 it was 24.7 per cent."

This is how the position stands. It makes any friendly understanding between these two great powers out of the question. There can only be a truce, and truce is always of a temporary character. Truce implies hostilities and hostilities do exist between these two in quite an undisguised form.

Armament Race.

The antagonism in economics breeds antagonism in armaments. It is a simple truth. This economic rivalry between U. S. A. and Britain in the entire post-war period is marked by an

intense armament race, intenser indeed than the race preceding the last war.

Britain exhausted by war and crisis, faced with movements in her colonies, could not very well afford to compete with America—the most potential factor with immense resources of wealth. A formula, therefore, had to be found to bring into check the unbridled ambitions of American world supremacy. The formula was found at the Washington Conference of 1922. Lord Balfour attended it as the chief British representative.

The outcome of this Conference was definitely a triumph for the American diplomacy. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance was terminated and American parity on sea was theoretically accepted by Britain.

Thereafter America launched a new naval programme to come to the parity line with Britain. The naval arms built had the latest technical devices at their disposal and were therefore the more dreadful.

America spent £ 35,000,000 worth on armament in 1927. It was an increase of 124 per cent over 1913. Britain already riding the high seas no one to compete with her, nobody having parity with her except America and that too very recent, America having at that time more of a theoretical aspect; she had no rival of note to fear and yet her increase over 1913 was 65 per cent. The gross sum spent by Britain in 1927 was £ 509,000,000 (Louis Fischer in "Soviets in World Affairs".) Not being quite satisfied with the achievements at Washington and facing the American forces everywhere in her zones of influence and being terrified at the building capacity of America Britain sought further readjustment with America. Not competitive building but comparative reduction was the theme of British proposals.

The Conference of three powers was suggested, America, Japan and Britain being these powers. This so-called Three Powers Naval Conference met at Geneva in the second half of 1927. After a lot of scramble and haggling over Tonnage and Categories problems this Conference came to naught.

Three of the main causes which contributed to the failure of this Conference were:—

- (1) British insistence ~~over~~ keeping the number of 6" guns cruisers undefined,
- (2) Britain's insistence on limiting the number of 8" gun cruisers, by keeping the number of six inch gun cruisers thus

undefined Britain could turn its entire Mercantile fleet (which is the biggest in the world) into a fighting force by mounting six inch guns, as happened during the last War. Secondly not acceding to the American demand for 8" gun cruisers meant subjecting America to handicaps from which Britain did not and does not suffer because of her preponderance in merchant-ships and naval bases.

(3) Third cause was the sabotage organised by the protagonists of the American Big Navy Party.

Mr. Shearer, the technical adviser to the American delegation was working as an Agent of the American ship-building magnates. This was subsequently proved by his trial in America.

These were a few of the factors which smashed the three powers' Conference. "The failure of Geneva Conference demanded of U. S. A. to spend between two hundred and eighty and three hundred and forty million pounds or a perpetual inferiority (London Times dated 14-4-30).

The repercussions of the failure of this Conference were tremendous. America announced a big construction programme and Britain proceeded with continental alliances. Overtures were made to France for the revival of the Entente Cardiale.

It was about this time that M. Briand, the French Foreign Minister, was in correspondence with Mr. Kellogg, the U. S. A. Foreign Secretary for the cancellation of war debts in exchange for a pact of friendship. Mr. Kellogg appreciated the offer of alliance which was so much needed at this time against Britain but the price of the proposed alliance was too big. American financial interests would not tolerate any suggestion about the cancellation or part readjustments of these debts. However this obstacle did not deter Mr. Kellogg. The temptation of an alliance was too a great at a time when the Anglo-American rivalry was riding rough shod. He wrote a very cordial note to Mr. Briand about the Pact but avoided any mention of the debt problem. M. Briand treated this note with contumely, Mr. Kellogg knew this. To cover up this diplomatic defeat Mr. Kellogg issued invitations to all the big powers for signing a World Peace Pact at Paris outlawing all wars. The first invitation of course went to Paris. Both France and Britain made ridiculous reservations knocking the bottom out of the Peace Pact. Mr. Kellogg ignored it.

Before the American Foreign Secretary could leave the shores of his country for Paris and while the Preliminaries of the Pact were still going on, the news of an Anglo-French secret naval

pact startled the world. It fell like a thunderbolt. This news in America spelt the success of British diplomacy where America had failed.

American opinion was stirred to a high pitch. The advocates of the big naval programme got further adherents. A systematic campaign for retaliation against the Entente started. Wall Street started pinpricks. An American-Egyptian Commercial Treaty which upset Downing Street was signed. Mr. Kellogg managed to travel on the same boat with Mr. Mackenzie-King, the Premier of Canada. This unique fraternisation was simply to tease Britain. Before going to Paris Mr. Kellogg visited Dublin but refused to land on the British soil. These were reckoned as definite hostile acts against Britain. In reply Downing Street treated with contempt the Kellogg Pact. Whereas every other government sent its Foreign Ministers to Paris but Britain sent Lord Cushendon, a person of not much importance. Sir Austin Chamberlain announced himself to be too ill to cross the Channel. But within a short period of this, the British Foreign Minister was cruising in the far-off Jamaican waters.

The extent to which American feelings were roused against Britain found expression in a pronouncement of the American President. Mr. Coolidge was so much upset that in his Armistice Day speech he advocated the building up of a large cruiser fleet, as a reply to the Entente Cordiale. And this was no empty threat, this was the expression of big navy programme already under construction.

The Kellogg Pact was signed, but nothing tangible came out of it. The Powers were no nearer the solution of peace problems than they were before. It was a mere eyewash. The Anglo-American relations again remained in the melting pot. The building capacity of America was haunting British Imperialism. Britain could not think of successful competition with that Power nor could it try conclusions with Yankee Imperialism. Moreover Britain had another great Power to face. This was the Soviet Union. With its revolutionised economics and simple diplomacy it was ousting Britain from her eastern spheres of influence. The hegemony which this power exerted was not so much economic as political and cultural. This danger with Britain has always weighed heavier than any other. The consolidation of the Soviet Union in the East is an apparition for British Imperialism.

Therefore Britain wanted truce with United States and it could not help itself. It wanted peace for a drive on the power which was so dangerously near to her interests in the East. Truce was urgent, but the Conservative Government which had antagonised America so much was thought to be incapable by the British bourgeoisie to bring about this truce. The Baldwin Govern-

ment was going too fast. Its break-neck speed left no grounds for economic reorganisation or for readjustment of relations with powers other than those bound to Britain by some common ties.

The 1929 British General Elections put a pacifist Government into saddle. The first pronouncement of the new British Premier was about the necessity of rapprochement with America. But before it could do that Britain had to undo most of the provocations of the Baldwin Government. This necessitated a declaration from Mr. MacDonald at Geneva, "That there is no more need for an Entente Cordiale." This had a bad press in France. But little did the French Government care when the secret understanding between the General Staffs of the two countries was there. A compromise with America was absolutely necessary and especially at a time when British industries were in state of chaos, rationalisation programme not yet even partially achieved, colonies in a ferment, and finally the U. S. S. R. taking long strides towards economic consolidation and so dangerously near to Britain's important geographical frontiers.

This is how this period of truce was to be utilised: (1) to push forward British Trade in the lost markets, (a) by sending economic missions to Egypt, Manchuria, Japan and South American countries, and (b) intensifying the sale of war materials to the Baltic, Scandinavian and Balkan States, (2) to crush the Independence Movement in Egypt, Iraq and India, and to bring about an understanding with the bourgeoisie of these countries by minor concessions in order to enlist their active participation in case of any war. (Note: so far as India is concerned this was more or less achieved on the 4th of March this year); (3) to intensify the war preparations against the U. S. S. R., (a) by bringing about the mechanisation of all units of army on the N.W.F.P. including the mechanisation of artillery and cavalry, (b) by multiplying the aerodromes in Iraq and the N. W. F. P. and (c) by bringing the semi-independent countries south of U.S. S. R. under Anglo-French influence by forming a cordon sanitaire in the south similar to the one on the western frontiers of the Soviet composed of the Baltic States, Poland and Rumania.

This was the mission for which the Conservatives made way for the pacifist Labour Government who alone could be fit to utilise their prestige to serve the British bourgeoisie in this direction.

With this programme the labour Government assumed office. Mr. MacDonald in his speech at a dinner given in his honour by the Lossiemouth Municipality said:—"I have made it clear before and during the Elections that I will put our relations with the United States in the forefront of the national concern."

Then came Mr. MacDonald's visit to America. A formula was devised in consultation with Mr. Hoover for bringing Anglo-American rivalry within control. The formula was the Five Powers Naval Disarmament Conference.

The Five Powers Conference representing America, Britain, Japan, France and Italy met in the St. James Palace early in 1930. After a pompous opening and camouflage propaganda the Conference, so far as disarmament is concerned, achieved nothing.

I do not propose to dwell long on this Conference. In the words of Izvestia (quoted from Manchester Guardian 2/5/30), "The results of the Conference are nil. The agreement for a reduction in battle-ships is brought about by the expensiveness of that category of war ships, each ship costing ten million pounds as well as being only moderately useful in modern warfare. By scrapping some of the warships England saves 54 million pounds. The so-called second achievement of an agreement humanising submarines is not worth the paper on which the agreement is signed". But this is Izvestia. The Prosecution might not like it. Perhaps that paper wanted to belittle the achievements of the bourgeois powers. Alright, I will rule this paper out. I will now mostly depend on the organ of the British Liberal bourgeoisie-the 'Manchester Guardian'. After quoting from this paper it will be absolutely clear that it is not the Communists alone who say that after a scramble over tonnage and submarine questions the Five Powers Naval Armament Conference came to grief. It is admitted by that paper too that the Conference was a fiasco, pure and simple. In the course of a leading article the 'Weekly Manchester Guardian' of 18/4/30 sums up the results of this Conference: "The Five Powers Conference having come to grief, there is a natural tendency to make the most of the Three Powers Treaty which is now assured.... Grateful though we must be for that it is of more importance to understand the reasons and the consequences of the failure to include France and Italy in this scheme of naval limitation. The first thing to be noted is that this failure sets a limit (perhaps already reached) to the extent America, Great Britain and Japan can reduce their armaments. Indeed the Three Powers agreement will expressly reserve rights to increase construction should the present naval programmes of France and Italy materialise.

"It is not so much a question of how much further the Three Powers will be able to carry disarmament in 1936 as whether they may not be forced back on their steps before then by the growing competition of the Mediterranean Powers."

Now what is this Mediterranean competition? It is quite simple. It is the French ambitions which are at the root of it. It is France's categorical refusal to concede Italy parity in naval armament. France demands 240,000 tons more than Italy. This was one of the main causes of the failure of the Five Power Conference. Anyhow I leave the French-Italian rivalry for the time. I will

proceed further on the main theme, the Anglo-American relations. What were the benefits of the truce, the Three Power Treaty? Let me express this in the words of the then First Lord of Admiralty Mr. Alexander who speaking at Sheffield, (Manchester Guardian of 18/4/30) said:- "The greatest value of the measure of agreement already secured is, I think to be found in the helpful moral effect created in support of a general move to disarmament and peace". So much dope for the masses. Let me go further. "But it must not be overlooked that there are also economic advantages. This would have involved the expenditure of at least 50 million pounds up to 1936. In addition we shall make a saving of over 4 million pounds in maintenance charges in respect of five battleships which are to be prematurely scrapped". Then about saving with regard to cruisers and submarines he says, "Under the agreement we have now arrived at, the maximum number of cruisers will be fifty and it is certain that during the whole of the period of the agreement up to 1936 the savings will be many millions. As to the submarines we shall save in constructions up to 1936 about 450,000; the total saving in this category of 3,850,000."

As to the benefits to America the American President Mr. Hoover speaking on the success of the Naval Conference says (The Leader, 15/4/30, "Geneva Letter"): "For the first time in history the United States has obtained parity with Great Britain for its Navy".

The failure of the Geneva Conference had demanded of the United States of America to spend between 280 million pounds and 340 million pounds or failing that a perpetual inferiority of the American Fleet; but the London Treaty made possible a considerable reduction of between 100 million pounds and 130 million pounds and gave parity. (London times 14/4/30).

Not a bad bargain any way. What was the naval position of the three big naval Powers at the end of 1929? We get the following comparative figures in the London times of February 13, 1930.

	August 1914. Tonnage.	December 1929. Tonnage.
British Empire	2,160,326	1,201,930
Japan	522,082	771,908
U. S. A.	848,403	1,095,992

And here are the figures of the five naval Powers on the eve of the war and on the eve of the Conference (Manchester Guardian 13/2/31).

1914		1930
Tonnage.		Tonnage.
Great Britain	2,476,326	1,296,396
Japan	644,000	853,382
U. S. A.	964,500	1,349,902
France	1,139,306	681,808
Italy	688,812	360,479

(France demanded in the Conference a total of 726,479 by the end of 1936).

This is the comparative naval strength of these five Powers. The main object of the London Conference was to reduce expenditure so as to make capital available in the economic sphere, to allay political fears which were so very acute, and to avert a clash of arms between America and Britain which was so very imminent.

Here I quote Mr. MacDonald himself. I take the Manchester Guardian of 25/4/30, "On the opening day of the Conference Mr. Mac Donald said that he hoped that the Conference would agree upon an equilibrium in strength and competitive building, reduce expenditure on ships and bring fleets down in size." The Manchester Guardian sounds a pessimistic note while proceeding further. It says, "In none of these aims has the Conference met with substantial success". This paper is a bit sceptical in this regard. I have already given the data showing that the Conference did make some reductions possible.

So much is really sufficient to demonstrate that the Anglo-American rivalry is a living, thing that it is bound to lead to a gigantic clash, that the war preparations against one another are tremendous. There should remain no doubt if the following data is added to the already quoted evidence, and that too after the London Naval Conference.

U. S. State resources in the event of war: Nobody talks of "resources" in the event of war unless there is possibility of war, and there is possibility enough. The correspondent of the London 'Times' in Washington in a Cable to that paper on 3/6/30 wrote, "The Senate this morning passed a joint resolution, which had been passed by the House of Representatives on April 1st, creating a Commission, to study and consider amending the constitution of the U. S. A. to provide that private property may be taken over by the Congress to be used without profit during war, and methods of equalising the burden, and removing the profits of war, together with a study of the policy to be pursued in the event of war so as

to empower the President immediately to mobilise all the resources of the country.

The Commission consists among others of the Secretaries of War, Navy, Agriculture, Commerce etc. This Commission is, to report definite recommendations to the President of U. S. A. to be by him transmitted to the Congress not later than the first Monday in December 1931.

This is how Yankee Imperialism, the originator of the Kellogg farce is preparing for war. This is how it is utilizing the truce period.

Great dirigibles furnished with Helium gas are under construction, armies have been fully mechanised and gas experiments are carried on. The Manchester Guardian's New York Correspondent writes under date 16/5/30: "A Bill has been introduced in the Congress on behalf of the War Department for appropriation of 960,000 pounds for the construction of a great dirigible as a flying fort for the army. While slightly smaller than the chief airships built or building in the U. S., England and Germany would have a speed of 100 miles an hour, which would be 20 per cent faster than the majority of the others. It would be metal clad, 547 feet long, carry two aeroplanes, ten machine guns and have a gross lift of 100 tons."

On the sea along with many preparations and new naval bases there comes the proposal for the construction of the Kra Canal. The Far Eastern Review, Shanghai, (Sunday Times dated 5. 10. 30) says:—

"The digging of Kra Canal which would divert the through sea traffic to the Far East from the Straits of Singapore, would so completely undermine the new British Imperial scheme of defence, as to call forth immediate opposition of the Lords of the Admiralty.....there could not be any valid reasons advanced at this time for opposing the construction of the canal, if the Siamese Government has the funds or the credit to finance the contract.....the development of aerial navigation together with the construction of a canal across the Isthmus of Kra will eventually reduce Singapore to a third rate port completely isolated from the main world trade routes."

If this project fructifies or America sees its way to finance the construction of this canal then the Indian invulnerability from the eastern fleets is gone. As to the American interest in the affairs of Siam we get some inkling:—

"The news published in the Sunday Times last week, that the King and Queen of Spain have been invited to visit Los Angeles next summer is followed by the announcement that the King and Queen of Siam have definitely decided to travel to the United States in the summer of 1931 (Sunday Times dated 16. 11. 30)."

It is interesting to note that the two kings, one sitting at the head of the Gibraltar base and the other at the head of the Singapore base were to visit America together. The inference is but a move against Britain. (Alfonso XIII was deposed and he never went to America).

"In 1929 the American expenditure on her armaments was £ 133,659,400 (Bombay Chronicle, November 30 th, 1930).

As to the British war preparations against America they are equally numerous. First in importance in this respect is the construction of the Singapore base which is not only a threat to America but to Japan and the Soviet Union also. The canard that the Singapore base had been dropped as a result of the London Naval Conference, has absolutely no foundation. I quote here some more passages from newspapers to show that Singapore base is more than a reality.

"If the rumour that the Singapore base is to be proceeded with at once is true it will cause great satisfaction to the whole of the Empire and not least to Australasia and the Federated Malay States," said Lord Lloyd, speaking at the Nelson dinner (Statesman, air-mail letter, dated 25. 10. 30). Here is the confirmation of this rumour.

"It is believed that the heads of the delegation to the Imperial Conference have approved the reports of the Committee presided over by Mr. MacDonald in favour of the Singapore Dock in accordance with the tender given by Sir John Jackson Limited in 1928" (Leader, 7. 11. 30, London 5. 11. 30 Reuter). What is the importance of the Singapore base ?

"Singapore is the true strategic centre covering the Pacific and also India and the approach to the West" (Statesman, military letter dated 31. 10. 30). I think this much is sufficient about Singapore.

Next come the preparations in Canada. There is the famous mounted police (America has also constituted such a force in Alaska recently, Sunday Times, 16. 11. 31) which is nothing less than an auxiliary military force. Then about the armed forces.

"We find in Canada not a force, but an army of 35 line brigades, and Artillery Corps of 24 Brigades, a complete Engineer Regiment, Machine-gun Corps, Signal Corps, O. T. C. and Ancillary Regiment. As an organisation the Canadian army ranks high with British and Indian armies. (Statesman, military letter 31. 11. 30)

Then there is another point of vital interest, in as much as it means the transference of the entire British army to Canada every year for the military manoeuvres. The military correspondent of the Observer remarks (12. 10. 30) that owing to lack of space on Salisbury Plain the annual manoeuvres should be held in Canada. The Imperial Conference of 1930 as a matter of fact did take into consideration this aspect.

"Before the War British armed forces cost 77 million pounds, today the cost is 112 million pounds." (Bombay Chronicle, November 30, 1930).

"According to another version in 1930 Great Britain spent 115 million pounds on armaments. "(Bombay Chronicle, November 30, 1930)."

BUT WITH ALL THESE THE WAR BETWEEN AMERICA AND GREAT BRITAIN IS UNTHINKABLE IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE. FOR THE TIME BEING THE ATTENTION OF THESE RIVALS IS FOCUSED ON A COMMON ENEMY WHICH IS SOUNDING THE DEATH KNELL OF BOURGEOIS ECONOMICS, WHICH IS THRILLING THE WORLD WITH ITS GIGANTIC ACHIEVEMENTS IN THE FIELD OF SOCIALIST RECONSTRUCTION.

THAT COMMON ENEMY IS THE UNION OF THE SOCIALIST SOVIET REPUBLICS AND AGAINST THAT MIGHTY REPUBLIC OF THE WORKERS AND ^{PEASANTS} WORLD IMPERIALIST FORCES ARE CONCENTRATED IN ALL DIRECTIONS.

The British bourgeoisie has already started a vigorous campaign for joint Anglo-American action against the Soviet Union. After a perusal of the speeches delivered from time to time by Lord Brentford, Mr. Churchill and Sir Robert Horne this fact is quite manifest that an Anglo-American united front against the Soviet is under preparation.

The Inter-European Rivalries.

Next in importance to the Anglo-American rivalry are the inter-European rivalries. The whole of that continent is once more split into alliances and counter-alliances. From the big

powers to the small ones all are busy in an armament race unprecedented in the history of mankind. Even the tiny states of Balkan and still tinier states of the Baltic are also arming to the teeth. Their deficits in Budget owing to their armaments are considerable; their financial state is deplorable.

This is how the Europe of today stands:—

(1) The Anglo-French Entente, directed against the Soviet Union; operating mostly in Baltic and border states, including Persia, Afghanistan and China.

(2) Franco-Italian rivalry operating mostly in the Balkans and Africa.

(3) The Balkan states and their rivalries.

(4) Germany, standing alone and feeling the isolation, orientating towards western combination at one time, at others inclining towards Soviet Union and at others following full-fledged the dictatas of Wall Street.

(5) Soviet Union, with so many enemies and no friends except the working and peasant masses of the Imperialist countries and the colonies.

(1) *Anglo-French Entente*

I take first the Anglo-French relations in the post-Versailles period. It would be wasting my breath to dilate much on the relations of these two countries. On the whole the Anglo-French relations have remained very cordial except with short interruptions and bickerings. Save some incidents the two powers have maintained almost the same cooperation which they had maintained during the War.

Immediately after the Versailles treaty the relations between France and Britian took a bad turn. This was mainly due to the policy to be followed as regards their dealings with the Soviet Union. Whereas Britain, appalled by the growth of the working-class movement at home and their demonstrations against her Soviet policy, and faced by an unprecedented ferment in colonies, had to cease hostilities against the Soviet Union, France wanted to pursue the anti-Soviet joint policy to its logical conclusion. Britain could not afford to agree to this. Then France suggested joint negotiations about the future relations with the Soviets. Here again Britain did not accede to French desire.

Yet another cause lay at the root of strained relations. France had different notions about the vanquished nations, following an iron policy towards them, while Britain wanted to reestablish

relations with them which were so very vital to her trade. There was one more point of dispute between the two. It was the competition for the mastery of the League of Nations. These were the causes which culminated in tension between the two. Each chalked out a different course to follow.

Resulting from this difference came the French big naval and aerial programme which formed the subject-matter of a debate in the House of Lords in 1922. The rivalry was further reflected in Britain's helping Greece against Turkey, and France's championing the cause of Turkey.

This sort of thing continued for a considerable time. But France could neither safely take the risk of a clash with Britain by pressing her policy too far, nor could she afford to build equal armaments. Therefore she concentrated on building a big submarine fleet, which is the biggest in the world. Britain could not very well justly object to this so far as it did not exceed the allotted total to Japan and France.

Another manifestation of the strained relations of these two powers was the French gesture of friendship to the Soviet in 1923, when the Anglo-Soviet relations had reached a crisis. When Curzon presented his notorious ultimatum of 1923 to the Soviet Poincare, the then French Foreign Minister, exchanged cordial telegrams with Chicherin (Soviet Foreign Commissar). He promised the return of the Russian fleet handed over by Baron Wrangle to France and now stationed at Bizerta base on the Tunisian Coast. But within one year affairs in England took a sudden turn and inclined favourably to France.

To put in Mr. Louis Fischer's words: Immediately after the defeat of the MacDonald Government in 1924 when the Conservative Government came into power, Sir Austin Chamberlain, the new British Foreign Minister, visited the French Premier in Paris. They reached an understanding on a number of problems. 'With respect to Russia', said the official communique, 'it was agreed that both Governments should practise a common policy.'

During several years, Poincare had endeavoured to establish a united Franco-British front vis-a-vis the Bolsheviks. He failed. But where he had failed Chamberlain had succeeded..... On December 7th 1924 the 'Matin' published a statement which seemed to be too prophetic to be less than official,

'We must, say the British,' the Communique read, anticipate the situation when it will be necessary to break with the Soviets and exert pressure on them... Lloyd George and MacDonald

thought the Soviets could be trusted. The new Minister does not think so. But he does not propose to declare a war but considers them as an enemy much to be feared in many parts of the world.'

Chamberlain and Hariot agreed on many international questions. They discussed Turkey, North African questions, Morocco and Egypt, the near East, the Mediterranean.....Chamberlain offered aid to France in the German theatreand then the 'Matin' having explained the situation with respect to Moscow adds:

"It is logical therefore that in offering this alliance against Germany which he does not think he need fear, he asks for the support of France against the adversary who worries him in his possessions in Africa and Asia." "Britain would side with France in Central Europe if France endorsed London's Russian policy. But in 1925 after the adoption of the Dawes plan and when Europe entered upon economic stabilisation, an alliance against Germany looked crude. It would give France much and England very little.... Chamberlain preferred an alliance with Germany which would allay the fears and permit Germany as well as France to join England against Russia. This was the germ idea of Locarno." (Louis Fischer in "Soviets in World Affairs," page 578)

The idea was further developed when the Three Foreign Ministers-Herr Stresemann, Briand and Mr. Austin Chamberlain met in preliminary discussions at Thoiry. The main hitch about the interpretation of article 16 of the League Covenant which gives the Allies the right of marching their armies through German soil in case of the situation demanding such a course, was surmounted and Germany signed the Locarno Pact. It was 1925. Hereafter Germany's western orientation began. In 1926 Germany joined the League of Nations. This was a definite triumph for Anglo-French diplomacy.

But this aspect soon took an awkward turn. Britain's pressing too much for the withdrawal of the Allied armies from Rhineland in order to convince Germany of their sincerity and thus win over Germany completely to them, made France rather suspicious of Britain's intentions. France took this as a definite move to endanger French security.

Briand proposed at this juncture the renewal of the Entente Cordiale. This was a test case. Britain avoided this issue. She did not want to have any more entanglements. France further orientated towards America. Britain retaliated by helping the Crusades in Syria. France did not remain passive, she actively stirred trouble for Britain in Palestine.

Britain pampered Italy and looked with favour on Italian advances to the Morocco Riffs.

When Anglo-Soviet break came France remained unmoved to Britain's suggestion of a joint action against Bolshevism. France discredited Britain's fears regarding the immediate danger of Bolshevism in Europe.

"In June 1927 Session of League Council at Geneva the representatives of England, France, Germany, Belgium, Italy and Japan met in secret to discuss the Soviet problems. Briand presided..... Chamberlain dilated on the dangers of Bolshevism (Louis Fischer)."

None took the British Foreign Secretary seriously. None of the Big Powers showed any inclination to follow suit. Briand for the first time in the history of Franco-German relations agreed with the formulations of the German Delegate regarding the Soviet state of affairs.

Thereafter came the three powers Naval Disarmament Conference at Geneva. This Conference of course was torpedoed by the uncompromising attitude both of Britain and America. Thereafter the Anglo-American relations went on worsening; France wanted to reap the benefits of this. She wanted to bargain with America on the war debts problem in exchange for a pact of friendship. Britain was not unaware of this. Downing Street proceeded with the proposal of a bilateral treaty and the renewal of Entente Cordiale so much desired by France. America's cold shoulder to France on the question of War debts made France to readily accept British offer. Just on the eve of the Kellogg peace pact the news of the revival of the Entente Cordiale and the text of the secret naval pact startled America.

Although the revival of the Entente and the Naval Pact was partly admitted and partly denied that Pact remains a fact. It has never been abrogated. After this event there has never been any occasion for friction between these two powers. The cooperation of these two Imperialist powers is quite apparent in all spheres of activities. For the first time after the occupation of the Rhine-land the French and British Armies had joint manoeuvres in 1928. All the military manoeuvres in Baltic states, Poland and Rumania were conducted jointly by the British and French general staff. The French system of continental alliances was patronised by Britain. The Military Governor of Paris paid a visit to India in the end of 1928 and watched military manoeuvres on the North West Frontier.

In the summer of 1929 the Labour Government came into power. This poured a bit of cold water on the Anglo-French

alliance but this was a temporary phase. Joint anti-Soviet activities however veiled again began to take shape. The visits of the two countries naval squadrons, one after the other, to the Rumanian port of Constanza were a further proof of the joint anti-Soviet policy.

On the visit of the French squadron the entire Soviet Press reverberated with protest. ~~The~~ French fleet had just left the straits when the British fleet entered—ostensibly it was waiting in the Aegean Sea for the return of the French squadron, as according to the terms of the straits commission no two fleets can enter the Black Sea together. It is astounding to see the joint anti-Soviet policy during the time of the Labour Government in Britain.

Writing about the visits of the British squadron the Moscow correspondent of 'Observer' says:—

“ Commenting on the visit of the British Naval squadron to the Rumanian port of Constanza, 'Pravda' says that the visit to the Black Sea ports obviously bears the character of an anti-Soviet demonstration.”

“ The view is confirmed according to Pravda by the recent declaration by Rumanian officials in which the drive against the Soviets was considered to be the pressing problem of the Rumanian policy. ”

If any more proof be needed of the joint anti-Soviet policy of activities of these two powers then it is safely furnished by the trial in the end of 1930 of a number of counter-revolutionaries in Moscow. According to the statements of the accused the complicity of Briand, Poincare, Churchill and Henry Deterding the junta behind the two Governments—is proved. Instances could further be quoted to demonstrate the operations of the extensive cooperation of Anglo-French Imperialism, but for the purposes of establishing that the Entente Cordiale is a reality and that it is solely directed against the Soviet Union so much would suffice.

Though undoubtedly there had been minor incidence between these two Powers, some real and some artificial, during the Labour Government, yet these have not altered or disturbed the common policy inaugurated by Chamberlain and Heriot in Paris in 1924.

Though the incidents during 1924–28 had obscured the spirit of this policy yet the signing of the Secret Naval Pact in 1928 dissolved all the differences between the two governments and to all apparent purposes removed all causes of friction.

Having established this fact I shall show later with as much data as possible under the circumstances how these two Imperialist Powers are engaged in actual war preparations against the Soviet Union.

(2) *Franco-Italian antagonism.*

Now I take up Franco-Italian relations in the post-war period. The Versailles treaty gave Italy nothing substantial. The war loot was mostly shared by the Anglo-French bourgeoisie. She got neither the Anatolian Plateau, as promised to her at the time when she had broken away from the Central Powers, nor was she returned the southern provinces of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire (only a small portion was given) nor Nice, over all of which Italy had ethnological claims and which were promised to her at the time of entering the war on the Allies' side. In one word Italy got nothing. Emasculated by war and internal disorder she was not in a position to assert her rights by force of arms. To take up arms against the united strength of Britain and France was no joke. Italy could not dream of such an adventure.

Having got no stimulating resources, nor possessing extensive colonial empire, the economic system of Italy began to collapse earlier than expected. Chaos reigned supreme. Forces of revolution developed. The weak Government headed by a politically bankrupt landed aristocracy was tottering, and proved incapable to cope with the situation. At this time, about 1922, the Communist revolution seemed so imminent that the internal bourgeoisie was appalled, and financed by the forces of counter-revolution and reaction, fascism grew. At this time Signor Mussolini, the protagonist of the Roman traditions and the head of Fascism effected, a Coup-d'Etat. The communist revolution was drowned in blood; unheard-of and unmentionable shocking atrocities were perpetrated on Communists. Having crushed the Communist revolution Mussolini proceeded with the consolidation of Fascism.

Mussolini not only aimed at making Italy a strong economic unit but he adopted an aggressive Imperialist policy. This brought Italy into active conflict with France which could not tolerate the rapid strides of her neighbour, an agricultural country, towards industrialisation. To France Italian consolidation, under whatever regime, meant danger to her security and Italian industrialisation meant to her nothing less than trade competition in the Mediterranean. Thus France, forgetting that Italy was her ally once and that too at a critical juncture in the world history, started fortification of her eastern frontiers and began

actively supporting the anti-Fascist elements in exile, which number several millions together on French territory. This hostile attitude on the part of France made Italy alert and conscious of danger. It led to the strengthening of Italian land, naval and air forces. The naval needs of Italy led to the Italian claim of naval parity with France. France did not like this. Post-war France wanted to play the role in Europe which the United States play in world affairs. She aimed at establishing a financial as well as political hegemony in Europe, but the ways of Mussolini foiled her plans. They directly interfered with the French Continental policy.

The antagonism between these two first rate Powers of Europe developed very rapidly. The political rivalry manifested itself in the race for armaments. I shall come to this later on.

Whereas the alround antagonism between Britain and the United States emanates mostly from trade competition the Franco-Italian rivalry has got mainly a politico diplomatic character, culminating in an intense armament competition. But the economic reasons cannot be overlooked. Economics govern the world. ~~The~~ overlook this fact is to confess one's abject ignorance of world affairs. However, I proceed with this particular case. Franco-Italian rivalry operates mostly in the Mediterranean, Adriatic and Black Seas and to some extent in Central Europe. (1) The rivalry in the Adriatic expresses itself in Italian-Yugo-Slavian relations. (2) In the Mediterranean it operates along the North African Coast, Spain and Turkey and to a lesser degree in Greece. (3) In the Black Sea it expresses itself in Bulgarian-Rumanian relations. (4) In Central Europe the rivalry manifests itself in the Italo-Austro-Hungarian-German blocs opposed to the Franco-Belgio Polish-Czech bloc.

When one looks to these combinations and counter-combinations one feels that the prospects are not bright in Europe. In other words Europe is an armed camp.

Owing to America having limited the Italian immigration and Mussolini's anxiety to keep Italian population as near at hand as possible due to the strained relations with France, Italian expansion was directed to the Balkans and North Africa. This intensified conflict with France. To check Italian expansionist policy and also to garrison against Soviet France fortified Yugo-Slavia and Rumania.

Finding thus her advances in the Balkans interfered with, and Yugo-Slavia so near to her and directly under French control, Italy set about fortifying the Peninsula of Apulia-projecting at the entrance of Adriatic Sea.

But the fortification system would not be complete without the possession of the Island of Corfu opposite to the Apulian Peninsula and belonging to Greece. With these two strategic positions in hand Fascist Italy would have bottled up Yugo-Slavia in the Adriatic surrounded by Hungary and Bulgaria—Italy's two allies and Albania, Italy's virtual colony.

Excuse was to be sought for occupying Corfu. It was soon furnished by the murder of two Fascist guards by some Greek bandits. This was considered sufficient ground for the Fascist Government to capture Corfu. Italian men-of-war bombarded Corfu. An ultimatum was delivered to Greece and Corfu was demanded as ransom. Greece would have succumbed to the Italian demand, but the plans of Mussolini miscarried. Britain soon took up the cause of Greece. When the independence of Greece from the Ottoman Empire was recognised the Island of Corfu was ceded to Greece by Britain on the explicit understanding that it would not be handed over to any other Power.

Threatening diplomatic despatches from the British Foreign Office were soon followed by the embarkation of a British flotilla for the Mediterranean. Mussolini found himself in a hole. His game was lost. He silently submitted to the British proposal of Greece, firing apologetic salutes to Italian and British Fleets. This was the ransom which Mussolini was made to accept. This incident closed here. Having suffered reverses in this direction, Mussolini turned his attention to Fiume and later on to Albania.

King Zugo, who have captured the Albanian throne with the help of Yugo-Slavian bourgeoisie, fell an easy prey to Mussolini's advances. This tiny state on the Adriatic is now so much under the Italian influence that it could easily be termed an Italian colony.

With the drift in the Anglo-French relations as already described the British bourgeoisie utilised Mussolini as an instrument against their neighbour. Everywhere Mussolini appeared in the role of Britain's chief bully. So much so that the Italian Foreign policy was absolutely subservient to Whitehall. This state of things continued till 1928.

When crisis developed between Britain and Turkey over Mosul Oil fields Mussolini at once sent ultimatum to Turkey. At another occasion when trouble broke out in Syria there appeared hints in the British press that Britain was offering Syrian Mandate to Italy.

Everywhere Fascism was obeying the dictates of British Imperialism. In China, where Italy has no stake at all, she

dispatched her marines at the dictate of Britain. Then again when France was engaged in a mortal struggle with the Moroccan rebels, the Riffs; Italian help was discovered. Italy was helping the Riffs "materially and spiritually". Some documents found with the Riff prisoners of war established Italy's complicity. But in the course of time, when Anglo-French differences were dissolved completely owing to the Naval Pact and Italy having derived no benefit out of her valuable services, Mussolini chalked a different policy.

Thereafter Italian Imperialism has followed seemingly an independent foreign policy which of course has never come in conflict with British diplomacy in any part of the world. The course of Italian diplomacy has never been smooth. It has rapid shiftings and turnings, now making a common cause with the defeated Powers, now with those who stand for revision of Versailles Treaty, at others orientating towards America or flirting with Moscow.

After the fashion of French Balkan alliance system Italy has also developed her alliance system. It consists of Bulgaria, Albania and to some degree of Greece and Turkey. Then there is the Italian Continental system on the pattern of French Continental system though not so very sharp. It is composed of Germany, Austria and Hungary, the latter completely under Fascist influence. Mention should here be made of the military treaties between Rumania and France which are not only directed against Italy but also against Soviet. Likewise I should mention the agreements between Italy and Hungary, between Yugo-Slavia and France, between Italy and Bulgaria. The bonds between Italy and Bulgaria have further been strengthened recently. With the unsuccessful termination of the Five Powers Naval Conference in London early in 1930 Franco-Italian relations were further strained. The Five Power agreement could not be reached because France refused categorically to recognise Italy's right of naval parity with her. Pressure was brought by Britain to make Italy submit to France's superiority and thereby not to press any further demands for parity. The Anglo-French joint action against Italy's claim stirred Italian feelings. The Manchester Guardian's Rome Correspondent writing on 19/3/30 says: "Reports of the Naval Conference in the Fascist press have become gloomy since M. Tardeo's visit to London. Today's messages all refer to pressure and threats of four Powers (United States, Britain, Japan and France) pact, excluding Italy, and the like, which are being thrust on the Italian delegation in London in order to make Italy withdraw her claim for parity with France." This threat did not fructify then but it was with such a threat that Mr. Henderson accompanied by the first Lord of Admiralty descended upon

Rome in the ~~end~~ of February and made Italy yield to what she had refused to do in London Conference. And the mission of Mr. Henderson was successful. Italy grudgingly submitted. Referring to this achievement of Mr. Henderson "the Echo-de-Paris" says, "that the agreement gives France a fleet of 630,000 tons with a superiority of 150,000 tons over Italy." (Reuter, 4/3/31 Statesman). On the eve of the London Conference the following are the figures of the two Powers.

1930

TONNAGE

FRANCE	681,808
ITALY	360,679

(Manchester Guardian 14/2/30)

And here is the total fighting strength.

AREA IN SQUARE KILOMETERS.	NO. OF INHABITANTS	SIZE OF ARMY	PER 100 KILOMETERS.	APPROX. NO. OF SOLDIERS PER 1000 INHABITANTS.
FRANCE 550,986	40,743,000	673,000	120	16
ITALY 310,090	40,548,000	248,000	70	6

(LOUIS FISHER "SOVIETS IN WORLD AFFAIRS")

It would be futile and waste of time to go into any more detail over the ~~Italian-Franco~~ relations. For establishing that the French and Italian rivalry has been a living thing and that it has been a standing menace for the peace in the Mediterranean so much would be quite ample.

The question can be asked now as to why with all this antagonism between these two Mediterranean Powers war has not yet broken out, why in spite of the Bellicose speeches and provocations from Mussolini, France did not declare war on Italy. Was it because France would not like to crush the growing power of Italy or that she would not desire to smash the Italian system of alliances? The answer to this question is quite simple. France is after some bigger game. Her attention is mainly focussed on the growing power of the U.S.S.R., which has taken gigantic strides towards ~~the~~ socialist reconstruction of Soviet society under the Five years' Plan. Against that power France intends to muster together all the forces of International capitalism. France as events during the last two years have shown has been trying hard for drawing Italy into Anglo-French anti-Soviet Combination for the purpose of launching an offensive of world Imperialism against

Soviet Union. This is the fundamental idea underlying France's postponing a crisis in the Mediterranean or the Balkan. And with this aim France is arming the Balkan States and exerting hard through Venezelos to bring about the union of all the Balkan States in a federation.

D/—3.9.31

Q. Can you explain how this discussion of European Politics is relevant to the case ?

A. If prosecution rules out all exhibits put against us collectively and against me individually, the exhibits pertaining to the War Danger and the file of the 6th World Congress of the Communist International, then I shan't bother about the War Danger. I have shown that all these exhibits, that is those put against us, prove the War Danger, and I am substantiating them that there is a War Danger and that the War Danger is systematically being turned against the Soviet Union by the World Bourgeoisie. When I come to the Soviet Union then the whole thing will be very clear.

III Balkan States and their Rivalries.

To take up the Balkans now. Much has already been said about the rival groups of these States. Almost all of these States are agricultural, depending mostly on the sale of their agricultural produce. Their national incomes are very scanty and perhaps this accounts for their equilibrium being so very unstable. The Balkans have always been called the powder magazine of Europe.

The composition of these tiny States of the South Eastern Europe is as follows:—

(1) Yugo-Slavia and Rumania, the backbone of the French alliance system in the Balkans.

(2) Bulgaria and Albania, the main-stay of Italian alliance system here.

(3) Greece has more or less maintained neutral attitude until recent years. It has not been consistent however. At occasions it has come in the orbit of French combination though maintaining an independent dealing as regards her relations to Yugo-Slavia and Rumania. At other times Greece has flirted with Mussolini.

(4) Turkey is mostly a Near East Asiatic Power with her hands full of her own problems in that sphere; but in as much as she concerns herself with the Balkan affairs she belongs to Bulgaro-Albanian camp, thereby falling within the Italian bloc.

While dealing with the Franco-Italian antagonism I have demonstrated that these States are under the political hegemony of France and Italy respectively. It will therefore be needless to recapitulate the already covered ground.

However, I shall emphasise that whereas France and Italy share the political hegemony over the Balkans, Britain's economic supremacy over them cannot be ignored. The British influence is tremendous.

Not only in the post-War period, but even previous to that also the British financial penetration had made considerable headway. Take for instance Greece. It is dominated mainly by the British banking system. Next to Britain France is the only State which controls the economic life of Greece.

Then there is the post-War State of what is known as Yugo-Slavia. It is the Serbia of the pre-War period which has absorbed most of Thrace, depriving Bulgaria of a considerable territory, devoured a large portion of the former Empire of Austria-Hungary. Serbia had no outlet to the sea, while the Yugo-Slavia of today has come right on the sea covering two thirds of the Adriatic Eastern Coast. Yugo-Slavia is the creation of the Entente and is their outpost in the Balkans. If this fact is grasped, it would be easy to understand the advances of British Imperialism. The loans granted by Britain so largely needed by the Serbian Bourgeoisie for the consolidation of its hegemony, explains the powerful pressure of British capital in Yugo-Slavia.

The independent role of these countries is nil. They are more or less pawns in the game of International Imperialism. Just as India is renowned in Europe for her Sadhus, Fakirs, Mahatmas and snakes, similarly is the entire Peninsula of Balkans known as abode of warring peoples ready to fight any one's bidding. This is how the International bourgeoisie interprets the national characteristics of different peoples. Judged from this angle of vision the Balkans are judged by their Frontier incidents. Little wars have always been going on in that Peninsula. If peace begins to reign, the interested parties begin to finance the 'Comitaji'.

The most notable event in Balkans in the post-War period is the Greek drive on Anátolia under the dictates of Lloyd George-Curzon administration in England. This was the time when France and Britain were arrayed against one another in the diplomatic arena. While Greece had the backing of Britain, Turkey was facing the invaders with French long-range guns. Greek forces better equipped than the Turks and having overwhelming resources

at their disposal overran the whole of Western Anantolia. Capturing Iskishehr the Greeks were threatening the outskirts of the Turkish Capital.

Mustafa Kemal made one desperate effort and repelled the Greek offensive. The morale of the Turkish forces was superb under the nationalist leadership, their equipment improved with the aid of the Soviet Union.

Routing the Greeks at one pitched battle near Iskishehr the Turks developed their success. The victory at Iskishehr further improved the morale of the Turks and they pursued the Greeks right up to the sea. Greece never recovered from this adventure. It gave a rude shock to Greek expansionist policy. All her dreams about the revival of Hellenic Empire were shattered. This fact clearly illustrates that an independent war in ~~the~~ Balkans is possible without drawing the world actually into war, provided the International bourgeoisie can afford to let the Balkans have their own way or that such a war be in the interest of the big bourgeoisie.

After the Turko-Greek War came the minor skirmishes. Frontier incidents became very common especially between Greece and Bulgaria, Bulgaria and Rumania, and Bulgaria and Yugo-Slavia.

The course of events was never smooth in the Balkans. The rival States had been playing the 'Comitaji' against one another.

The unfriendly relations between Yugo-Slavia and Bulgaria culminated in the Sofia Bomb outrage. After murdering several hundreds of Communists for this, the Bulgarian Government subsequently discovered the complicity of Yugo-Slavia. It was in 1923.

Taking advantage of their mutual rivalry the two Mediterranean Powers roped in the Balkan States in their alliance system. This naturally intensified the antagonism in the Balkans.

It goes without saying that France and Italy have heavily garrisoned these States. Not much is required to set ablaze the Balkans. France has two aims in garrisoning them. One is the strengthening of her hold against Italy; second and more important one is to utilise the Balkans as the spring-board of operations against the Soviet Union.

This is the state of affairs in Balkans. A change has come now. With the intensification of War preparation against the Soviet ~~the~~ Union especially by Anglo-French Imperialism the necessity was felt last year for further strengthening the Balkan

base. The first step in this direction was the Sinaia Conference in October last year, between the Ministers of Rumania and Yugoslavia, although it met under the cloak of effecting a Customs Union its anti-Soviet character cannot be denied.

On the head of it came the Athens Conference. The chief object of the Conference was stated to be a Balkan Federation. In other words it was the creation of a political and economic bloc against the Soviet Union.

As I have no intention to exhaust all my knowledge of Balkan affairs I stop here. Suffice it to say that war danger is acute everywhere and that it is successfully being turned against the Soviet Union. If the Balkans unite in this Federation it would be a step towards a war against the Soviet. It would be one more link in the Imperialist preparations for a drive on the Soviet. A glance at the military budgets of these tiny States astounds an honest observer. Hoarding of armaments is a useless task unless the hoarder has in view some warlike designs. The warlike designs are there. They are shown every now and then in the speeches and writings of the people, the statesmen behind the Imperialist governments, busy all the time pulling wires in this direction. They are incessantly inculcating a war psychology against the Soviet amongst their fellow citizens.

(4) GERMANY.

However, I leave this topic here and take up Germany, the last but not the least important link in the Imperialist chain. Germany of today is not the same Germany of pre-war period. A glance at a map of Europe will show how dismembered is now the former empire of Kaiser Wilhelm. The Treaty of Versailles handed over the two important industrial centres of Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium, Upper Silesia went to Poland and a corridor was drawn right up to the sea between East Prussia and the Fatherland. Danzig one of the chief ports of Germany in the Baltic was made a free city under the supervision of the League of Nations. Besides Alsace-Lorraine, France snatched away Saar Basin from her.

Versailles Treaty was a forced treaty on Germany. The war guilt was thrust entirely on Germany. Huge sums were imposed on her as penalty. Germany grudgingly submitted to a reparation scheme under whose weight her economical and political structure was broken to pieces.

War and Versailles Treaty disorganised Germany's economic system. Her industrial life was thrown in to chaos by the seizure of her important industrial areas. At one time it seemed as if

Germany was also breaking away from the Imperialist chain like Russia. But the International bourgeoisie could not afford to let Germany go the same direction and helped the German bourgeoisie to the utmost in crushing all the forces of revolution. With the help of International Imperialism unheard of atrocities were perpetrated on the Communists.

Then came the American finance. It set going the industrial fabric of Germany and once more Germany entered in the field of cooperation with some and competition with others of her former rivals.

Note:-The rest connected accounts can be found in No. 1 Anglo-French relations.

Contrary to the general practice, this competition did not promote armament race so far as Germany is concerned. Versailles Treaty had partially disarmed and to a great extent limited her armaments. Germany's disarmament as a matter of fact was to be the preliminary step towards a general disarmament of Europe. This, as every body ought to know, has not come yet and will not come as long as international imperialism with its inherent contradictions survives.

The gulf between the defeated and the victors went on widening. Entente and Germany were living in two different worlds. Feeling herself completely isolated and regarded as a pariah by the Western Combination, Germany orientated Eastward. The Rapallo Treaty between Germany and the Soviet Union was the expression of this trend. It warranted close economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Germany. It was in 1922.

This move of Germany startled the Entente. Anglo-French bourgeoisie realised the dangers of such a combination. As an outcome of this appreciation came a united front of Entente against both Germany and the Soviet. But this did not help any farther. The British bourgeoisie felt that their extreme attitude towards Germany would only drive her nearer to the Soviet. There came a turn in tactics.

This turn in outlook led to Locarno - thus drawing Germany in the Western orientation. The next move was bringing Germany into the League of Nations. But it was soon discovered that neither the Locarno nor the entry in the League made Germany sub-servient to the plans of the Anglo-French Entente. All through Germany maintained an independent foreign policy. The last effort of Whitehall to draw Germany in an offensive against the Soviet failed in 1928, when Lord Birkenhead visited Herr Stresemann

inducing him to allow Entente forces a safe march through the German territory.

The revival of the Anglo-French Entente and the Naval Pact of July 1928, between these two Powers made Germany further conscious of the dangers to which she was exposed. This forced her into the Italian system of alliances. Under the slogan of the revision of the Peace Treaties these two states rallied round themselves all the disgruntled and dis-satisfied countries of Europe.

First I have shown in this particular chapter there is intense fear in France about Germany's preparing for a war of revenge. France is spending huge sums on armaments and has considerably fortified her frontiers in a way as no other power on earth can dream of doing. She has formed a steel bulwark on her eastern frontier, the chain beginning from the Italian frontier and ending or rather submerging in the Belgian Frontier System. This is the mightiest bulwark in the history of the world.

Next in importance of the German-French antagonism there is the Polish-German rivalry. It is the legacy of the Great War. The wounds inflicted on Germany by the Versailles Treaty have become a festering sore. The creation of Poland has not only deprived Germany of her rich eastern areas but has also separated her from the Eastern Prussian territories and made any economic cooperation between the Soviet and Germany an impossibility.

Needless to emphasise that war danger is intense in Central Europe between Germany and the aggressive states encircling her. But it does not come from a famished Germany, it comes from the terrified conquerors who are up against her. The real danger to the peace of Europe over here arises from her armed supremacy. I mean the French Imperialism fearing to lose its supremacy.

But for the existence of the Soviet Union, Germany would have been smashed long ago. International Imperialism is too sagacious to let its internal contradictions go so far as to forget the real enemy, the U. S. S. R. It does hope to rally one day the active support of the German bourgeoisie in a war against the Soviet Union. Hoover Moratorium is an important step in this direction.

(5) SOVIET UNION.

Having fully demonstrated the contradictions within the Imperialist camp, which may lead to a war at any time, I come now to the Soviet Union — the first Socialist State.

This is a Federation of Socialist Republics carved out of the former Russian Empire. I do not however intend going to ethno-

logical description nor do I intend dealing with the history of the Russian Revolution and much less do I intend to enter into the judicial justification for the existence of the Soviet Union before the Court. Its very existence in the teeth of the International opposition and its successful emergence from the armed intervention of the International Imperialism is sufficient justification. It needs no better credentials. For the last fourteen years it has stood alone and as successfully defended itself against all-round attacks. By its achievements in the field of Socialist reconstruction it has justly falsified all lies and calumnies spread by the bourgeois press and platform against it. All dreams of the world bourgeoisie to smash this bulwark of the world proletarian movement, this cluster of Socialist Republics, have come untrue. Their incessant attempts at depriving the working and peasant masses of their gains of revolution have been drowned deep. What happened in the past will be repeated in the future, if the world Imperialism is not yet disheartened by its past defeats.

Leaving the world bourgeoisie to their mischievous designs I come direct to the Prosecution. Much abuses, mis-statements and calumny have been poured on the U. S. S. R. by them. In doing that they have laid aside all codes of bourgeois morality. They have demonstrated terrible vindictiveness towards an enemy on whom they cannot, I say dare not, lay hands.

Of these mis-statements, the one that a Socialist revolution ought not to have taken place in Russia is not only misleading but it is absurd. Their contention that a Socialist revolution in Russia has falsified Marx is absolutely mis-quoting Marx. Of course so many of the leaders of the bourgeoisie and their allies of the Second International have misinterpreted Marx, no wonder that the Prosecution goes the same way. However I cannot let this misleading statement go unchallenged.

In order to conceive the Russian Revolution as a whole in relation to the world revolution, it is to be realised that that revolution was only one event in a process embracing the whole world. It was the first breach in the hitherto invulnerable fortress of Imperialism. It was the harbinger of a new era, the era of the world revolution and of the general collapse of capitalist organism.

It is not necessary for proletarian revolution to break in a country industrially highly developed. The process is not so very mechanical as the Prosecution and their friends of the Labour Party have understood. The capitalist front will be broken where the chains of Imperialism are the weakest and the oppression intense. Russia was the weakest link in the Imperialist chain. This will be dealt with in its proper time.

Russia was predominantly an agricultural country. Capitalism had not developed to the same extent as in Britain and Germany. But so far as the concentration of wealth is concerned it remained in few hands who exploited and oppressed the masses. The peasants were almost fleeced, taxation was very high, the oppression of the landlords was very unbearable. Workers were tortured and humiliated. Striking workers used to be shot just like in India. Living was dear; death was cheap. 99 per cent of the population lived below starvation line. The heart-rending repression and forcible conscription during the war set ablaze all the combustible stuff. It threw all the revolutionary elements in one camp. Thus the revolutionary situation developed and revolution broke out in Russia as a direct product of the objective circumstances.

The Russian Revolution was a mass revolution in which the great masses of the workers, peasants, soldiers and sailors all took active part. It was a revolution and not a coup-d'etat of a small body as the Prosecution has suggested. To call the Russian Revolution a coup-d'etat is not only misleading but stupid too.

To understand the Russian Revolution one should turn back to the great crisis which culminated in the Great War. This crisis was responsible to a considerable extent for great many changes on earth. It facilitated the bursting off of chains of at least the countries where the hold of Imperialism was the weakest and where the state apparatus was the most oppressive. It released the forces of revolution everywhere. The general breakdown of the Imperialist organism gave rise to a series of revolutions and revolutionary actions on the continent as well as in the colonial world. The Russian Revolution was the first breach. Here is a chronological list of some of the most important revolutionary outbreaks:—

1918 January	Proletarian Revolution in Finland.
„ August	So-called Rice riots in Japan.
„ November	Revolution in Germany and Austria, which overthrew the semi-feudal monarchies of Hohenzollern and Hapsburgs.
1919 February	Afghan War of Independence.
„ March	The Proletarian Revolution in Hungary. The rising in Korea.
„ April	The establishment of Soviet regime in Bavaria.
1920 January	Ferment in India covering the whole of this year as well as the next. A bourgeois national revolution in Turkey.
„ September	Seizure of factories by workers in Italy.
1921 March	The rising of the workers in Germany.

I need not prolong the list any further.

Most of these revolutionary outbreaks were drowned in blood by the bourgeoisie, but the world bourgeoisie failed miserably in their attempts against the Soviet.

To come back to the happenings in Russia it surprises one to hear that Sir George Buchanan the British Ambassador at the Court of Tsar was materially helping in the overthrow of Tsarism and that the March Revolution in Russia was hailed by the Allies with a sigh of relief. The reason of this was quite simple and logical. The Tsarist regime headed by a corrupt and feudal aristocracy had proved incapable for the successful conduct of war. Therefore it was necessary to replace it. But as soon as the October revolution succeeded, the whole aspect changed. It did not take the Allies much time to understand the significance of this revolution. They hastened to end war by the Armistice of November 1918, in order to direct all their energies against this new ideal—which brought about a Socialist State in Russia.

Mustering of the forces at their command the world bourgeois States launched their offensive against the Soviet Union. I need not go in detail over the armed intervention, blockade and material help in money and munitions given to the counter-revolutionaries by the world bourgeoisie. This is all a matter of history today.

Britain played a very prominent part in these anti-Soviet activities. In view of Mr. Winston Churchill's admission in his book "The World Crisis: The After Math", (and also in the House of Commons) already referred to, I need not emphasise this point very much. Who could be a better authority than Mr. Churchill who was at that time the War Minister of Britain?

It is a matter of common knowledge today, how well-planned were the counter-revolution, the armed intervention and blockade, and that how all these came to a miserable termination. How very fervently had the interventionists started their drive on Petrograde and Moscow from all directions and that how very triumphantly the organised workers and peasants of Russia had hurled them all back to their respective ambushes.

It is thrilling to recall how the Soviet repulsed all the armies of the Allies. From the North-West had poured in the armies of Letts, Finns and Lithuanians. From the North had descended the British, the French and the Americans. Up from the South had rushed the aeroplanes, tanks and the death-battalions of General Denikin. Out of Esthonia had marched Yudenitch, out of Poland the well-trained Legions of Petlura, out of Crimea advanced the cavalry of Baron Wrangel. In short the blockade and armed intervention were well co-ordinated on all sides. But

all these forces of counter-revolution were resolutely crushed by the Soviet.

The forces of Kolchak were hurled back, the Admiral himself was tried and killed by his own troops. The Allies were forced back to Archangel, to get themselves shipped off across the frozen waters of the White Sea. Denikin was crushed at Tula, hurrying back to the Black Sea he escaped on board a British cruiser. Yudenitch was cut to pieces and the Baron driven back to the Sea of Azov fled to Turkey carrying away with him a large part of the Russian fleet, now in the possession of the French Government.

This was the end of all this. But this in no way was the end of Imperialist designs. The defeated Allies heavily garrisoned the States bordering the Soviet Unions and created what is now generally known as the Cordon Sanitaire.

The Kronstadt rising was the last hope of the Interventionists. The Czarist Generals were sent by the Allies as the leaders and organisers of the counter-revolutionary uprising. As a matter of fact on the success of this uprising depended the future plans of the Entente.

Before the rebellion could assume any dimensions the Red Army succeeded in crushing it. This completed the list of Allies' failures. But the strain of this was terrific; "For three years", said Lenin, "our whole energy was devoted to the task of war."

The history of the last one decade after the collapse of intervention is the history of the socialist consolidation of the Soviet Union and the war preparations by the Imperialist powers. All along this period times out of number they have attempted to embroil the Soviet Union in a war with one or other of the neighbouring States in order to obtain a pretext for fresh intervention and mobilisation on this score of all their forces.

The list of the provocations is very big one. No other State, even a fourth-raid power, would have tolerated even the ordinary breach of International diplomatic code, not to speak of the provocations of the kind the Soviet has borne in patience. If in place of the Soviets it were Poland or Italy, ultimatum and war would have been the consequence. But the Soviet did not move, it ignored them. Here is a small list of some of the most important provocations:—

- 1923 Murder of M. Vorovsky (the Soviet ambassador at Rome) at Geneva during the Geneva Conference.
 The notorious Curzon ultimatum.

- 1924 The Zinovieff letter scandal.
Anti-Soviet propaganda on the basis of the so-called religious persecutions.
- 1925-26 Provocative propaganda against the Soviet in the British Press consisting of contributions from the Cabinet Ministers like Mr. Churchill and Lord Birkenhead.
- 1927 The Arcos Raid.
The breaking off diplomatic relations by Britain.
The raid on Soviet Embassy in Peking.
The murder of M. Voikoff, the Soviet ambassador in Warsaw.
- The Murder of the Soviet citizens in China at the instigation of the Anglo-Franco-American Imperialists.
- 1928 The extensive military manoeuvres in Poland and Rumania along the Soviet Frontiers conducted by the Anglo-French General Staffs.
- 1929 The seizure of the Chinese Eastern Railways by the War Lords of Manchuria, not only with the connivance of but at the instigation of the Anglo-American bourgeoisie.
The attempt on the life of Antonov, the Soviet Ambassador at Warsaw.
- 1930 Anti-Soviet campaign in connection with the so-called anti-religious policy of the Soviet Union.
- 1931 A world wide scare about the so-called dumping of the agricultural produce by the Soviet Union and the propaganda about the forced Labour in the Lumber Camps.

This in no way is an exhaustive list. A study of the relations of all the bourgeois States with the Soviet Union makes one understand that at one time or other every State has carried her relations with the Soviet union to the ultimatum point. These have not been ordinary incidents which occur in an ordinary course of diplomatic life, but have arisen out of a deliberate policy to drag the Soviet into a war.

While dealing with inter-Imperialist rivalries I have demonstrated that but for the existence of the Soviet Union the world bourgeoisie would have come to grips amongst themselves long ago. A question can be asked, and it would be quite appropriate, as to what is in that State that the world bourgeoisie is keeping up a united front? To understand the answer to this question it is better first to understand the class composition of that State.

The Soviet Union is the Federation of the Soviets, of workers, peasants, soldiers and sailors organised on a socialist basis. There are no capitalists or landlords there. These Soviets passing through the various phases of revolution are becoming simply cooperative bodies in the economic sphere. The Soviet system aims at organising production for distribution. The underlying idea of capitalism is production for sale and profits, not caring in the least whether the producers of the commodities get sufficient or not; this is no concern of theirs. The Soviet system stands for the prohibition of the exploitation of man by man. Capitalism not only accepts such exploitation but promotes it too.

The first principle of the Soviet system is the socialisation of all means of production and organising production on collective basis, production for distribution and not for profiteering.

Here lies the clash between the two ideals.

The Soviet ideal appeals not only to the workers in the capitalist countries but also to the colonial oppressed masses. This is exactly where two ideals collide. Imperialism cannot tolerate the existence of this ideal which is an open challenge to its right of exploitation and which forms an ideological background for the world revolutionary movement. There is no question with Imperialism to live and let live. International Imperialism which wields all the forces of the united capital and all the equipments of military technique is a mighty power. In no circumstances, under no possible conditions can it live in peace with the Soviet Republics. A conflict between the Soviet Republics representing the world revolutionary force and Imperialism is inevitable.

Is it not known to every student of History that as soon as this ideal state came into being in the former territory of Czar Nicholas, the world bourgeoisie dashed to crush it? But for the revolt of their colonial slaves and the growth of working-class demonstrations, the world bourgeoisie would have pursued their designs still further.

Thereafter truce was declared. The armed hostilities were for the time being given up. An era of recognition *de jure* of the Soviet Union commenced. All the rival bourgeois states vied with one another in recognising the Soviet and each hurried to obtain as many economic concessions as possible.

This period of truce the World Bourgeoisie utilised in intensifying the war preparations against the Soviet Union, "both materially and spiritually". Taking advantage of their diplomatic facilities and immunities they spread the so-called authentic stories

about the brutalities against religion. They have all along been systematically carrying on propaganda against the Soviets in all possible ways.

This period of one decade and a half has been a very curious period in the world history. Whenever the rival Imperialist powers have come very near to a war amongst themselves it has been successfully averted by their pointing to one another the existence of the Bolshevik spectre.

I have already described the rival powers of note. I put them crudely in this form in relation to the Soviet:—

- (1) Anglo-French Entente with a large number of satellite states around them.
- (2) Anti-Versailles combination led by Italy and Germany.
- (3) The United States as a symbol of Pan-Americanism.
- (4) The Soviet Union, representing the world revolutionary movement.

Three of the four belong to the camp of Imperialism. The fourth represents socialism. It is this fourth factor which is objectively if not subjectively acting as a restraining factor. It is this factor that makes a truce possible between America and Britain. It is because of this that Franco-Italian rivalry slows down. It is because of the existence of this state that many political and diplomatic crises have been averted within the camp of Imperialism and all energy of World Bourgeoisie focussed on the Soviet.

The war preparations against the Soviet Union are divided into three categories:—

- (1) Diplomatic steps.
- (2) Anti-Soviet propaganda.
- (3) Armaments.

Ignoring all the diplomatic steps that Whitehall took before the recognition of the Soviet Union there can be no justification whatsoever for their hostile steps during and after 1924.

Everywhere during this half a decade one finds British forces pitched against the interests of the Soviet Union. We have seen that in China, in Persia and in Afghanistan, not to mention the Continent.

The most outrageous thing a government can do from the point of view of bourgeois International code is to raid the Embassies, legations and the premises enjoying diplomatic immunity. Britain

with so many of her liberal traditions violated these laws. The Arcos Raid is a standing disgrace in the history of the British diplomatic relations. Arcos was not only raided but was ransacked by the order of Sir Joynson Hicks, the Jix, now Lord Brentford.

This raid was soon followed by the termination of the diplomatic relations with the Soviet and the murder of Soviet Ambassador in Warsaw. The two acts were so well coordinated that they almost seemed prearranged. Who can deny that it was a definite provocation to drag the Soviet into war? Britain wanted war, but she overestimated the Continental political situation. All the powers of Europe treated Britain very lightly and refused to support her in an anti-Soviet adventure. The direct outcome of this little joke of Jix was that the British bourgeoisie lost Soviet trade, which was readily picked up by the bourgeoisie of other countries including France.

However it did not take British bourgeoisie long to realise that the Foreign Policy of Chamberlain had embittered relations with America and Jix had put them in a fix as regards the Soviet.

The General Elections opened a new chapter. The Labour fought it on the slogan of amicable settlement with America and the resumption of the diplomatic relations with the Soviet. The Labour won the Elections with a large majority over the Conservatives, and the bourgeoisie put them into the saddle. This is how the Labour lackeys of Imperialism assumed power. They put aright the relations of Britain with both America and the Soviet. But to declare that the Labour Government was friendly towards the Soviet is just like Poincare's charging of Lloyd George with pro-Soviet proclivities. The subsequent events have borne this contention. The first unfriendly act of the Labour Government after resuming diplomatic relations was their appointment of Sir Esmond Ovey as British Ambassador to Moscow. This Sir Esmond Ovey is no other gentleman than the one who at one time was the head of the anti-Soviet department of the British Foreign Office. He had just taken up his office in Moscow when the outcry of alleged religious persecutions startled the world. As to the fact that it emanated from British source, there is no doubt about it at all.

The second hostile act was Mr. Henderson's Note to the Soviet over Chinese Eastern Railway affairs.

The third was the appointment of Sir Francis Humphreys as High Commissioner of Iraq, the man who successfully conspired against Amanullah and who stirred the Kurds against Turkey.

The fourth was the acceptance of the principle of financial assistance to the States not only victims of aggression but also threatened with aggression. This is a clear indication of giving financial support to Poland and Rumania any time the Entente Powers wanted them to declare war on the Soviet.

The fifth and the last but not the least important is the British help to Nadir in money as well as munitions. The consolidation of Nadir's regime in Afghanistan is an important link in the southern cordon against the Soviet; and it is rumoured in the press that Afghanistan will join the League of Nations. This will further entitle Mohammad Nadir to League's financial help whenever Britain or the united Imperialism wants Nadir to start war with the Soviet. To illustrate the British interests in the consolidation of Nadir's regime suffice it to say that the recent prosecutions in India for writing articles against Mohammad Nadir are a clear indication.

Commenting on the principle of financial help Mr. J. L. Garvin, a Liberal journalist, writes in the 'Observer' dated 14/9/30:— "We hope that neither this country nor any of the Dominions will think for a moment of pledging a single farthing to any scheme of the kind while the provisions for disagreement in Europe upon disarmament and revision remain what they are..... otherwise we should encourage ultimate war and not peace, by making the nations expecting financial aid less inclined to concessions.... subsidies would have to be given to a number of nations at once..... Poland and Rumania for instance under war excitement might claim to be subsidised for attacking Russia with strict accordance to Article XVI."

Mr. Garvin has left nothing more for me to say on this item.

Now what had been the position of the Labour Government. Would it have declared war on the Soviet? I do not want to guess. What is very clear on this point is that the Labour Government did assiduously carry through the war preparations of the British bourgeoisie. How far did the Labour Government succeed in carrying through these preparations? Let me quote a few instances:—

(1) It came to a truce with America by the conclusion of the London Naval Disarmament Agreement. By this it not only neutralised America but did win over her active support vis-a-vis U. S. S. R. as is clear from the recent rapprochements.

(2) It did successfully crush the Indian Independence

Movement and won over the Indian bourgeoisie by the bait of Round Table Conference.

(3) (a) It built new military roads—for instance Khajuri Plain Road in the North-West Frontier Provinces.

(b) It started building new strategic railways like Haifa—Baghdad Railway running between Iraq and Palestine right up to the Mediterranean Coast.

(c) It strengthened and extended aerodromes of Mosul and Hinaidi in Iraq, Karachi, Quetta and many others on the North-West Frontier.

(4) It brought into control the Franco-Italian Naval competition thus freeing France from worries in the Mediterranean.

(5) It consolidated the Rumanian-Polish and Finnish Fascist regimes.

Now take the case of the alleged Soviet dumping. I have stated in the beginning that a similar scare had been started against Germany before the outbreak of war. That scare was a prelude to mobilising all the rival forces against Germany. The case is the same here. It has avowedly the same object. There is no doubt whatsoever that this scare is for forming a political combination against the Soviet. This is what the Geneva Correspondent of the 'Manchester Guardian' dated 26/9/30 has to say:—"It is a very probable hypothesis that this outcry against Soviet dumping is merely another excuse, like the outcry against the religious persecutions, for forming a political combination against Russia." And Moscow Correspondent of the 'Manchester Guardian' voices the Soviet feelings on this dumping outcry thus. "The campaign against the Soviet dumping aroused much indignation here and is interpreted as an effort of capitalist countries to blame the Soviet Union for the economic condition in the bourgeois world and to prepare for a new war. The 'Pravda' says:—"That in political practice the cry of dumping had always served the same purpose. When England was preparing for a war with Germany, the cry of German dumping was used to mobilise opinion against Germany. It is most suspicious that countries like France which are the least affected by the danger of Soviet dumping cry most." The 'Pravda' says, "that the entire turn-over of Soviet Foreign trade is only half that done before the war, being now less than two per cent of the world's trade turn-over. By what miracle can these two per cent upset the equilibrium of the entire world market?" says 'Pravda' (Manchester Guardian dated 3/10/30).

The cries of Soviet dumping in the bourgeois press and

platform are nothing short of disguising political designs against the Soviet by bourgeois countries who blame the Soviet Union for their own inevitable economic depression and attempt to stir up feelings of farmers in agrarian countries against the Soviet Union in order to prepare for a new anti-Soviet war.

Referring to the meeting of the second committee of the League Assembly in September 1930, the 'New York World' says:—"While on the surface Russia has chiefly, been denounced during the Assembly, the 'World' is authoritatively informed that Czecho-Slovakia, Germany, Poland and the United States are regarded as equally culpable of dumping by many countries which are desirous of maintaining the greatest possible measure of free trade."

By the decrees of October 3, 1930 the French Government laid an embargo on the Soviet agricultural produce. The example was soon followed by Rumania, Yugo-Slavia and Belgium.

(Note:—There is a temporary change in the tactics which is noticeable in the British papers of last month about France proceeding to negotiate commercial agreement and abrogating this particular decree. But this does not alter the position since it is a temporary Anglo-French joint move).

Canada and United States also united in barring imports from the Soviet. United States banned timber and pulp wood according to Reuter's message dated 11/2/31. Canada ~~banned~~ Soviet coal according to the message of the same Agency dated 12/2/31. America has started and is going to intensify her offensive against Soviet in the next year.

It is amusing to note that the world-wide scare about dumping has now been supplemented by the cries of forced and prison labour in the timber areas.

After quoting so much from the bourgeois papers it is not too much to say that the cries of Soviet dumping or the forced and prison labour in the bourgeois press and platform are nothing short of disguised political designs against the Soviet.

It is not out of place to say that the bourgeois States dishonestly blame the Soviet for their inevitable economic depression, and attempt to stir up feelings of farmers in agrarian countries against the Soviet. There is no doubt that this is a clear indication for preparation of war.

So much for the Soviet dumping. Now I come to the armaments of the Powers engaged against the Soviet.

While dealing with the Anglo-American inter European rivalries I illustrated the race for armaments. I lay emphasis here that whereas operations against the United States can be conducted through navy and naval air-arms, the operations against the Soviet can mainly be aerial on land and only a small unit of the army is to be employed to conduct operations in the Black Sea, on Viladivastak Murmansk Coast.

I will be very brief with armament figures and shall only mention of those Powers which are actively engaged against the Soviet at present as the events during the last two years have shown. France is the anti-Soviet leader these days. The Labour Government did not risk an open opposition; therefore naturally the lead was handed over to Britain's best ally. As to the contention that France is the leader, I turn to the Geneva Correspondent of the 'Manchester Guardian' dated 23/1/31. Referring to the Commission of Inquiry on European Union Discussion, he says:—"The discussion made one thing at least very plain, namely, that the French Government is at the head of the European combination against Soviet Russia."

The revelations in the trials of the counter-revolutionaries in Soviet Union left no further doubt about it.

Coming to the figures I must admit my inability in procuring British figures. The only thing which is possible for me is to give the expenditure figures of Britain on armaments this year. Going through the occasional notes of the 'Statesman' dated 13/3/31, I come across this:—"Expenditure of the fighting services totals £ 109 millions". The British armament figures as I have said are difficult to obtain, because it is always by the criticism of foreign newspapers about the armaments of a power that one gets an idea about the real state of affairs. The only thing under the circumstances I can do is to give official version and leave the inference. "Before the war the British armed forces cost 77 million pounds, today the cost 112 millions", (Bombay Chronicle, dated November 30, 1930). According to another version in the same paper "In 1930 Great Britain spent 115 million pounds on armaments." Take the Simon Commission Report volume I page 94 para 114. It runs; "60,000 British troops and 150,000 Indian troops (as well as 34,000 Reservists) are organised into a field army, into a cover army, and into a garrison for international security amongst others constantly in mind". As to British intensions against Soviet nobody could be better authority than the Chairman of the Statutory Commission. Simon Commission Report Volume II page 173 para 206, it runs:—"On Indian Frontier alone is the

Empire open to any serious threat of attack by land, and it must be remembered that such an attack might be delivered on account not of any quarrel with India but because a dispute between the Empire and a foreign Power had arisen in quite a different part of the world". That Power cannot be the satellite state of Mohammad Nadir nor of the docile Raza Shah. Sir John Simon has no other Power in his mind than the Soviet Union which stretches from the Pacific to Europe and which has often come in conflict with British interests in different parts touching its borders and specially the eastern and western frontiers (not very near to India).

D/7.9.31

Turning to France and the satellite States under the hegemony of Anglo-French Entente I will depend on Baron Von Rheinbaben (formerly the German Secretary of State). In reply to an article of M. Herriot on disarmament he writes in the London "Sunday Times," dated 16.11.30: "In view of a security based on treaties, which nobody could have foreseen ten years ago, it is well to picture the present position of the armaments of France and her military Allies-Belgium, Poland and the countries forming the little Entente. France has at her disposal a total peace establishment, including the air forces of 655,700 men and a war strength of 4500,000 men; her war material consists of 1332 light and 1172 heavy guns, and 120 anti-aircraft guns, 450 mine throwers, 2,500 tanks, 1667 first line aircraft, 1000 second line aircraft; and 2,000 training aircraft.....

Belgium has a peace establishment of 62,163 men and war strength of about 600,000 men, 588 light and 278 heavy guns, 96 mine throwers, 50 tanks; and 234 aircraft. Poland has a peace establishment of 265, 871 men plus 33, 170 frontier troops, a war strength of about 2,250,000 men, 1284 light and 426 heavy guns, 270 mine throwers, 220 tanks and 1000 aircraft.

Rumania has a peace establishment of 144,000 men and war strength of about 2000,000 men, 1402 light and 175 heavy guns, about 150 mine throwers, 90 tanks, and 350 air craft.

Yugo-Slavia has a peace establishment of 144,000 men and war strength of 2000,000 men, 1,104 light and 178 heavy guns, about 100 mine throwers, ten tanks and 492 aircraft."

Of these States Poland is the most militarist one. She has got several so-called Defence organisations. The strongest of these is the "Defence alliance" which has at present between 250,000, and 500,000 men (P. 1204).

Moreover Poland is developing the port of Gdynia as a naval base against the Soviet. Although the naval position of Poland is very insignificant, the base is not entirely meant for her Naval Arms. It is going to be the rendezvous of French and British fleets.

Next I take the Baltic States the most important link in anti-Soviet designs. These States while playing a negligible role in the world economy and world politics, nevertheless play an important role in the encirclement of the Soviet Union, and in the war preparations against it. Besides regular armies these tiny States have got so-called voluntary organisations.

This is how they stand: 1. Finland. In addition to a regular army of 30,000 there is an army of 100,000 men armed with the latest weapons and military technique, organised in regular military formation.

2. Estonia. In addition to a regular army of 15,000 men there is a defence force of 30,000 strong organised on the same lines as the Finnish Defence organisation.

3. Latvia. In addition to the regular army of 20,000 men there is an army of 35,000 men organised on regular military lines. (P. 1204)

Compared to these the Soviet armaments look very scanty. The Red Army and Navy count 563,000 men including officers. So much for the armaments.

When I began with the subject of War Danger in the beginning I said there was a danger of war, I also said that the danger of War against the Soviet was very acute. I think I have justifiably proved this assertion and our attitude before our arrests and our allegations from time to time against Britain, her Allies and the Imperialists of the world. As to the Danger of War even the Bourgeois Liberals do not deny the fact that the West is heading towards destruction, that every Imperialist nation is secretly cherishing war designs. Their Budgets sufficiently betray their mala fide intentions.

Every now and then we hear of peace talks but this is a sheer camouflage and bunkum. This is what all the Disarmament Conferences have proved. This is what the periodical sabre-rattling of Poincare, Churchill and Plisudsky—the tin-soldiers of the Anglo-French Imperialism—have proved.

Imperialism cannot be peaceful. It is full of explosive contradictions. Let me quote here a Liberal bourgeois American

journalist, Dr. Parker Thomas Moon, Associate professor of International Relations, Columbia University, published in Sunday Bombay Chronicle, 15. 3. 31, he writes:—

“Can Imperialism become peaceful? Hitherto it has closely been identified with wars. One of its chief aims has been to secure raw materials, naval bases, strategic routes, and man-power for political use in war. Its methods too have been warlike. The great Colonial Empires of today have been erected by force and cemented with blood, they have been built by countless minor wars of conquest, punitive expeditions and interventions, and by a number of greater wars. Since 1870 Imperialism has been the chief cause of war. It runs all through the documents of the causes of the Great War”.

Then I take Mr. Vandervelde, the hero of the Second International. He says that Europe is on the point of war, which may break out at any moment (Manchester Guardian dated 2. 1. 31):—

“Both Mr. Vandervelde and M. Barde consider that at the back of the proposal is the fear that Belgium might be dragged into a war for the defence of Poland.” This refers to the proposals for revival of the military treaty between Belgium and France.

So many Disarmament Conferences have met but all have come to naught. Commenting on the Disarmament Commission Sessions in October last year the “Manchester Guardian” dated 21. 11. 30 writes:— “After a fortnight’s tortuous debate at Geneva the Disarmament Commission has decided that land disarmament is impossible.” Commenting on the Preparatory Commission on Disarmament the “Observer” dated 24. 12. 30. writes:—

“The 7th Session of the League’s Preparatory Commission has finished its labours. The long elaborate draft convention has been printed. So far as Europe is concerned the Convention might have several interesting results but the limitation or reduction of armaments would not be among them. By the convention conscriptionist countries would be allowed to keep as much a trained reserve as they choose.” Deploring the situation in Europe the “Manchester Guardian” writes under the caption “A Gloomy Prospect”, the paper is dated 12. 12. 30. “The international situation of western Europe is today worse than at any moment since the evacuation of the Ruhr—one might say since the Armistice—because the difficulties of the early postwar years were always lightened by the knowledge that the war mentality would pass away in timeit was thought that a new chapter would open with the signing of the Locarno Treaty and the entry of Germany into the league. That hope has been disappointed and even the withdrawal of the last

soldier from the Rhineland has left a situation which is profoundly disquieting. With the healing of the worst sores it has perhaps become even clearer that a possible basis of permanent peace has not yet been found, that there is no sufficient accord on fundamentals. There is still a fatal gulf to be bridged between a dictated peace and a peace of concord, and the gulf between ^{these} two conceptions yawns more visibly and therefore more dangerously than it did."

Does there remain any more doubt about the existence of War Danger? Referring to the coming general Disarmament Conference to be held at Geneva early 1932, Mr. Henderson spoke at the disarmament demonstration in London on the 9th of February last: "if the people wanted disarmament they could have it, and friends of peace had 12 months wherein to mobilise opinion in favour of a great opportunity which might not recur. If they really drifted then the next war would be a most disastrous one, for a military expert said that in the last war we were killing retail but the next time it will be done wholesale."

But where are the prospects bright for the success of the so-called Disarmament Conference? Yes, it will be a success, a tremendous success, but only for the hotel-keepers of Geneva. None of the European powers do genuinely believe in disarmaments. (The recent pronouncements of Messrs. MacDonald, Baldwin and the responsible Ministers of Crown have made it quite plain). They cannot, so long as their trade rivalries remain. And the trade rivalries will remain as long as the capitalist system of production remains. The trade rivalries will naturally give rise to race in armaments and the race in armaments leads nowhere else than to general slaughter. The Soviet position is quite simple in this. It is quite honest in as much as the Soviet chief delegate to the Geneva Disarmament Conference of 1927 laid down the Soviet points for immediate general allround disarmament. These proposals have been repeated times out of number by the Soviet, but the Imperialist Powers feeling embarrassed at these genuine attempts of the Soviet have treated them as a piece of propaganda. Here are the points laid down before that Conference by M. Litvinov, now Soviet Foreign Commissar.

(1) The dissolution of all land, sea and air forces and their prohibition in any concealed form whatsoever.

(2) The destruction of all weapons, military supplies, means of chemical warfare and all other forms of armaments, and means of destruction in possession of troops, or military or general stores.

(3) The scrapping of all war-ships and military aircraft.

(4) The discontinuance of calling citizens for military training, either in armies or public organisations.

(5) Legislation for abolition of military services, either compulsory, voluntary or recruited.

(6) Legislation prohibiting the calling up of trained reserves.

(7) The destruction of fortresses and naval and air bases.

(8) The scrapping of plant for military purposes and installations for military industry in the general industrial establishment.

(9) The discontinuance of assigning funds for military purposes both in State Budgets and in those of public organisations.

(10) The abolition of Ministries of War, Navy and Military aviation, the dissolution of General Staffs and of all kinds of military administrations, departments and institutions.

(11) The Legislative prohibition of military propaganda and military training of the population and of the education of the youth in the same spirit either by State or by public organisation.

(12) The Legislative prohibition to patent all kinds of armaments and means of destruction, with a view to the removal of the incentive for invention of the same.

(13) Legislation making the infringement of any of the above stipulations a great crime against the State.

(14) The withdrawal or corresponding alteration of all Legislative Acts both of national and International scope which are in contradiction to the above stipulation.

While laying his draft before the League Commission of November 30th, 1927, M. Litvinov declared:—

“The Soviet Government is of opinion, it has always held that under the capitalist system no ground exists for counting upon the removal of the causes which give rise to armed conflict. Militarism and big navies are essentially natural consequences of the capitalist system. By their very growth they intensify existing contradictions, immensely accelerating and sharpening all hidden potential conflicts, and inevitably convert these into armed clashes.”

This is perfectly our position. War Danger is real and it exists. It exists and International bourgeoisie wants to change its course. They want to direct it against the Soviet and they are doing it as I have fully demonstrated; as is perfectly clear by the moves of the Anglo-Franco American Imperialism.

But let the International bourgeoisie tremble. This war against the Soviet would lead to great many revolutions in their midst, the war will be changed into a civil war in every Imperialist country, the Colonial slaves will shake off their yokes. The war against the Soviet would not remain unavenged. The war will end in the universal bankruptcy, in the collapse of the old States and their routine political wisdom, a collapse so complete that not only monarchies but the bourgeois republics with all the crowns and sceptres will roll in gutter not in dozens but in thousands, and no one except Communists can foresee how all this will end. It will end in the establishment of a World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S
BRANCH LIBRARY
BOMBAY
CRISES.

It will not be out of place here to say something in connection with the present crisis which is sweeping over the world for the last two years and is dis-organising the already weak capitalist economic system.

It goes without saying that the present crisis like its predecessor is crisis of over-production and that it is the greatest the world has ever witnessed. The most outstanding and significant feature of this crisis is that the industrial crisis has coincided with the agricultural one.

I do not wish to dilate much in producing the evidence of its existence. Its existence is too obvious to require any evidence. From the capitalist to the worker, from the landlord to the peasant, everyone feels the existence of this monster.

The main question therefore is not the existence, but the remedy. The essential point is to analyse the causes and to find and prescribe the methods to overcome this evil.

Numerous and totally divergent theories are being advanced and elaborate editorials with striking head lines appear in all the bourgeois papers with the schemes of "softening, overcoming and liquidating" it. One section of the bourgeoisie headed by Churchill and Poincare point to the existence of the Soviet Union as the root cause of this devastating crisis, and another led by the financial bourgeoisie as strongly accuses the Gold Reserve Policies of the Governments of France and the U. S. A. These are the cries quite high sounding but there is not much, nothing as a matter of fact, scientific in them. These theories no doubt do appeal to the imagination of the unimaginative easy-going petty bourgeois populace of the world, but they do not convince the proletarian mass. The bourgeoisie quite cunningly hides the real character of this

evil. In consequence the bourgeois brain wave is running riot in producing grotesque theories! The gallant celebrated bourgeois economics have lost balance of mind. In spite of their studious life in the museums and libraries they have proved utterly bankrupt in their analysis and diagnosis of the crises.

While analysing the crises the following points should be borne in mind.

1. That crises are not accidental events in the frame-work of capitalist economy.
2. That economic crises are the inevitable result of the capitalist development—the more it develops the greater are its contradictions and the greater still the crises.
3. That the crises were born with the birth of capitalist supremacy.
4. That ever since the industrial revolution cyclic (periodic) crises have been taking place—repeated at the average interval of ten years.

What is the root cause of crises and what is their basis? In a few words the basis of crises lie in the contradictions between the social process of production and capitalist process of appropriation of the proceeds of production. The manifestation of this basic contradiction of capitalism is the contradiction in the gigantic growth of the productive forces opening gates to immense capitalist profits and the relative reduction of the purchasing power of the masses. The contradiction between the process of production and consumption further manifests into capitalists trying to keep within limits the lowest standard of living.

Developed technique in industry contributes in no small a measure to the crises. It intensifies the exploitation of workers and increases their production capacity—in simpler terms production increases immensely. This over-production leads to an acute form of competition on International scale. Competition within a single country is no less severe. Markets are glutted, chaos and dis-organisation follow. ♪

If with the improvement in the technique of production there was a simultaneous improvement in the purchasing power of the masses, there will be no acute crisis then. But such a move would necessarily mean establishing an equilibrium between production and consumption. This would necessitate capitalism adapting itself to keeping balance between production and the purchasing power of the people. Such a process if adapted rules

out the profit craze of capitalism. If all this could be possible then I say there would be no more crises of over-production.

But such a course as suggested above would be absolute Utopia. Capitalism is no capitalism, if it can adapt itself to this course. Capitalism without profits is like a man without head.

Therefore the conclusion arrived at is that there is no remedy for the abolition of these cyclic crises so long as capitalist order of things continues. No Hoover tonic, the debt moratorium for a year, no Briand Scheme of Economic Union of Europe would save decadent capitalism from its doom. Crises cannot be abolished in spite of the good intentions of all without abolishing capitalism and capitalism cannot be abolished by the capitalists themselves, in the same way as Feudalism was not abolished by the feudal lords themselves. The net result is that these periodic crises will continue so long as capitalism is not overthrown and socialist order of things not ushered in. Therefore to associate the crises with the existence of the Soviet Union is a mischievous misleading bourgeois propaganda to rally round opinion for an offensive against that mighty state of the workers and peasants. There is no other meaning.

P 1970 : I have nothing to say about this letter from Muzaffar to Spratt. Muzaffar was the proper person to answer it. Same is the case with 1971.

P 2408 : Letter from Ghate to Dutt. Ghate is the proper person to explain it.

P 1647 (c) : Dange to explain it.

P 1348 (38) : Comrade Ghate is the proper person to say anything about it.

P 1302, 1336 : Muzaffar to Ghate. Ghate or Muzaffar are the proper persons to answer.

P 474: Ghate to Muzaffar. Comrade Ghate is the proper person to explain it.

P 337: Usmani to Joshi. I do remember to have written such a letter.

P 996 : Letter to Dange. I admit writing this. The remaining of this list of exhibits either I have dealt with or I am going to deal with just now.

P 2041 (c), 2042 (c), 2031 (c), 415 (5), 2043 (c) and the cross references 2186, 2189, 2190, 2419, 1174, 957, 1865 and 1624 and 1625:— According to these exhibits the prosecution has alleged

and the learned Magistrate has unreservedly accepted that Shaukt Usmani left India and went straight to Moscow in 1928.

With all the resources of State at their disposal the prosecution have not been able to establish the route of my alleged journey and the way back. There is no suggestion whatsoever from the prosecution of my being the proprietor of some ship company, nor have they charged me of possessing an aero-or hydro-plane or a flying fort. The charge, therefore, is of my possessing some super-natural powers in-explicable to the mortal prosecution. I wish to assure this court that I have got no such supernatural gifts. I assure you, if an assurance be necessary, that I have got no wings on my heels. I am not God Hermes of Greek mythology nor am I his descendent in direct or indirect line. I am a human not super human being. Accept this or reject it, I leave it to your honour's common sense.

The main drive of the prosecution against me is based on the so-called absence of my correspondence from June 1928 to January 1929. What a tragedy! You write letters, you conspire against the King; if you do not write letters, all the same you do something mischievous. Well, I wrote letters or not, prosecution knows it very well. They want to throw definitely the incompetence of the interception or the Intelligence Department on my head. From this absence of my correspondence during this particular period they infer my absence from India. How very intelligent! Very fine logic indeed.

The question automatically suggested therefore is where was I during this particular period? First of all I question the validity of this query. I was not by law or otherwise bound to report my movements from place to place to the police. If in their ordinary routine work it was a part of their duty to intercept my correspondence and preserve it for this day, then was it not equally necessary for them to watch me.

P1574 shows that I had office establishment in Delhi and was working through it (The Oriental Information and Publicity Bureau). I assert with all the emphasis at my command that I was very closely being watched day and night and it was more than impossible for me to have defied vigilance. Doing perfectly legal work, as the prosecution have proved through various reports, witnesses and exhibits, I had no cause to foil any sort of vigilance. I never did that. My correspondence, post cards and letters through postal channels (and on which this particular surmise about my leaving India arises) bear me out perfectly well. It is a matter of common knowledge and a matter of personal knowledge too

because of my trial in the Cawnpore case) how the Intelligence Branch haunts post offices, intercepts, photographs and copies out the letters of all politically minded persons. This is proved in his case also. I knew all this perfectly well and still carried on correspondence in this ordinary manner.

The prosecution have no evidence against me as regards their allegation of my leaving India. No witness has deposed it. The case is admittedly based on scrappy information and illogical inferences (from my correspondence to my friends as they point out). Their main conjecture arises out of the so-called 'absence of correspondence' during a certain period and the so-called 'frenzied letters' to Dange and Muzaffar in early and middle of 1928, about the strike figures. As to the frenzied nature of my letters I challenge the prosecution to produce a single letter of mine which is not 'frenzied', frantic and full of earnestness. It is my usual way of writing. I am habituated to this strain and style. Then about the strike figures. Is it a crime to ask for strike figures? However, as the prosecution has laid much emphasis on this I must explain these 'frenzied' letters.

I required these figures for a book on "the Growth of Trade Union Movement in India" which I intended to bring out simultaneously with my book P1574, "A Page from the Russian Revolution". To a considerable extent I succeeded in getting the figures from 1898 to 1927 from various books on labour movement and the Labour Gazette. The book would have been incomplete without up-to-date figures. Therefore I wrote to Muzaffar and Dange the only two persons whom I knew were taking some active part in the Trade Union Movement at that time. I wrote them because I knew them. I knew also that they were taking part in the strikes in Calcutta and Bombay respectively.

I had written to Muzaffar Ahmed previous to the one the prosecution has put as an exhibit P2041C dated 29/4/28. The particular letter I am referring to is not in the exhibits. Perhaps it was not in the interest of the prosecution to put any other intercepted letters than those which go to serve their purpose. In the letter referred to above I had written to Muzaffar that I had made an arrangement with a Delhi press for printing my two books together as it was cheaper to do so than to bring out each book separately. I had in that letter requested Muzaffar Ahmed for the figures but as I did not receive his reply, I wrote another letter P2041C which actually begins with a complaint against Muzaffar's negligence. This is how the letter begins: "In spite of the fact that you do not reply my letters I am constantly pouring in letters to you". This proves my assertion that I had certainly written

him letters previous to P2041C. These letters of course could not escape Intelligence's detection and were surely intercepted like the others, but as they are not in the interest of the prosecution they have not produced them in the court.

However the Magistrate with his usual alertness and without any hesitation accepts that Usmani wanted these figures to be used before the 6th World Congress at Moscow.

This allegation is not only false, it is puzzling too. It is not only puzzling to me it must be puzzling to every sensible man and much more to the authorities in charge of the 6th World Congress. How on earth do these hon'ble representatives of the British bourgeoisie indulge in such cheap riddles?

If for a while I grant the hypothesis of the prosecution and the learned Magistrate that these figures were required for no other place than to be used before the 6th World Congress, then why were they required in Delhi, especially when Usmani had already written to Muzaffar about his intention of going to Calcutta (P2041C).

I required these figures in Delhi *within a week*, P 2041 C because I wanted to bring out my books before leaving Delhi for Calcutta, Madras etc. As Muzaffar and Dange never sent these figures I could not complete my book "The Growth of the Trade Union Movement in India" and consequently had to delay the publication of the other book, "A Page from the Russian Revolution" P 1574. The police on my arrest were able to get this particular typed-script P1574, but I fail to understand why the other type-script was left out or perhaps taken and not produced as an exhibit. I do not find it in the un-exhibits either. That type-script is either in police possession or thanks to them is lost.

To my letter P 2041 C and referred to above I got Muzaffar's reply which I mentioned in P 2042 dated 4th May 1928. Muzaffar wrote that he was very ill and therefore he could not accede to my request about the figures. In my reply P2042C I had written to him expressing my sympathy with him in these words: "Really am pained to hear about your failing health and mental worries". In his letter he asked me as to when would I reach Calcutta. I replied in these words "As to the date of my reach Calcutta I cannot tell you definitely as I have to get down at so many places namely Cawnpore, Allahabad and Benares."

To my letter P2042 C Muzaffar replied in a reassuring way and asked if at least the one manuscript was ready. I should here remark that the prosecution have deliberately not put my other letter to Muzaffar which so far as I can remember was written in

the third week of May 1928 and in which I had written to Muzaffar that as I could not receive the figures neither from him nor from Dange I had therefore decided to drop the idea of publishing "the Growth of Trade Union Movement in India" along with the article P1574.

Thereafter Muzaffar wrote me a letter enquiring about my other manuscript, "A Page from the Russian Revolution," P1574. In the same letter he asked me as to what I had done with a certain book of Spratt which he had lent me at Cawnpore. I replied to him in P 2031C or P415(5) dated 28/5/28 that "Assure Comrade Spratt his book has reached Bombay as I was not sure of his presence in Calcutta." As to my book P 1574 I wrote to him it was ready and that I wanted his suggestion. I wrote to him about giving it in newspapers first. The words run thus: "Better if some paper can pay me on it otherwise its publication is my first concern." I was in earnest about publishing the book and wrote to him therefore to reply soon as I had not much time to wait in Delhi intending as I did to leave Delhi soon for Calcutta and Madras. His reply to this letter was never received and therefore this book P1574 neither went to the newspapers nor was it brought out in book form. It remains a manuscript up to today.

Before proceeding any further with my letters to Muzaffar I take up two letters to Dange P1624 and 1625 which point to the same direction as my letters to Muzaffar. P1624 is dated 2/4/28. In this letter I asked Dange to send me a copy of "the Russian Revolution" by Comrade Page Arnot. I needed it to test and make sure of the facts in my book P 1574. Further in this letter I requested him to supply me with the information sought for by me in a letter to Ghate. This information was pertaining to the strike figures. As I had not received Page Arnot's book from Dange nor the strike figures I wrote to him again a letter P 1625. In this letter I wrote to Dange in a beseeching tone to send me the strike figures. I wrote to Dange that I needed these figures as badly as a man needs food. There was no exaggeration in this. Figures did mean food to me as the publication of this book did mean some income to me. I wrote to Dange that if I received these figures they would do him immense good. Surely my book 'The Growth of the Trade Union Movement in India' would have meant a mine of information to all connected actively with the Indian Labour movement. Dange was such one man who was working in the labour movement at the time.

However, I leave Dange here and take up Muzaffar again. P 2043C is a letter dated 7-6-28 in which I wrote to Muzaffar about

my leaving Delhi that day for Calcutta en route to Madras. It is a fact that I did leave Delhi that very day. It is also a fact that I went to all the places mentioned in this letter, namely, Cawnpore, Allahabad and Benares. I spent about a week in U. P. Thence went to Calcutta and lived with Muzaffar and Spratt for a week and then proceeded to Madras where I reached in the last week of June 1928. I do not remember the exact date of reaching there as it is already more than three years since, but I am sure it could not be earlier or later than the last week of June as leaving Delhi on 7th June P 2043C I had spent a week in U. P. and another week in Calcutta.

I lived in Madras for about two weeks. I was just making arrangements for settling down there when my health which was already delicate (as mentioned in 2041C) began to break down. There is a further mention of re-current intestinal trouble in P 2138P.

I fell ill in Madras and that too very seriously. I was advised by a doctor to leave South India immediately. South India he said was too bad a place for me to live in. Not only he advised me to go to north but emphasised that I should go to some hill resort there as soon as possible.

Accordingly I left Madras and came back to Delhi without breaking my journey in the way. It was about the 2nd week of July 1928. In Delhi I was informed by a friend of mine about a certain money order for me from Amritsar. Presuming that a money order for me could not be from any other source than the Kirti office I informed the Kirti people about my presence in Delhi and within a few days I received a money order of Rs. 8/- (P. W. 195 and P. 750). This was for contribution of an article through the bureau. It was published in the July number of Kirti (P 911) Vol. 1, No. 4, page 3.

Collecting little more money in Delhi by the sale of my scanty property I left for Kashmir. I could not possibly go to live in Simla, Mussoorie or Naini Tal for recouping my health. I could not afford such a luxury.

Leaving Delhi I passed through Lahore, Wazirabad and Sialkot and reached Jammu, that picturesque little mediaeval town. (Although there is no use narrating this piece of information about which the exhibits do not support me however I think it necessary to proceed and give all the places I lived in there). Though living in Jammu compared to India was much cheaper yet this could not be a place for recouping health. Therefore I travelled further north by lorry and crossing Pir Panjal mountains came to

a beautiful small village of about 50 houses known as Veri Nag, by the side of a stream which is the source of river Jhelum. I lived here for 1½ months, then went to Anant Nag (known as Islamabad also) and where the river is navigable accommodating small boats. From here I went to Avantipura in a ferry boat.

In October it grew quite cold there and at the same time I had recovered much in health, therefore I came down to the plains and spending some time in Amritsar and Lahore came down to Calcutta in November and underwent further treatment till I became quite fit to rejoin political activities. By December I was all right, and left for the Punjab again to work in the Labour Movement there.

P 957 dated 8.1.29 is a letter to Dange written from Amritsar which the learned Magistrate has twisted in a manner to suit prosecution purposes. I totally fail to understand his logic when he says, "Or the fact that he returned from Kashmir to Amritsar via Calcutta suggests that Kashmir is another code name, for, say, Moscow, and he actually returned via Madras and Calcutta as he went". (Committal Order).

Nowhere have the Prosecution deposed that Kashmir is another name for Moscow. The Magistrate has quite unnecessarily and in quite a ludicrous manner twisted my post-card (P 957) addressed to Dange. This letter is dated 8-1-29 and runs, "Coming back from Kashmir I had been to Calcutta but found nothing interesting there." 'Coming back' clearly suggests coming back to the Punjab and particularly to Amritsar from where this particular letter was written. It makes it also clear that (coming back) to Amritsar I had been to Calcutta and as I found nothing interesting there, it accounts for my presence again in Amritsar. How then Kashmir becomes Moscow and what evidence leads the learned Magistrate to this conclusion, is a marvellous riddle. However, I proceed further with my activities in the Punjab. I wanted to work here and negotiated with Mr. M. A. Khan to allow me to work in N. W. Ry. Union. But as I failed in persuading him in this direction I came down to Bombay (P 1895, dated 17-1-29).

I have nothing further to say on these exhibits. But I should make it quite clear here that had I been granted the benefits of bail and facilities for adequate defence arrangements I would have surely substantiated those portions of my statement (and of course they are very few) which are not supported by the Prosecution exhibits. It will be unfair to myself if I do not mention here that the Prosecution has maliciously deprived me of the opportunities for defence by opposing my bail application on the flimsy pretext

of absconding. It is nowhere suggested that I ever avoided law, it is not even alleged against me that I ever ran away from custody. There is no such mention. They have painted me as a desperado although they know perfectly well that I passed full four years and three months in the U. P. Jails in connection with the Cawnpore Case. Moreover they are perfectly aware that I passed a major portion of my last sentence in a place like Dehra Dun Jail from where absconding is a joke. I never absconded because I am not a criminal. I never absconded or feared arrest because I am a political worker working not for personal aggrandisement but working for my political beliefs.

Their own exhibits and evidence puncture their theory of my going to Moscow and attending the 6th World Congress. Well, I was not so fortunate as to go there and attend such an important function. I had gone to the Soviet Union in 1920-21 and I have admitted it. I would never have denied if I had gone for second time to that land of my dreams.

The 6th World Congress opened on July 17th, 1928, (pages 212, 213, 214 Committal Order). But my presence in the second week of July is proved by the Prosecution witness Balwant Singh, P. W. 195. Then by what miraculous conveyance did I reach Moscow on the 17th of July. The Prosecution will absolutely fail to answer this. Will they answer the following:—

(1) Is there any air-service between Delhi and Moscow ?

(2) Have they proved any passport about me ?

(3) Is there any evidence against my leaving India ?

Which of the three hundred witnesses has deposed it ?

(4) Is there any evidence of my landing or entering India, if so, which of these witnesses depose it ? And what is the name of the ship or which is the land frontier where I crossed this country ?

I take now P 2186, 2189, 2190, 2419, 1174, and 1865 (1). Most of these exhibits are of abusive character. The Prosecution allege that all these exhibits refer to Usmani. It is incredible to me. They are neither suggested in my handwriting nor is there any suggestion of my being in the knowledge of these particular exhibits.

To me it seems their object is twofold in connecting me with these exhibits; (a) to discredit me as a political worker by sticking these abusive exhibits on me; (b) secondly to raise me as high as to warrant a severe vindictive sentence.

There is no third object in sight. None knows better than the Prosecution that the evidence put against me is miserably scanty and feeble. Hence the necessity for connecting me with some extraordinary episode in the history.

This is the meaning in simple terms of connecting me with these mysterious communications and making me almost a legendary hero.

Admittedly and conclusively the evidence against me so far as this case is concerned is miserably flimsy and inadequate to warrant any punishment. The interval between my release from the previous conviction and the arrest in this case was too small. But let me assure your Honour I entertain no illusion regarding the role of this Court. I will again be duly sentenced. There is absolutely no question of justice or impartiality of the Court. The impartiality of the bourgeois court is a myth and this myth has sufficiently been exploded in this case on minor as well as major issues and will further be exploded on that day when your Honour will pronounce sentence on us. Having accepted the position as it is I am quite prepared to receive most cheerfully what British Imperialism has decided to award me for my services to the cause of the Indian revolution. I need not emphasise the obvious much that we Communists do not take things personally. We bear in patience whatever hardships and sufferings are inflicted upon us in the pursuit of our aims.

Q. The following evidence comes under the head of miscellaneous evidence mainly relating to connections:—P 1383, 10,992, 949, 1895, 1894, 1335, 1694, 1987, 302, 303, 1580, 1375, 1577, 1559, 1560, 1574, 311, 756, 866, 1000, 1086, 1261, 1561, 1562, 1563, 1578 (2), 1571, 1572, 1573, 1576, 1578, and 1579. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. P 949 and 971:— I have nothing to say about these exhibits. They may be taken for whatever they are worth.

P 1335 and 1261:— In my Lenin Day speech I graphically described the scenes, the frenzy of the Russian people, when Lenin died in 1924. The impression of the hearers was perhaps that I was present at the time of the death of Lenin, but this impression was wrong. It was only due to my graphical description. Desai took the same impression and wrote the thing in his paper. Moreover Desai being unacquainted with me did not know my antecedents and therefore he did not know that I was in prison when Comrade Lenin died. Muzaffar wrote this letter to Ghate which is now in the exhibits. I wrote a letter to Mr. Desai asking him to contradict the wrong impression created by the

publication of that particular portion. But before Desai could do it we all were arrested.

P 1987: While dealing with my activities as author and editor I have already accepted my responsibilities about the 'Paym-i-mazdur'. I was its editor and naturally I filed the declaration.

P 1375, the Kranti of 2. 7. 27:— I have nothing to say regarding this particular appeal as I was in prison at that time.

P 311:— I never wrote anything to Krantikari as that paper was in Hindi. Moreover it was for Comrade Joshi to explain these notes.

P 756 :— I have already dealt with it.

P 1562:— I have nothing to say regarding this address. I took it from Comrade Bradley or rather he gave it to me on the assumption that he was going to be deported soon from India. The proceedings of the Public Safety Bill at least made it quite evident that the British Communists were going to be deported under the provisions of the Public Safety Bill.

D/8. 9. 31

The charge of conspiracy.

As regards this charge of conspiracy to deprive the King Emperor of the sovereignty of India I am inclined to agree with the answers of Comrades Mitra, Chakravarty, Goswami and Sohan Singh. This conspiracy is a myth, the trial for it is a farce. What an Imperialist hypocrisy! This case of strikes, demonstrations, speeches and writings against Imperialism has ridiculously been termed a conspiracy against the King's sovereignty. I am in full agreement with the formulations of Comrade R. R. Mitra when he exposes the ridiculous status of a sovereign. There is nothing like a sovereign under the suzerainty of capitalism. The sovereignty of British Empire to-day belongs to the omnipotent ~~of~~ Big Five (Banks), who not only forge methods of exploitation in India but are as ruthless in Britain too. The British working-class and our ally is as much their victim as the Colonial peoples.

It is quite evident therefore that the sovereignty in India is the virtual sovereignty of the British Finance-Capital. If to fight against this monster Sovereign Finance-Capital and to fight and organise against this exploitation by it is sought to be brought under this particular section 121 A, then in all decency to them-

selves the Imperialists ought to change the wording of the section. It ought to run :—

“Organising to fight to deprive the British Finance Capital of its sovereign right of exploitation of the Indian masses.” Thus framed the section would be more comprehensible.

There has been no conspiracy at all and no conspiracy is needed to overthrow this system of blood and chains. It has itself created the necessary requisites of its destruction which at the proper time will destroy it.

I should say in this connection that this case is not an ordinary incident governed by local causes. It is not a mere conspiracy of British Imperialism to deprive 31 persons of their liberty. Nothing of the sort. It is a conspiracy of British Imperialism against the rising forces of revolution throughout the colonial world. It is an attempt to stam this revolutionary tide. After the colonial uprisings in China, Indonesia, Iraq, Syria and Morocco, the blows of which have been directed at the very heart of capitalist system, the Imperialist expropriators have become convinced of the fact that they are not strong enough to call a halt to the revolutionary movement in the colonies. The capitalist system is sinking under the very weight of its multiplying contradictions. Therefore, by various devices, by violence and provocation, it is trying to keep body and soul together. Whatever it might do, the capitalist system is doomed. To save itself from this doom Imperialist bourgeoisie in India has launched in vain its offensive against the surging tide of revolution. The Imperialist bourgeoisie aided by its indigenous agents, the Indian bourgeoisie, and its feudal alliances can at the worst torture, mutilate and murder freely, but it cannot stop the inevitable from happening. It can at the worst drown the unprepared attempts of the Indian Proletariat in blood, yet it cannot stop the volcanic eruption from taking its natural shape underground.

What were the causes of this trial ?

“ A new wave of revolt is sweeping over India. At the same time we hear of the arrests and convictions of hundreds of working-class strikers in Madras, Calcutta and Bombay, a crop of arrests for sedition and political murders in the Punjab, a series of prosecutions for sedition in Bengal and the Punjab.” This was what Comrade Spratt wrote in the ‘Spark’ dated 17.2.29. And all this repression was justified by the Imperialist Government owing to the increasing “intrigues” of the Communist International.

"Let us come into power and I will put a stop to all the nefarious activities of that body (Comintern) not only in India but throughout the entire Colonial East," declared Mr. MacDonald in one of the election speeches. To give him his due Mr. MacDonald has kept his word. This case instituted by the Conservative Government had been kept up by the Labour one.

After quoting this much there remains no doubt left as to why this case was started. It is an open secret that this case is an offensive against the Soviet, as proved by the amazing opening speeches of the late Crown Counsel, that this case is an offensive against Comintern and Communist ideology as will be fully demonstrated by the verdict in this case and the subsequent executive actions by the Indian Government. This case is a propaganda against us and our ideals. Long before our arrests were effected the whole public opinion of this country had been deliberately worked up so that not much support for our Defence should come forth. There were newspaper articles, there were speeches by important people with leaning towards the Government. The late Mr. Langford James of the European Association and later on the Crown Counsel in this case, summarised all these warnings and pronouncements in these words:—

"In this Association (thereby meaning the European Association) there are no two views, I think on the subject of Bolshevism. We regard it as the imminent and the most dangerous menace which this country has to face at this stage." This is one of the several speeches delivered by the representatives of the British bourgeoisie in India. Thereafter came the Assembly debates over the Trade Union and the Public Safety Bills where the worst abuses were hurled at us by the Hon'ble representatives of the British-cum-Indian bourgeoisie. These speeches formed the prelude to a storm of repression as the events during the last two and a half years have proved. And we are here today to satisfy further the thirst for blood of these honourable gentlemen.

But let these gallant gladiators of the bourgeoisie understand that few individuals do not and cannot stir up the movement. Let them understand that we are a few negligible drops in the ocean. We might be sentenced, we might be transported, but it will not stop the tide, new stratum will rise over the dead and the struggle will continue unabated and with greater ferocity until it has succeeded in establishing a Communist order of things.

Q. What about your Defence witnesses?

A. I am a signatory to the common list. I will specify my witnesses at the proper time.

Q You have read over the whole of your statement above and it has been corrected and amended as and where requested by you. Are you now satisfied that the record of it is correct?

A. Yes.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

19-9-31

Sd. Shaukat Usmani

19-9-31

Certified that the above is a full and true account of the statement of accused taken down by stenographers in my presence and hearing and subsequently transcribed by them and corrected and amended as and where requested by accused and admitted by him to be correct.

Sd/ R. L. Yorke

19-9-31

Saraswati Machine Printing Press, Meerut U. P. (India.)

List Of Defence Witnesses, Examined.

<u>D.W.No.</u>		
1	Pt Indramuni Vakil of Meerut.	25-1-32
2	Ch. Sheonath Singh Vakil, Meerut.	26-1-32
3	Lala Mahabir Prasad, Zamindar, Meerut	26-1-32
4	Bishamber Sahai, Press Owner, "	26-1-32
5	Dr. Ajodhya Prasad, Poona	26-1-32
6	Ch. Raghuraj Narain Singh, Zamindar, Meerut	26-1-32
7	Ch. Vijaypal Singh, Vakil, Meerut	26-1-32
8	Pt Ram Chandar Sharma, "	26-1-32
9	Pt Ram Prasad Kayasth, Gorakhpur	27-1-32
10	B. Kamta Prasad, Meerut	28-1-32
11	R.V.Dhulekar, Jhansi	28-1-32
12	Raj S. Chandrika Prasad, Ajmer.	30-1-32
13	Hari Har Nath Shatri, Cawnpore.	30-1-32
14	G. Shethi, Jamsedpur	1-2-32
15	Bindhyavasini Prasad, Gorakhpur	1-2-32
16	Kali Das Bhattachayya, Calcutta	1-2-32
17	Mahbubul Haq, Calcutta	10-2-32
18	Dr. S.K. Basu, Calcutta	10-2-32
19	Sri Prakash, Benares	11-2-32
20	K.C. Mitra	12-2-32
21	L.G. Khare, Bombay	15-2-32
22	K.P. Khadilkar, Bombay	15-2-32
23	V.K. Tawade, Bombay	16-2-32
24	M.R. Jadhav, Poona	17-2-32
25	D.Y. Pathak, Poona	17-2-32
26	G.R. Kadam, Bombay	17-2-32

D.W.s

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| 27 | P.C. Bose, Jharia | 18-2-32 |
| 28 | Kiran Shankar Roy Calcutta | 19-2-32 |
| • 29 | N.M. Joshi, Bombay DEFENCE WITNESSES. | 20-2-32 |
| 30 | Knahaya Lal, Gorakhpur. | 23-2-32 |
| 31 | Dr. D.R. Dhar Calcutta | 23-2-32 |
| 32 | N.C. Kelkar, Saa Poona | 26-2-32 |
| 33 | D. Chaman Lal, Lahore | 29-2-32 |
| 34 | S. Sadanand, Bombay | 9-3-32 |
| 35 | C.F. Andrews. | 21-3-32 |
| • 35 | R.R. Bakhle, | 21-3-32 |

D.W. 1.

DEFENCE WITNESSES.

For Gauri Shankar accused.

1. Pt. Indramani Vakil of Meerut on S.A. age 50.

I am a B.A.L.L.B. lawyer practising at Meerut. I am also Senior *Vice* Chairman of the Municipal Board of Meerut. I know that there was a Kisan and Mazdur Sabha in Meerut in 1928 to 1929. I was a member of it. Its object was to organise the Kisans and Mazdurs, for the sake of removing social evils among them. The objects are stated in my original address in P. 322 on page 9 which I gave as President of the Reception Committee of the Conference of peasants and labourers held in 1928 or 1929. This was an independent organisation started under the auspices of the Congress workers, a district organisation. I was a member of the Congress up to the time when it was declared unlawful the other day. None of the aims and objects of the Sabha offended against the principles of the Congress. A parallel political conference was organised here on the same dates as the Mazdur Sabha Conference. That was a Congress Political Conference and the other was a Congress Mazdur and Kisan Sabha Conference. To the Kisan Mazdur Conference Messrs. Sahgal, S. S. Josh, Spratt and Muzaffar Ahmad and Majid accused were invited. They were invited to educate the public, being known as best workers. I read the printed resolutions Exh. P. 175 at the time when they came from the press. The resolutions printed therein were the only ones which were passed at that Conference. The Sabha was never affiliated to any other organisation within my knowledge up to this time. In the same way as the 5 gentlemen named were invited so also were a number of other gentlemen such as Dr. Satyapal and Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru. Dr. Satyapal was invited from the Political Conference to lecture in our own Conference. Pt. Jawahar Lal also came to lecture but I do not know about the invitation in his case. I had talked with Gauri Shanker accused about his political ideas. As long as he worked with me I never found any thing against the accepted Congress ideas. He was a co-worker with me for 4 or 5 years.

(No other accused wishes to examine this witness in chief).

XXN. By Prosecution. The Mazdur Kisan Sabha started some time in 1928. I do not remember the exact date. It existed about 2 years before the Conference, from about 1926. I was

Chairman of the Reception Committee, of the Conference held about 13th to 15th October 1928. The Political Conference was a Congress Conference purely and simply. It was the idea of myself, Gauri Shankar, Ram Chandra Sharma, Lala Balwant Singh and several other villagers whose names I do not recall to hold this Mazdur Kisan Sabha Conference. Pt. Gauri Shankar accused drafted the resolutions. He had no pattern from which he drafted them. We all put our heads together. I was present at any important lecture that took place in that Conference. Of the 5 accused invited I knew only Sahgal accused, and him by reputation only. It was not my suggestion to invite any of the other 4. I agreed to the invitation of them all. I can not say with certainty whether Gauri Shankar or somebody else suggested Spratt's name; the same reply applies to Muzaffar, Josh and Majid. I had not heard of Muzaffar before. I agreed because I was told he was a very good labourer lecturer. I asked who Spratt was. I asked the man who suggested his name and was told he was an Englishman who sympathised with the poor. I had not heard his name before or Muzaffar Ahmad's. Before October 1928 I had never in any way heard or read of Muzaffar Ahmad's having been connected with the Cawnpore Conspiracy Case. I had never heard that there was such a case, or heard of it at all up to the date of that Conference. I have heard of the Public Safety Bill, but I had not heard of it up to October 1928. I only know it was a Bill but not what its object was. Until 2 years ago I only looked in the newspapers cursorily. From 2 years ago I began to buy them and read them thoroughly. As far as I think I never came across the Public Safety Bill in the former period of cursory reading. Since then I have come to know only that there is such a thing. I have not been interested to understand what it is about. About the Nehru Report I never read anything except criticism I only knew there was a report recommending Dominion Status. I knew then from what I read that Congress had rejected it. As a Congressman I know it continued to be rejected. Not the whole of the Nehru Committee resolution in P. 175 was my idea. I do not remember who did suggest it. The first para about Communal differences was suggested by me. I knew about the Report from the newspaper criticisms I had read.

I heard the speeches of Spratt, Muzaffar and Majid at that Conference. I understood Spratt mostly. I do not remember hearing him say he was a Communist. So far as I remember he did not. I did not know the term before or in that Conference so I say he did not use it. I remember him saying that he differed from Gandhiji on the question of 'Non Violence', and said it was a mistake to give it so much importance. I think he said

'I' and not 'we'. Muzaffar Ahmad did speak but I do not remember his speech. I do not remember his resolution. I do not remember his moving a resolution suggesting the formation of a strong U. P. Mazdur Kisan Dal, nor anything about sending people as representatives to Calcutta. I do not remember Dr. Mukerji's name being mentioned to be chosen as representative, or Joshi or Gauri Shankar. The last 2 were there at the Conference. I was in the Political Conference also part of the time. I heard Spratt speaking there but not at the Town Hall. I heard Majid speak but do not recall what he said. I do not recall what he said about Russia. Or if he mentioned the name of M. N. Roy. Sohan Singh Josh talked about labour organisation; not about Revolution or Inqilab. After that Conference I used to go on addressing villagers. I saw with Gauri Shankar rules of the Sabha saying that Congress rules must be observed entirely. I have never heard of the paper Krantikari. I do not know of any election of office-bearers made at the Conference. P.C. Joshi was introduced to me by Dr. Bhopal Singh. There is no such thing as the Mazdur Kisan Dal. In the Nehru Committee resolution there is mention of a Mazdur Kisan Dal. It is the same thing as a Sabha. I suggested the Mazdur Kisan Conference because poor men could not pay to go into the Political Conference. Entrance was free to this one. Gauri Shankar invited these men Spratt and Muzaffar. We gave him power. I do not remember who suggested Sahgal first. All I knew about him was by reputation that he was Arya Samajist etc. I knew nothing about the rest. The object of the Sabha was to organize and educate the labourers.

Sd. R. L. Yorke,

25-1-32.

All my statement of yesterday refers to a Mazdur Kisan Sabha which was in existence prior to the Conference of October 1928. No Party was formed at that Conference. If a Party was formed without my knowledge what I said does not apply to it. I do not remember if I heard Muzaffar Ahmad speak once or twice but I certainly heard him speak. I did not hear him propose that a Party should be formed. (Shown P. 1091 witness said after seeing first 2 paras down to end of list of names of members and the last para) Muzaffar Ahmad did not say anything like what is written there. I mean I did not hear him say anything like it. I realise he is said in that report to have said he was directed to place that resolution before the meeting. I did not hear him say that. I do not know the writing of P-322

page 3 (pink paper). I have read that paper through and it does not remind me of anything, which happened in connection with that Conference. I can not suggest any circumstances in that Conference which could have given the accused Spratt the impression that a workers and Peasants' Party was being formed. Gauri Shankar never came to me after the Conference to ask for subscriptions for an All India Workers and Peasants' Conference. I have worked with Gauri Shankar very closely for 4 or 5 years. He never showed me Exh. P 203. I do not remember if I have ever seen anything like P 331. Seeing the whole document including object on reverse witness said 'I do not remember whether I have or have not ever seen it in the past'. The same is my answer about P 333. I have never seen Exh. P 310 before. The Party mentioned there is not the one about which I was deposing yesterday. I know Mr. Dharmvir Singh well. He has been a Congress worker with me. I do not know his writing and have had no correspondence with him. I must have seen Gauri Shankar's writing. I can not say if I would recognise it. P 1432 does not remind me of any Party. I know P. C. Joshi accused. I saw him in Meerut for several days after the Conference. I do not know his writing. I was on the Subjects Committee at which the resolutions were drafted. The draft resolutions were written by different people. I was not present throughout. I do not know the writing of any of P 186. I heard Sahgal's presidential speech at the Conference. I have heard of Bolshevism but what it is I did not and do not know. I do not remember whether he said anything about Bolshevism or Bolsheviks, but it was a very fine speech. I did not read it in the Deshbhagat. I do not remember if Sahgal said anything about Russia or the Russian Revolution. As I appreciated it I do not think there was anything against the Congress in it.

REXXN. I joined the Bar only 3 years ago.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE,

26-1-32.

D.W. 2.

Chaudhri Sheonath Singh Vakil Meerut on S.A. 45.

I am a practising lawyer since 1913 and practise at Meerut. I was Chairman of the Meerut District Board from 1925 to 1928. I was a Congressman till 1929. In 1928 there was a Delhi Prov.

ince Congress Political Conference at Meerut. There was also a Kisan Mazdur Conference at the same time. I was Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Political Conference. One sitting of the Kisan Mazdur Conference was held at night in the pandal of the Political Conference. I do not know if the Town Congress Committee gave Sahgal accused an address of welcome. I know Gauri Shankar accused well. He used to work in the Congress also up to the time of his arrest.

(No other accused wishes to examine in chief)

XXN. Nil.

Sd. R.L. YORKE.

26-1-32

D.W. 3.

Lala Mahabir Prasad on S.A., Zamindari 38.

I was Senior *Vice* Chairman of the Meerut Municipal Board. I pay over Rs. 15,000 Land Revenue, besides Income Tax, the amount of which at present I do not exactly remember. I know Gauri Shankar accused. I was a Congressman up to the time it was declared unlawful. On principle I could not help any organisation whose principles were opposed to those of the Congress. I had heard the name of a Mazdur Kisan Sangh in Meerut some years ago. I recognise my signature on page 3 of D. 330. I paid a subscription to the Mazdur Kisan Sammelan Meerut.

(No other accused examines this witness in chief)

XXN. Nil.

Sd. R. L. YORKE

26-1-32.

D.W. 4.

Bishambar Sahai on S.A. 32. Owner of Premi Press.

I am the proprietor of the Premi Printing Press. I know there was a Mazdur Kisan Sangh in Meerut. Its notices etc used to be printed in the Premi Press. P 175 was printed in my press, after the Conference, perhaps 15 days later. The document D 732 was printed at my press.

(No other accused wishes to examine this witness in chief).
XXN. This document D 732 was printed long before the
Conference referred to in P. 175.

Sd. R. L. YORKE,

26-1-32.

D W. 5.

Dr. Ajudhia Prasad on S.A. 40. Residence Meerut.

I have been practising since 1910. I know Gauri Shankar accused. Up to 1929 I was a Congressman. I used to see Gauri Shankar also doing Congress work up to 1929. I used to have conversations with him. I used to find his views in entire agreement with the Congress.

(No other accused wishes to examine the witness in chief).

XXN. I had no talks with him on any other political subject except the Congress.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

26-1-32.

D.W. 6.

Ch. Raghubir Narain Singh on S.A. Residence Asora P.S. Hapur.

My son pays about Rs. 30,000 Land Revenue and some Income -Tax. I got a sword of honour in the war for war services in this district. I was president of the All India Bhuihar Sabha at Patna in about 1926 or 27. I was member of the All India Zamindars' Association of which Maharaja Darbhanga is Chairman. I was also member of the All India Congress Committee and have been Chairman of the Delhi Provincial Congress Committee. I know Gauri Shankar accused. He was a member of the Meerut Town Congress Committee, of the Meerut District Congress Committee and the Delhi Province Provincial Congress Committee. So far as I remember he was so up to the time of his arrest. No one is elected to these Committees whose creed is against that of

the Congress. In fact the voters vote for those who they think are in thought and deed faithful to the Congress. I have often discussed political matters with Gauri Shankar. From our discussions I can say that I found him a follower of Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress. He was a keen Khaddar worker, kept a Charkha and preached it here and at Hardwar. There used to be a Mazdur Sangh at Meerut. I knew it as Mazdur Sangh, not Mazdur Kisan Sangh. He mentioned it to me several times, and I gathered it was a Mazdur Sabha with the same objects as Congress. The name I understood was given to it to give it importance. I often saw Congress people working in it. This Mazdur Sangh is the one which had a Conference at same time as the Political Conference. I knew Kidar Nath Sahgal accused. So far as I remember the Town Congress Committee gave Sahgal an address at the time of the Political Conference when he came for the Mazdur Sabha Conference. I was on the Executive Committee of the Political Conference.

(No other accused wishes to examine this witness in chief.)

XXN. Nil.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

26-1-32.

D W. 7.

Ch. Vijaipal Singh, Jat, Vakil, Meerut on S. A.

I am a practising lawyer at Meerut. I was for 3 years a member of the Legislative Council. I was also *Vice* President of the Meerut Town Congress Committee. I have been in the past a member of the District Congress Committee and the Delhi Province Provincial Congress Committee. From 1921 up to 1929 so far as I know Gauri Shankar was a member also of the Town, District and Provincial Congress Committees. He and I talked several times about Congress programme. I never found his ideas and creed clashing with the Congress creed. I know of the existence of a Kisan Mazdur Sangh at Meerut. I was a member of the Working Committee of it. As far as I know that was a local district organisation only. It was never to my knowledge affiliated to any other organisation. It was created for the amelioration of labourers and peasants in the district on Congress lines. The workers in the Sangh were those who were interested in the

uplift of labourers and peasants. They were all Congressmen. I have seen D. 732. This gives the creed of the Sang about which I have spoken above.

(No other accused wishes to examine this witness in chief).

XXN. There is nothing in the membership form D 732 limiting membership to members of the Congress. I do not know all the members of the Sangh. I know many.

REXXN. I knew almost all the workers in the Sangh.

XXN. I know now of the formation of the Workers' and Peasants' Party of the U.P. since this case was started. I knew nothing personally before. I have never heard of the Krantikari. It was never sent to me. There is another Ch. Vijaipal Singh B.A.L.L.B. of Meerut. It may be his house which appears as No 946 in P 433. He passed his examination the same year as me. I came because I received summons.

By Ghosh accused (Nothing relevant in Court's opinion)

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

26-1-32.

For Kadam accused.

D. W. 8.

Pt. Ram Chander Sharma on S. A. Meerut.

I attended the Session of the Indian National Congress at Calcutta in 1923. I reached Calcutta on 22nd December. On the way at Cawnpore I met Lachman Rao Kadam accused and others. On the same date on which I reached Calcutta I attended a Mazdur Kisan Conference. I also attended it on the 23rd and 24th. Kadam attended the Mazdur Kisan Conference on the 22nd. I did not see him there on the 23rd or 24th. I asked him to come again on 23rd but he said to me that he had thought it was like the Conference held at Jhansi but he found the Mottoes not to his liking and therefore he did not want to attend it any more. I asked him to come again but he refused. He did not say anything to me about the speeches he had heard. I was present on 24th at the time of the election of the National Executive Committee of the Mazdur Kisan Sabha. Kadam

accused did not attend the meeting. The name of Lachmi Narain Pandit was selected for Jhansi.

For Gauri Shanker accused.

There was a Mazdur Kisan Sangh at Meerut. I was a member of it. I was so as long as it lasted. It came to an end when Gauri Shanker was arrested. I did some work at the time of the Conference held here. The Sangh was a district organisation and not a branch of any other organisation. The Sangh was started by us people, Congress workers. The aims were those stated in the Mazdur and Kisan betterment resolution of the Gauhati Session of the Indian National Congress. That Sangh was never affiliated to any All India or Provincial Mazdur Kisan Sabha. So far as I remember in the Meerut Conference of 1928 no resolution was passed for its affiliation. I met Gauri Shanker accused at Calcutta in the Indian National Congress but I did not see him on any date at the Kisan Mazdur Conference there. I saw him there staying in the bazar at the house of a Rais.

For Banarji accused.

There had been 2 Conferences of the Kisan Mazdur Sangh at Meerut before the one to which I have referred. One was at Garhmuktesar and before the 1921 Meerut Conference. I do not recall the date. The other was at Nauchandi Fair. The Sangh made the arrangements for all 3 Conferences and convened them all. (after reading the account of Garhmuktesar Conference in the 'Bir Hindu' dated 21. 11. 27. witness said). The account given here is correct. I remember it well now. I cannot remember the resolutions passed at that Conference. Seeing document P 189 D Gauri Shanker (Objection made by prosecution under section 159 evidence act but withdrawn as not worth pressing); I do not remember the resolution passed but this paper is the same as what appears in the Bir Hindu.

Sd. R. L. YORKE

26/1/32

I can not remember the date of the Nauchandi meeting but it was at the time of the Mela. The arrangements for it were made by the Mazdur Kisan Sangh. I was present at that meeting. I did not do any work in it but had a shop at Nauchandi. I do not remember seeing any notice like P 188 at that time. After the October Conference I used to be meeting Gauri Shankar

regularly up to the time of his arrest. It was in connection with public work. We remained in agreement.

For Kadam by permission. In the Meerut Mazdur Kisan Conference the first thing done was that a photograph of the late Mr. C.R. Das was unveiled. Kedar Nath Sahgal was invited to the Conference because he was a good Congress worker and worker of the Naujawan Bharat Sabha. I do not know if there was any U.P. Kirti Kisan Party at the time of the Conference. Nor do I know anything about one afterwards.

(No other accused wished to examine the witness in chief).

XXN. I know Gauri Shankar since 1921. I was probably a member of the Mazdur Kisan Sangh from its commencement. The first Conference of this Sangh was at Garhmuktesar, then at Nauchandi. The Nauchandi one would be in March. I was present at the Nauchandi Conference from time to time, not the whole time. To the best of my knowledge Diwan Datt, Kamta Prasad, Balwant Singh and Gauri Shankar were the organisers. The President was Diwan Datt. He was in place of Diwan Chaman Lal who could not come. When I attended the Conference I saw Diwan Datt presiding. I think I only went once to the Conference. I know Shaukat Usmani accused since this case is proceeding. I know that Shaukat Usmani was present at that meeting. I have never spoken to him but only come to know him by sight. Having seen P 187 D Gauri Shankar witness said I can neither assert nor deny the truth of the statement therein that Shaukat Usmani presided at this Conference.

I was one of the organisers of the October Conference, and one of the Committee which sent Gauri Shankar to invite Sahgal to be President. I never weighed whether there were other Congress workers in the neighbourhood of Meerut nearer than Lahore as good as Mr. Sahgal at that time. The reason that Sahgal was selected was that some one in the Committee suggested his name and so he was sent for. Muzaffar Ahmad and Spratt's names were suggested by Thakur Moti Ram, I do not know who suggested the names of Sohan Singh Josh and Majid accused. Moti Ram said about Spratt that just as Mr. Stokes used to work among the peasants so Mr. Spratt took an interest in the peasants in Bengal and so he and Muzaffar Ahmad were invited. Their expenses were sent. Mr. Moti Ram is a witness summoned and present today. I was present throughout the October Meerut Mazdur Kisan Conference. I heard everything that took place. No party at all was formed at that meeting. It was a Conference. I never heard of any Party being formed after it. I know

Pt. Indramani. I saw him in Court yesterday. I did not see him after he had given his evidence. I was waiting in the witness room and did not see him going out. Why should I go and see him. I was not interested in what he was asked. After the Conference I used to see Gauri Shankar often and talk to him. He never came to me and asked me for a subscription for the All India workers' and Peasants' Party Conference. I read about that Conference in the newspapers. I can not say in what newspaper. I never saw any posters like P 375. I went to Calcutta for the Indian National Congress. This Mazdur Kisan Conference was on so I attended it too. The 1st day of the National Congress was on 26th, 27th or 28th December. I can not deny that the sittings of the Congress began on 29th. I went there beforehand because it is a big city. It is also more expensive than Meerut. I stayed in the Congress Nagar with U.P. and Delhi delegates. There were many Meerut people there. Moti Ram was there. Gauri Shankar was in the the city and not there. Kadam was in the Congress Nagar. I attended the workers' Conference because at Meerut I had met Sohan Singh Josh. I went to see him at Calcutta and he gave me a ticket, and so I went. I went to see him in the house where he was staying perhaps in Circular Road. I had no correspondence with him after he left Meerut. I met Kadam for the first time at Cawnpore on my way to Calcutta. Gauri Shanker was in Calcutta before I arrived. I was not present at the opening of the W. P. Conference. I went there on the 2nd day with the President Sohan Singh. I saw some 400 or 500 people present at it. First there was singing and then English resolutions. Some persons spoke Hindi too. Most of the proceedings were in English. I heard the Hindustani speeches. All resolutions were in English. In Hindustani one day Kadam made a speech and one day I recited a poem. One day a boy spoke in Hindi. I did not find the English proceedings interesting. I did not remain present all the time. It was 23rd I did my recitation. That was before the election of the All India Working Committé. The proceedings were written in English. The names were given out in Urdu. I was interested in who was elected. I wanted to know who was elected. I had no connection with this party. There was no reason for my interest. I remember who were selected from U. P. but not from Punjab. Puran Chand Joshi was elected and Dr. Bisnath Mukerji and Gauri Shanker and Lakshmi Narain Sharma of Jhansi. Lakshmi Narain I met then for the first time. I did not find out his business. I was in Jail with him for 6 months. There he told me he kept a press at Jhansi. I did not talk about what papers he published. I do not know the newspaper Krantikari. I know P. C. Joshi since the Meerut

Conference I was not on the platform in the Calcutta Conference. I had not heard the name of Dr. Mukerji before this case I did not see him in the Conference or hear his name except at the time of the election.

Kadam mentioned the Workers' and Peasants' Conference to me in the train. I had seen it mentioned in the newspapers at Meerut before I started. I did not however know it was a Conference of the W. P. Parties of the U. P., Punjab, Bengal and Bombay. That was not in the newspapers so far as I saw. His impression about it and mine were the same. I saw Kadam in the Calcutta Conference on the 2nd day sitting near me in the same line of chairs. Before that day's proceedings ended I and Moti Ram, Jahdeo Singh and Khem Chand of Meerut and Kadam and some one I did not know left together. We talked on the way back. So far as I remember he said some of the mottoes hung up were against the Congress and he did not like them. I also did not like them. There was other talk about the Conference. Next day I went to the Conference after mid-day. I did not recall if I saw him in the Congress Nagar that day but I did see him in the Congress Nagar afterwards. I do not know when he went back to Jhansi. I went back to Meerut on the night of 31st. Gauri Shanker returned to Meerut after me. He stayed on in Calcutta. I know Gauri Shanker was Secretary of the Meerut Mazdur Kisan Sangh. I did not see him at all at the Calcutta Conference. I looked for him there. I was not surprised not to see him there, in spite of the fact that he was Secretary of the Meerut Sabha and present in Calcutta. I met Gauri Shanker in Calcutta at a house in the Bazar. I do not remember when. It was before the Congress. He had gone to Calcutta in order to go to the Congress. He did go to the Congress. I think I saw him every day there was a sitting of the Congress. I traced Gauri Shanker's place of residence through Ram Saran Vidyarthi. I mentioned the W. & P. Conference to Gauri Shanker. It was the first time I met him when I went to borrow some vessels from him. I can not remember if it was after the W. P. Conference was over or before. Kadam did not go to the W. P. Conference along with me. I can not say if he had got his ticket already. I had never been to Calcutta before. No one took me to Sohan Singh Josh. I saw in the papers that he was President and went to him myself. The papers printed that the Conference was at Albert Hall and went to inquire where I learnt the address and went there. It was in Circular Road or Lower Circular Road. I do not recall the number. I went again to that house on the 24th, but not again. It was for the meeting. At the meeting on 24th there was only election while I was there. It

had begun before I arrived. There was great disturbance at that meeting. The meeting was still going on at 4-30 or 5 p.m. when I left it. I arrived after midday. There was some break in the proceedings while representatives of each province were told to select their numbers of the All India Committee. That was the only break. I do not remember hearing Muzaffar Ahmed speaking about the objects of the W. P. Party in the Meerut Conference. It was not a short speech but took more than an hour. I can not say whether or not Muzaffar Ahmed spoke about the formation of a W. P. Party. I do not remember. I have come to the Court a number of times since the case has been proceeding in the Magistrate's Court. I was present outside the Court on the day when Mr. Randive was arrested. I was in the front row of the crowd on that occasion. I do not remember if there was a banner with Long Live Revolution written on it or if I was near it. There were banners. I remember well that nothing was written on them. It is possible. I was shouting. I remember shouting Inqilab Zindabad. I do not take any interest in this case as far as it relates to Communism but only so far as it relates to certain people. I have done all in my power to assist some of the accused including Communist accused. But about those I only knew later that they were Communists.

REXXN. For Banarjee. My knowledge that Shakaut Usmani was present at the Nauchandi meeting was from someone saying it at my shop. The Mr. Stokes about whom I spoke I once saw at Gaya Congress. I have read of his work among the Kisans against begar. Congress usually has its sittings from 26th, 27th, 28th or 29th December in the Christmas holidays. I certainly knew the date on which the Congress was to begin in 1923, through Congress Office. Before the actual Congress Session there are meetings of the Subjects Committee. They are held 2 or 3 days before. I have almost always attended the Subjects Committee meetings at the Congresses which I have attended. I went to Jail under the Salt Act in the course of the Civil disobedience Movement. The persons accused in this case in whom I take an interest are those who are Congressmen and wear Khaddar. I used to come because I was a member of a Sewa Sangh which was started when this case came here. It was started to look after the comforts of the accused. That was the kind of help I was speaking of having given to the accused.

XXN. In chief by Ghosh accused under S. 291. C. P. C. This Sewa Sangh was formed after the accused came here, at the end of March. 12 or 15 people worked in the Sewa

Sangh. The Meerut people started it. In those rule there was no specification as to what kind of accused persons of this case should be helped. I gave the help I did in the capacity of the Sewa Sangh. I was not aware of the political views of all the accused in this case at that time. In the case of some I was aware. I did not try to find out the political opinions of any of them before giving assistance. If I had found the political opinions of any of the accused not agreeing with mine I would have given help or not according to the opinion of the majority of the Committee. I did not render any personal help to any of the accused in this case.

REXXN. Nil. XXN. By Crown Counsel on last portion. Nil.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

27-1-32.

D.W. 9.

Pt. Ram Prasad, Kayasth. 47 Service Residence Gorakhpur Town on S.A.

File P. 1384 was seized by Police from the office of B.N.W. Railwaymen's Association. I am the Secretary of that Association. In that capacity I received cyclostyled letter D. 733 (1) (9 sheets) and under the directions of accused Mukerji replied to it in D. 733 (2) which bears my signature. I do not remember if I received any reply from Mr. Saklatwala. I sent a copy of my letter to Mr. N.M. Joshi and asked him to send me a copy of the Constitution of the British Trade Union Congress. I received a copy of that Constitution. I remember to have carried on a correspondence with the British Trade Union Congress. The B.N.W. Railwaymen's Association was founded in 1920. Its first president was R.B.B. Narsing Prasad. I have been connected with the Association since 10 years. I used to attend most of the meetings of the workers. Accused used to address the workers and tell them to remain non-violent. I do not think any meeting to celebrate Lenin Day was ever held at Gorakhpur. No meeting was ever held by the Association certainly. Resolution No. 6 in D. 190 (50A) and (51) was moved by Dr. Mukerji and passed by the Executive Committee of the Association. A

copy was sent by me to Mr. N. M. Joshi.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

27-1-32.

D. 190 (1) bears my signature and this was the press note sent by me. D. 190 (2) was prepared by me and included in this file. I recognise my signature on D. 190 sub-numbers 1, 3, 4, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 25, 28, 31, 38b, 54, 61, 69, 72, 73, 74, 81, 83, 85, 92, 102. These letters I issued as Secretary of the Association. I recognise the signature of Dr. Mukherjee on D. 190 subnumbers 26, 29, 33, 36, 40, 43, 52, 64, 67, 75, 79, 90 and 109. I was the person who kept this file and I can say that all the letters from outside included in it were received by me and included in it in the ordinary course of my duties. D 191 (6) is a correct report of the proceedings and was printed by the orders of the Executive Committee of the Union. D 191 (9) is a copy of the rules of the Kisan Mazdur Sabha Gorakhpur. The office was close to mine and so I was acquainted with the rules. D 191 (12) was issued under Dr. Mukerjee's orders. I got it printed as directed by him. I received D 193 (13) by post. D 192 is the revised rules of the B. N. W. Railwaymen's Association, drafted by Dr. Mukerjee under the orders of the Executive Committee in 1927 and 1928. It was just before the registration of the Union in 1928. All the work I did in the office of the Union was done under Dr. Mukerjee's instruction. I identify the writing and signature of Dr. Mukerjee on D 193 (1) and his writing on subnumber 2.

The Conference of the B. N. W. Railwaymen's Association was held on 20th January 1928. The Conference of the Kisan Mazdur Sabha was held on the following day in the same pandal. I visited the Conference. I could not remember any of the resolutions zabani (*i. e.* without something to remind me). Seeing D 194 (1) I can say that those resolutions were passed. I recognise Dr. Mukerjee's signature on D 195 (2) and (3) and (6) (8) (10), also on D. 203 page 7. The Hindi signature on page 9 looks like his. So does that on pages 10, 11, 12. That on 13 in English is his. That in Hindi on page 18 looks like his. I recognise his signature on D 202 page 9, 10, 26, 35, 63, 64. In D 205 I recognise Dr. Mukerjee's writing and signature on page 19, and signature on page 23, 25, 39 (also hand writing). I am a Congressman. In March 1929 I saw a member of the Executive Committee of Town Congress Committee of Gorakhpur. In 1929 early in March a public meeting to celebrate Swaraj Day was

held at Ismail Park Gorakhpur. Dr. Mukerjee presided. A resolution supported Nehru Committee Report and the resolution of the Congress Working Committee was passed at that meeting. Dr. Mukerjee explained both of these to the audience as President of the meeting. May Day was celebrated in Gorakhpur in 1928. It was celebrated because a circular letter was received from the Secretary All India Trade Union Congress.

(No other accused wishes to examine this witness in chief).

XXN. I worked in the office of the B. N. W. Railwaymen's Association in Mohalla Jafra Bazar. I used to go to Dr. Mukerjee's house sometimes to take his instructions but not to work there. It was close by. There was no meeting and nothing to celebrate Lenin Day in Gorakhpur. I do not know when Lenin Day is. I say there was none because if it had been I should have known of it. That is if it had been celebrated by my Association I should have attended it. Had my Association been not concerned there would have been no necessity for me to know about it. My hours of work used to be from 12 to 6. I do not know whether Dr. Mukerjee is a great admirer of Lenin. I do not remember ever to have seen any picture of Lenin. I know who he was. I never saw a picture of some one rather like Dr. Mukerjee but I never went inside Dr. Mukerjee's house. I always stood in the verandah. I did not know Dr. Mukerjee was engaged in educating the public on Bolshevism, writing treatises about. I never saw P 1424. The writing of his name on page 1 and 3 looks as if it was handwriting.

REXXN. Had Lenin Day been celebrated in a meeting at which Dr. Mukerjee presided I would have known if he had told me.

By Ghosh. Gorakhpur is a big city. There are 2 places where public meetings are commonly held. One is half a mile away from the office and the other a full mile. I should pass one of these places on my way to and from the office. Notices of meetings are usually given by handbills leaflets and posters. My Association office was well known. I used often to receive such notices in my office. If Lenin Day meeting had been held a notice must have been received in my office. Dr. Mukerjee was in the habit of taking me to such meetings, I mean the meeting of the workmen, labourers, Congress Committees. I do not remember his ever taking part in any meeting which was not a workmen labourers' or Congress Meeting. I ought certainly to know if any big meeting took place in Gorakhpur.

XXN. By Crown. Dr. Mukerjee used to take me to meetings because I was interested. It was to know what was being done in the meeting. It was because most of the meetings held was of the workmen and of the Congress. It was to know the proceedings and because I was a member of those 2 bodies. Dr. Mukerjee could answer why he took me to meetings in which I was not interested. I served no useful purpose at such meetings to him or anyone. I understood the Hindi proceedings. If there was no notice of a big meeting I ought to know because there would be drumbeat. Or if I did not see notice or hear drumbeat I might meet people in the street. Otherwise I would not know.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

28-1-32.

D.W. 10.

B. Kamta Prasad witness for Gauri Shanker, Vaish, Mukhtar on S. A.

I am a Mukhtar practising at Baraut. I was last year the Senior Vice Chairman of the Baraut Municipal Board. My father is a zemindar. I know Gauri Shanker accused. There was a Kisan Mazdur Sangh at Meerut I knew. I was a member of it, for 2 years in 1927 and 1928. I ceased to be a member of that Sangh after Mr. Gauri Shanker's arrest. It was a local organisation of the Congress. Its main object was, according to the Gauhati resolution, to popularise Khaddar and the spinning wheel among the peasants. Gauri Shanker came to Baraut in connection with this organisation. I remember a Delhi Province Political Conference being held at Meerut during 1928. As far as I remember Gauri Shanker came to Baraut sometime in January 1929. He stopped a night at Baraut and next morning went on into the villages. I think I never accompanied him into the villages. I discussed political matters with him many times. I think that his political views, so far as he disclosed them to me, were the same as those of the Congress. So far as I remember there was no Kirti Kisan Party in the Punjab and the U. P. up to the time of Gauri Shanker's arrest.

There were 2 Conferences held at the same time in 1928, at Meerut, the Delhi Province Political Conference and the Mazdur Kisan Conference. I attended them both only on one day the 13th October. I was present at the opening ceremony of the Kisan Mazdur Conference. It began with a national anthem, and then some one proposed Mr. Sahgal as President of the Conference.

(No other accused wishes to examine this witness as his witness).

XXN. I did not hear Majid accused speak at that Conference nor any speeches on the 14th or 15th. I can not say positively that there was no Kirti Kisan Party in the Punjab or U. P. up to Gauri Shanker's arrest. I think there was none because I never saw anything in the papers up to the time of his arrest. I did not take in such papers as the Krantikari or the Kirti.

REXXN. Nil.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

28-1-32.

D.W. 11.

Mr. R. V. Dhulekar on S.A. Advocate, Jhansi. Witness for Kadam accused.

I have been practising for the last 18 years, in Jhansi. I am engaged in Congress activities, since 1910 and as a member and office-bearer since 1915. I have been Secretary and *Vice* President and President of the Town and District Congress Committees, and also represented Jhansi on the Provincial and All-India Congress Committee. I was for 1½ years Secretary of the U. P. Provincial Congress Committee. I have been attending National Congress Sessions regularly for several years. I attended the Gauhati Session as a delegate and member of the Subject Committee. I remember the Labour resolution moved by Pt. Moti Lal Nehru and seconded by Maulana Shaukat Ali at that Congress. It is as given on page 211 in the statements of accused (Kadam's statement) I have known L. R. Kadam accused since 1917. We have been in close touch. He had taken part in Home Rule League agitation in 1916 and 1921 became a member of the Congress. He also occupied posts as Secretary or Joint Secretary. In 1923 he was Swarajist candidate in the Municipal Board and remained a member for 6 years. At the time of his arrest he was one of the Secretaries of the District Congress Committee. I was then *Vice* President of the District Congress Committee. I know of the Provincial Political Conference held annually. It goes round the Province, to a different place each year according as it is invited. It was held in Jhansi in 1916 and again in 1928. There were 2 other functions along with it, Kavi Sammelan (poets conference) and the other was a Bundelkhand Kisan Mazdur Conference. The latter was organised by the members of the Congress at Jhansi myself and Kadam included. Kadam was Joint Secretary of the Reception Committee. In the Political Conference only political subjects were discussed while in the Kisan Mazdur one there were subjects not almost coincident with the Congress. I mean that in it there were discussed economic and social subjects, e.g. takavi grants, remissions of revenue, early marriages etc. Political Subjects were not discussed at the Kisan Mazdur Conference. The reason for holding 2 conferences was that traders, zamindars, cultivators, labourers do not ordinarily attend Political Conferences and this Conference was to deal with the subjects that interested them. This Conference was held in the same Pandal as the Political Conference and in the intervals between its sessions. The arrangements for the Pandal were made by the Reception Committee of the Political Conference. The officers of the 2 Reception Com-

mittees were the same. There was no organisation of the name of the Workers' and Peasants' Party at Jhansi. I never saw a letter heading like P 2015P. There was a Kisan Mazdur Sabha at Jhansi. I was a member of it. It was formed some 6 or 7 months before the Political Conference. Mr. Kadam was the Secretary and Mr. Gangadhar Nilkant Aushde was the President. There was ~~was~~ no separate Working Committee. It was working under the auspices of the Congress. It had no connection with any other body outside Jhansi. So ~~for~~ as the wording goes of the object on the back of the form attached to P 1350 (8) there is not in my opinion anything in it opposed to Congress principles (Note. Nimbkar accused objected to the question on the ground that witness is not an expert on Congress principles). I had occasion to see a paper called Krantikari issued from Jhansi. I read it sometimes, off and on. I know Hindi. The proprietor was Lakshmi Narain Sharma and Krishan Gopal Sharma was also a partner. I know them both well. They were both connected with the Congress. K. G. Sharma was Secretary of the Reception Committee of the Political Committee.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

28-1-32.

Continued on S. A. L. N. Sharma and K. G. Sharma were in charge of the management of Krantikari. Kadam accused had no connection with the paper. There was a Municipal workers' Union at Jhansi, formed about the beginning of 1929. I was its President. Kadam accused was its Secretary. He was not a member of the Municipal Board at that time. I was present at the inaugural meeting in which the Union was formed. This Union had no connection with any other body in Jhansi or outside. There were one or more Congressmen interested as members of that Union but mostly they were employees of the Municipality. There was no workers' and Peasants' Party or branch of it at Jhansi of which Mr. Krishna Gopal Sharma was Secretary. The statement to that effect in the Krantikari dated 24. 11. 28 is not correct. There was no other Kisan Mazdur Sabha in Jhansi up to the time of Kadam's arrest except that of which I was a member, Kadam Secretary and Gangadhar Nilkant Aushde President. Excluding the Congress no organisation with which both Kadam accused and I were connected was affiliated to any outside organisation. To the best of my knowledge there was no organisation at Jhansi which was affiliated with any Party outside excepting the G. I. P. Union which was a branch of the Head Office at Bombay. I of course exclude Congress. The

announcement for the Simon Commission was made in August 1927. I was generally in Jhansi from then until March 1929. Almost all sections of the people at Jhansi worked for the boycott of the Commission. At first the politically minded people of Jhansi had faith in the British Labour Party thinking them friendly towards them but on the appointment of the Simon Commission they lost faith. I remember that 2 members of the British Trade Union Congress came to India after that announcement Messrs Purcell and Hallsworth. I had talk with others at Jhansi about their coming before they came. We thought that the British Labour Party had co-operated with the Government in the appointment of the Simon Commission and therefore they would not do anything for Labour in India. Kadam mentioned to me that he wanted to go to the Cawnpore Trade Union Congress Session. He did not mention any particular object.

I remember a meeting on 6-2-28 in connection with the G. I. P. Railway workers. I was President of the meeting. The object of that meeting was that our Union which was founded in 1918 was somewhat dormant and we wanted to reorganise it and make it a branch of the Bombay G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union at Bombay. So we were in communication with Jhabwala accused who was its Secretary. I and my co-workers had founded the G. I. P. Railway workers' Union, Jhansi. Kadam was present at the meeting on 6th February. He had joined me in the work some time in middle of 1927. He was not an office-bearer. In that meeting he was elected Secretary and I was re-elected President. I know Kadam accused's handwriting. The 3 draft telegrams in D 341 are in Kadam's hand. They are invitations issued for the Provincial Political Conference in 1928. Kadam accused was discussing with me for some time what Communism was. I am a Maratha, Kadam accused does not speak or understand Marathi. I know the author of D 338 by reputation. He is an advocate of Cow-protection and this is a book on that subject. D 619 is a notice of a meeting of the District Congress Committee. Kadam's name is on it as Joint Secretary. It is written by Ram Nath Duivedi whose writing I know and he was the Joint Secretary also. P 428 is a notice of 4 meetings at Jhansi including the Political Conference and the Kisan Mazdur one. A resolution on the Nehru Committee Report was passed at the Kisan Mazdur Conference. There was also one about the Boycott of the Simon Commission. The Nehru Committee Report was discussed only in so far as it guaranteed the rights of landholders, Kisans and traders, and the Simon Commission in

reference to the non-representation of kisans and labourers on it. I have read through P 1445 (1). It is not at all a correct account of the Conference (Kisan Mazdur). The resolutions were not worded as shown in this document and of the 5 subjects covered by these resolutions only 2 were actually discussed. Subjects Nos. 1 and 3 were not discussed at all and resolutions on the subjects dealt with in 2, 4 and 5 were not worded like this. There were resolutions on other subjects as well such as one praying to the Government for Takavi, Nehru Report.

There was no organisation at Jhansi called the Young Comrades League. Unless it were a secret society no public organisation could be started at Jhansi without my knowing. Kadam was one of the delegates from Jhansi to the Calcutta Session of the Indian National Congress. After the Calcutta Session the Working Committee asked that there should be a National Week to popularise the Nehru Report among the masses by holding meetings. There was a meeting held at Jhansi and several in the district. I do not remember the date exactly. It was in March 1929. I was present and Kadam was the president of the meeting. The meeting passed a resolution supporting the Nehru Committee. I was asked to bring the proceedings of the District and Town Congress Committee but I have not been able to trace them. I asked Krishna Gopal Sharma who said they were seized by the Police in 1929 in connection with this case. The names of the speakers in P 1445 (1) do not appear to me correct except myself, Lakshmi Narain and Jhabwala. The other names are incorrect. I know P. C. Joshi accused. He came to my house during the Political Conference to see my nephew Balkishan Damodar Dhulekar. He did not take any part in either conference that is either the Political or the Kisan Mazdur. He was not invited to either. Later on Lakshmi Narain Sharma was also made a Joint Secretary of the Railwaymen's Union because membership increased and we had to open another office. I and Kadam and others after discussion amongst ourselves suggested the name of Jhabwala as President of the Kisan Mazdur Conference. He was selected as a prominent worker and Congressman and Secretary of the Bombay G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union Head Office. He belonged then to one of the Ward Congress Committees in Bombay.

By Ghosh accused. At the Gauhati Session the President was Srinewas Iyengar ex-Advocate General of Madras. I remember that a resolution was put from the chair and passed for disseminating correct information in foreign countries and appointing Jawahar Lal Nehru to represent India in Oppressed

Nations Conference. (A resolution shown to witness but no copy tendered). There was a heated discussion on the Khaddar franchise in that session. I know both Nimbkar and Joglekar accused. They were both present at Gauhati Session and were on the All India Congress Committee as was I. Mr. Joglekar opposed the Khaddar franchise resolution (Question objected to by Nimbkar but objection disallowed). So far as I remember he said he was in favour of Khaddar and wore it himself but he did not support it for others because he thought it would be a difficulty in the way of those who wore mill cloth but were ready to join the Congress.

I know the book shown to me. It is a report of the Congress Session at Gauhati. I first saw it 4 or 5 months after the Congress. I was at that time able to remember what had happened at the Gauhati Sessions. I could in the case of some resolutions in which I was interested at that time have said if there were errors or mistakes in reporting the speeches. This resolution and the speeches were among those in which I was so interested that I would have noticed any mistakes. I believed the report to be correct when I read it.

XXN. By Nimbkar with reference to application of section 159. The report of the Gauhati Session was published in 1928. (Ruled that the document can not be used for refreshing memory as witness's answers show that he could not at the time of reading the report have been in a position to remember and know that the report of the words used by Joglekar accused was correct). Accused asks no further question in cross-examination in chief.

In reading out witness says he did not admit he was a speaker.

(No other accused wishes to examine the witness as his witness).

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

30-1-32.

XXN. By Crown. Except for a few minutes I was present throughout the proceedings of the Jhansi Mazdur Kisan Conference. I heard the speech of Jhabwala accused. There was nothing in it that struck me as being little out of the ordinary way of saying things at Congress meetings. There were some

political subjects discussed, from the economic point of view. Russia was mentioned. All that was said was that there was a Labour Movement in Russia also. He did not deal with Russia particularly at all. He included it with all the other countries of the world. I have seen the printed copies of his speech but not read it. I saw the printed copies of the speech during the Conference. Some one in the joint office gave it to the press. Kadam did not speak to me about the speech. I do not know if he was dissatisfied on a particular point and wanted an explanation from Mr. Jhabwala. I have seen a copy of Kadam's statement to the Court outside the Court. I knew it was his statement because it was his statement. I do not remember who showed it to me. There were several witnesses present but I do not know their names. I saw it but I did not read it. I saw the beginning and so I learned it was his statement. Learning it was his I dropped it because I thought that I should not read it. I did not want to prejudice my mind in any one's favour. Kadam and I did not discuss the evidence I was going to give before I came into the witness box. He knew that I knew all about him. He said I was president of the Union and a Congress worker and I should say all I knew about him. I did some work in the G.I.P. Railwaymen's Union office. I went to the office every week or so to look through the papers. Papers were put up before me and I saw those papers. I also sometimes looked at documents which were not put before me. I received a sample copy of Kranti. I had not seen these copies P 1440, of Kranti either in the G.I.P. Union office. Nor did I ever see the issue of 23-2-29. On his attention being drawn to the article headed Betrayal of Railway workers in Kranti of 23-2-29, printed speech of Jhabwala P 292, speech as reported P 1093 and Kadam's statement in this Court witness: I still say that Jhabwala made no mention of Soviet in his speech at the Jhansi Conference. Nor did he say anything about Bolshevism. The mottoes at this Congress were put up by Congress purely. Motto No. 4 in P 1094 is not representative of all sections of the Congress. It represents the views of that section which thinks there should be no landlords and no rich people. I did not attend the Meerut Conference. I had a talk with K. G. Sharma, about the formation of a Workers' and Peasants' Party at Meerut. So far as my knowledge goes I know that there was no party formed at Meerut. I saw something in Krantikari that a party had been formed, and therefore I spoke to Krishan Gopal Sharma. He also had not gone to Meerut. I used to get Krantikari regularly. It does not purport to be the prominent national weekly paper of the Workers' and Peasants' Party but the paper of the Peasants' and Workers'

organisation. I read the article on page 10 of No. 2 of Krantikari dated 24-11-28 P 431 entitled U.P. and Delhi Mazdur Kisan Dal or Workers' and Peasants' Party, when I received the paper. I know both Krishan Gopal Sharma and Lakshmi Narain Sharma well. I talked to Krishan Gopal about this. He is at Jhansi now. He has not received any summons as a witness. I used to read Krantikari sometimes but I was not interested in it. I did not go to Calcutta for the Indian National Congress. I do not know if he went for the All India Workers' and Peasants' Conference. I think Lakshmi Narain went to the Congress. I do not know if he went to the All India Workers' and Peasants' Conference. I am sure Krishan Gopal did not go as a delegate to the All India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference. I had talked to Krishan Gopal about the Party but not about the Conference. So far as I can remember Krishan Gopal did not go to Calcutta. In photograph P 460 I recognise Ajudhia Prasad accused, on his left a man from Jhansi whose face only I know, then Kadam, then Lakshmi Narain Sharma and then Joshi accused.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

29-1-32.

Apart from myself, Kadam, and Lakshmi Narain the only other office-bearer in the Railwaymen's Union was one Din Mohammad *Vice* Chairman, a railway employee. P. C. Joshi did not stay with me in October. He stayed in one of the houses arranged for delegates and visitors (added in reading over) for the Conference. I had not known he was coming. I did not know he had written to people beforehand saying he was to be found at my house. He had no talk with me about the Conference. He did not express any views to me. I do not remember the occurrence of Lenin Day on January 21st 1929. I know from newspapers that it is celebrated by certain people. I do not know if it was celebrated by certain people in Jhansi that year. I do not remember to have read that in Krantikari. I do not know that Krishana Gopal Sharma spoke at a Lenin Day meeting. Shown Krantikari P 431 dated 28-1-29 page 2; I never saw that para about the celebration of Lenin Day. Rameswar Prasad Sharma mentioned in it is a Congressman and editor of the Sahas. I do not know any connection between Har Prasad Singh of Banda (M. L. C. at one time for Hamirpur) and Jhansi. Pt. Gangadhar Aushde Vaidya of Jhansi is a physician. He is the same person as Gangadhar Nilkant Aushde. I

know a Parsi called Rustamjee at Jhansi. He is a Congressman. He was a student, a young man. I do not know if he had anything to do with the Kisan Mazdur Sabha. Mr. Saklatwala visited Jhansi I remember, when he toured India. I have no idea of the date.

REXXN. My reasons for saying that no Workers' and Peasants' Party was formed at Meerut are first that there was no office at Jhansi. I never visited Meerut. The talk I had with Krishna Gopal about that was that when I read the report in the Krantikari I asked him, what is this? You are mentioned here as Branch Secretary; what does it mean? I tried to ascertain whether the report was correct. My opinion was that there was no party formed there.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. Yorke.

30-1-32.

D.W. 12.

Rai Sahib Chandrika Prasad, on S. A. For Thengde and Mukherjee. 74. Residence Ajmer. For Thengde. I retired in 1914. Before that I was in the service of the B. B. C. I. Railway, as Asst: Traffic Superintendent. I became Rai Sahib in 1903. I have been a member of the A. I. T. U. C. since 1921 and was President in 1926-7. D 145 (32) is a copy of my Presidential speech at Delhi. It is not quite as delivered as a portion was modified just before delivery. It is substantially correct. I also know the All India Railwaymen's Federation. I was President of the first Conference of All-India Railwaymen at which the Federation was founded. The Federation used to issue Bulletins like D 478 and I may have received this one. I know D. R. Thengde. He was President of the A. I. T. U. C. once and was my colleague in it, from 1925 to his arrest. I was present at the Session of the T. U. C. at which Thengde was President. D 145 (18) is a copy of Thengde's Presidential address. I received a copy at the time and believe it to be a correct account of the speech which he delivered. I attended with him a number of meetings of the Congress and of the Executive Committee. He took part in the deliberations. I do not say that he took any

particular line. I never disagreed with Thengde. Generally our views were in consonance. I do not remember our ever voting on different sides. I attended one or 2 Executive Committee meetings every year. Generally 2 or 3 Executive Committee meetings were held every year. I do not remember the last Executive Committee meeting we both attended. I think he was at Jharia. There was also a meeting of the A. I. R. Federation at Jharia. I presided. I know the East Indian Railway Union. As far as I remember that union was not affiliated to the All India Railway Federation at that time. Only representatives of affiliated unions which have paid their affiliation fees have the right to vote at the meetings of the All India Railway Federation. That rule was applied at Jharia as it was always. It is quite possible that E. I. R. Union people attended the meeting. I remember one, Mr. K. C. Mitra doing so. I know him as General Secretary at Asansol or somewhere of the E. I. R. Union. I do not remember anything special about his attendance. I do not remember if he spoke. I know Banarjee accused. I saw him several times at meetings of the Federation as representative of the E. I. Railwaymen. I think I saw him at Jharia at the All India Railway Federation ^{Meeting} by Mukherjee. Owing to my meeting with Mr. Ramsay MacDonald in 1909 I came into the Labour Movement. I have travelled in Europe and England. I met Labour leaders there. I first saw Dr. Mukherjee in 1921 at the 1st Conference of All India Railwaymen at Bombay. He took a leading part in the proceedings. I saw him again at the Bombay meeting in 1925, at Cawnpore 1927, at Gorakhpur in 1928. He took a leading part at all these places. He was throughout a genuine constitutional trade unionist. I presided over the Railwaymen's Conference at Gorakhpur in January 1928. I delivered ~~a~~ Presidential address which is contained in D 191 (6). I was invited by Dr. Mukherjee as General Secretary of the B. N. W. R. Association and the members of the Committee. Dr. Mukherjee was Chairman of the Reception Committee. He also gave an address as Chairman of the Reception Committee which is also contained in that report at page 7. I met with all a large number of Railwaymen present at the meeting. A procession was also taken through the town. The Railwaymen called Dr. Mukherjee Deshbakht. Literally that means Devotee of the country. Mukherjee was a member of the Executive Committee of the All India Trade Union Congress. Mukherjee gave me general co-operation in these meetings. We were in correspondence in Union matters up to the time of his arrest. He took my advice now and then on Union matters.

By Ghosh. I know Mr. A. P. Dube Barrister at Law of

Allahabad. He lived at 10 Edmonstone Road. The letter shown to me D 734 is one written by me in my own hand. It was in reply to a letter received from Ghosh accused a typed letter; I may have that letter the original I received. I have not destroyed any papers. It was a typed letter in which only my name and the signature were in longhand but I cannot say if it was a circular letter.

I am in correspondence with Mr. V. V. Giri. I know the signatures on D 291 and 292 to be those of Mr. Giri. I know Mr. A. P. Dube's writing and can say that D 268 is written by him. I know Mr. M. Daud, and his handwriting. D 244 bears his signature. I know Mr. B. Shiva Rao and his handwriting. D 165 (8) and D 165 (9) bear his signature and the latter also his description in his own hand.

(No other accused will examine the witness as his own witness).

XXN. By Crown. I do not remember a Mr. P. Gladding at the A. I. T. U. C. at the 1925 Bombay Session, nor do I recollect any particular European attending that Congress. Shown D 623: I remember some of these Ginwala, Thengde, Mukherjee. I cannot say that all the important persons were sitting down. A good many of those sitting were important. I recognise D 399 as the official report of the Delhi All India Trade Union Congress session. I cannot vouch for its correctness. The Secretary alone can. I remember a resolution No. 3 about China being discussed. I took no active part and dont remember anything about the discussion, or who brought it forward. I was added to the Sub Committee for drafting a Constitution for India as a member to represent with them the A. I. T. U. C. at the All Parties Convention. I went to the Calcutta meeting of the All Parties Convention. I dont think Mr. Thengde was there. I know Thengde's writing. Seeing P. 806 page 9 witness said: I still dont remember seeing him there or hearing him say anything. That book is in his writing. Thengde was not to my knowledge concerned in the A. I. R. F. He did not attend the A. I. R. F. at Jharia.

No question in Rxxxx.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

30-1-32.

D.W. 13.

Harihar Nath Shastri. on S.A. Kayasth. Life Member of Servants of the People Society, Residence, Cawnpore.

I recognise the handwriting of page 19 of D. 205. It is Dr. Mukerjee's. On seeing this paper I remember that I received that telegram. It was in response to an invitation, sent by me. I identify my own writing and signature on the letters D. 190 subnumbers 24, 27, 30, 34, 41, 45, 46, 47, 66, 71, 77, 80, 82, 86 and 91. These are all letters which I wrote to Mukerjee accused. I am a Congressman. I am also a Trade Unionist. I do remember that Dr. Mukerjee and some other persons formed a group on the A.I.T.U.C. I was Secretary of the Reception Committee of the Cawnpore Session of the A.I.T.U.C. Late Ganesh Shankar Vidyarthi was Chairman of the Reception Committee. Mukerjee accused was one of the *Vice* Chairman. A provisional Committee of the U.P.T.U.C. was formed after that Cawnpore Session. Afterward it became a branch of the A.I.T.U.C. after a year. The fact that it was to be such a branch was mentioned in the constitution of the U.P.T.U.C. That constitution was framed by myself and Mukerjee jointly. It was framed on the same lines as the constitution of the A.I.T.U.C. There was a proposal between me and Mukerjee to tour the province in connection with the Trade Union work. Once or twice I invited Mukerjee accused to address meetings of the mill workers at Cawnpore. He did so once, after the Cawnpore A.I.T.U.C. session. The subject was organisation of workers. He stressed the organisation and betterment of the economic conditions of workers and r~~o~~oting out of social evils. The U.P.T.U.C. had representation ~~of~~ the U.P.P.C.C. Mukerjee was a member of the United Province Provincial Congress Committee and the All India Congress Committee. Mukerjee was a member of the U.P.P.C.C. and the A.I.C.C. up to the date of his arrest. I was not invited to attend the session of the All India W. & P. B. Calcutta. I did receive an invitation to attend Workers' ~~Conference~~ ^{Present} at Meerut.

By Ghose. I dont remember receiving any letter from Ghose accused in my capacity as Secretary of the Reception Committee of the A.I.T.U.C. at Cawnpore. Nor do I recollect if I received one from the Secretary Bengal Trade Union Federation. I issued a notice to persons concerned ~~to~~ who wished to move any resolution to give notice with copies to the Secretary a fortnight before the beginning of the session. I do not remember whether I have any letter of Ghose's in my possession. I have some recollection of the resolutions at the Cawnpore

Congress and who moved them. There was one about Simon Commission. In the E.C. there were 2 resolutions but after a hot discussion Mr. Chamanlal came out with a 3rd Resolution which was accepted by the mover of the 1st resolution. Perhaps Kishorilal Ghose accused was the mover of the 1st resolution. The mover of the 2nd was Dange accused. He also accepted the proposition of Mr. Chamanlal. It was probably Kishorilal Ghose who moved the resolution in the open session of the Congress. I dont know who seconded the resolution.

By Kadam. Letters D. 735 and 736 were written by me to Kadam accused. I once received a letter from Kadam asking me to allow him to attend the All India Trade Union Congress as a visitor. I issued the invitation asked for. He attended that session. I was once present at an interview between Kadam accused and N. M. Joshi during the Cawnpore Congress. Kadam asked Mr. Joshi for his advice in connection with organising the Railway workers at Jhansi. Mr. Joshi expressed his sympathy and advised Kadam to correspond with Jhabwala in the matter.

For Banerjee. There was a social party at the Pratap office a day or two after the Congress was over. It was on the invitation of the Chairman of the Reception Committee Mr. Vidyarthi. He was the editor of the Pratap. All the delegates who still remained at that time were invited. Most of the delegates had gone home by that time. A group photograph was taken of the delegates who attended the function. That group was reproduced in the Pratap. P 992 is a copy of it.

No other accused will examine the witness.

XXN. I did not attend the Delhi A.I.T.U.C. Session. I was a delegate from the Cawnpore Mazdur Sabha to the A.I.T.U.C. I was the General Secretary of the Provincial Committee of the U.P.T.U.C. and we discussed its formation a day or 2 after the A.I.T.U.C. We met twice at my residence. I live in Cawnpore. I was invited to the party at the Pratap office but I could not go. The invitations for that party were sent through me. The T.U.C. affairs had been finished by ~~them~~^{me} some 2 days before. I have seen Puran Chandra Joshi once, at Cawnpore. He came to Cawnpore in the year 1928, apparently as a student to know something about the Labour movement by practical study. He gathered certain information from me about the activities of the Muzdur Sabha. He did not ask me to help him in carrying on organisation. He expressed a desire that after his studies were over he wanted to join the labour movement. I do not remember if he said anything about Meerut. I was not aware that he had

anything to do with Meerut. I did not know that he had come from Meerut and did not ask him anything about Meerut. I was asked to the Jhansi Conference and went to it. I mean in connection with the Political Conference but I also attended the Muzdur Kisan Conference. I heard most of the proceedings at it. That was after Joshi had seen me. Jhabwala was presiding. I saw Joshi there. He was living in the same camp in which I was living that is the United Provinces Political Conference camp. I heard Jhabwala's presidential speech. I dont remember to have heard the concluding speech. I did not see the printed copy of Jhabwala's speech. A reference was made to Russia along with several other foreign countries. I met Mr. Dhulekar here yesterday but was not allowed to talk to him. He said that workers in other countries were much better off than workers in India in various respects, wages etc. That was the only reference to Russia that he made. I dont remember if he referred to what had taken place in Russia. He spoke in Hindi which I understand. He did not speak about revolt in Russia. I dont remember if he said that the means of your liberation consists in the example set by Russia. He never said money had come from Russia to help workers in India.

No accused claims a right of crossxxn.

No REXXN.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

30-1-32.

D.W. 14.

G. Sethi on S.A. Mechanical Engineer. Jamshedpur.

For Ghose.

The letter shown to me D. 737 is in my handwriting. I wrote a letter to Ghose accused from Edinburgh about September 1927. I sent him a printed copy of the Presidential address delivered at the British T.U.C. annual session held at Edinburgh that year. D. 219 is either the copy I sent him or another copy of the same thing. These copies were distributed to the delegates just before the President started delivering his address was following the address in the copy. As far as I reme

there were no difference between the printed address and the address actually given by the President. I was present as a fraternal delegate from the A.I.T.U.C. I was at that time a member of the Executive Council of the A.I.T.U.C. I represented the Jamshedpur Labour Association, of which I was in 1927 the Honorary General Secretary. I held that office up to October 1928 from 1921. In 1927 and again in 1929 I visited Geneva as adviser to the workers delegates of India. Ghose accused visited Jamshedpur on several occasions. He came at least 2 or 3 times in 1928. It was on the invitation of the Labour Association Executive Committee. It was in order to bring about the settlement of the dispute, as a strike was going on. The E.C. had invited Mr. N. M. Joshi, Mr. M. K. Bose, President of the Bengal Trade Union Federation, Ghose and a few other leaders, including Mr. Giri. This was about the middle of July. Mr. Joshi was present at the time of Ghose's visit. Ghose accused came again about the beginning of August. Ghose accused addressed some meetings and had an interview with the General Manager, to put before him the grievances of the men and bring about a settlement. I was present at the interview. That is how I knew the purpose. I was present throughout the open meetings of the Cawnpore A.I.T.U.C. I remember a resolution being passed that the A.I.T.U.C. should boycott the Simon Commission.

Most probably Diwan Chamanlal and Ghose either moved or seconded that resolution. The President was Diwan Chaman Lal. I moved an amendment to the Resolution that the British Labour Party should be asked to withdraw their members from the Commission. I was also present throughout the Jharia session of the Congress, including the Executive Committee meetings. I remember that Ghose accused made a statement and appeal on behalf of the workers of Bauria at the E.C. meeting. It was an E.C. meeting in the course of the Session after a good deal of business had been done. It was after a big resolution had been passed for a one day strike as a protest against the passing of the Public Safety and Trades Disputes Bills then pending before the Assembly. He pointed out that it was not enough to pass big paper resolutions and here there were 15,000 people on strike at Bauria for the last several months. He asked for a practical proof of sympathy by contributing funds towards their relief, through the A.I.T.U.C. Representatives of several unions came forward with offers of help. Ghose accused suggested a particular procedure that all the money for this purpose should be sent to the General Secretary of the A.I.T. if C. at Bombay, who would send it on to Ghose. All the money

must come through the A.I.T.U.C. At the Cawnpore Session a Sub Committee was appointed to draft a Labour Constitution for the Government of the Country. I was a member of that Sub Committee. No meeting of the Sub Committee was held till at Jharia some of the members met in a hurry informally and discussed the matter. The members who then met were Diwan Chamanlal, Ghose accused, myself, Spratt accused, and may be one or 2 more. One was Mr. Daud. The All Parties Convention was then just about to be held at Calcutta. The A.I.T.U.C. had just passed a resolution advocating the establishment of a Socialist Republic in India. Or perhaps I am wrong and the resolution was passed after this informal meeting. The Sub Committee along with delegates one from each union not exceeding 50 in all were authorised to place that resolution before the All Parties Convention. The Sub Committee held its informal meeting while the E.C. was sitting. The resolution of the A. I. T. U. C. as ultimately adopted was the result of the informal meeting. That resolution was moved in the open session by Mr. Daud or Diwan Chamanlal. Either Diwan Chamanlal or Ghose accused seconded that resolution. Usually when a resolution is moved from the chair it requires no seconder. Mr. Daud was the President that year. I received a letter from Ghose accused expressing his views about the working of the various groups in the Jharia Conference about the end of January or middle of February. I have not got the letter here. Nor have I got it in my possession. I destroyed it. Ghose spoke of a group which was well organised and able in spite of not being in a majority to get what it wanted and of another lot of members who were in a majority but not organised. He suggested that we might have a meeting of some of those members to organise ourselves into a group. I dont remember if he referred to a particular party. I recognise D. 305 the official report of the Jharia A. I. T. U. C. session. I received it some time about April 1929. I read the report and found it to be substantially correct. A message from Mr. C. F. Andrews was read out. There was at one time a proposal to affiliate the Jamshedpur Labour Association and the Indian Colliery Employees Association to the Bengal Trade Union Federation and form one organisation to be called the Bengal and Behar T. U. F. I can't be certain whether Ghose made a speech in connection with the Socialist Republic resolution at the Jharia Congress. I remember Ghose having a hoarse voice at Jharia.

(No other accused will examine this witness as his witness).

XXN. By Crown Counsel. I have been connected with the A. I. T. U. C. from 1921 onwards and on the E. C. from 1922 up

to July 1931. I am not on it now. I have not attended all the Congresses. I attended at Bombay in 1925, Delhi 1927, Cawnpore, Jharia. In D. 623 I recognise the following sitting on chairs from the right Jhabwala accused, Hasan from Lahore, then some one I dont know, Mr. Kirk, Mr. N. M. Joshi, R. S. Chandrika Prasad, then Thengde the President, ^{the} Mr. Bole, Mr. Ginwala. Mr. Aiyar, then some one I dont know by name or face, then Mr. Sarkar, and then Dr. Mukherjee. No. 3 from the right I dont know at all. I know 11 out of 13. No. 3 must be a mill manager or some one else ^{could} to see the proceedings and put down in the chair because perhaps he was very friendly to Mr. Joshi. I know of no other reason. As far as I remember he could not have been a guest invited by the A. I. T. U. C. What I mean is that as far as I remember he was not a guest of the A. I. T. U. C. Most probably there were no official guests invited by the A. I. T. U. C. I say there were no official guests because till then they had no outside connection or correspondence with outside people. No. 3 from the other end or no. 11. I cant say if he is a European or not (note: this answer refers to the gentleman no. 3 from the left and wearing spectacles). (Mr. Sinha objects that when the witness says he does not know this person the question "can you suggest any reason why this gentleman should be sitting there" does not arise. I can only say that I dont agree and overule the objection) Witness answers: No. I dont remember the name of a Mr. P. Gladding as a person who attended this session at Bombay in 1925. As far as my memory now goes I dont remember meeting any European Trade Unionist except Mr. Kirk in 1925. I remember Mr. Saklatwala being up at Delhi. I was not present at any small meeting if any which Mr. Saklatwala addressed. In reading over witness says he also said "if at all it was held." I did not attend any private meeting outside the Congress which Mr. Saklatwala addressed. At the time I received Ghose's letter I did not think it important enough to keep it so I destroyed it after some time. After coming to this court I came to think it important. Up to that moment I had not thought any more about it. I answered that letter.

By Bradley. I dont remember that any resolution to the effect that the money for the Bauria strikers be sent to Mr. N. M. Joshi and redirected was passed. If there was one it must be in the official report.

By Nimbkar. The Bengal Juteworkers Association was affiliated to the A.I.T.U.C.

(Mr. Sinha wishes for permission to ask the witness if Saklatwala addressed any small meeting at Delhi. It is evident that if the witness did not attend any such meeting he cannot know. He has not proved any such meeting. The question is unnecessary and I refuse permission.)

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

1-2-32.

D.W. 15.

B. Bindyabasini Prasad, Advocate, Gorakhpur on S.A. 41.

I have been a Congressman about 20 years. I have known Mukherjee accused about 25 years. On March 20, 1929 I was President of the Gorakhpur District Congress Committee and Mukherjee was the General Secretary. Mahatma Gandhi was according to the original plans to have visited Gorakhpur in May 1929. We had received such instructions from the All India Congress Committee and the U.P. Provincial Congress Committee and Mr. Sitla Sahai came from the Ashram to make arrangements for the tour. The District Congress Committee was entrusted with the local arrangements and the responsible persons were the President and the General Secretary. I passed an order that the Secretary should arrange for propaganda and other necessary arrangements. Correspondence was accordingly carried on with the Tahsil Congress Committee's. The District Congress Committee arranged for propaganda meetings and Mukherjee addressed such meetings, in 1929. I was told that Dr. Mukherjee was assaulted in a village in the district in about September 1928 and I subsequently saw marks on his body. I did preside over a meeting held in Ismail Park in which a resolution was passed offering sympathy to Dr. Mukherjee and admiring his courage in sustaining the assault without retaliation. I was the legal adviser of the B.N.W. Railwaymen's Association. There was an organisation in Gorakhpur called the Divisional Mazdur Kisan Sabha but I was not a member of it. I know of no organisation called the Workers' and Peasants' Party there. I think Lenin's Day has never been celebrated in Gorakhpur. I know the handwriting of Sitla Sahai mentioned above. I recognise it in D 205 page 4. I know Babu Ram Ghulam Sahai of Deoria for some 10 years. He was

President of the Deoria Tahsil Congress Committee. I know his handwriting. D 204 page 7 bears his signature. I know Pt. Changur Tirpathi of Barhaj Bazar. I know his handwriting. The whole of P 204 page 2 is in his handwriting. I know Mukherjee accused's Hindi writing. D 203 page 9 is in that writing, so is page 10, 11, 12, 18. So are D 202 page 1, 5, 6, 11, signature on page 12 and 14 and 15. D 202 page 16 is in Sitla Sahai's Hindi writing which I know. D 199 (20) is in Mukherjee's Hindi writing.

By Ghose accused. I know Mukherjee's English handwriting. The 2 lines of writing on Photograph P 1383 below the photo are in his handwriting.

(No other accused wishes to examine witness as his witness).

XXN. By Crown Counsel. When I spoke of celebration of Lenin Day I referred to celebration by public meeting big or small. If it was a meeting of any real consequence I ought from my public position to have known of it. If the publicity was bad and if it was a very small meeting or say a ~~fine~~ fiasco I might not have known about it.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

1-2-32.

D.W. 16.

Kali Das Bhattacharya on S. A. Homeopathic Doctor, Brahman, 45, Residence Bhatpara. ~~For Banerji~~ I used to practise as doctor in Bhatpara but do so now in Bankura. I practised at Bhatpara from 1921 to end of 1923. I was also doing the Trade Union work at Bhatpara. There was Trade Union there. I started the Trade Union work in 1923. I was also an employee in a mill up to 1924. When I was working in the mill I joined a Union called the Gauripur Works Employees Association and in consequence they dismissed me. I did not leave the Union when I was dismissed. That Union was organised by Mrs. Santosh Kumari Gupta who was conducting a strike there. She was helped by a man called Satya Narain Chattarji. The work I used to do in the Union was to enlist members, sell a paper called Sramik, of which Santosh Kumari Gupta was editor and I also used to contribute. I know of a Union called Naddea Millworkers Union.

1 ^{and} 2 or 3 of my friends together organised the Union. I know of Reliance Labour Union also. This Union also was organised by me. These Unions existed only for a year and a half or so. Then they were all amalgamated into one, called the Bengal Juteworkers' Association. That began its existence from the 1st January 1925. Juteworkers of all mills were its members. The first President was Mani Mohan Mukherjee pleader. I do not remember if there was a General Secretary but the Secretary then was Sideshwar Chattarji. I do not exactly remember but I might have been one of the Joint Secretaries or Vice President. D 68 is a booklet which I wrote. It relates to matters of interest to the B. J. W. A. and gives at the end the list of officebearers of the B. J. W. A. for 1925 and 1926. Both are correct. For 1925 I am described as Secretary and Sideshwar Chatterjee as General Secretary. No one else took an interest in the Union in 1925. At the end of 1925 Shib Nath Banerjee came. He was introduced by Mrs. Gupta and Mr. Subodh Roy. Mr. Roy said he was busy in Calcutta and could not come but Mr. Banerjee had been to Europe and had experience and would do us well and we could have him if we liked. Thereupon I asked Shib Nath Babu if he would be willing to come and he said yes but he could not come at once for good but he would come now and then and would also give us publicity by writing in the papers about the activities and condition of the workers. He did us a lot of work besides publicity in accident cases getting compensation. He used to write in Sramik and also in Atma Shakti and Forward. He had nothing else to do with Sramik. I knew Messrs Johnstone and Sime. Sometime in 1925 in October or November they came to Calcutta where I went and saw them and they visited Bhatpura. I heard that Sime was Secretary of the Dundee Jute and Flaxworkers Union. They came to study the workers' conditions of living and work. Shib Nath Babu and Mrs. Gupta and I helped them a lot in their enquiry and were always with them. After inquiring into the conditions of the workers they said that they found that in comparison with the conditions of workers in the jute area in their country the conditions of the jute workers in India were terrible. They asked us to organise the Union and make it a very strong union. They said if you will organise this union well we will promise to help you. They did help us by giving us money several times whenever we asked for it, sometime 100, or 200 or 300 rupees. The last time was in 1928 during the Bauria strike when we sent a telegram and got some money.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

1/2/32.

Continued on S. A. They used to give publicity to the activities of the Union by publishing in their paper the Forward and in handbills of which copies were received by us. They also published an appeal for money. I recognise D 65 which I have seen. This sort of Pamphlet we received. Sime sent them. He sent us many copies not only of this but of others. I understand English a little but Mr. Sideswar Chatterji and others explained the whole of D 65 to me. There are some mistakes in the pamphlet. I pointed them out then. For instance on page 17 it was not correct that the B. J. W. A. had conducted 9 strikes. The statements about grievances of workers and their conditions are generally correct. Only 2 strikes were conducted by the B. J. W. A., others were before its foundation. Personally I took part in almost all the strikes. Of the rest 3 were conducted one each by Naddea Juteworkers' Union, Gauripur Union and Reliance Labour Union. In the others the workers came to me and I conducted them before the Unions came into existence. "I go there after strike began." (This last by witness in English). After Johnstone and Sime went away from Bhatpura Shib Nath Babu stayed a couple of days and then went away. After a few days I went to Shib Nath at Calcutta and asked him to join the Union. It was because Johnstone and Sime had asked Shib Nath in my presence to join the Union. Shib Nath then came and joined the Union. At first he used to look after the Compensation cases in Calcutta, going there from Bhatpura. D 738 is a letter written by me to Shib Nath (December 23, 1925). In January 1926 the next election of B. J. W. A. office bearers took place. Shib Nath Babu was elected General Secretary I proposed him. I was also one of the Secretaries. In 1926 Shib Nath and I and Sideswar Chatterji were the persons controlling the Union or Association. Its chief work was fighting compensation cases and cases for the realisation of wages, running a school, cooperative society, recreation club, holding workers' meetings. Meetings were addressed by me usually and Shib Nath and Sideswar occasionally. In October or November Shib Nath went to Calcutta. He said he could not secure an employment and must go there. I saw him there. There he secured some private tuition. It might be in December or in January I saw him. After that he could not come to help the Association, except occasionally. In January 1927 the election of office bearers took place. There was no General Secretary in 1927. None was elected. I was President. There were 2 Secretaries that year Shib Nath Banarjee and Sideswar Chatterjee most probably. Shib Nath only came once or twice on Sunday, and otherwise he could not take part as he had no time. At first Sideswar Chatterjee and I managed all the work but later about the middle of the year Gopendra

Chakravarty accused came and joined the Union. He came of his own accord and said that I could get him employment there he could attend to that and do the work of the Union too. We got him employment in the Naddea Jute Mill. He was not given any office in the Union in 1927; but practically he used to do the work of a Secretary. He went on working till about a month before the searches for this case and then went away. In January 1928 office-bearers for 1928 were elected. Gopendra Chakravarty was then elected General Secretary and I was elected President. Shib Nath was only a member of the Executive Committee. We could not elect him Secretary because he himself said he could not find time. There is another reason. He raised an objection because I was a member of the Peasants and Workers Party of which he did not approve because he said by joining that party our work may suffer. Letter D 668 is in my handwriting and is mine. I wrote it to Shib Nath. He objected when I became a member of the Executive Committee of the P & W Party. That caused much difference of opinion between us. Shib Nath said that if I joined the W & P Party our objects would not be fulfilled and we would not get any help from the Congress or the Trade Union Congress. But I continued to be a member of the P & W Party. I became a member of the Executive Committee of the P & W Party some time in 1927. I joined the P & W Party because I thought there was no harm. On reading their circulars I thought we should get benefit from them. I had seen a copy of Rules & Regulations (P 549 (8)) before I became a member. I remember receiving a copy of the letter shown to me P 416 (1) 2nd page. The original is in office of the B.J.W.A. But the papers were taken away by the police. I did not do anything at the time of its receipt. Either Muzaffar Ahmad or Halim asked me afterwards verbally at Calcutta to get the Union affiliated to the Party. I replied, let it be affiliated, I have no objection. That was verbal too. I do not remember whether I have said anything in writing. We separated from the Bengal Trade Union Federation because there was a struggle going on in it. I saw that some other Unions were affiliating to the Workers and Peasants Party so I thought it good to affiliate ours also. I came to know that our Union was affiliated when the report was received. We never paid any affiliation fee. We had no money and they also had none and did not demand any. We got no pecuniary or other help but they published our activities in their paper Ganavani. I was a member of Executive Committee of the P & W Party in my personal capacity. At first I was an ordinary member of the Party. There was no official election of any one to represent the B.J.W.A. on the

Executive Committee of the P. & W. Party. I do not know if the P. & W. Party elected any one to represent the B.J.W.A. on the Executive Committee of the P & W Party. I never paid any subscription to the P & W Party either as a member of the Party or of the Executive Committee. I used to go to Executive Committee meetings sometimes. That was all I did except write articles to the Ganavani and sell copies of Ganavani which were sent to me. Sometimes I sold a few copies, can not remember how many. I also occasionally received a few leaflets and booklets from the Party. I used to keep them in the office where people sometimes saw them. I attended the Conference of the P & W Party at Bhatpara in January or February 1928 or even March. I and Gopendra Chakravarty made all the arrangements for that Conference. Because I was a member of the Executive Committee they asked me to make arrangements for holding a Conference there. I did not take the initiative. The B.J.W.A. did not have anything to do with the conference. Mr. Atul Chandra Gupta presided over the Conference. After the Conference I hardly did anything for the Party and also kept myself aloof from it. It was because I found we were getting no benefit from the Party because they were too busy with their own affairs. After the Conference I took no part in the Executive Committee meetings of the Workers and Peasants Party. We had got no benefit and also by the affiliation Shih Nath Banarjee was annoyed with me. Gradually the tension was increasing. I resigned my membership of the Workers and Peasants Party in 1929. I remember receiving the letter P 144 (D-Mittra). I have seen D 37 before, either this or another copy. As indicated by the contents of P 144, D 37 was received along with that letter. In reply to P 144 I sent a letter of resignation by registered post. D 106 is that registered letter. I had sent a letter of resignation on 16th February but they did not then reply to me they sent me P 144 and D 37. I further told them that there was no necessity to keep my Unions affiliated. I do not remember if I did it in writing or verbally but if verbally it must have been to Muzaffar Ahmad. The Workers and Peasants Party did not exercise any control over the Bengal Jute Workers' Association while it was affiliated to the Party. They never gave us any directions for work. The B.J.W.A. was also affiliated to the All India Trade Union Congress, and the Bengal Trade Union Federation. The B.J.W.A. was affiliated to the A.I.T.U.C. that is we paid affiliation fees from 1925 to 1928 so far as my knowledge goes. I can not say about 1929 because I was not in Bhatpara. We originally paid affiliation fees to the B.T.U.F. and then stopped doing so when the dispute was going on in it and began again doing so. I do not remember

when we stopped paying. Nor do I recall the year when we started again. The B.J.W.A. had a representative on the Executive Committee of the A.I.T.U.C. I do not remember who was in which year but once I was and once Shib Nath was and once Sideshwar Babu was. I remember that at an Executive Committee meeting of the B.J.W.A. on 22-4-28 a resolution for the reaffiliation to the B.T.U.F, was passed unaimously, being seconded by Shib Nath accused as shown in P 283 on page 6. When Shib Nath was in Calcutta in 1927 I used to go there occasionally and used to see him. I told him about the B.J.W.A. being affiliated to the W.P.P. He said on hearing it, then I shall not be able to work with you and in the course of a few days I shall resign. After a few days Shib Nath wanted to put in his resignation after making his position clear. I told him why should you resign? Better wait a bit. See whether we actually get any benefit from the W.P.P. He said he knew exactly what benefit we would get. He further said he would not be able to work at the Central office at Bhatpara but he could establish a branch at Titagarh. He actually did so on the understanding that we would not be able to interfere with the working of the branch. He worked 2 or 3 months there. After that he joined the East Indian Railway workers Union as Secretary. Because the W.P.P. Conference was held at Bhatpara without consulting him he got annoyed and locked up the office and went off to Lillooah. After joining the Lillooah Workers' Union he did no work for the Bengal Jute Workers Association. In 1929 again there was an election of officebearers of the B.J.W.A. We then elected Shib Nath as President. He was not present at the election. I proposed him. It was because he did the work of the B.J.W.A. very well in the past. It was also out of respect for his incarceration and also to show to Government our attitude. There was no other reason except that he was going to jail and his election would not be liable to give rise to any difficulty. Shib Nath did nothing as President. I was acting President. I do not remember having any talk with any member of the Workers and Peasants Party about this 1929 election. The W.P.P. were never satisfied with Shib Nath nor was Shib Nath satisfied with them. Muzaffar Ahmad and Halim said that Shib Nath being a man of Congress Mentality should not have been elected. I had talk with them. They used to say also that Radha Raman was a person of Congress Mentality. I can not remember if they objected to any one else. Of course Shib Nath is a Congressman. He was a member of the Congress, and the Congress Labour Board. The B.J.W.A. got its income from subscriptions from members, donations, contributions from Dundee, and from A.I.T.U.C. The Central office of the B.J.W.A.

was transferred to 97 Cornwallis Street in 1929. It had one room there. There were other offices there, of the Swadeshi Bazar and the Young Socialist Club or something like that. They had no connection with my office of B.J.W.A. P 358 is the application form for membership of the B.J.W.A. It contains a pledge in order to stop bribery in the mills. I started the People's Welfare Society at Bhatpara. I used to receive the reports of the I.F.T.U. I used to receive regularly reports like D 47, 60 and these are those I did receive by post. I also received D 63 and 64 in my office. D 27 is an office copy of a letter actually despatched to the address given in it.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

2-2-32.

Continued on S. A. I recognise the file D. 30. It was maintained in B. J. W. A. office by the Secretary. I received the following letters of this file in the office 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 14, and 16. I recognise D 43 as a copy of the Rules of the B. J. W. A. It is a correct copy. D. 44 (1) is a letter written and signed by me. I recognise D 44 (12) which is a copy of a letter written by me to Shib Nath Banerjee accused. D. 44 (17) which I also recognise is a copy of a letter written by me to Subash Bose. I recognise the following files and registers which were all kept in the B. J. W. A. office in the ordinary course of business: D 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58. The list at page 1 of D 51 is a correct list. In D 53 the entries on pages 45 and 61 are correct. In D 58 the endorsement copy forwarded on the first 2 pages are in my hand. The letter dated 4. 2. 26. is in my hand (addressed to Editor 'Forward' and 'Servant'. D 78 is a circular issued by the B. J. W. A. to its member. I do not know its date. I know an organisation called the Ichapur Ordnance Workers Union. I attended the formation meeting. Certain letters were issued and after that nothing more was done. I myself worked for some time in the Ordnance Factory. That was why I had some acquaintance with the workers there. They knew that the work of Juteworkers Union was going on well so they invited us to form a Union for them. By 'us' I mean myself. I was elected Secretary at the formation meeting. Spratt accused was elected President. I proposed him. I did so because I considered that if an Englishman is appointed President the work will go on well. That was the only reason. Shib Nath accused was elected Vice President. Very likely I proposed him. He was working at Titagarh then and was known to the Ichapur workers so I thought he would be a good man. He was not present at the

meetings. He never took any part at all. Sometimes I went to Lillooah during the workshop strike there. Mr. K. C. Mitra had issued a circular asking for help and the B. J. W. A. had deputed Gopendra Chakravarty accused to go and help. The letters now shown to me D 739, 740, 741 were all written by me to Shib Nath accused. I know R. R. Mitra accused. I also know Mr. Bankim Chandra Mukerjee. I first met them when they were forming a Juteworkers' Union at Chengail. There was a strike there and the Chengail workers asked for help. It was Bankim Babu who informed me. Workers took the leading part in that strike but Sadali and one Aswani were the leading workers conducting that strike. I went to Bauria after the Chengail strike was half way through. Bankim Babu asked me to go. It was somewhere about the middle of 1928. I went again in August, September or October. I was called there by Bankim Babu and R. R. Mitra. They asked me ^{that} it is necessary that you stay here and settle this strike for the workers. The B. T. U. F. had formed these 2 Unions with the help of Bankim Babu and Radha Raman Mitra. They wanted my help because the B. T. U. F. and Bankim Babu and Radha Raman were unable to settle it and I should help. I said I could not stay because I had too much to do at Bhatpara. I said I would send a man from Bhatpara. I sent Gopendra Chakravarty accused at least I asked him to go, I sent a wire to Mr. Sime at Dundee. In reply he sent about Rs. 329, for the help of the Bauria strikers. I sent Rs. 250 to Radha Raman Babu and the rest was spent in expenses coming and going to Bauria. The strike at Chengail and Bauria were conducted by the workers. We were helping them, that is I and Bankim, Radha Raman, Gopendra Chakravarty and Kishori Lal. Kishori Babu was Secretary of the B. T. U. F. and President of the Bauria Juteworkers Union. Both sides tried much for the settlement of that strike, on the side of employers Mr. Reid, and on the side of strikers the same 5 already mentioned. Once Subash Bose was called and he did much for the settlement. The efforts at settlement were not successful. The employers said they did not like to hear anything from the outsiders.

By Ghose accused. I went to Bombay in April 1926 to attend a meeting of the Executive Committee of the A. I. T. U. C. I had a special reason for going namely to appeal to them for some money for the B. J. W. A. My application was considered at that meeting. Other members objected that there was no money. But I persisted and to my surprise, Kishori Babu supported me much. I thought that in the quarrel in the B. T. U. F. Kishori Babu had taken me as one of Mukund Lal Sirkar's party. Ultimately the Executive Committee granted me Rs. 300.

I know of the Kankinara Labour Union. Kankinara is 1 mile from Bhatpara. Mr. K. C. Rai Chowdhury was President of it almost all the time. The B. J. W. A. and the Kankinara Union had no good relations. Once Kishori Babu tried to settle the differences. It was about 1927-1928 but I do not recall exactly. He suggested that both parties should select one arbitrator on whom both could rely and accept his decision as binding. The person suggested was Mr. Upendranath Banarjee. I took it as a good suggestion. But no good came from it. Kishori as Vice President of the Kankinara Union was willing and so was I but other members of both organisations were not willing. In my personal knowledge Mr. Roy Chowdhuri was not willing. He refused in my presence. Possibly I received D 240 but I do not remember if I did. I was not present at the formation meetings of the Chengail and Bauria Unions. In my opinion by forming the Chengail and Bauria Unions they had disobeyed the rules of the A. I. T. U. C. and had also harmed the workers. There is a rule that overlapping trade unions should not be formed. I am referring to the rules and not to any resolution. I told Kishori Babu that I thought it against the rule. His reply was, let the small unions be formed now and afterwards they can be federated. I did not agree to that. I met Kishori Lal Ghose many times at Bauria and Chengail. I have met him there in the company of Mr. Daud, Mr. Mrinal Kanti Bose, Mr. Indu Bhushan Sirkar, and Mahbulul Haq. It was during the time of the Chengail and Bauria strikes from middle to end of 1928. The signature on the left edge of P 34 is mine. I know Hemanta Kumar Bose mentioned as Assistant Secretary therein. He was Secretary of the North Calcutta Congress Committee. He was so many times but I can not say if he was at that particular time. Radha Raman Mittra and Bankim Mukherjee were also connected with the North Calcutta Congress Committee. I never informed Ghose accused that I received money for the Bauria strikers from the Dundee Union. I received a copy of P 53 which is Report in Bengali of Peasants and Workers Party 1927-1928. The statement on page 5 that the membership of the B. J. W. A. was over 5000 may have been correct at that time. I recognise P 52 also. I received that also, towards the end of 1928. The other unions that I saw affiliating themselves to the Peasants and Workers Party were the Scavengers' Union Calcutta and the Bengal Papermill Workers' Union, and the Workers Protection League. There might be one or 2 more which I do not remember. I do not know if any of those were affiliated to the All India Trade Union Congress.

(No other accused wishes to examine the witness as his witness).

XXN. By Crown Counsel. I have been a Homeopathic Doctor since 1920. I was working in the mills then and the only occasionally practised as a Doctor. That is my profession now. I know one Soumyendra Nath Tagore from 1926. I can not say if he was ever Secretary of the Peasants and Workers Party. He used to go to the office of the Peasants and Workers Party and I saw him there. (Seeing passage about Tagore being sent to Europe in P 52) I know he went to Europe but I did not know he was Secretary. I did not see it properly that he was described as Secretary. I received 2 or 3 letters from him from abroad and I also wrote letters to him. If I can see the handwriting I can say if it is his. Shown P 416 (12) I can not say definitely if the signature in that letter is his but it looks very much like it. In P 440 too the signature is very like his. I can not say about that in P 2008 P, or if I received a letter with the signature as in P 2028 P, I would take it to bear his signature. That in P 2032P appears to be of the same writer.

Looking at P 2035 P, the signature in this also is like his.

Looking at P 2038 P, the signature in this also is like his.

Looking at P 2056 P, the same is the case.

Looking at P 2098 P, the same is the case.

Looking at P 2120 P, the same is the case.

Looking at P 2130 P, the same is the case.

Looking at P 2131 P, the same is the case.

Looking at P 2143 P, I can not say if this is his signature.

Looking at P 2168 P, this also appears to bear his signature.

When I went to Bombay in April 1926 I stayed 3 or 4 days. I have met Donald Campbell but I did not meet him at Bombay on that occasion. I was not well acquainted with him. When the Police searched they found his passport in my possession. I was present on one day at the Calcutta Conference of the Peasants and Workers Party in February 1927. I was elected to the Executive Committee at that Conference. I was also present at the Bhatpara Conference on 31.2-28. I cannot say whether notices were issued beforehand referring people who wanted to know about the Conference to apply to the office of the Bengal Jute Workers' Association at Bhatpara. Shown leaflet P 355 I now remember that notices to that effect were issued. The statement in the 1st paragraph of the body of P 523 Call to Action is correct (not the preface). At the time of preparing the report

for the Bhatpara Conference I and Dharani Goswami and Gopendra Chakravarty were members of the Executive Committee of the Peasants and Workers Party. I was at that time an office-bearer of the Bengal Jute Workers' Association. I do not remember whether Goswami was so also or not. Seeing P 283 I now remember after seeing the minutes of the 1st January 1928 that Goswami and Chakravarty were also at that time office-bearers of the Bengal Jute Workers Association. I was not sent a 'good many' copies of Ganavani to sell. I used to get 25 copies whenever I contributed an article. I never received more than 25 copies of Ganavani at a time, I think. I do not think it possible that there should have been 27 ever. P 1996 searchlist bears my signature and I was present at that search. I see the item 27 copies of Ganavani of 12-10-26. It must be correct. I can not say if I had contributed to that number. I cannot say if that was the last number before it ceased publication.

I was present at the All India Workers and Peasants Party Conference in December 1928 at Calcutta, only on one day, not the 1st but the 2nd or 3rd. It was the day when the question of election of General Secretary came up. It was the day when the amendment was discussed as to the method of election of the General Secretary. The General Secretary was Muzaffar Ahmad. I do not know if anyone tried to push Muzaffar Ahmad out but we tried to put in another man. I was one of those wanted to put in anyone else. We 3 members of the Bengal Jute Workers Association mentioned before were in that party. We all 3 spoke, I and Goswami and Gopen Babu. I do not know if Manindra Sinha was in it or a member of the party. About the decision I do not remember the details but I heard that in the end Muzaffar Ahmad was elected General Secretary. Besides the 3 persons mentioned there were no other members of the Bengal Jute Workers Association who were also members of the Peasants and Workers Party. I know Nirod Chakravarty. Without seeing the papers I cannot say if he was a member of the Bengal Jute Workers Association. As long as the Central Office was at Bhatpara I do not know if he was made Branch Secretary of any branch. Shown P 34 I know Nirod Chakravarty and remember from this that in January 1929 he was made Branch Secretary of Champdani Branch. Seeing name of Manindra Sinha Branch Secretary of Matiaburz, Branch B.J.W.A. I know him most probably he was a member of the Workers and Peasants Party and I saw him sometimes at the Workers and Peasants Party office and I also saw him at Matiaburz. He was also at one time Secretary of the Bengal Textile Workers Union. I cannot say if that Union was started

by the Workers and Peasants Party. Do not know who started it. I know Kali Sen, B.J.W.A. Branch Secretary Calcutta. I cannot remember without seeing papers if he was a member of the W.P.P. I resigned from the W.P.P. I do not know about other people resigning. Seeing P 423 I do not know Kali Sen's signature. I am not certain one way or the other whether Kali Sen was or was not a member of the W.P.P. I had 2 reasons for resigning from the W.P.P. One was that I used to quarrel with Shib Nath because I was on the Executive Committee of the Workers and Peasants Party and the Bengal Jute Workers Association was affiliated. The other was that we got no benefit and they were always busy with their own work. I did not mention the matter of Shib Nath in my resignation letter but I did say that I did not get any benefit out of it. I did not state in my letter what the benefits were which I expected to get from the Workers and Peasants Party. My letter of resignation was written before I received the resolutions contained in D 87 but I knew all about the arrangements for them beforehand. In the resignation letter I complained that I would not be a member of the Executive Committee and that my Association would not remain affiliated. I did not write it in my letter but the reason of the resignation was that I knew those resolutions were going to be passed. I do not remember whether in my resignation letter I mentioned any reason except that we were getting no benefit out of the W. P. P. I did not find anything objectionable in the aims and objects of the W. P. P. The paper shown to me P 2615 is an office copy of my letter of resignation but not in my hand. The signature is mine. I see that I have not mentioned the point of getting no benefit in it at all. The only reason I gave was that the Party leaders were not taking me into their confidence and letting me know what was being done.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

3-2-32.

Continued on S. A. There is no contribution from me in the Ganavani of 12th October 1926. It is not correct that I said before that one of the reasons I had for affiliating the B.J.W.A. to the W.P.P. was that I saw other Unions being affiliated to it. I admit that the 3 Unions I mentioned were the Scavengers' Union Calcutta, the Bengal Papermills Workers' Union and the Workers' Protection League. Possibly the Scavengers' Union was formed in January 1928. The affiliation of the B.J.W.A. took place in October 1927. Asked if in that case it was not untrue that the Scavengers Union was affiliated at the time of

affiliating the B.J.W.A witness: I dont remember. I have nothing else to say about it. I dont know whether the Scavengers Union was formed by the Peasants and Workers Party or W.P.P. The address of the Scavengers Union was 2/1 European Asylum Lane. I know Dharni Goswami was Secretary of the Scavengers Union. Seeing P 52 I see from this that the Scavengers Union was formed under the auspices of the Party. I was a member of the Executive Committee of that Party. As to the Bengal Papermill workers Union that was formed by the efforts of the B.J.W.A. itself and had its headquarters at Bhatpara. I know that Union was affiliated but I dont know when. It is not possible that it should have been affiliated long before the B.J.W.A. was got affiliated. I never said that those Unions were affiliated to W.P.P. before the B.J.W.A. was. After my Union was affiliated I heard that other Unions were affiliated. I can not say if the Workers Protection League was organised by the P.W.P. Seeing P. 52 I cant say if it is true as stated there that Party Members established the Workers Protection League.

Most probably Shib Nath was not present at the General Meeting of the B. J. W. A. on 1st January 1928. I say most probably not because he used to come to Bhatpara very seldom. I shall certainly agree if he himself has said that he was there. I still cant remember unless I see papers. Shib Nath locked up and left the Titagarh office without my knowing of it. I heard it from one Sheobalak Shukl some 7 days later. It was at the middle or end of March 1928. It could not be in April. It might be in 1st or 2nd week of April that Sheobalak gave me the information. It might be more than 7 or 8 days after Shib Nath left. I read of the Bamangachi firing. I cant say if he left before or after that or if I heard of his going before or after it. A report of the working of the year 1927 must have been submitted by the Secretary at the meeting on 1-1-28 but there were 2 Secretaries and I dont know who submitted it. They were 2 Joint Secretaries. Chakravarty was only an ordinary member in 1927. Without seeing papers I cant say he was not stating the truth when he said in his statement shown to me that in 1927 he was Assistant Secretary of the B. J. W. A. I dont know where the 1927 Minute Book is. If he says he was Assistant Secretary I must have been wrong.

I cant say whether at the time of the Annual General Meeting on 1-1-28 he was one of those who were authorised by a resolution passed at that meeting to represent the B.J.W.A. on the Executive Committee of the A.I.T.U.C. in 1928. Seeing P. 283 page 3 it is a fact that he was. Shib Nath attended the next E. C. meeting of B. J. W. A. on 22nd January and

was again present at the next meeting on 22nd April, but not on 17th June the next meeting, but on 12th August he was again present and again on 9th September, which was the last meeting in 1928. He at that meeting moved resolution No. 4, at page 13. The resolution was "That this committee condemns most vehemently the attempt of the Government to pass the Public Safety Bill which means nothing but a heinous attempt to prevent the real friends of the mass people from coming to India." It was seconded by Goswami accused. I did not inform Banarjee beforehand that I was proposing him as President. I did so afterwards. I cant remember if it was by letter or word of mouth. I can only say it is unnatural that we should not have informed him. Most probably I wrote to Mr. Sime after the election of 3-1-29 that I was elected President. D. 26 is in my handwriting. In my opinion it was immaterial that Shib Nath was elected President because he was in Jail. I must have informed him. I dont remember meeting him after he was elected President so I cant say if he was very surprised at his election. If I informed him I did it by letter. I dont remember whether he ever wrote a letter in reply. My letter if I wrote one I dont remember when I sent it. If Shib Nath said that he got the news from a newspaper report 2 days before he went to Jail that must be correct (Statement of Banerjee accused page 95). I cant say if he ever received my letter. I cannot say whether D. 44 (4) is the first letter I got from Shib Nath after the election. Shib Nath might have written such letter in which he mentioned that he was annoyed with me because I had affiliated the B. J. W. A. to W. P. P. but I cannot produce any because the police took all the papers away in the searches on 20th March 1929. There is no letter apart from those papers. (Mr. Sinha objects that the witness added with me and Banerjee accused supports him. Interpreter does not remember him saying it. Crown Counsel says the answer was only a nod. I did not notice). How can I produce now or say whether there is any letter with me, mentioning it? I cant remember after so long time whether there is actually such a letter in which he mentioned that he was annoyed about it. There might have been. From Chakravarty's word it appears that he was closely connected with the working of the B.J.W.A. from the beginning of 1927. (statement Chakravarty page 152) I do not agree with him that the B.J.W.A. conducted a strike at Kankinara in 1926 but it is correct that on behalf of the B. J. W. A. I conducted the strike at Jagatdal for a few days. I was its leader I mean for 2 or 3 days. It is correct as he says that on behalf of the B. J. W. A. I (Kali Das) helped the Ludlow Jute Mill strike in April 1928. It is also correct that I and he

(Chakravarty) helped the Bauria workers from November 1928. What he says about the B.J.W.A. not confining its activities to the Jute Industry only is also correct. Bengal Papermill workers Union and Angus Engineering workers Union were organised by the B.J.W.A. as he says, and there were others such as Peoples Welfare League, Cooperative Credit Society. The Ichapur Union was due to me and Spratt accused. I took the initiative and called Spratt in. Asked about the passage beginning from the very beginning its object was and still is to fight the entire employing class in general and the jute employers in particular witness said; I cant say whether I agree with that passage because I dont know what "to fight" means. Between 1926 and 1929 I was mostly at Bhatpara. After the office of the B.J.W.A. was transferred to Calcutta I had been there 2 or 3 times, not frequently. That office was conducted by Kali Sen. He had a separate room somewhere in Cornwallis St. I dont know exactly where. Bhatpara is 22 or 24 miles from Calcutta. Titagarh is 10 to 12 miles from Bhatpara. Ichapur is between Bhatpara and Titagarh. I went to Titagarh from Bhatpara. I did not pass through Titagarh in going from Bhatpara to Ichapur. I did not tell Shib Nath that I was going to propose him as *vice* President at Ichapur. Shib Nath told me that he had either received or written letters to some Sahibs about the formation of an Ordnance Workers Union at Ichapur. I cant say that he was interested. I dont remember when I told him about his election as Vice President. It was quite natural, I must have told him. I did not go Titagarh that day.

By Nimbkar. It is about 3 or 4 years since I last received a letter from Mr. Tagore. I have received at the utmost 3 or 4 letters from Tagore. I never actually saw him writing. I have already said that I cant say with certainty that the letters shown to me are his. The reason is that they have got similar writings in the Tagore family.

By Mitra. Very likely I addressed a meeting at Bauria the first time I went there on the invitation of Bankim Babu and Radha Raman. I dont remember if I saw Radha Raman Mitra at that meeting. Perhaps he was not there. There was no Bauria Union then, I am not sure what month that was. Shown P 118 D Mitra. It was about 20th June but I cant say if it was exactly so. Within about a month from then I passed through Bauria on my way to the Budge Budge Branch of B.J.W.A. I then saw a single shift notice at the gate of the mill. It is a fact that I met Mitra at Calcutta and told him about this notice.

(Note. The witness here fully understood a question put entirely in English.) I explained to him the meaning of the change. I dont remember if I told him the change must be resisted at all costs. Mitra accused wanted help from me in stopping the change. I said that I could not interfere as the Bauria Union was working under the B.T.U.F. I dont remember when I said that but there was such a talk. There was a conference at Kishori Lal Ghose accused's house when Kishori Babu, Gopen Babu, Radha Raman, Bankim Babu and I were present, and some others. (Note. It is obvious that this examination is really an examination in chief. Leading questions are therefore barred and the accused is treated as examining the witness as his own witness. The accused says that in those circumstances he does not wish to continue the examination.

REXXN. By Mr. Sinha. Reference the 1st para in 523 very likely Muzaffar Ahmad paid the cost of the pandal mentioned there. The expense of the Conference, were borne by the W.P.P., Muzaffar Ahmad, Halim etc. Asked what is meant by Comrades of the B.J.W.A. in that sentence witness said: anyone who becomes a member of the B.J.W.A. is a 'comrade of the B.J.W.A.' The W.P.P. paid the expenses for erecting Pandal and I with the help of coolies got it done. The Jagatdal strike lasted from 5 to 12 days. The Bengal Papermill workers union worked for only a few days and there were only books and papers.

No other accused wishes to re-examine the witness.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

4-2-32.

Had
Accused wishes Court to ask witness questions about the Conference mentioned above. I am not able to see that the Conference mentioned has any such importance against any accused that further inquiry into it is necessary. I therefore decline to pursue the matter further.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

4-2-32.

D.W. 17.

Mr. Mahbul Haq. For Banarjee. on S.A. Pleader.

I have been practising as a Pleader in the Judge's Court at Alipur, Calcutta since 1918. I was a member of the Bengal Legislative Council from 1925 to end of 1926. I have been connected with the Trade Union and Trade Union Movement in Calcutta since 1919. I was one of the Secretaries of the All India Trade Union Congress in 1926. In 1928 I was one of its Vice Presidents, being elected at the Jharia Session. In 1928 I was sent as an adviser to the Labour Delegate from India at Geneva. The Delegate that year was Diwan Chaman Lal. I attended the British Commonwealth Labour Conference as a delegate from the A. I. T. U. C. in 1928. It was held in London. I know of the Calcutta Tramway Workers Union. I was one of its Vice Presidents in 1928. It was Shib Nath Banarjee accused in Court who came to me one morning and requested me to become so. I consented. Shib Nath Banerjee was one of the Vice Presidents. The Secretary was one Phanindra Kumar Sanyal. The Union was registered under the Trade Union Act. It was the first Union to apply, soon after the passing of the Act. It applied for affiliation to the A.I.T.U.C. at the Jharia Congress in 1928. I can not say if it was affiliated that year. It was also one of the Unions affiliated to the Bengal Trade Union Federation. I do not know if it was affiliated to any other body. I heard of an organisation called the Workers and Peasants Party. I do not know whether there was any connection between the Tramway Workers Union and the Workers and Peasants Party. I attended very few meetings of the Executive Committee of the Tramway Workers Union. I know the signature on the Post Card D 742; it is that of the Secretary of that Union, Mr. Sanyal. D 743 is in his handwriting. I am acquainted with his handwriting and signature. D 744 is in my own handwriting. It is in reply to a letter of congratulation received by me from him, which I destroyed. He had congratulated me on my selection as Adviser at Geneva. I attended the Jharia Session of the A.I.T.U.C. after my return from Geneva. There was a hot discussion on that matter of sending delegates to Geneva in a meeting of the Executive Committee at Jharia. The proposal was to send a Delegate and Adviser for the next International Labour Conference and some members were against it, and spoke against it. So far as I remember Shib Nath Banarjee was against the proposal and spoke. On that occasion I spoke and said to Shib Nath that you congratulated me on my selection and how you are opposing the proposal. He said he was opposed

to it because the delegation diverts the attention of the real Trade Unionists from the actual work. He also said it resulted in the formation of Party cliques for pushing up their own nominees. Others also spoke against the proposal. I remember the visit of Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth to Calcutta. The Tramway workers Union presented an address but I was not present at the function. I heard from some of the officebearers that it would be done. I was otherwise engaged on that occasion. D 139 (14) is also in the handwriting of Phanindra Kumar Sanyal.

By Ghosh accused. I have known Ghosh accused since 1923. I first met him at the Bar Library of the Judge's Court Alipur. I used to go now and then in 1923 to the Forward office. I saw Ghosh there also working as an Assistant Editor of the Forward. I was a Swarajist member of the Bengal Legislative Council. I was connected with the B.T.U.F., and the Press Employees Association. I was a Vice President of the latter. I maintain a file of correspondence in connection with the B.T.U.F. and the Press Employees Association. There was a Manifesto issued to Press workers in connection with the visit of Purcell and Hallsworth and I was a signatory. Other signatories were B. Mrinal Kanti Bose President and Krishan Chandra Rai Chowdhri Vice President, and the Secretary Kishori Lal Ghose. The Vice President is better known as K. C. Rai Chowdri. D 745 is that Manifesto to (tendered). I remember that during the Scavengers Strike a relief fund was started and I was elected a member of the Committee. I received a notice from the Committee, and have it here. D 746 is that notice and bears some of my handwriting on it about reply. I received a notice about a meeting in connection with the Trades Disputes Bill and other important matters to be held on 2, 9. 28 at Albert Institute. D 747 is that notice which I have here on my file. I attended that meeting. A resolution was passed, about securing the cooperation of the National Congress in opposition to the bill. I opposed the resolution, as I wanted such activities to be confined to the Unions and that we should not be relegated to a subordinate position. Ghose accused delivered a speech saying there was no such misunderstanding or misapprehension as we thought. He supported the Resolution. In connection with the visit of Purcell and Hallsworth a Manifesto was issued over the signature of the President and Secretary of the B.T.U.F. I have a copy here, but D 270 is the same. I remember the visit of Mr. Mardy Jones to Calcutta, in 1927. I received letter D 748 from Ghosh accused in that connection. I attended the All India Press Employees Conference in 1927. D 749 is a notice of that

Conference which I received. The B.T.U.F. gave an address to Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta on his election as Mayor of the Calcutta Corporation for the 3rd time. I was present. D 750 is a copy of that address. So far as I remember Ghosh accused looked after the drafting of the address. I was connected with the Bengal Mariners Union and the Indian Seaman's Union Calcutta. Ghosh accused was invited along with others to meetings of the Mariners Union. D 751 is a notice of such a meeting which I received and produce at which Ghosh was one of the speakers along with myself and Mrinal Kanti Bose and K. C. Rai Chowdri. The gentleman named as President was Mr. Fazlul Haq one time Minister in Bengal and Delegate to the Round Table Conference. I also received paper D 752 and attended that meeting. (Professor Orchard) I also received printed letter D 753, bearing the signature of Mr. Mrinal Kanti Bose which I recognise (relating to the B.T.U.F. split). D 754 is a letter I received from Mr. S. K. Dutt (same connection), D 755 is a letter relating to Chengail affairs which I received from Ghosh accused dated 29-3-28. D 756 is a postcard which I received from Ghosh accused on 4-1-29 relating to Bauria. The reference to the Kidderpore group of unions is to the Bengal Mariners Union, the Indian Seamen's Union, the Port Trust and Marine Workers Union, and the Quartermasters' Union. I received a letter dated 12-11-26 from Ghosh accused mainly about the B.T.U.F. split. The person referred to there as the Labour Dictator of Bengal was Mukund Lal Sirkar. I also received a letter from Kishori Lal Ghosh accused dated 17-8-28 with reference to a meeting of welcome to me etc. at Chengail: I tender it D 757. D 758 is a Post Card which I received also. D 263 is a letter written by me, and the cuttings from the Daily Herald with it were sent by me from London. D 267 is a copy of a letter of introduction which Ghosh accused gave to me when I was going to Europe. The original is no longer in my possession. I was once Secretary of the Port Trust Marine Workers Union. It was in the latter part of 1927. I know Abdul Halim whose name appears in P 67 as signatory and Joint Secretary. He is a seaman, and connected with the Indian Seamen's Union also. He lived in 1927 and 1928 in Mominpur Road in the house of one Sayid Minnat Ali the Treasurer of the Indian Seamen's Union and Port Trust Marine Workers Union and Bengal Mariners' Union and Quarter Masters' Union. He used to attend B.T.U.F. meetings as representative of one of these Unions.

(No other accused examines the witness as his witness).

XXN. By Crown Counsel. I did not know before I came into Court what I was going to be asked about the Jharia

Conference and the hot discussion referred to above. The only discussion I had before coming here was about some letters which I had on my file. It was within the precincts of this Court on an earlier date. I have been here since the 1st of February. The discussion was only stray remarks while passing and repassing in the Court precincts. As a lawyer I appreciate how very dangerous it is to call a witness without knowing exactly what he was going to say. I would not do it myself. The same holds good with regard to Ghosh accused. That also was stray remarks only. I came provided with all these papers because I thought it might be Kishori Lal Ghosh who had cited me. I had flagged beforehand every letter which has gone in in my evidence. In my summons I was not asked to bring anything. I had never received any letter from Kishori Lal Ghosh either about bringing papers. What I brought I brought owing to my instinct as a lawyer. I was one of those who supported sending delegates to Geneva at the Jharia discussion; Kishori Lal Ghosh also spoke supporting the proposal rather vaguely saying delegates should be sent to Geneva as it is an international forum for the ventilation of the grievances of the workers. So did Abdul Haq of the Bengal Mariners Union, Diwan Chaman Lal, Dr. Pillai, Mr. R. R. Bakhle, Aftab Ali, in support all of them. In opposition were Shib Nath Banarjee, Joglekar accused, Mr. Kulkarni, perhaps Bradley accused. I do not remember the reasons Joglekar accused gave, or Kulkarni, Bradley gave a short speech opposing saying no useful purpose was served because the Conference is an Imperialistic organ. The reason I said "perhaps Bradley" was that at first I was not sure but on further thought I did remember. By "so far as I remember" (Shib Nath was against) I meant "so far as my personal knowledge goes." I did not mean to convey any doubt about my memory but only "so far as I was concerned in the matter." I did not know what Shib Nath had said to this Court in giving his reasons for opposing the sending of a Delegate. He did not explain what he meant by saying that it diverted attention from the actual work. What I have stated he said to me was said in private conversation in the same meeting and I cannot say if he said the same in the course of his speech.

ReEXXN. The letters I referred to as flagged were those in my possession handed to the Court from my file, in answer to Kishori Lal Ghosh's questions.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

10-2-32.

D.W. 19.

Mr. Sri Prakasa, on S.A. Barrister-at-Law Residence Benares. Witness for Mukherjee accused. I am a Congressman. I was General Secretary of the U. P. Provincial Congress Committee in 1929. I have known accused Mukherjee about 10 years. As he was chief Congress worker in Gorakhpur and I was General Secretary we were closely associated together in Congress work. I thought him at that time to be an earnest Congressman, chiefly interested in the social side of Congress work. I have been many times to Gorakhpur and twice to inspect Congress work. D 204 page 1 is a Post Card dated 12-3-29 written by me to Mukherjee accused. Following that Post Card I visited Gorakhpur as I said in it that I would, and inspected the office of the District Congress Committee. I also saw in the same building the office of the Railwaymen's Association. There was also a Kisan Sabha office there. So far as I remember I did not notice any office there by the name of the Workers and Peasants Party. I remember once to have attended a meeting of peasants some miles beyond Kasia in company with Jawahar Lal Nehru and Sheo Prasad Gupta. The meeting was held at the place where an assault on Mr. Mukherjee was alleged to have taken place. We all 3 spoke on that occasion and condemned the actions of those who assaulted Mukherjee accused. I know of the U. P. Charkha Sangh. I know B. Sital Sahai of that Sangh. I also know his handwriting. I also know Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru well and can recognise his handwriting. I also know Mr. Sampurnanand and can recognise his handwriting. I also know Mr. Sahdeo Singh the head clerk of Mr. Sampurnanand's office, and his handwriting. I also know Krishan Chandra Sharma of U.P. Provincial Congress Committee, and his handwriting. D 200 (3) is in my handwriting. Presumably D 202 page 13 was issued by Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru; it is a printed circular. D 202 page 40 is the same. D. 202 page 44 is a letter from me so is page 51, D 202 pages 69, 70 is a circular which I remember to have issued. D 203 page 2 is a letter written by me, D. 203 page 4 is a circular issued from my office bearing my stamp, D 205 page 13 is also a circular which I remember issuing, D 205 page 15 bears my signature, and page 20 is in my handwriting.

I recognise the signature of B. Sital Sahai in D 205 page 5.

I recognise the signature of Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru in D 202 pages 39, 55 and 56 and D 205 page 24, and the whole writing in D 202 page 38 is his. The handwriting of Sahdeo Sing appears in the marginal note on D 202 page 61 and D 205 page 7.

Krishan Chand's signature is on D 202 page 61. I recognise the handwriting of Pt. Gobind Ballabh Pant's in D 202 pages 47 and 66 and that of Mr. C.Y. Chintamani on D 203 page 8. D 205 page 9 bears a stamped signature of Mr. Rafiq Ahmad Qidwai. I know he had such a stamp and used to use it.

I was Editor of the Aj, Benares at one time. (Accused Mukherjee states that he does not want Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru as his witness).

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

11-2-32.

By Ghosh accused. I was present at the Calcutta Session of the Indian National Congress in 1928. I do not remember whether while in the Pandal I received a copy of an appeal for the Bauria workers. I could recognise the signature of Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta. I do not remember to have received any letter from him which was all in his handwriting. I cannot recognise the initial signature on D 170. D 208 (3) is in the handwriting of Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru. Mr. Shiva Prasad Gupta mentioned therein is a friend of mine in Benares and in 1929 was one of the Treasurers of the All India Congress Committee. Pt. G. B. Pant was leader of the Swaraj Party in the U.P. Council. Mr. Sri Prakasa mentioned therein is myself. I remember vaguely that D 208 (3) relates to a subscription for some strike somewhere, possibly in Bengal. The signature in D 296 is Jawahar Lal's, so is that in enclosure No. 1, while enclosures 2 and 3 are entirely in his handwriting. I recognise his Hindi writing also. In regard to D 208 (3) Pt. Jawahar Lal said he had promised a certain sum and asked us to help. The Independence League was founded by Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru. So far as I remember its object was to induce the Congress to accept Independence as its goal.

No other accused wishes to examine witness as his witness.

XXN. Nil.

Read and admitted correct.

Correctly. Halderson
upto page 20

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

11-2-32.

Printed by O'Brien's Press, Meerut

T. M. S. Ghosh
Halderson

D.W. 20.

Kiran Chandra Mitra on S. A. Witness for Banarji and Ghosh. (Gives evidence in Hindustani) age 52.

MEMORANDUM.

I have worked in many railways particularly in E. I. Railway and O. R. Railway. The last post I held was that of station-master. I left service in 1920; as I was working in Non-Cooperation Movement I was dismissed. After that I worked in the Railwaymen's Association at Lucknow, up to 1926. It was at first the Association of the O. R. Railway but in 1925 after the O. R. R. was amalgamated with the E. I. Railway the name was changed to the E. I. Railway Association. Men of both railways were members of it. D 670 is a copy of the Rules of that Union. It was published by me. The office continued to be at Lucknow up to 1926 and after that was moved to Dinapur. The Union had a paper at Lucknow called the Weekly Mazdur. I was the Editor and Printer. It moved to Dinapur along with the office of the Union. I continued to be Editor up to 1928. I was General Secretary of the Union after it moved to Dinapur. The Union was registered at Dinapur under the Trade Unions Act in 1927 I think. In 1926 Mr. Deoki Prasad Sinha was President of the Union, and S. N. Sahai was Assistant Secretary. Mr. B. C. Mitra was Assistant Editor and Manager of the Weekly Mazdur. Many branches of the Union were opened. The biggest of these was at Lillooah. It was opened at the end of 1927. It was because the workers there had many grievances and used to write to me. The Union Committee therefore deputed me to open a branch there, and I did so. I also worked as Branch Secretary in addition to my duties as General Secretary. From 1927 a large number of members was enlisted. In January or February 1928 it was 11,000 or 12,000, subscription paying members. After the branch was started I took up grievances of the workers, by making representations to the Railway officers and interviewing them and giving publicity through the Weekly Mazdur. I got some grievances redressed. In January 1928 the relations between the workmen and the authorities were peaceful. At the end of the month there was a one-day strike about a petition by the workmen to the Agent for increase of pay etc. The Agent gave an unfavourable reply and the men were dissatisfied. One day at the midday interval they went to the Works Manager's office. He however refused to listen to them, and told them to go back to work. They did not do so and he told them that if they were not going to work they should go out of the workshop.

They went out. The District Magistrate came there and called me there. The District Magistrate was Mr. G. S. Dutt. He called me to effect a settlement. He took me to the Deputy Agent, who said the workers would get their pay for that day and should go back to work and their grievances would be considered. So work was resumed next day. Some 20 or 25 days later 6 men were dismissed but no reply was given about the grievances. They were prominent Union workers. The men were angry at this and petitioned for the reinstatement of those men to the Works Manager. 4 of them were taken back but 2 were not. That did not satisfy the men. Efforts were made on their behalf. At the same time the reply about the grievances was received. The annexure to D 207 (4) is a copy of the notification issued by the Agent, E.I. Railway. A copy of it was hung up in the Workshop in English, and Hindi. The men were excited and downed their tools and sat in the shops. I heard of it at midday and at 4 p.m. when they came out a meeting was held in Maidan. I attended it. No other outsiders attended. The leaders of the men said they would not work until they got redress. Next day however they went back to work, but instead of working they just sat idle, resisting persuasion. Next day 8th March they were locked out. I sent a wire informing the President of the Union. He came a few days later. Meanwhile meetings were being held morning and evening and I addressed them. So far as I remember no outsiders came. Workers also addressed the meetings, many of them. The object of the meetings was to keep the men together and control them so that they should not go away anywhere. We used to take a roll call. The object of control was to prevent riots. A wire was also sent to N. M. Joshi. He replied that I should meet the Agent and try to effect a settlement. On that wire I and the President and some workmen interviewed the Agent. I selected the men at a meeting. Nothing was settled with the Agent and he was not willing to listen to us. Some 10 or 12 grievances were mentioned to him. We had discussed the grievances beforehand in our Committee. After our return there was a meeting in the evening when the men were informed. The men said they would continue the struggle until their grievances were settled. A statement was issued by the President on behalf of the Union which appears on pages 1 and 2 of the Weekly Mazdur dated 21-3-28. The President then went away to Europe on business. The strike went on under my guidance. After that when no hope of settlement appeared I issued an appeal to all the Unions in Calcutta for money and men. D 146 (15) pages 1 and 3 contain that appeal. Other similar appeals were issued. Such is D 127, which bears my

signature. A Conference was held at Lillooah to which many persons came. It is mentioned in D 127. After it some workers came to help, Spratt accused Gopen Chakravarty and Mani Babu and Mukand Lal Sirkar, and many others. Mukand Lal was the first. He stayed some 15 days at Lillooah, at the Union Office. He had invited Singaravelu Chettiar of Madras. Singaravelu's policy and mine did not agree, and so both of them went away. I suggested they should go if they did not agree with me. Spratt came a day or so after the Conference, to see the strike but as he did not know Hindi he could not do much work. Spratt used to attend some meetings. Meetings continued to be held twice daily throughout the strike so far as I remember. Most of the meetings were addressed by me or by the workers. I had called my Assistant Secretary Sahain Babu from Dinapur and Mr. B. C. Mitra Manager of the Mazdur. They also used to speak.

I know Shib Nath Banarjee accused. The President Mr. Sinha mentioned him to me once when I was at Dinapur. I was then ill and going on leave, and had asked for someone to be appointed General Secretary. Shib Nath was sent for from Calcutta to work at Dinapur. It was about the middle of 1927, probably June. He was however unable to come to Dinapur. Work increased at Dinapur and I was unable to go on leave and then I went away to Lillooah. There Shib Nath came to see me. I told him that when I wanted his help I would send for him. He used to come and see me from time to time. At the time of Purcell and Hallsworth's visit about January 1928 Shib Nath took me to them to introduce me to them. A reception was organised for them at Lillooah and Shib Nath helped in organising it. It was on behalf of the Union. After the Bamangachhi firing I sent for Shib Nath to help in the strike.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

11-2-32.

I called him to help in the inquiry and in conducting it and looking after the interests of the Union. He was then taken as Joint Secretary of the E. I. Railway Union. He remained so until the end of August 1928. After that I went on leave and he acted as General Secretary. Possibly I returned from leave in September. After my return he continued as Joint Secretary. In the time of the strike his duty was to conduct court cases and to do his best to enlist Congress sympathy and help, and to attend and speak at Union meetings. He was given Court work because

he was on terms of acquaintance with many barristers, and Congress work because there his janpahchan (acquaintance) was to a special degree. After Bamangachi others also came to assist such as Subash Bose, J. M. Sen Gupta, and others, and officebearers of the Railway Unions and other Unions, and Andrews and Giri and Naidu and other labour leaders. They used to attend and address the daily meetings. There were 2 meetings a day for 4 months that is over 200 in all. The most frequent speakers were myself, Godbole, S. N. Sahai, K. D. Bose, and certain of the workmen. Banarjee accused also sometimes spoke when he had leisure to attend the meetings. I do not remember up to when S. N. Sahai remained helping us. Spratt accused may have spoken in 3 or 4 meetings in all. Muzaffar Ahmad also came to Lillooah during the strike sometimes, 2 or 3 times altogether. He never spoke at meeting. He was called because he knew well the work of Secretariat but he did not do anything. D 146 (1) and (5) to (11) and D 160 (1) & (2) were edited by me (copies of Weekly Mazdur). The editorials in these were written by me. I used to write them at Lillooah and send them to Dinapur where the paper was printed. The 3 telegrams printed at foot page 2 and top page 3 in D 146 (10) were sent by me and are copies of the originals. The statement of the Agent on page 3 is printed from a copy given by a workman from the workshop where it was hung up. I do not remember at what meeting what resolution was passed zabani. After meeting the resolution printed at page 3 of D 146 (9) witness said I do not remember that this resolution was passed. It must have been passed. I can not say who sent this report to be printed there. I attended a meeting at which the persons mentioned in this report were present. I issued the statements headed Workers' Demands and More Light printed at pages 3 & 4 of D 160 (1) Weekly Mazdur. (Witness took 5 minutes to read these through before being able to answer). The Agent's Communique on page 4 was printed from a copy given to me from those hung up in the workshop. On page 3 of same number the article Bamangachi news was not written by me. As far as I think the article Retrenchment Win Workshop on page 3 of D 146 (7) was written by me. The Agent's Circular there referred to was received by me through the workshop. I attended the Shradhdhanand Park meeting mentioned in D 146 (7). By Court. I do not remember its date. By Counsel. The resolutions mentioned at page 5 of the same issue were passed at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Union. The Appeal for Help which appears on page 5 of D 146 (5) was written by me. In D 146 (3) the notices of All Bengal Labour Conference and Labour Procession were both issued by me.

News of the Lillooah Strike was mostly published in the Forward and Amrita Bazar Patrika. Their reporters used to visit my office, and attend the meetings. When I had leisure I used to read the reports. If there was anything special the office clerks used to show the reports to me. I had read the report in D 160 (4) cutting at the time of its publication. I was present at the meeting mentioned therein. The resolution printed here was passed. After that resolution was passed I began to correspond with other Unions and with the A.I.T.U.C. and B.T.U.F. asking them to take steps against the retrenchment. The retrenchment further excited the men and affected the strike therefore. I was not present at the Bamangachi incident on 28th March but I had taken a procession to the Agent's office that morning. I was the leader and I had 10,000 or 12,000 workmen with me. It was to speak about a settlement. It was in accordance with a decision at workers' meeting. The Agent asked for a deputation of 20 men. I went in it with 19 workmen. The Agent heard the men but made no settlement. We came back. At about 5 p.m. I heard the news of the firing, and went to the spot. The Union instituted a case before the Magistrate. In that connection the Magistrate held an inquiry and I deputed Banarjee accused in that inquiry. Banarjee accused was not present with the deputation that went to the Agent. I met him that day, then said, I met him on 29th March but not on 28th. There was a meeting at Albert Hall after the Bamangachi shooting and I attended it. I read a report of the meeting in the Forward or Amrita Bazar. Perhaps B. Mrinal Kanti Bose presided. I also spoke there. Resolutions appointing a Non-Official Inquiry Committee and a Medical Committee were passed. The Non-Official Committee held an inquiry. Banarjee accused worked on that Committee for the Union. Mr. Andrews came a week after the shooting to hear the case and to arrange a settlement. Banarjee accused brought him from Calcutta. He had an interview with the Agent and after it the B. T. U. F. held a meeting at Wellington Square of which Mr. Andrews was President. At that meeting Mr. Andrews reduced the demands, and asked the Secretary B. T. U. F. to take a deputation with those reduced demands to the Agent. The Agent however refused to meet the deputation of the B. T. U. F. 8 or 10 days later we filed an application to the Howrah Magistrate Mr. Douglas. I and all the strikers went. Banarjee accused and Mandal Babu also went. The Magistrate sent for the Railway officer and he came and talked to us but nothing was settled. We asked Mr. Douglas to help us get the arrears of pay or settle the strike. I had written letters to him and received replies and may perhaps recognise his signature. D 674 bears

his signature, and this is the order which came to us after the meeting. (Mr. Sinha wishes to prove the application made to the District Magistrate of Howrah by means of a copy of a newspaper. It was presented in a Court and the proper secondary evidence if the original is not obtainable (which is not shown to be the case) is a certified copy). Banarjee was present at the talk with the Railway officer. I do not remember anything special he did. The Magistrate's order was explained to the workers at a meeting that evening. They were disappointed. A fresh application was made to the Magistrate that the dues should be made or arrangements made for feeding the strikers. The Magistrate arranged an interview with the Agent and we went. It was 2 or 3 days later. Mr. Douglas was there and I and Ghosh accused, and B. P. Pyne and Banarjee accused and some workmen. There was a long discussion with the Agent but without any result. The demands had been still further reduced. On our return we informed the men at a meeting at Howrah Maidan. It was decided that if no settlement could be arrived at the strike should be extended along the line. Men were accordingly sent along the line to do this. To Ondal Spratt and Dharni Goswami accused were sent and one man from the Union; they had been called in to help and were not officebearers of the Union. There were no other persons available to send. We were very busy at Lillooah. I do not remember but perhaps it was I who proposed extending the strike along the line. The idea was to put pressure on the authorities. Many workers spoke at the meeting on that proposal. Ondal and Asansol men had also come to that meeting. The workers who spoke supported the proposal, so did the Ondal men and Asansol men. I do not know if Spratt accused was present at that meeting or not. Nor do I recall how many persons spoke on the proposal. After 8 or 10 days steps were taken for extending the strike. I think the delay was due to arrangement being made for doing Satyagraha at Howrah Court. There was a quarrel about it. Satyagraha was due to the workers thinking something about a settlement might come out of it. I do not remember if any appeal was made after the decision to extend the strike. I went on the line myself later, some 6 days after the strike started at Ondal. That was perhaps at the beginning of June. Men were being sent and meetings held at Ondal, Asansol and Sitarampur for extending the strike. To Ondal later Noni Babu, Radha Raman Mitra and Sahai and Godbole went. The same went to Asansol. Noni Babu Mukherjee was Branch Secretary of the Ondal Branch. The expenses of sending them were paid by the Union. These persons worked there according to my "rai" that is they consulted me and acted on my instructions. Reports and telegrams used to be

sent to me from those places. I do not remember any visit of a Government or Railway officer after the Ondal and Asansol strikes or at that time. I used to meet Mr. G. S. Dutt District Magistrate of Howrah daily. I also interviewed the Governor, in the hope of a settlement being effected, but without result. I received a reply a few days later. Later I went to the Agent along with Kunwar Arun Singh and that also had no result. The strike went on to 10th July when it was called off. I was at Lillooah at the time. It was called off because the funds were at an end and the men were suffering, and exhausted. The decision to call off the strike was reached at a meeting at Lillooah where I explained the situation to the men. The strike ended at Lillooah that day and men were sent along the line to call off the strike. I think Spratt and Banarjee and Dinesh Chandra Roy were sent. So the strike was called off at Ondal and Asansol also. Those who had gone to conduct the strike came back to Lillooah and their respective homes. Spratt perhaps came back to where he was living at Calcutta. After that there were no relations between Spratt and the Union. Banarjee returned to Lillooah and continued to work as Joint Secretary. D 146 (15) sheets 2 and 4 are appeals issued by me, during the strike. These appeals were sent out to all Unions, Works and everywhere. I received monetary assistance from the A.I.T.U.C., B.T.U.F., A.I.R.F., B.N. Railway Union, E.B.R.U., and other Calcutta Unions and also from Congress and Khilafat Committees. An Anna Fund was also started. I also went to Kanchrapara, Srirampur, Titagarh and other places myself with men to collect subscriptions. Money also came from outside India, from England, Amsterdam and Russia. I do not know from what bodies. English money came through the A.I.T.U.C. It is my idea that an account was kept of all the money received and spent, and published in the newspapers. It must have been published in the Weekly Mazdur, Forward or Patrika. I certainly sent such accounts to the newspapers. I sent the portion headed Account of Foreign Help at the foot of column 4 in D 124 (19) for publication. The letter printed in the cutting D 126 (1) is mine. D 672 is another appeal which I issued. The manuscript writing at foot is not mine. Appeals were issued in English, Hindi and Bengali and Urdu.

The notice about an All-Bengal Labour Conference was inserted in D 146 (3) because it had been decided by the Lillooah Union to hold such a conference. Notices were issued to various labour centres and associations by me as General Secretary of the E.I.R.U. D 149 (1) & (2) are notices of the Conference and Procession which I sent to newspapers like those in D 146 (3).

I sent others also to other newspapers. Some 15 or 20 days before the National Congress I and Banerjee accused went to Dr. B. C. Roy General Secretary of the Reception Committee of the Indian National Congress and gave him a written petition for permission to hold a Labour Conference in the Congress Pandal during the National Congress. The permission was granted. A written permission was given to us. (Note; both the above replies which contain statements as to the contents of documents not produced are ruled out). I issued the vernacular notices D 161 and D 277 (3 sheets) which are shown. D 684 is a license for a procession 13-10-28 which I received from the Police. D 73 (8) is a notice issued and signed by me. The procession in D 684 and D 73 (8) was a rehearsal for the procession to be held at the Labour Conference. It started at Lillooah. I led it. D. C. Roy and S. R. Mandal also took part.

The procession of which this was the rehearsal actually took place on 30th December 1928. That also started from Lillooah and was led by me and Banarjee accused and D.C. Roy and Mandal and Radha Raman Mitra accused. Spratt and Muzaffar Ahmad accused were not there, and had nothing to do with that procession. The procession went from Lillooah to the Ochterlony Monument Maidan, where it has been arranged that workers from Matiaburz and Titagarh and Kidderpnr etc should meet. Those workers were led to the Maidan by the leaders of their Unions.

D 685 is a license which I received from the Police Commissioner about the procession of 30th December. I reached the Ochterlony Monument at 8 or 9 a.m. We left there at 10.30 or 11 a.m. We were delayed there because the Deputy Commissioner of Police stopped us there for a short time. I cannot say why he stopped us. After that he allowed us to go on. From there we continued to lead the procession and B. Rajendra Prasad of Patna and Mani Lal Kothari Congressmen were with us. Spratt and Muzaffar accused were not with us. We went to the gate of the Congress. We found the gate closed. It was about 12.30 or 1 p.m. and the Congress time was approaching. The gatekeepers refused to let us in. I sent 2 or 3 men to Pandit Moti Lal Nehru and we got permission to go in. We went in and held our conference in the Congress pandal. Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru was President of our Congress. He and Pt. Moti Lal Nehru and I spoke and Radha Raman Mitra accused and 2 or 4 others. The meeting lasted an hour. As we were going out Gandhi arrived and made a speech also. He did it standing on a motor inside the gate. The Conference was held to enlist the sympathy of

Congress leaders for the grievances of the workers. I mentioned them in my speech. After that the Conference ended and we came away.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

12-2-32.

After the lockout began the workshop gate was first opened again on 25th or 26th May. Many men went in that day but did no work. On that occasion Mr. Douglas called me into the workshop and asked me to take the men out as they were not working. I asked the men to come out and they did so. At 4 p.m. the usual meeting was held and it was decided in it that if the gate was opened the men would go in but not work. Next day gate was again opened. The men on duty at the gate asked the men to affix their thumb impressions to a statement that if they went in they would work. Some did so and went in but they did not work. The workshop authorities turned them out. There was again a meeting and it was decided that the men would not go in till a settlement was reached, and the Union instructed the men to go in. After that the men did not go in till the strike was called off. In India the greatest amount of help in the strike was received from the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee. They gave us Rs. 7000 at the beginning and at end of June or beginning of July Rs. 2000. For the latter amount I and Banarjee went to Subash Bose, to ask for help. He gave us rice worth Rs. 2000, not cash. In the early stages the Union had funds for distributing relief; that was up to May. After that we got help from the B.T.U.F., and after that the Congress at end of May took charge, and helped up to 2nd or 3rd July. I used to produce the accounts of all moneys received and expended before the Executive Committee of the Union at Dinapur. The total amount expended during the strike was about Rs. 43,000 or 44,000. The accounts were audited by a Chartered Accountant, as required by the Trade Unions Act, for submission to Government. In my opinion no financial help was received from the Workers' and Peasants' Party in the strike. My Union also received no money from that Party before or after the strike. When we went to interview the Governor the demands had again been reduced below the reduction made by Mr. Andrews. At the time of Kunwar Arun Singh's intervention the demands had been even further reduced. The only demands then were: No Victimisation and Recognition of the Union.

There was a Factory Workers' Union at Howrah with office at Telkaghat. It was founded I think in January 1928. I was

the founder, and President. Banarjee accused never had anything to do with that Union.

I attended the A. I. T. U. C. Jharia Congress as representative of the E. I. R. U. Banarjee accused and B. C. Mitra were also representing it there. We all 3 stayed together in the delegates' camp. I attended that Congress throughout. We used to receive daily agenda in advance, and the 3 of us used to discuss them, and decide how we should vote, and speak. We all 3 did as we had decided to do, and voted together. I spoke on the 1st day. The 2nd day I was unwell and did not speak Banarjee accused spoke once or twice that day.

We all 3 also attended the meetings of the A. I. R. F. Conference. Our Union was not affiliated that year. But we got special permission from the President to attend. I was also allowed to speak on a special proposal. We did not vote as we were not authorised to do so. D 675 is in my handwriting. It is in reply to a letter which I received from Banarjee accused. That letter was in the Asansol Office. I cannot say where it is now. The Asansol files came to the Lillooah office. Mr. Saha mentioned in D 675 was a reporter of the Englishman, and had come to me with news about the settlement from K. Arun Singh. So far as I remember the terms were amended by Arun Singh. D 677 (1) to (6) are all in my handwriting. Ratanganj is my home. I had gone there ill. I know the handwriting of B. C. Mitra. D 683 (1) to (5) are in his handwriting and (6) to (8) bears his signature and some writing in his hand. I know J. N. Chattarji accountant of my Union and his handwriting and signature. D 679 and 680 are both his. Dinesh Chandra Roy was clerk in the Lillooah branch of my Union and I know his handwriting. D 681 and 682 are in his handwriting. In D 677 (2) the person referred to as Gopal is my nephew whose name is Promodh Kumar Dutt. Gopal is his home name.

By Ghosh accused. D 207 (9) bears my stamped signature. I sent this letter to the Secretary B. T. U. F. I attended public meetings under the auspices of the B. T. U. F., three meetings. The object of those meetings was to collect funds for the Lillooah strikers. I attended a meeting held at Beadon Square, and one held at Wellington Square. At the Beadon Square Meeting B. Mrinal Kanti Bose at first presided, and after some time B. Subash Chandra Bose came and presided. A resolution was passed to form a deputation to wait upon the Agent, for settlement of the strike. The terms stated were the minimum demands stated by Mr. Andrews in the Wellington Square meeting, which had been held the day before. I received a copy of

correspondence between Ghose accused and the Agent. Those copies will be in the Union office. I am not now connected with the E. I. Railway Union. I did not as Secretary of the Union receive any letters from the Agent. I may have received one or 2 from his office. I do not remember who signed them. The Committee which was appointed to form the deputation at the Beadon Square meeting was C. F. Andrews, Subash Bose, Satyendra Nath Bose, Kishori Lal Ghose, myself, Mrinal Kanti Bose, and 2 or 4 more. S.N. Bose is a M.A.L. The Agent refused to receive this deputation. I first saw Ghose accused at Lillooah in the middle of February probably, along with Mrinal Kanti Bose; I had asked accused and Mrinal Babu to come and address a meeting. The next time I saw him was with Mrinal Babu and Tushab Kanti Ghose at the office of the Amrita Bazar Patrika, when I went there with Mr. D.P. Sinha. I had asked Mr. Sinha to ask the B.T.U.F. to help us in the strike as he was going to Europe. It was a day or 2 after the strike began. 5 or 7 days later Mrinal Babu and accused Ghose visited the Lillooah office. Mr. Ghose said he had come to write the grievances of the workers and their demands with a view to writing them to the A.I.T.U.C. He did take notes. I received letters from Mr. N.M. Joshi Secretary A.I.T.U.C., in the course of the strike. (Witness is asked to prove D 208 (14) and (16) copies of letters received by him as Secretary of the E.I.R.U. Question disallowed. The originals are in the E.I.R. Office and have not been called for. Prosecution objects). Before the strike was called off I consulted other people besides the workers at the meeting referred to above. I consulted the Secretary A. I. R. F. B., A.N. Bose, Subash Bose, Mrinal Kanti Bose, Kishori Lal Ghose accused, J. M. Sen Gupta, and others who had helped in the strike. I issued a statement to the Press about the calling off of the strike, and saw it in the newspapers. It was probably in Forward or Amrita Bazar, a few days after the calling off of the strike, and was correctly reproduced. I sent a cable to Moscow for help for the strikers. I did not consult Ghose accused about doing that. The cable was refused as objectionable. It was published in the English newspapers in Calcutta and comments were made against the workers because of it. Afterwards I had some talk with Ghose accused about it. He told me the Cawnpore A.I.T.U.C., had decided that Unions should not send wires to Europe direct but if it was necessary it should be through the A.I.T.U.C. I did not know of the resolution. I received the money from Russia at the end of May or beginning of June at time of the Baqr Id. I got the money from Lloyds' Bank. In order to get the money I had to and did get myself identified before the District Magistrate.

I was the leader of the Lillooah strike. The control did not at any stage pass into any other hands. I used to see statements of accounts from time to time published over the name of Ramanand Chattarjee. They were like D 174 (5). I used to receive money from B.T.U.F., but I cannot say how much.

(No other accused wishes to examine the witness as his witness.)

XXN. No accused wishes to cross-examine the witness. By Crown Counsel. The Weekly Mazdur was started in 1924. I was the Editor then and until the middle of 1928. I find a difficulty in expressing myself in English because I have never given evidence in Court before. I speak Hindustani better than I speak English I think. The English phrases used by me yesterday and quoted to me are not good Hindustani. I read mostly Forward, Amrita Bazar Patrika and occasionally Englishman when any article of mine appears. The accused Spratt did suggest the extension of the strike to Ondal and up the line. The other people who sent the wire to Russia with me were Spratt and Muzaffar Ahmad accused. I cannot recall if it was addressed to Profintern. Nor do I remember hearing the name of Profintern. I cannot say if the money that came from Russia came from the All-Russian Cooperative Bank, nor can I remember the name of the person who sent it. Nor would I remember if I heard it. I do not know the name Lozovsky. When we went with the petition about the Labour Conference I saw Dr. B. C. Roy and gave him the petition. There was a copy of that petition. The answer was in the office. I do not know if it is still there. I do not remember if I saw a copy of the Forward of 30th December 1928. I do not remember what day it was. (D 54 (2) page 15 Col. 2 para. headed "a misunderstanding.") The statement in the first 2 sentences implying that permission was not granted for the holding of the Labour Conference in the Congress Pandal is not true. Forward is the official paper of Congress. I cannot say whether there was in Forward of 30th December an official statement that permission was not granted. (Issue of Forward of 30-12-28 page 6 col. 6 shown to witness headed False Rumour. Also at page 7 col. 4 headed also False Rumour). It was not possible for the publicity Secretary of the Congress to put in such a notice as the latter as the notice of the Labour Conference was appearing daily in the Forward. It is false that permission was not given. In the former passage the statement that no permission had been applied for or had been given was false. I cannot remember whether I saw Amrita Bazar Patrika that day or the next. I saw an account

of the procession in the papers next day but I do not recall what paper. (Prosecution tenders the copy of Forward containing the 2 passages referred to which are marked P 2616 (1) and (2). Copies to be taken and marked as P 2616 (1) and (2) C and the original returned.)

It is not a fact that it is untrue that permission was ever granted.

I was not aware whether Banarjee was authorised to attend the A. I. T. U. C., Jharia Session as a delegate of the Bengal Juteworkers' Association. I do not remember on what point I spoke at the A. I. T. U. C. meeting, or on what point Banarjee spoke. I have been convicted twice for defamatory articles in the Weekly Mazdur.

ReXXN. Spratt accused made the suggestion to extend the strike 4 or 6 times. The first time was probably at the end of March or beginning of April. He continued to make the suggestion up to the time he was actually sent. The last time was about the end of May. I did not agree to accept the suggestion, the first time it was made and said Not Yet. I went on making that reply up to end of May. The names of Spratt and Muzaffar were put in the telegram to Russia because I did not know anything about things in Russia. Volunteers: They told me that money could be got from there if a telegram was sent. I did not consult the Executive Committee before sending that telegram. I did ask Sahai Babu and B. C. Mitra of my office before sending it. When the telegram was returned everyone in the office saw it. After the telegram came back Banarjee accused said it should not have been sent, and you should not have put your name along with these people.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

13-2-32.

DW. 21.

Mr. L. G. Khare, on S. A. Witness for Desai accused. I am the Editor of the Bombay Chronicle. Its circulation is about 18,000 to 20,000 per day. I am a B. A. of Cambridge University. I studied Journalism also and worked on the Tribune in 1908 and 1909. From 1916 I began to work as a Journalist in this country.

I have been associated with the Bombay Chronicle from that time. I went on as a Special Correspondent for some 10 years. From 1926 I was understudy to the Editor Mr. Brelvi. My special job was to collect Labour Statistics and deal with International Politics. I have acted as Editor informally when Mr. Brelvi was away and formally when he went to Jail at the time of the Civil Disobedience agitation. I was Editor and proprietor of a weekly paper called "The Indian Nationalist" which ran for about 2 years. I stopped working on it as my duties on the Chronicle left me no time. The Chronicle has correspondents in different parts of the world. The Chief Editor appoints them. As a rule no one else in the office knows the names unless they are correspondents who want their names to be known. I know Mr. Brelvi's handwriting and signature, D 760 and 761 bear Mr. Brelvi's signature, as does D. 726. I know Mr. M.R. Jayakar who is a friend of mine. The signature on D. 763 is his. I know M. G. Desai accused in Court. He was a member of our staff, at the end of 1927 and left it after about a month. Several weeks later he came to see me. He came to see me about a weekly journal, at the instance of Mr. Brelvi. He wanted to consult me about the business prospects of a weekly paper. I advised him against it as no weekly had any prospects unless it were to be a special kind of paper. One must have means of one's own to do it. If it were going to be a paper of the type of The New Leader it could not be sold for more than 2 pice. After a long time he came again. He told me he was determined on the new venture and wanted to put money in it. I warned him again saying I had lost Rs 4000 over mine but he said he was going to do it. He asked me to suggest a name. I said it was difficult but for a weekly the name should be short and significant. He asked me to suggest 4 or 5 names as a lot of weeklies came to my office and I suggested he should call it the Champion, but warned him against the printer's devil who might make it into Champagne. I also suggested Torch but he did not like it. So I suggested Spark from the Electric Spark and said I hope it would not be an intermittent sort of Spark, and then went away. I saw the first issue of the Spark. I know a Mr. Dhairyawan. He is my night Sub Editor. I gave him leave twice to go to do something for the Spark. My paper receives articles and contributions containing views which are not in consonance with the official views of the paper. We publish such if they are worth having. We dont nowadays append any note to the effect that we dont agree with our correspondent's views. That is out-of-date journalism. I know Spratt accused in Court. He came to the Chronicle office once to see me, in connection with an article on Miners' Cost of Living which he had contributed. Under

Mr. Brelvi's instructions I asked him to finish the article and give me the second part of it. He came once again (I saw him only twice at the office). I introduced Spratt to Desai accused who happened to come in saying that Desai was a man who had worked in the New Leader office and was interested in the collection of Labour Statistics. I then went on with my own work. The Sunday Worker used to come to our office, not regularly but some stray issues now and then. Some 2 years ago I used also to see a Communist paper called Inprecorr coming to the office. I have also seen publications of the League against Imperialism. Some of its pamphlets used sometimes to come to our office. We have a Correspondent for the Bombay Chronicle in Moscow also, and we publish his contributions, over his name which is Aziz or A. Aziz. We include articles on Russia in the Sunday edition almost every week. That is because it is an item of news value. (Mr. Sinha tenders 13 Sunday issues of the Bombay Chronicle which are marked D 764.)

No other accused wishes to examine Mr. Khare as his witness.)

XXN. By accused. Nil.

By Crown Counsel. My age is 44 and I took my degree in 1910 and came out to India at the end of 1910. At first I taught people French and German from then to 1922 or 1923. One year I was Professor in French also. After that my Chronicle work which had been by contribution and going round as Special Correspondent increased. I ran the Indian Nationalist in 1924 and 1925. About a month after Desai left the Chronicle. I found that he had gone to the Indian National Herald. It was a couple of months after he left us that he first came to consult me about his paper. It was then he told me that he was in the Indian National Herald. He did not mention to me the financial condition of the Herald. I gathered from his talk that he wanted to leave the Herald but I did not ask him why. Some months later the Herald collapsed. His first visit I should estimate to be in February 1928 and the second about April. I cant say if the Herald has collapsed by the time of the second visit. The name accused Desai himself suggested for his paper was I think the Guardian. I said the name was too common. He also suggested Nationalist but I objected that it was too near the name of my paper which I hoped to revive. It would not have been a rival as mine was a heavy sort of paper costing 2 annas. I always read the articles on Russia which appear in the Bombay Chronicle. I have also read many books on the Russian Revolution. I know who Lenin was, I did not know that Lenin ever ran a paper. What I knew was that he

was a Prince who turned Communist. I had read a book by Michael Farman and also Lenin and Gandhi by Rene Fullop-Miller. I read them when they appeared and I should say before this talk with Desai, about the name for his paper. I cant name off hand any other book on Russia or Lenin I had read. I am not aware that Lenin ever had anything to do with a paper called the Spark. Desai accused has never told me what the point was in this case about his editorship of the Spark and I dont know yet what the point is. The passage on page 64 in D. 302 Lenin and Gandhi by R. Fullop-Miller (the whole of the last para on that page) was read by witness who said : I skipped a lot of this and never read that passage (about Iskra (or spark.) I did not read the first number of Desai's Spark I'm afraid. My paper did not comment on it. I did not see it commented on in any other paper. He did not ask me and I did not offer to write anything for his paper. I have sometimes read Sunday Worker and Inprecorr. I dont know if they are prohibited. I gathered they must be prohibited because they did not come to the office for the last 2 years. They did not come regularly at any time. No one else was present at either of my 2 conversations with Desai accused. They took place in my personal office in the Chronicle office. I was then Assistant Editor and had a private room. I mentioned these conversations to Mr. Brelvi. I dont know if he is coming as a witness. He is in prison. Mr. Dhairyawan has been in the Chronicle some 12 years. Desai told me he had enough means to start a paper. He did not say he did not mind if it failed. I dont know when he was finally out of a job. I did not keep in close touch with him. About April I learnt that he had left the Herald I think; I learnt that there was some quarrel between him and the Herald people. He had had the quarrel before he came to me the second time. I had heard it. He said to me that he was not satisfied with the Herald people. I asked him why and he said it was a question of money or something, some financial trouble. I saw Desai accused when he came to Bombay on bail. He said he wanted some files of the Daily and Sunday Bombay Chronicle. He did not see Mr. Brelvi, he could not. Mr. Brelvi was under detention and Desai could not see him. I did not ask him (Desai) how he was getting on in his case. I did not see him again till I saw him here. I arrived here last Thursday and have seen him at my hotel. I did not talk to him about the case. I told him I was quite comfortable in the hotel and asked him to go away as I had a lot of work to do which I have brought with me. I am afraid I have not read any number of Desai's Spark.

I first met Spratt accused at the beginning of December 1927. I get the date by remembering that we were writing comments on the Miners' Strikes in Britain and their cost of living then. Desai had just been taken on at the end of November as a permanent member of our staff. The conversation with Spratt was also in my private room and no one else was present except Mr. Desai who happened to come in. On Spratt's second visit no one at all was present. I don't know what Desai's objection was to the name 'Torch'. I would not be prepared to say that for the newspaper boys 'Torch' was easier to shout than 'Ishpark'. I don't know anything about any articles contributed by Desai accused as a Correspondent from England to the 'Chronicle'. I don't know the Mr. Field mentioned in D. 760.

(No accused claims any right to cross examine the witness).
I never had any letters from Desai or came across him except 4 or 5 times when I sent for him for some mistake, or something.

REXXX. (Question asked of witness, "To what political party do you belong" disallowed as not arising in REXXXN). I have no sympathy at all with Communism and very little interest in it.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

15-2-32.

D.W. 22.

Mr. K. P. Khadilkar, an S. A. Journalist, Bombay, 60. I am the proprietor of Sri Dattatraya and of 2 daily newspapers Nawakal a Marathi daily and Swadhin Bharat a Hindu daily. I pay supertax on an income exceeding Rs. 50,000 per annum. I have been a journalist since 1926. I am a dramatist since 1894.

I began my journalist career with the Kesri of Poona, as Sub-Editor under the late Lokmaniya Tilak. I also acted as Chief Editor of the paper, and was connected with the paper till his death in 1920. Kesri's normal circulation was about 30,000 but it rose at times to 50,000. After Tilak's death I came from Poona to Bombay and became Editor of a Marathi daily called Lokman, for about 2 years. Its circulation was 8,000 to 10,000. I left it owing to difference of opinion among the directors.

In 1922 Tilak's followers fell into 2 camps, one under N.C. Kelkar of Poona being for Responsive Cooperation and the other for Gandhi's full programme. I was one of the strong advocates of the Gandhi policy. For that purpose I started my own paper the Nawakal, as a daily. I also founded my own press. I was editor of the Nawakal till February 1929. Since then my son is the editor. I know Desai accused. I came to know him at the beginning of 1928. He was working on the National Herald staff. One of my sub-editors introduced him to me. As he was newly returned from England and said he had journalistic experience and I was wanting to start an English monthly then I asked him if he would like to serve on my staff. I did not actually start that monthly. I know Desai's paper the Spark. It was printed at my press. Desai first spoke to me about the middle of 1928 and asked for quotations. He was getting quotations from other places also. After a few weeks he came back to me and said that as he was sure to incur loss I should encourage him by giving him certain concessions. I advised him to issue as small a paper as possible, as so that the loss might not exceed Rs. 500 to 600 per annum. He then asked me to give quotations for the present size of Spark at concession rates. He said he would start it at the end of January or beginning of February 1929 as he was on the staff of National Herald till the end of 1928. I asked him the policy of his paper. He said it would be a Socialist paper conducted on the line of the Daily Herald of London. I did not ask for any security because I knew he came from a well-to-do family. This arrangement was made complete in about November or December 1928. Desai used to come many times in the week on business after that to my office. The date fixed for starting the paper was the 1st week of February. It actually started the last week of January. I had suggested to him that it would be better if it started then for publicity, as there were the Bombay municipal elections. They were on the 29th of January. He accepted my suggestion. Nimbkar accused had approached me for giving publicity to his views because he wanted support in his candidature in the elections. He wanted it for the Labour Party candidates. I had said to him that as the Congress had rejected the Labour Party candidates and I was a member of the Congress I would not be able to give him full support in my paper the Nawakal. But I would give second place to the Labour Party candidates in my paper. I suggested to him that if he approached Desai he would get proper support, as the new English weekly was a Labour weekly. Nimbkar said he was not acquainted with Mr. Desai, and asked me to induce Desai to advocate their cause. He left Manifestoes and other literature with me for Desai's use. I gave that literature to Desai and suggested his having his 1st

issue in the last week of January. I did give some support to Nimbkar and the Labour Party candidates in my paper. (As the Congress had not put in the full number of candidates for all the seats I advised my readers in an editorial of Nawakal to give support to the Labour candidates after giving their first support to the Congress candidates). My paper also published the manifestoes of the Labour Party candidates. I supported the candidature of Nimbkar and the other Labour candidates because during the 1928 Textile strike they had worked very energetically in the cause of the workers. I knew Nimbkar as a Congress worker from before. P. 1262 (1st issue of Spark) Shown the note in italics at the top of column 3 of page 1 and asked if he remembers anything about it witness said: Yes. When the 1st issue was ready for publication I happened to see Desai in the Press and asked him if anything had been put in explaining why the paper was appearing a week earlier and the 2nd issue would not appear for a fortnight. Desai said he would make arrangements immediately to put in the necessary explanation. I know Mr. Dhairyawan. He is a journalist working on the Chronicle staff and related to Desai accused. Desai had told me that he himself would look after the whole business of the Spark and that in his absence none else but Mr. Dhairyawan should be allowed to do it. Mr. Dhairyawan used often to come to my press in connection with the Spark.

(No other accused examines Mr. Khadilkar as his witness).

This piece of evidence is objected to as proof of contents of a document. The objection is clearly sound and the evidence stands as struck off the record.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

15-2-32.

XXN. No accused wishes to cross examine witness.

By Crown Counsel. I know the Daily Herald of London and have seen and read it. It bears a resemblance to the Spark in Policy. I know of the existence of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. I knew Dange and Nimbkar as the leaders of that party, also Joglekar. I had heard of Mirajkar but was not well acquainted with him. I may have seen his photograph or even published it in Nawakal but I cant remember him. I have not seen any of the literature of the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay. I believed their policy to be on the same lines as the Daily Herald of London. It was not Desai who told me. I got it from reading the reports of the meetings such as strike

meetings in the daily papers of Bombay. I was arrested on 14-2-29, and charged under section 124 A and convicted in connection with an article on the causes of the Bombay riots. I got 1 year's simple imprisonment and fine of Rs. 2000. Prior to my arrest I was closely in touch with Congress activities in Bombay not with all that was going on. Almost all the meetings to which I referred above as those from which I got the policy of W.P.P. were connected with Congress. Some of them may not have been. I cant give an instance. I know of a public meeting in celebration of the anniversary of the Death of Lenin. I did not attend it and dont know if it was under Congress auspices. I did not see the account of that meeting in Spark. I only saw the 1st number of Spark. I looked at the paper to see what its policy was and whether what Desai had told me was realised. I did not notice the column headed Lenin is dead, not Leninism. I did not notice that there was an account of this Lenin Day meeting. I know C. G. Shah by name. I did not read the article on page 6 over his name entitled Storm in Heaven. In the editorial I just read a few sentences where the policy of the paper was enunciated. I did not read the whole editorial. I stopped before I came to the end. I did not read the Article entitled Dominion Status appearing over the name M. G. Desai. I read no subsequent issue of Spark. Mr. Dhairyawan is a cousin of Desai on the sister's side. I did not attend any Lenin Day meeting apart from 1929. Important events in Bombay are recorded in my paper. An account of a Lenin Day meeting might have appeared. I dont remember I cant say if any account of the meeting to celebrate the Anniversary of the Russian Revolution appeared in my paper.

(No accused claims any right to cross examine on the above.)

REXXN. Nil.

Read and admitted correct.

S. R. L. YORKE.

15-2-32.

Crown Counsel, by request.

The card P 658 may be of Mr. Dhairyawan but I dont know. I kept accounts of Spark. It did not go out direct from my office: the copies were taken by Dhairyawan or Desai who themselves distributed. I dont know the writing of Dhairyawan or Desai. I had no register of subscribers to Spark.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

15-2-32.

REXXN. There is a man called Bagwe in my office not in my employ who is a newsagent and contractor for distribution of newspapers, mine and others.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R.L. YORKE.

15-2-32.

D.W. 23.

V. K. Tawde witness for Alwe, Clerk. Bombay, on S. A. (Ghose accused acts as mouthpiece for Alwe accused). 31. I have been acting as a clerk the last 12 years and was in the Prahlad Mill. I am not working there now. I left the mill in March 1929 because I was elected General Secretary of the Girmi Kamgar Union, on 23-3-29. I have known Alwe since 1920. His brother used to live near my place and Alwe used to come there and so I came to know him. I had heard his name before as a person working with Baptista, Jhabwala and others, attending meetings and taking part in Labour agitation. I became connected with a Union in 1923. It was the Girmi Kamgar Mahamandal, of which I was a member since its foundation. I was a member of its managing Committee from the beginning. In the beginning Mr. Bhatwarkar was President and afterwards Alwe, who became President a few months after the foundation. The original Mahamandal existed as such till in May 1928. I came to know that there was a Union registered the Girmi Kamgar Union was registered as the G. K. Mahamandal, with Mr. Mayekar as Secretary. Alwe was its President at the time of registration. The G. K. Union was also registered and Alwe was its President. He was not President of the Mahamandal after it was registered.

There was a Textile workers' strike in 1923, over the stopping by the owners of the bonus which the workers used to get. It was a general strike of all the mills. I attended meetings during that strike. Some handbills were issued then. Alwe accused addressed some meetings then and I saw him. The G. K. M. was founded while that strike was going on. I was a member of a deputation which waited on the Governor during that strike along with Alwe, Mayekar, Parulekar and others, 14 or 15 in all. In consequence of something said by the Governor then we held a public meeting and founded the G. K. Mahamandal. An Inquiry Committee of 3 persons afterwards sat and the strike ended the Committee refusing to give the bonus. I dont remember anything in the strike line happening in 1924. In 1925 there was another General strike of all the mills because of a notice about a wage cut. The strike was conducted by the G. K. M. A strike committee was formed after the strike had started. Messrs Joshi, Bakhle and others were on behalf of the Social Service League and Mayekar, Alwe etc represented the G. K. M. Help was received in that strike from British Labour Union.

In 1926 there was strike in 2 mills of the Sasson Group, no it was in 1927. It arose out of the introduction of the 3 looms and 2 sides system. The millowner Sasson invited representatives of the G.K.M. to discuss settlement. Alwe, Mayekar and some others, strikers, went. They were all members of the G.K.M. The strike was settled on the condition that the system would be confined to those mills where it had been introduced already. In 1928 there was again a strike in the Sasson group in January probably, 10 or 11 mills being affected. It was because the new system was extended to all the mills of the Sassoon group. The G.K.M. conducted this strike. There was a Committee of the Mahamandal to do it. D 439 (33) is a handbill which I with others issued. I was the Secretary and Mayekar General Secretary of the G.K.M. I know of a resolution removing Mayekar from the post of General Secretary. After his removal I did the work. At first Mayekar and afterwards Alwe took the steps necessary for printing the handbills of the G.K.M. In the G.K.M. strike committee were Alwe, Mayekar, myself and some strikers. G. R. Kadam was a member of it. A strike fund was formed for the relief of the workers, handbills were issued and meetings held. Relief started a month after the strike began. The strike ended about the middle or end of February. Notice was given of a lockout and then after a few days the strike came to an end. The scheme was withdrawn from some mills. The strikers had approached the G.K.M. before

going back to work, to ask for advice about that notice. The G.K.M. left it to the men to go back to work or not. After this there was a strike in the Bombay Textile Mill of Wadia. It was in March. The owners acceded to the strikers' demands and the strike ended. It was through the efforts of the G. K. M. After 2 or 4 days there was again strike in the Textile Mill. There was also a strike in the Kasturchand Mill of the Karrimbhoy group. It was in 1st week of April, and at the same time as strike in Textile Mill. It was over a wagecut. A few days later there was a strike in the Simplex mill, also over wagecuts. Then the 3 looms 2 sides scheme was started in 2 mills of the Finlay group of 3, and men were reduced in some other mills, in the Karimbhoy group. Meetings were held by the G. K. M. to explain to the people the condition of the mills and the complaints of the strikers. It was suggested by the workers that a general strike should be called. The G. K. M. called a public meeting of all the workers and took their votes after explaining the situation and then after that decided to call a general strike. D 439 (30 to 37) are handbills issued by the G. K. Mahamandal. D. 765 (1 to 6) shown to me were also issued by the Mahamandal. (Note. No translations of these have been made. Accused must furnish a translation, otherwise they will be treated as irrelevant.) That decision was taken about the middle of April, and was communicated to the workers by means of a handbill. 8 or 10 days afterwards the general strike began. After it began a strike committee was formed, about the end of April. It was after that that the G.K.U. was registered. The strike committee consisted of 30 members. I know Joglekar, Nimbkar, Dange, Ghate, Mirajkar, Bradley accused since 1927 or 1928. I knew Joglekar before 1927. I came to know Nimbkar when I was a member of the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee and Nimbkar was its Secretary. Joglekar used to come into the G.K.M. with Mayekar. I became a member of the B.P.C.C. in 1926-27. I was not a member of it in 1928. I met Dange after he came into the strike Committee in 1928. Mirajkar and Bradley the same. After Mayekar either I or another Secretary Satam used to write the minutes of proceedings of the G.K.M. I can recognise Satam's handwriting. D. 420 is the Minute book of the G.K.M. In it page 9 back, 10 front and back, and 11 front are in my handwriting. 13 back and 14, 15 & 16 front and back are in Satam's handwriting. I dont know anything about the Workers' and Peasants' Party.

P. 953. I dont know either the original handwriting or that in which the pencil corrections are made. I recognise the red pencil signature of Alwe. I was a member of the Managing

Committee of the G.K.U. from its foundation as one of its Secretaries. I was present at a meeting of that Committee when a question came up about relief to the Bauria strikers. It was decided to send them help. Bradley accused who was in the Committee told us about the strike. Bradley spoke in English and either Dange or Nimbkar explained it and it was decided to send them Rs. 1000. A resolution was passed and it was decided to send Rs. 500 as a first instalment. The President Alwe moved the resolution. It was decided that the General Secretary G.K.U. should send the money to the Secretary of that Union. I dont remember if anything was said as to whom the money should be sent to if there was no secretary of that Union. I dont remember anything else about that money. I have seen a banner like D. 766 before. It was carried during the Sassoon strike.

(No accused wishes to examine the witness as his witness.)

XXN. By Dange accused. It was the practice in the G.K.U. Managing Committee that the proceedings of one meeting were sanctioned (confirmed) at the next meeting. It was also the practice that during these meetings either a Secretary or the General Secretary used to take rough notes of the proceedings. Any mistake which was found in the wording of a resolution at the time of confirming the minutes used to be corrected. I think that the fact that the money for the Bauria strikers was to be sent to the Secretary of the Union was a part of the resolution. Resolution number 5 on page 17 of P. 958 is that resolution. I see that in that resolution there is no mention about who the money is to be sent to. The minutes of that meeting are signed by Alwe as President. I dont remember particularly a meeting of the Managing Committee in March 1929 but meetings were being held. Being shown P. 960 pages 10 and 14 witness said. Meetings were held on 5th and 8th March, I remember. On page 7 is a resolution about Bauria and on page 9 is a signature of Alwe and date 16-1-29. These are the rough notes of the meeting of 16th January. I dont remember if the Managing Committee of the G.K.U. was against cooperating with N. M. Joshi and his group in the Textile Trade Union activities. It was decided that in the Joint strike Committee 15 men should be taken from Mr. Joshi's Union, but I cant say if it was done. I was not in Bombay throughout the General Strike of 1928 as I fell ill after the formation of the Joint strike Committee and was away at my village for a month. I was not at any time a member of the joint strike Committee. Dange, Nimbkar, and 2 or 3 others were on the strike committee representing the Millworkers' Union. A resolution was passed in the

Managing Committee of the G. K. M. appointing Dange, Nimbkar, Jhabwala as advisers of the G. K. M. I dont think I was present at the meeting of 15th May 1928 whose minutes have been shown to me, or at the meeting of 2nd May. What I said about Dange etc. representing the Millworkers' Union on the strike committee was only hearsay.

By Nimbkar accused. I remember a resolution in the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal that only workers should be its office-bearers. I do remember that there was a practice of appointing outsiders as advisers of the G. K. M. I remember advice being taken from Joglekar accused in 1927. He continued to do so occasionally until he went to the G. I. P. R. Union. I dont remember the part Joglekar played in the fight between Alwe and Mayekar. I attended one or 2 meetings in Apollo mill strike and heard Joglekar speak at them. The information about the deputation to Sassoon in 1927 I got from Alwe and Mayekar who told us. I attended most of the Managing Committee meetings of the G. K. M. during that strike. Alwe and Mayekar were members of that strike and Joglekar used to do much work for the strikers but I dont know if he was a member of the strike committee. Joglekar was adviser to a Committee which inquired into the G. K. M. accounts at end of 1927 or beginning of 1928. The Committee produced a report D. 420 Minute Book of G. K. M. proceedings; I see that the proceedings of 4-2-28 which are signed by Alwe contain a resolution about that report. The minutes of 15-5-28 are also signed by Alwe accused. I dont remember if I was present at a public meeting of workers at Nagu Sayaji Wade on 18-4-28. I did not attend a meeting at DeLisle Road called by Mr. Ginwala that day. I may possibly have been present at a meeting of the strike committee elected then held in the G. K. M. office. I was not elected on the strike committee. I dont know personally about the negotiations between this strike committee and Mr. Joshi. I dont know the composition of the Joint strike Committee from my personal knowledge.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

16-2-32.

Continued on S. A. The Millworkers' Union is mainly composed of the mechanics' class I have heard. I dont remember if Joglekar was ever a member of the G. K. M. after January 1928. I recognise the handbill P. 1452 and I was one of those

who signed and issued it, on behalf of the G. K. M. It was issued towards end of Sassoon strike in 1928. I dont remember whether I personally read it before signing it. I can say that as far as I remember the account in P. 1462 of the activities of Joglekar in the G. K. M. is correct. Mayekar had not returned the papers of the G. K. M. after the quarrel in 1928. I dont remember about Joglekar but Nimbkar used to come occasionally to the public meetings during the strike in the Kasturchand and Textile Mills. I dont remember a meeting of the G. K. M. Managing Committee after Mayekar had deserted to which Nimbkar was invited.

XXN. By Crown Counsel. Nil.

REXXN. By Alwe (through his mouthpiece Ghosh accused.) The G. K. U. had a General Secretary and 3 Secretaries. The General Secretary used to take notes of most of the G. K. U. Managing Committee meetings. The pukka minutes were written either by me or by the General Secretary. The rough notes in P. 960 of the meeting of 16-1-29 were written by some other Secretary or by Joglekar or Mirajkar. The 3 Secretaries were myself, Satam and Joglekar, but Satam was succeeded by Mirajkar, I dont remember when. Mirajkar was I think a Secretary at the time of this meeting. In P. 958 the writing on pages 16 to 19 is mine (Note: the Bauria resolution is on page 17). I wrote those proceedings from the notes in P. 960. I wrote the pukka report 4 to 7 days after the meeting.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

17-2-32.

Note: statement of this witness and P.W. 24 were interpreted to them by the Court Interpreter and subsequently read over in Court in English and admitted by the witnesses to be correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

17-2-32.

D.W. 24.

M.R. Jadhao on S.A. Residence Kirkee.

I was employed in the Kirkee Arsenal till the year 1928. I know of the Kirkee Arsenal Workmen's Union. I was a member in 1925 and 1926. The Union was founded in 1922 by D. G. Pandit. I know Messrs N. M. Joshi and Kirk. They came to see how the Union was working in 1926. They held a meeting of the workmen there, and gave advice in regard to the systematic conduct of the Union. They suggested the name of D. R. Thengde of Poona in order to conduct the Union properly. In 1927 a labourers' Conference was held at Kirkee, an annual meeting of the members of the Union. N. C. Kelkar of Poona presided over it, and office bearers were elected. Thengde was elected President. I was elected General Secretary. We continued in office for 2 years. I know Mr. Roderick. He also came to Kirkee to inspect the working of the Union. He came with Mr. Kirk, I cant say at what time of year. I was General Secretary at the time. There was a strike in the Arsenal in 1928. It lasted 10 to 12 days and arose out of the imposition of a trial test on old employees and reduction of staff and wages. The strike was started by the labourers. Thengde accused the President was at Poona at the time and before the strike advised the men not to go on strike. I was present at a meeting at which he did that. Thengde did not have anything to do with the strike. After the strike the Union ceased to function. The papers of the Union remained with me but it is now 6 months since Thengde's son took them away with me. The file D. 767 shown to me is one of those taken away. Handbills D. 767 sub-numbers 1 to 6, 9 and 10 were issued by the Union through me and the Managing Committee. D. 767 (7) is a bill for a handbill issued by the Union which Mr. Kirk got printed and hence the Union paid the bill. The handbill referred to is D. 767 (9). I cant read English. I cant read the document shown to me (marked D. 768 for reference) but I can recognise it. Forms like that were filled up. D. 769, Marathi document shown to me, is from the same file. I dont know the handwriting, but I am sure it is the same document which I handed over with others to Thengde's son.

No accused wishes to examine or cross examine the witness.

XXN. By Crown Counsel. I used to keep the file D. 767 and keep these papers in it. I never filed the papers in it but merely used it something to keep the papers in. I never filed

anything in it. I only remember to have kept subnumber 1 in it. I cant read English so I cant say whether subnumbers 1, 5, 7, and 8 were really in that file. I say they came from the file because they were pinned together. Thengde accused did take some part in the Arsenal strike. He asked the people to go to work, and to break, the strike. When the strike was on he asked the men to go back to work saying that they did not stand to gain anything by the strike. I am speaking of the strike of October 1928. (P. 815 English statement found in Thengde's possession interpreted to the witness). In spite of that I say that Thengde asked the men to go back to work. I cant explain why he issued this notice. The wording that the men are of good cheer does not mean that Thengde was pleased that they were holding out. Though it was read out I cant say if there is anything in it suggesting that the writer was telling the men to go back because I cant understand English. Document interpreted again : there is nothing in that suggesting that he was sorry the men were on strike. I fully understand that document now. (Mr. Sinha objects to the question about there being anything in the document suggesting that the writer was sorry the men were on strike.) I dont know who that Mirajkar was named in P. 815. I was not present at a meeting addressed by Mirajkar and Bhuskute.

REXXN. Nil.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd R. L. YORKE.

17-2-32.

D.W. 25

D. Y. Pathak on S.A. Residence Poona, Mechanical Engineer. (For Thengde accused).

I am a member of the Mechanical Engineers' Association. I was its 1st Secretary. Thengde accused was the chief man in that association, and was once President and for a long time Vice President. I cannot say exactly if I received the notice D. 666 page 85. I did not attend the meeting to which it relates. I was present at the search of Thengde's house on March 20, 1929 and I signed the following documents which were recovered at

that search: D 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, I have known Thengde accused for a long time, and know his English handwriting. The writing in D. 655 and D. 665 is all Thengde accused's. The Mechanical Engineers' Association was affiliated to the A.I.T.U.C.

. (No other accused examines this witness as his.)

XXN. By Crown Counsel. Nil.

By accused. Nil.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

17-2-32.

DW. 26:

G. R. Kadam, Millworker Bombay on S. A. (Witness for Alwe).

I know Alwe accused since 1925. We were working together in the Crown Mill. In 1925 I was a member of the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal. In 1926 I became a member of the Managing Committee of the G. K. M. I was a member up to 1928, till April or May when I became a member of the G. K. U. I am still a member of the G. K. U. I was a member of the Managing Committee up to November or December 1929. I was also Secretary of the Sewri Centre of the G. K. U. - I know about the 1928 General Textile Strike. There was a Joint Strike Committee formed, of 3 Unions. It was called Sanyukta Sampa Committee, and called Joint because it was of 3 Unions, the Girni Kamgar Sangh, G. K. M., and Millworkers' Union. The G. K. S. was also known as the Textile Labour Union and was Mr. Joshi's. N. M. Joshi was its President. I do not know its name exactly in English. Jhabwala was President of the Millworkers' Union. Alwe was President of my Union, the G. K. M. There were 30 members of the Joint Strike Committee. 15 were from the Sangh, Joshi's Union, 10 from the G. K. M. and 5 from the Millworkers' Union. The representatives of the G. K. M.

were Alwe, Kasle, Tahmanekar, Bhagwan Pednekar, Krishna Ausekar, Khanderao Desai, Gadkari, Triambakrao, Baburao and myself. I can name only some of those who came from the Sangh. Joshi, Asole, Ginwala (witness said Jhabwala first but corrected himself), Parulekar, Saiyid Munawar, Umar Rajab, Mr. Deo, Hafiz Mohammad, and others whose names I forget. The representatives of the Millworkers' Union were Jhabwala; Dange, Nimbkar, Bradley and Mirajkar. Nimbkar and Sayid Munawar were the Secretaries of the Joint Strike Committee. Parulekar and Bradley were the Treasurers. There was no permanent Chairman, one being elected at each meeting of the Committee but generally Joshi was elected.

Alwe was President of the G.K.U. He complained on several occasions in the Managing Committee against other members of the Managing Committee, Dange and others. The complaint was about a handbill. Alwe asked Dange why the handbill was issued without showing it to him. That handbill was shown to the Managing Committee at the time of the complaint. P. 966 is that handbill. Alwe said that if the handbill had been shown to him before issue he would have substituted some word like Volunteers for the words Red Army. He said he knew what Army meant because he had himself served in the Army. The word Volunteer was in common use since the foundation of the G.K.M. There was a good deal of discussion over this matter. It was decided that every handbill must bear the signature of the President first and then the Secretary. I did not like seeing Alwe's name low down in the list of signatories of this notice and not at the head of them. Alwe on another occasion complained that the correspondence which was conducted in English ought to be explained to him. He moved a resolution that he should be given a clerk. The clerk was not given at that time but a resolution was passed that a clerk should be appointed. The resolution was carried out. That was in December 1928 or January 1929. I mean that it was decided that the Committee should select a candidate. But no candidate was ever selected. The G.K.U. used to have a red flag. It was hung outside the office above the signboard. It was first hung 4 or 5 months after the foundation of the G.F.U. It was to distinguish the G.K.U., as there were offices of other Unions close by so that workers should not pay their subscriptions to the wrong Union. The red colour was selected because it was easy to see from a distance. P. 962 are pattas or sashes (badges) of volunteers of Joint Strike Committee or G.K.M., or G.K.U., or for Shivaji anniversary which was celebrated by the G.K.M.

I was a member of the B. P. C. C. in 1927 and 1928. So was Alwe. I first came to know Nimbkar accused in 1927-28 when he was Secretary of the B. P. C. C. Joglekar also I came to know in 1927-28.

(No accused examines the witness as his witness).

XXN. By Nimbkar accused. Asked if he was a personal friend of Alwe: We were working in one mill so we were personal friends. I might have received a few letters from Alwe since he came to Meerut. I cannot say how many I have received. I did not receive as many as 50 letters from him before his release on bail. I was not looking after Alwe's family after his arrest but I used to take my meals with them. I met Alwe in Bombay in the street about 2 months ago. I stopped taking meals with Alwe's family because his wife came here. I have not read Alwe's statement, nor do I know what he has said in it. I did not meet Alwe a number of times when he last visited Bombay. I was not told here in the Court Compound what evidence I should give. I have seen Ghosh accused here. I have never had a talk with him.

Men of 2 or 3 Unions gathered together and they settled the names of the members of the Joint Strike Committee. They met in the yard at the back of Damodar Thackersey Hall. I cannot remember the date. Nor can I say whether or not that meeting was an informal meeting of the Joint Strike Committee at which secretaries were elected. I do not remember who called those men together. Alwe called me there. I do not remember that the composition of the Joint Strike Committee was decided at a public meeting at Nagu Sayaji Wadi, or that the names were selected by Joshi, Nimbkar, Alwe and Jhabwala. I cannot say in what year Triambakrao was a member of the G.K.M., or Baburao. I do not remember whether I had met them in the G.K.M., before the strike. I do not know in what mills they were working, or what work they were doing. It is not false that Triambakrao and Baburao represented the G.K.M. I do not know if it is a fact that when the strike was on Baburao was a Secretary of Jhabwala's Millworkers' Union, and Triambakrao a Vice President of that Union. I do not remember whether I ever saw his name in any G.K.M., handbills.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

17-2-32.

Continued on S.A. I worked for 6 months with the members of the Strike Committee. I cannot say definitely about a Strike Committee of 85 members elected at a meeting at Nagu Sayaji's Wadi on 18-4-28 and later confirmed by a meeting held by Mr. Ginwala at DeLisle Road the same day. I do not remember whether I worked as a member of such a strike Committee. It might have been elected, I do not remember. I have not been told to say I do not remember in answer whenever an inconvenient question is asked. I do not know whether a Strike Committee of eleven was elected by the Bombay Textile Labour Union on 19-4-28. I did not know anything about the negotiations in regard to the Strike Committee till I was called by Alwe to the meeting behind the Damodar Thackersey Hall. I do not remember that the Joint Strike Committee was so called because it was a joint Committee of the 2 Strike Committees just mentioned and not of 3 Unions as I said yesterday. I know the G.K.M. was registered but I do not know the date. So also for G.K.U. I cannot say if the G.K.U. was registered before Jhabwala's Union. Jhabwala was Vice President of the G.K.U. for some days. I do not remember it being said in the Joint Strike Committee that the Governor and the General Member had told us to get our unions registered. I cannot say when Triambakrao and Baburao became members of the G. K. U. Those who paid subscriptions to the G. K. U. at time of its foundation became its members. It is not correct, if someone else has said it, that in the Joint Strike Committee there were 10 from Joshi's Union, 15 from the G. K. M. and 5 from Jhabwala's Union. It is wrong even if Kasle accused has said it (Kasle's statement on page 1006 of the accused's statements shown to witness). (Alwe's statement on page 960 shown to witness). It is not a fact as stated by Alwe that the 5 accused Jhabwala, Bradley, Nimbkar, Dange and Mirajkar were outsider representatives of the G. K. M. as well as of the Millworkers' Union of Jhabwala. I have not been in the habit of going to see Joglekar at his place since 1925. I did not meet Nimbkar at Joglekar's place in 1926. I do not remember the date but Joglekar was taken on as an adviser of the G.K.M. with no right to vote. I do not know if he was working at the time of the Apollo and Manchester Mills strike. I did not attend any meeting of strikers during the strike in the Textile Mill in March 1928, or during the strike in the Kasturchand Mill. I did not participate in any processions taken out, (if there were any), by the G. K. M. during those strikes. I have no personal knowledge about the Millworkers' Union of Jhabwala. I do not know directly that Nimbkar, Dange, Bradley and Mirajkar belonged to the Millworkers' Union. I do not remember the date of the handbill P 966. I do not remember if after the settlement

on 6th October 1928 the Sassoon men were dissatisfied. Alwe's complaint in the Managing Committee about the Handbill P 966 was in October or November. I cannot say why the decision to which I have referred is not in the Minute Book P 958. The decision that every handbill must bear the signature of the President first and then the Secretary was also in October or November. I cannot say why it does not appear in the Minute Book. I cannot remember if any handbills were issued over the signature of the President and Secretary after that decision. I cannot say if P. 929 was issued by the G.K.U. nor do I remember distributing it nor seeing it on the day of the Lalbagh firing. I see it is signed by the General Secretary. In P. 951 (D Nimbkar) I see that a number of notices issued after beginning of 1929 are signed by General Secretary only. I do not remember if the General Secretary was censured for this. There were more than 10 clerks in the G. K. U. Head office and centre offices. I do not remember if on the same occasion as Alwe asked for appointment of a translation clerk he also suggested that extra clerks should be dismissed. I do not remember the names of the Committee which was to appoint the translation clerk. Even after hearing the names from the Minute Book. I do not remember if those were the persons. Tahmanekar is a worker in the mills and was then Vice President of the G.K.U. He has come here and I have seen him here. I cannot say who is Ganpat mentioned in the Minutes. I cannot say if Ganpat on the Managing Committee was a millworker or an outsider. The Managing Committee consisted of one or 2 members from each of the Mill Committees. I used to visit the Head office daily in the evening. Kandalkar's name is Ganpat I know. He was a worker. There might have been more than one English knowing clerk in the head office.

I do not remember whether I attended a May Day meeting on DeLisle Road in 1927, or in 1928 behind the Gokhale's hotel. I might have taken part in the procession and meeting for Simon Commission on 3-2-28. but I cannot remember. I do not remember a flag above the board of the G.K.M. in those days. I do not remember there being a flag above the Board of the G.K.U. head office from its beginning. I might have gone in one of the parties to collect subscriptions during the strike but I do not remember. I never went out with other volunteers with a red flag. I do not remember if other volunteers had red flags. The G.K.U. of which I am still a member has still got the Red Flag. Its President is Ganpat Kandalkar. I have not seen whether the signboard of the Union is inscribed Girni Kamgar Union (Red Flag Union). I attended some of the

meetings during the General Strike. I do not remember the Red Flag of the Union being referred to there as the flag which was soiled red with the blood of Parasram Jadhao. I have written letters to Meerut to Nimbkar accused also, cannot say how many. I asked for information about the welfare of all the accused and not Alwe only. The 5 postcards D. 770 (1) to (5) were sent by me and also a telegram like D. 770 (6).

(No other accused wishes to cross examine the witness.)

By Crown Counsel. The Joint Strike Committee was formed before the foundation of the G.K.U. (Shown D. 420 G.K.M. Minute book); It is correct as appears from the resolution No. 2 of 30-4-28 that as Joglekar the original adviser was away Dange was elected in his place and Jhabwala and Nimbkar also. On 15th May as the same exhibit shows other persons were added as advisers. I put forward the resolution for appointing them and it was passed unanimously, as the minutes say. I cannot say if the resolution is correctly recorded as it is long ago. It is merely my memory. I have no other reason for being unable to say whether it is correctly recorded. I see the names are Jhabwala, Nimbkar, Dange, Mirajkar, Ghate, Bradley, Thengde and Joglekar. Shown D. 498. I do not know whether any members of the Joint Strike Committee were members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. (Reference page 3 of typed translation of D 498 Marathi original shown to witness). No members of the Strike Committee were elected as being representatives of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. (P 966 shown to witness and it is pointed out that the word Volunteer is there already). It is true as I said before that Alwe said he would have substituted the word Volunteer. I cannot give any reason for thinking that P 966 is later than P 967 (which is shown to witness). I used to read the Kranti occasionally to see what it published about the workers. Asked whether it came out in 1928 as a strike bulletin and told him about the strike. I did not see it daily but occasionally. Shown issue of 5th October P 996T, I do not remember reading the portion enclosed in black leading on page 1 of that issue. I do not know that Alwe wrote articles in Kranti. I do not remember Alwe complaining about the publication of that Notice in Kranti, of 5th October. I cannot say now that the relations between Alwe and Dange were not cordial in October. When the G. K. U. was founded I do not remember whether Satam was a Secretary. I cannot say when Mirajkar was appointed Secretary. I do not remember whether Dange proposed that Alwe should get an allowance of Rs 50 per month. P 958 meeting of 25th October

1928 Minutes : Resolution No. 1. shown. I do not remember it, but on seeing this I think that was so. From reading what Dange said I do not think relations could have been strained, between them. I do not remember exactly so how can I say whether Dange accepted an amendment raising the amount to Rs 60. I am still a member of the G. K. U. There might have been recently difference of opinion in the Managing Committee but I am not on it now, and cannot say. I ceased to be a member soon after the ending of the 1929 strike, or rather in 1930. There might be difference of opinion in the Managing Committee in 1930 but I do not remember. I know a man, Deshpande. He was something like an adviser and Secretary but he is no longer in that Union to which I pay subscription. I do not know how he came to leave it. I did not attend the annual meeting at which election took place. There are now separate unions, one at Lalbagh and the other at Poibaodi. I pay my subscription at Lalbagh. One Randive was once adviser of the G. K. U. like Deshpande. He is not now in my Union. He is no longer in that Union. I do not know if he is B. T. Randive or Balchandra Timbak Randive.

REXXN. I do not know any language except Marathi. I can read and write Marathi. I read newspapers occasionally. I went to school, and read up to 6th standard in Marathi.

(Read over in Court in English and also interpreted to witness who says the statement is correct.)

Sd. E. L. YORKE.

18-2-32.

D.W. 27.

P.C. Bose on S.A. 85, Jharia (witness for Ghose accused.)

I am Secretary of the Colliery Employees association, Jharia, since 1925. I have also been a member of the Executive Council of the All India Trade Union Congress since 1926. I was an adviser to the Workers' Delegation to Geneva and was elected for that purpose in the Cawnpore Session. The delegate was

Dewan Chaman Lal. There was another adviser Mr. Mahbubulhaq of Calcutta. I went to Geneva in 1928. I attended the British Commonwealth Labour Conference held in London in July 1928. I went as a delegate from the A.I.T.U.C. I did not attend the 1928 Session of the British Trade Union Congress.

I invited the A.I.T.U.C. on behalf of my association to hold their annual congress at Jharia in 1928. The invitation was given at the Cawnpore Session. The Jharia Session began on the 18th December 1928. It was originally announced for November 24th, 25th and 26th. It was changed to suit the convenience of delegates and enable them to go on from Jharia to the Indian National Congress Session at Calcutta. The letter P. 84 is signed by me. Mr. Johnstone mentioned in that letter first came to my office on the 25th November. I asked him if he had gone to the Bombay A.I.T.U.C. office. He told me he had not because he thought he was a day late already. By 'other comrades' in that letter I meant other friends in the Labour Movement. I had in mind other persons whom I knew such as Mrinal Kanti Bose, Daud and so on. By "other things" I must explain that Johnstone wanted me to write letters of introduction to National Congress leaders and also to suggest how he could see the Labour areas. I thought Ghosh accused would be the best man to help him in this matter as Secretary of the Bengal Trade Union Federation, so I wrote this letter. I remember the passing of a resolution at the Cawnpore Session boycotting the Simon Commission. In the Open Session of the Congress it was moved by Ghosh accused. It was seconded by Mr. Daud. I attended the Executive Council meeting of the A. I. T. U. C., at Delhi in February 1928. Mr. Andrews attended that meeting but did not preside at the Session of that year. I remember the appointment of a Committee at that meeting to inquire into the conditions of Labour Unions in Bengal. It was appointed because the General Secretary complained that a large number of Unions were not paying their affiliation fees. 2 committees were appointed one for Bengal and one for Punjab. Ghose accused as Secretary of the Bengal Provincial Committee said there was really a number of Unions which existed on paper only, and that an inquiry by the Executive Council was necessary. The Bengal Committee appointed consisted of Ghosh and Spratt accused. I don't remember who suggested Spratt's name. It was Mr. Joshi who suggested Ghosh's. Diwan Chaman Lal was present and took part in the discussion. I know Muzaffar Ahmad accused. I don't remember

if I saw him at Jharia. At Jharia Session Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru was elected President for the coming year. So far as I remember Ghosh and Dewan Chaman Lal were canvassing for him at Jharia, and Chaman Lal proposed and Ghosh accused seconded his election. N. M. Joshi was elected General Secretary for 1929. 2 Assistant Secretaries were elected Mr. Bakhle and Dange accused. The latter was elected by a majority after contest. The other candidate was Joglekar. I cant say who proposed him. Some one suggested that Dange should continue in office and Joglekar perhaps said that Dange would not be in a position to accept. Bakhle then said he had had a talk with Dange and he (Dange) might accept the post. So Dange's name was proposed and he was elected. I voted for Dange. It was simly because he was doing well in the office. Bakhle has told me he was doing well.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

18-2-32.

Continued on S. A. I remember a resolution being moved at the Open Session of the A. I. T. U. C., at Jharia about a Socialist Republic. It was moved by Dewan Chaman Lal and seconded by Gosh accused, who made a short speech. I also remember his making an appeal on behalf of the Bauria workers in the Executive Council meeting. It was probably on the 3rd day of the Executive Committee Meeting. He made it after a lengthy resolution about a general one-day strike all over India had been passed drawing a contrast between that resolution and the subject on which he was appealing, that is the A. I. T. U. C., was passing high sounding resolutions while strikers were actually suffering and nothing being done for them. After that appeal a number of delegates offered monetary assistance then and there. It was suggested that the money be sent to the A. I. T. U. C. Ghosh suggested it. Ghosh was staying at Dhanbad with the Chairman of the Reception Committee G. N. Roy, Advocate of the Patna High Court. Mr. Ramanad Chattarjee, Mrinal Kanti Bose and Mrs Kanla Debi Chattopadhaya were also staying there. I remember the meeting of the Executive Council at Delhi being addressed by Messrs Purcell and Hallsworth. They addressed it twice. In P. 274 with reference to the statement that Messrs Purcell and Hallsworth offered valuable suggestions the first thing was that Mr. Purcell suggested organising the Railway workers and laid special emphasis on it. Asked why special emphasis was laid (witness having desired to give this in

answer to the previous question) said: he said that Railways were spread all over the country and successful organisation of the Railway workers would greatly influence other industrial workers as industrial centres are all situated close to Railway lines.

My Union sent a contribution to the Bauria Workers. I received a letter from Mr. N. M. Joshi relating to my appointment to a Committee to inquire into Jamshedpur conditions. I was however not able to go.

(No accused will examine the witness as his witness).

(No accused wishes to cross examine the witness).

XXN. By Crown Counsel. I dont know anything about who the husband of Mrs. Kamala Debi Chattopadhaya is.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

19-2-32.

D.W. 28.

B. Kiran Shankar Roy on S.A. Ex-M.L.C. Calcutta, Barrister-at-Law. Witness for Banarjee.

I have been connected with the Indian National Congress since 1921, and have been a member of the Bengal P.C.C., since 1921. I was its Secretary off and on 5 times for nearly 4 years in all. I do not remember anything about a Labour Board of the 24 Parganas. I know one Mr. Satya Narain Chattarjee who was a member of the B.P.C.C. I do not remember if he had any connection with any Labour Board under the Congress. The B.P.C.C., had a Labour Board or Sub Committee elected almost every year. I cannot be quite definite without records but to the best of my recollection we had such a Labour Board in 1927 and 1928. I know Dr. K. L. Ganguli. I think one year he was the Secretary of the Labour Board. I know Mr. Lal Mohan Ghosh. He was either Secretary or a member for one year. Its function was to work in co-operation with such Labour people as

were willing to work in co-operation with the Congress, and to look after Labour interests. I know Shib Nath Banarjee accused for 4 or 5 years. He was working in the Labour area and was I believe connected with the Congress in Khulna. I am not quite sure but I believe he was a member of the Labour Sub-Committee. I remember the E. I. Railway Lillooah Strike in 1928 and was in Calcutta at the time. The Congress (B.P.C.C.) organised a relief Committee, for giving relief to the strikers. I cannot say the time of year when it was organised. I do not know who was President of that Committee. Hemant Kumar Bose was Secretary. The B.P.C.C., was approached by some people connected with the workers for help. I remember meeting Banarjee accused during the strike. I met him often. I think he came to me about supply of rice for the workers. He approached Mr. Subash Bose more than he did me. Subash Bose was President of the B.P.C.C., As far as I remember this was the first time that the B.P.C.C., organised relief work for workers on strike. The B.P.C.C., in cooperation with other bodies organised demonstrations in regard to the boycott of the Simon Commission in Calcutta. The B.P.C.C., must have written to those bodies to get their co-operation. That is the general method. I am thinking of a procession organised by the B.P.C.C. The labour people formed a part of that procession. The programme for that procession was laid down by the B.P.C.C. D. 42 (4) is a circular issued by me. Such circulars were issued to the District C.C's. and to such bodies as co-operated. I know Subash Bose's signature. That on D. 30 (16) looks like his signature. The B.P.C.C., issued circulars like this in connection with the Simon Commission Boycott. I was an officebearer of the Reception Committee of the Indian National Congress at Calcutta in 1928 and was Secretary of the Pandal Committee and the Finance Committee. I know the report D. 163. It was prepared by the Reception Committee. I did not take any actual part in its preparation. It is generally done by the General Secretary. I do not know who wrote the introduction.

I did all duties which fell on the Reception Committee inside the Pandal. I attended the Congress Open sessions mostly. Some 300 speeches were delivered and I do not remember them. I saw the report after it was printed. I do not remember how long that was after the Congress. I did not read the report. I do not read Hindi. I was generally in the Pandal during the session and was presumably there on the 30th December. A meeting of workers was held there that day. I remember receiving orders from the President Pt. Moti Lal Nehru through a volunteer to allow the

labour conference to be held in the Pandal. I accordingly allowed it. That Conference lasted a couple of hours. I have no idea if any time was given to me during which it was to be held. It was to be a short affair. I do not follow the question whether I had any difficulty in connection with this conference. It was held peacefully. I was inside the Pandal while it was being held. I think Pt. Jawahar Lal presided. He also made a speech. I do not remember if any other prominent person spoke. I think but am not quite sure that Pt. Moti Lal Nehru was there. He may have spoken.

I have seen a paper called Sramik, but do not know who is the Editor.

The B. P. C. C., did provide rice for the Lillooah strikers, worth about Rs 2000. I know Lal Mohan Ghosh's signature but do not recognise it in D 18 (1). D 88 (2) bears my signature. D 44 (9) is in Lal Mohan Ghosh's handwriting and bears his signature.

By Ghosh accused. Mr. H. K. Bose was Secretary also of the North Calcutta D.C.C. I know his signature. D. 21 and D. 16 (1) both bear his signature. D. 19 bears the signature of Subash Bose which I recognise. D. 11 bears a rubber stamp of my signature. I know Dr. K. L. Ganguli's signature. I believe the signature in D. 235 is his.

In connection with Simon Commission Boycott a large number of meetings were held under the auspices of the B.P.C.C. It is possible that some notices were issued over my signature. Ghosh accused was one of the usual speakers at such meetings but my recollection is somewhat vague. I do not remember a meeting held with J. M. Sen Gupta presiding under the auspices of the B.P.C.C., and the B.T.U.F., at Albert Hall, in connection with the Public Safety Bill and Trade Disputes Bill.

No accused wishes to examine this witness as his witness or to cross-examine him.

XXN. By Crown Counsel. I may have been outside the Pandal on 30-12-28 for a minute or two but generally I was inside. I cannot say what arrangements if any had been made for the Labour procession and Conference. The General Secretary of the Reception Committee would be able to say. This arrival of the workers in the Congress did I know create rather a sensation in Calcutta. I can tell the Court anything which happened outside the Pandal in connection with their arrival. I do not

remember the time fixed for the Congress sitting that day. It seldom sits punctually. The order I got was that the Labour people were to be admitted and the Congress would sit later. I heard there was a commotion outside prior to that. My reason for saying that Jawahar Lal presided over the Labour Conference is that he was on the Rostrum and was the first to speak. Birendra Nath Sen Gupta was Secretary of the Publicity Committee of the Reception Committee. I do not remember having seen the paragraphs P. 2616 (1) and (2) in Forward of 30-12-28. I did not read the papers next day. I generally read Forward. I did not hear what Jawahar Lal said. All the speeches were in Hindi and I was far away from the rostrum. I did not have any talk with Pt. Jawahar Lal afterwards about this procession and conference. Before the orders came I heard rumours for about half an hour but I did not actually hear any commotion myself. I knew by face most of the speakers in that conference. I do not remember whether Banarjee spoke, or Nimbkar, or Joglekar, or Thengde. I do not remember anything about banners. They might have had little red pieces of paper. I heard from Jawahar Lal Nehru that he had had a bad fall from his horse that day outside the Pandal.

REXXN. Nil.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd R. L. YORKE.

19-2-32.

D.W. 29.

Narain Malhar Joshi on S. A. Brahmin. Residence Bombay witness for a number of accused.

For Thengde, Banarjee and Desai.

I am a life member of the Servants of India Society. I have been a nominated member of the Legislative Assembly representing Labour since 1920. I have also represented India at several conferences of the International Labour Conference at Geneva. I was also a member of the Royal Commission known as the Whitley Commission. I was also a delegate to the Round Table Conference re-presenting Labour. I have been connected with the All India Trade Union Congress since it was started I think in 1920. I was General Secretary from 1924 up to 1929 end. I attended all the annual sessions of the A.I.T.U.C., in that period except the 2 sessions at Jharia. I am connected with various Trade Unions in Bombay and other parts of India. Up to March 1929 the A.I.T.U.C., made no distinction between Communists and Non-Communists so far as work was concerned. It did not pass any resolution excluding Communists from any of its affiliated bodies in that period. I don't think I discriminated between Communists and Non-Communists so far as Trade Union work was concerned. (Witness is asked if any question arose during the period in question, in the A.I.T.U.C., or any affiliated body, of excluding anyone from Trade Union work on the ground that he was a communist. Question is objected to as useless and irrelevant. It does not appear to me that the prosecution case has ever been so put and I therefore rule the question out.) Reports of the annual Congress of the A.I.T.U.C., are published by the A.I.T.U.C., office. D. 367, 368, 305 and 393 are such reports. I was the officer responsible for their publication. They are printed on the basis of notes taken down by the office-bearers or the staff. When necessary I send the report or any portion of it to the Union or person concerned before publishing it, for the purpose of verification. D. 367, 368 and 383 are reports of sessions which I myself attended. I published them because I thought them to be correct. The accounts published in these reports are prepared by the Treasurer and passed by the Auditor and submitted to the Executive Council and also to the Open Congress. D. 771 is the report of the 1925 Bombay Congress which I attended and about it what I have said above is true. I got a letter at Delhi a couple of days ago asking me to produce the originals of some documents. I have not got any documents belonging to the T.U.C., in my possession. So

far as they are personal documents I dont preserve personal letters at all. D. 489 (26) is a document which I remember sending to members of the Executive Committee (Minutes of meeting of Executive Council dated 4-6-26), With reference to item 7, I remember that a Committee was appointed with Thengde as Convening Secretary to draft proposals for the formation of a Labour Party in India. I think I received some letters or circulars from Thengde as Secretary of that Committee. I have not got those circulars. D. 489 (25) is such a circular which I remember receiving (office copy from Thengde's file shown to witness.) D. 489 (24) is a document which I sent to Thengde accused. The original letter I had sent to the Govt. of India. (Note. Re-appointment of Giri as delegate at Geneva and Thengde and others as advisers). D. 489 (21) is the letter I sent to Thengde with the enclosed copy of resolution about the Negotiations Committee. It is signed by me. D. 489 (20) is also signed by and was sent by me with its enclosure. (Note. Re-appointment of Thengde as Administrative Secretary of the T.U.C.) D. 489 (19) dated 7-4-27 bears my signature. I sent it with the enclosed copies of cables. I must have sent those telegrams. So far as I remember the occasion was the appointment of a Unity Committee for bringing about unity between Amsterdam and Moscow. D. 489 [18] is an original copy sent to Thengde of a letter which I sent to Ginwala. D. 489 [17] shown to witness: I remember receiving a letter in these terms signed by Thengde. I can recognise L. Lajpat Rai's signature. I cant say if I can recognise his stamped signature. The stamped signature in D. 489 [16] looks like his signature. D. 489 [14] bears my signature: it and its 2 enclosures were sent by me. Enclosure No. 2 is a correct report of the proceedings of the Executive Council at Delhi in March 1927. I know of the Mechanical Engineers' Association. Thengde accused was connected with it. It was affiliated to the T.U.C., for some years. I believe that the Kirkee Arsenal Workmen's Union was affiliated to the T.U.C. D. 489 [13] bears my signature, and so does D. 489 [9] and 489 [8]. I received the originals of D. 489 [7] and [5a] and 2. D. 489 [6] bears my signature and so does 489 [1] which I sent.

I visited the Kirkee Arsenal Union twice or thrice but I cant say what the years were. I think Thengde accused went with me. Kirk I think went with me once. Thengde was connected with the Union.

The Bengal Juteworkers' Association was affiliated to the A. I. T. U. C. I cant say in what years, perhaps from 1925 or

even 1924. When anyone comes to the T. U. C., he generally brings a signed resolution or letter of credentials. I cant say exactly what is done with these but we generally take the letter. I think I must have received the news of the Lilloah strike from K. C. Mitra. I also received a telegram purporting to be from him, like that at page 3 column 1 of D 146 [10]. I tried to get an Adjournment Motion in the Assembly, and interviewed persons in authority. I corresponded with K. C. Mitra about the strike. I think the T. U. C., gave financial assistance to the strikers. The T. U. C., also secured money for them from Great Britain. I issued D 208 [14] to Ghosh accused and sent the original to K. C. Mitra.

I know of the Calcutta Tramwaymen's Union. It was affiliated to the T. U. C. I think the T. U. C. sent them a sum of Rs 80. D 29 (2) (3) (6) & (7) are bulletins of T. U. C., issued by me. The accounts in (6) and (7) were audited and passed by the the E. C. D 61 (2) is a pamphlet written and published by me. D 62 is a true account of a speech delivered by me at Madras. D 96 was edited and issued under my instructions. D 145 (33) was written and published by me, also (34). D 207 (5) is a telegram I sent to Ghosh accused. D 272 and 273 are T. U. C., Bulletins issued under my instructions. I have received some letters from Rt. Hon. Tom Johnston and to that extent know his handwriting and signature. D 118 (1) is in his hand and bears his signature. D 686 is in Mr. C. F. Andrews' handwriting which I know and bears his signature. I dont think I can identify writing or signature of Mr. Lindsay Trade Commissioner or of Lord Ollivier. I have had some correspondence with Graham Pole and D 690 is in his hand. I know the handwriting and signature of Mr. Brailsford and can identify them in D 694 and 695. I know the writing of Mr. William Gillies Secretary of the International Dept. of the Labour Party and D 693 is his. There is nothing in the rules to prevent a man being a delegate of 2 Unions at the A. I. T. U. C., Session but he would not have 2 votes. In practice it is not done. I cannot recall a case of its being done.

I know accused M. G. Desai, and have known him many years. D 578 bears the signature of Mr. C. S. Deole of the Servants of India. I know his handwriting. I know Mr. Fenner Brockway of the Indian Labour Party. He visited Bombay in 1927 or 1928. I met him several times then. I saw Desai accused in connection with that visit. I met them together both in my office and at the Hotel Majestic where Fenner Brockway was staying. On that occasion Desai talked to me about his

desire to do some journalistic work. He asked me to help him in that work and to give him some work in that line. At end of 1928 and beginning of 1929 I was ill and confined to bed, and under medical advice not allowed to go out or to receive visitors. D 4E looks like the handwriting of Col. Wedgwood. D 4 is certainly his. I did appeal to some organisation in Russia for financial help during a strike in India. I have also received money from there for help of strikers in India.

By Mukherjee. In D 190 subnumbers 11, 32, 48, 49, 50, 53, 55, 59, 76, 84, 89, 106 & 108 bear my signature and were issued by me. In the same exhibit subnumbers 19, 21, 23, 35, 39, 42, 56 with 57 & 58, 62 with 63, 68, 87, 93 with 94 and 95, 96 & 97 are printed circulars issued by me, as General Secretary of the A. I. T. U. C. You can say I am a 2nd Internationalist. I dont say that the 2nd International is against a Socialist Republic. I have known Mukerjee accused many years I saw him at the Calcutta A. I. T. U. C., Conference in 1924, at Bombay 1925 Conference where Thengde presided, at Cawnpore in 1927. I have also often seen him at the Servants of India Society office at Bombay. The occasions on which I saw him were meetings either of the A. I. T. U. C., or its Executive Council. I knew Mukherjee as a Trade Unionist. It was probably I who proposed Mukherjee as a Vice-President at the Cawnpore Session. I generally proposed the Vice-Presidents.

By Ghosh accused. I took part in May Day celebrations in India. I did so at Bombay in 1927. D 281 (equals 190 (42)) and D 207 [7] were both issued by me in regard to May Day celebration of 1928. I think there was a notice issued also in 1927. I used often to receive I. F. T. U. Press reports in my office. I remember receiving those shown to me D 220 and D 254. I know the handwriting and signature of Mr. Ginwala. The letter shown to me D 772 bears his signature as also do D 208 [2] and (19.) I know Mr. K. C. Roy Chowdhri and his handwriting and signature: D 207 [8] bears his signature. D 208 [13] and [17] are my letters and bear my signature. I used to send to Ghosh accused during the Lillooah strike copies of the letters which I wrote to Mr. K. C. Mitra because he was the Secretary of the B. T. U. F. I remember writing to K. C. Mitra a letter of which D 208 [16] which I sent to Ghosh is a copy. The fact that this copy is addressed to Mr. Giri is probably due to a mistake in my office which sent his copy to Ghosh and Ghosh's copy to Giri. I had asked the British T. U. C., for money for the Juteworkers. It might be in February 1929 or about that time. I had asked Ghosh accused for information what the situation was in order

that I might be able to make that request. He sent me a report. On that report I made my request and some money came. (Court refuses accused to put his 2 office copies D 285 (1) and (2) to witness as no notice has been served on the person in whose possession these documents should be). D 208 (6) an appeal on behalf of the Bauria strikers was issued by Bakhale Asst. Secretary under my instructions. The facts contained therein were obtained from Ghosh's reports and letters. I know Bakhale's signature and recognise it on D 208 (11). He and I live together. I saw the report referred to there. The action I took on receipt of the report was taken immediately and not after delay. Letters D 208 subnumbers 4, 5, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, and D 209 (1) all bear my signature. I know the handwriting of Mr. G. Sethi. D 234 bears his signature. D 208 (21) was issued by me. I have received many letters signed Jos Sassenbach. D 165 [2] I recognise as his signature. I know him personally. I know Mr. Citrine personally and his writing. D 165 (1) bears his signature stamped. I know Mr. D Hallsworth's writing and signature, and recognise them in D 166 on the first page. I recognise Sassenbach's signature in D 236. Seeing D 208 (12): I must have suggested Ghosh's name for this Committee. I think Daud was a member of that Sub-Committee, and G. Sethi. I must have suggested both of them. I think it might be Chaman Lal who originally drafted that Resolution at Cawnpore.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

20-2-32.

Continued on S.A. D. 145 [24] bears my signature. A copy of the resolution was attached to that letter. It is correct. D. 145 [22] was issued on my authority with the 2 enclosures attached. I do not think the Sub-Committee ever met. I think I received a Draft Constitution prepared by Spratt accused as convener of the Sub-Committee. P. 78 is that Constitution. I dont think I expressed any views on the draft. If I did not express my views no one could say I approved of it. D. 145 (23) bears my signature. The P.S. was written by my clerk at my dictation. The enclosure attached was also sent by me. D. 145 (25) bears my signature. The resolution referred to was I think passed at Delhi at the Executive Committee Meeting on 26-2-28.

D. 146 (29) bears my signature. I think the Council of Action resolution referred to was put from the Chair. I was consulted by the mover as to the personnel. I myself suggested the names of Kishori Lal Ghosh, Daud, Giri, Bakhale and others.

I was a member of the editorial board of the A.I.T.U. Bulletin. I must have verified the portion in D. 274 which relates to the minutes of the Cawnpore E.C. meeting. I think the account of the proceedings in regard to the Council of Action is correct. There is another portion relating to the making of appeals by affiliated unions to the international movement only through the A.I.T.U.C. I found that also correct. I know Mr. A. N. Bose. He is Assistant Secretary of the All India Railway Federation. I may know his handwriting and signature. D. 226 is signed by him. D. 207 [10] is signed by P. Ramchandra Rao whose signature I know. He is Secretary of the Bengal Nagpur Railway Indian Labour Union. I think Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru was present at that Delhi E.C. Meeting. I dont think he was connected with any affiliated organisation at that time. He may have represented the Indian National Congress. I remember that at that E.C. Meeting 2 Committees were appointed to inquire into the condition of Unions in Punjab and Bengal. For Bengal Ghosh and Spratt were the members. I dont know who suggested Spratt's name but it was not I. I suggested Ghosh's name I think. I think I paid Spratt Rs. 100 in connection with his travelling evpenses for this inquiry. D. 190 [57] was issued by me. At the meeting certaiu sums were sanctioned for organisation work. A report was received from the B.T.U.F., in that connection. I think a sum was granted to the B.T.U.F., for the purpose. It was on the basis of the report. I stayed at Calcutta with a friend at the time of the E.C. of the A.I.T.U.C., in December 1926. Ghosh and M. K. Bose and K. C. Roy Chowdhri and Daud came and others to see me there the day before the meeting. There was a reference made to a Mr. Donald Campbell by one of these gentlemen, with reference to the dispute, in the federation. Ghosh said he (Campbell) was making efforts to make a settlement. I think a final result was communicated to me then by Ghosh namely that there was no settlement. I met Donald Campbell at the E.C. meeting next day. He attended on behalf of the E.B. Railway Union. That E.C. Meeting settled a dispute in the India Seamen's Union. It was between Daud on one side and Aftab Ali on the other. Ghosh and K. C. Roy Chaudhri and M. K. Bose and others supported Daud, whose side's claim was upheld by the Council. I think it was after the dispute was settled that the B.T.U.F., of which Ghosh was secretary was recognised by the A.I.T.U.C. I first met Spratt some time before the Cawnpore Trade Union Congress. I dont remember the year. I was a member of a Committee set up to arrange for the defence of Spratt, at Bombay. We issued an appeal for funds. I sent copies to all people. I must have sent one to Ghosh. I think Spratt came

to me first with an introduction from the Labour Research Department. D. 209 (3) is the resolution referred to by me in D. 208 (4). I recognise the signature of Jawahar Lal Nehru in D. 209 [2] I received a letter in reply to my letters to Ghosh about Jamshedpur. I received a copy of P. 36. I dont object to anything in this letter. I use the terms solidarity, and class consciousness. I also use the slogan, Workers of the world unite.

I visited Jamshedpur in the middle of July 1923, and met Ghosh accused there. He wanted me to go to Bauria but I could not do so. Ghosh accused sent me a cutting from the Forward of 7th March 1929. I remember that I received the letter of which D. 251 is a copy. I have not got the original any longer. (Accused tenders D. 775 a copy of the Forward of 7-3-29). I recognise the signature of R. R. Bakhale in D. 203 (23). D. 238, 239 and 240 are circulars issued by me. The A. I. T. U. C. Circular in D. 203 (28) was issued by me. In D. 282 I recognise the signature of Naidu of Jamshedpur. I recognise the handwriting from Dear Mr. Campbell Forrester to K. C. Roy Chowdhri on back of D. 283 as that of K. C. Roy Chowdhri. I received a letter of which D. 285 (1) is a copy from K. L. Ghosh. I received it in my capacity as Secretary A. I. T. U. C., and the original was filed by me in my A. I. T. U. C. records. The pamphlet shown to me was written by me, and published recently. (Ordered that it be struck off.) D. 61 (1) is the Constitution of the B. T. U. F. D. 289 is the delivery copy of a telegram which I sent to Ghosh accused. D. 285 (2) is a report of which I received a copy from Ghosh accused. D. 218 is a draft of a letter of which I received a copy.

I believe Kadam accused wrote me a letter before the Cawnpore T. U. Congress. I met him at the Congress. I dont remember what we talked about except that I think he wanted to organise labour. He was connected with the G. I. P. people.

No accused wishes to examine Mr. Joshi as his witness.

No accused wishes to cross examine Mr. Joshi.

XXN. By Crown Counsel. I think I was a delegate of a Union before I became General Secretary. That was prior to 1924 or 1925. I cant say exactly which Union I represented. It was probably some Union in Bombay. I remember a Mr. Gladding at the 1925 Bombay A.I.T.U.C., Conference session. I dont know when he left India. I dont say a man cant be a delegate for 2 Unions but it is not necessary. I dont remember Mr. Gladding's face. I cant say who the man is sitting as No. 3

from the left of the photograph in D. 623. This photograph shows a large number of delegates to the A.I.T.U.C., but some may be visitors. I say a man cannot vote for 2 Unions. I dont know definitely whether there is a rule to that effect but I think it is not done. Voting on resolutions is generally done by show of hands in the first instance. If a division is claimed voting is done by Unions who are entitled to votes in proportion to their numbers. In that case they are entitled to count those votes whether they have one 2 or 3 delegates present, or more. If on a division 2 Unions are represented by the same man one of those 2 Unions will have to go without its vote being recorded. The reason is that we did not allow it to be done. I cant say whether it has ever occurred. I would not have allowed it because I would have considered it to be wrong. (Objection by Dange overruled.) The reason of considering it to be wrong is that we would not get the benefit of several minds sitting together and discussing. If the rules allow it the position would become so bad that a change in them would be necessary. D. 305 Appendix page 67 following shown to witness. If a man seeks to represent 2 Unions on a division there is no definite rule preventing it, then said, preventing his attempting to do it. I think it is correct to say that I think if it were to happen it would be a bad thing and it would be better to prevent it. We expect delegates to bring with them letters as credentials, that is letters signed by the President or Secretary of their Union. I dont know whether there is any rule about it. The only rule on the point is rule 10 in the Constitution which requires affiliated Unions to send names of delegates a fortnight before the date fixed for the Congress. I was at the Delhi Congress in March 1927. I dont remember how the credentials were gone into at the Delhi Congress. As regards the remark in P. 1828 to the effect that there was no Reception Committee which usually acts as a credentials Committee that is not correct inasmuch as I was myself the Reception Committee. As to the statement that there is no record of the number of delegates or of those represented I am not prepared to say either that it is correct or that is not correct. I dont remember whether there was trouble about the credentials at that Congress. I have a faint memory but I dont really remember if anything occurred.

I think Mukerjee's Union had suggested that he should get some office in the A. I. T. U. C. It might have been partly responsible for my nominating him. D. 190 (89), (88), (84), (83), (82), shown to witness. I am prepared to admit that this correspondence was a reminder that I should consider Mukerjee's claims.

I cant say when I first met Desai accused. I have not had

very much to do with him. I did not see much of his journalistic work. I dont think he wrote to me about it, or saw me particularly about it. I think I only met him in the streets but I dont think there was really any special talk between us. I dont think we have met much socially but I have known him. P. 526 (4): I cant say if this is his signature. I dont know his writing at all.

In saying that I did not discriminate between Communists and Non-Communists in T. U., work I meant in my capacity as General Secretary of the A.I.T.U.C. Referring to D. 274 and the list of those present at the E. C. meeting at Delhi it is possible that accused Spratt was there though perhaps not representing any Union.

REXXN. For Desai, etc. I dont find anything in the rules definitely permitting a delegate to present the votes of more than one Union on a division. Had an instance arisen of a delegate trying to give the votes of more than one Union I should as General Secretary have taken steps to prevent it. The object of letters of credentials is simply to enable the delegate to be identified, that is why we require them. The fortnight limit prescribed in rule 10 is not always observed. In my experience it has often not been observed and the delegates have brought the letters with them showing that they have been appointed delegates.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

27-2-32.

D.W. 30.

B. Kanhaiya Lal on S. A. Witness for Mukherjee accused, Service, Residence Gorakhpur, Jafra Bazar. (Deposes in Urdu).

D 193 (3) and (4) are all in my handwriting and they and (6) are signed by me as Secretary on behalf of the President of the Divisional Kisan Mazdur Sabha Gorakhpur. D 193 (5) was received by me in the ordinary course of my work as Secretary. The file containing these and other papers was maintained by me. The file D 195 was also maintained by me and it was I who

received and filed the letters in it. The file D 194 was also maintained by me as in my capacity of Secretary Kisan Mazdur Sabha.

Before I worked in the Kisan Sabha office I was employed in the B. N. W. Railway Audit Office, as proof reader. I am now working in the Dinapur Press at Gorakhpur. I worked in the Kisan Sabha from 1925 to March 1929. D 773 (1) to (7) are documents printed and published under the auspices of the Kisan Sabha and drafted either by me or by Mukherjee accused. They were printed under Mukherjee accused's orders and the proofs corrected by him. Notices used to be distributed 2 weeks in advance for all meetings held by the Sabha. The Kisan Sabha work and the Congress work used to be done together. D 196 is the latest rules of the Sabha. There was no office of the Workers' and Peasants' Party in Gorakhpur. I do not know of any meeting held at Gorakhpur in 1929 or any other time described as Lenin Day meeting. I am a Congressman. I recognise D 197. I sent a copy of it for publication and it was published in 1926 or 1927 in a newspaper. The same is the case with D 198 (7).

No accused will examine this witness as his witness or cross examine him.

XXN. Nil.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

23-2-32.

By Crown by permission. In 1929 I was not doing any work except that of Secretary of the Union. I used always to go to meetings of the Congress or Kisan Sabha. I attended all their meetings without exception. No record was kept in the office of my doing so. There is not in my office any list of meetings held. My office and the Congress office were in the same room. The Congress Secretary was someone else. It was not the practice for him to see my papers and I his.

REXXN. Nil.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

23-2-32.

D.W. 31.

Dr. D. R. Dhar, on S.A. Witness for Banarjee. Residence Calcutta.

I am M.B. Calcutta, D.T.M., of School of Tropical Medicine Calcutta and M.R.C.P., of London. I worked in many hospitals in London, and also in Berlin. I returned to India by the end of 1927 (in reading over says: the middle of 1927), and worked for 2 years as a Professor of Infectious diseases in the Carmichel Medical College. I have been practising as a Consulting Physician since my return. I was in London in 1924 and 1925. I know Shib Nath Banarjee accused. I met him in London by the end of 1924, at 21 Cromwell Road at the Government Hostel for Indian students, where he was residing. He told me he was stranded and asked me if I could help him with money to return to India. I raised some money amongst our friends for him. He subsequently came and told me he had received some help from the High Commissioner's office so at his request I gave it back to the donors. He on that occasion showed me some correspondence which he was carrying on with the High Commissioner's office. I think Banarjee accused returned to India by the beginning of 1925 or end of 1924. I knew Mr. Lindsay Indian Trade Commissioner and know his handwriting. He used often to come to the Cromwell Road hostel where he had some official position. I often met Mr. Lindsay during the time Banarjee accused was there. I know there was correspondence going on between Banarjee and Lindsay. I know that Mr. Lindsay helped Banarjee accused. Mr. Lindsay told me so himself, (i.e., his knowledge is hearsay). I recognise Mr. Lindsay's signature on D. 691 and 692 and his writing and signature in D. 694.

(No other accused will examine the witness as his witness).

XXN. No accused wishes to cross examine.

By Crown Counsel. I knew Mr. Lindsay for about a year. I first met him in October 1924 in Cromwell Road. I met him there once a week or fortnight after that. I have not had any correspondence with him. I have seen notices issued by him about socials and debates. I have never seen him writing. My knowledge of his signature is based on notices which purported to be signed by him and that is all. I first met Banarjee when we were in the same school in Jessore in 1908. I am aged 33.

He was senior to me in the school. We were together for 3 or 4 years at school. Then I lost sight of him, I saw him once or twice in Calcutta casually in the streets before I went to England. It might be in 1917 or 1918. The next time was in 1924 in Cromwell Road. I asked him where he had been since I last saw him. He said he had just come from Russia. I have not been to Russia. He did not tell me what he had been doing there and I did not ask him. All I knew was that he wanted to get back to India. I met other Indians in Berlin. My brother was there from the Indian Educational Service on study leave. I met others too, a Dr. Gangoli who was a special friend of mine, I did not meet S. N. Tagore in Berlin. I was in Paris on my way back to India when I heard he was coming. I did not hear it from him. It was in July 1927 not the end of it. I think he came to Berlin later. I did not meet any of his friends in Germany. I do not know V. N. Chattopadhaya. I know Mrs. Sarojine Naidu but none of her family.

REXXN. Nil.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd R. L. YORKE.

23-2-32.

D.W. 32.

Mr. N. C. Kelkar on S. A. Residence Poona, Journalist Witness for Thengde accused.

I was a member of the Legislative Assembly for some 6 or 7 years, and have been a Journalist for some 35 years. I have been connected with 2 newspapers the English paper called Maratha and the vernacular Kesari. I have been connected with the Indian National Congress since 1897. For 2 or 3 years till about 1923 or 1924 I was a member of the Working Committee. I did not again offer myself for election owing to difference of opinion, about Council entry etc. After that I established the Responsive Co-operation Party, and was its leader. I was associated with Mr. Tilak for a long time and belonged to his party. Our creed is to seek to reconcile the interests of capitalists and labourers and landlords and tenants. That is the creed of the

Tilak party and the Responsive Co-operation Party. I know D. R. Thengde accused of this case and have known him for the last 20 or 25 years. He was one of the prominent members of Tilak's Nationalist Party at Nagpur. Dr. Moonje and Mr. Ogle are others. Thengde has I think continued to be a member of that party all along until he came to Poona. I met him occasionally at Poona. He used to come to me as a friend and a party man. He was also I think a member of the Responsivist Party. He has all along been holding our views, up to the time of his arrest. I know the Fabian Society. Thengde has been a member of that society and a student of its literature, which he used to receive. I also am a member of that society. It was he who introduced me to it and signed my introduction form. I think he took interest in Trade Unions. He used to discuss things with me, trade union matters. I know there was such a thing as a Kirkee Arsenal Trade Union. I remember to have attended a meeting at Kirkee but not any meeting of the Union. Shown D. 767 (5): I do not remember seeing this document but I probably attended such a meeting as is described in it. The cutting shown to me (D. 774) appears to be a cutting from the Kesari. I was then the editor of the Kesari and must have read this report of the proceedings so far as it goes and my speech, within 3 days. I think I found it correct. I know the 3 gentlemen named in D. 767 (1). Paranjpe is a journalist with his own paper, Gokhale was an assistant on my staff and Vase a member of the Servants of India Society of Poona. I attended an annual conference at Poona of the Postal and R.M.S. Unions probably in 1928. I cannot remember the fact but Thengde must have attended it. At several public meetings in 1928 and 1929 at which I was presiding or speaking Thengde accused was also one of the speakers. At most public meetings police and government reporters are present and also of course press reporters.

By Ghosh accused. I know Mr. G. S. Khaparde, and his handwriting. D. 165 (5) is in his hand and bears his signature.

No accused wishes to examine this witness as his witness or cross examine him.

XXN. By Crown Counsel. I have been in Nagpur several times. It was there I first met Thengde. He came to Poona some 5 or 7 years ago. I did not know he was a member of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. I had heard of the existence of that party in Bombay. I had no knowledge whether Thengde had any connection with it. I had heard of the existence of the W.P.P., through the newspapers. I had not I think seen their

paper the Kranti. I was editor of Kesari in 1908 to 1909 and then again from 1910 to 1928, January. I took it up again in the beginning of 1929 after a year's leave spent in India. I do not remember whether the Kranti was advertised in the Kesari. It may have been. It might have been advertised there without my being aware of it. The policy of the W. P. P., may have been commented upon in the Kesari but not I think by me personally. At this moment I am not aware of any comments in the Kesari on the W. P. P., policy. I cannot say if Thengde ever wrote to the Kesari. He might have contributed to the Kesari on a subject he knew, about the Trade Unions or something of that kind. It is correct that what I have said about Thengde's views was expressed in ignorance of the fact that he was a member and President of the W.P.P. I know nothing intimately of the policy of the W.P.P. I know that they stand for asserting their rights as workers and peasants as against their masters either landlords or capitalists as the case may be. That is generally all I know. I do not remember offhand anything which appeared in the Kesari that rather perturbed Thengde or about which he came to speak to me. I do not know Thengde's signature. P 820 shown to witness. I know Joglekar accused. The mention in it of editorial note No. 6 in the Kesari of 24th April 1928 does not remind me of anything. I do not remember that he had any grievance against the Kesari such as is suggested there. I know Dange accused and have seen him but very rarely in Poona. He addressed a meeting at which I was I think President. I have also seen him rarely in Bombay. Nor do I remember anything about the incident mentioned in P 819 about the Kesari. I know Dattaram and Co., who are one of our Bombay advertising agents. I am not prepared to deny that the Kranti was advertised in the Kesari (witness was shown P 1348 (10a) and (10b). I began to subscribe to the Fabian Society about 4 or 5 years ago. I know accused Spratt and Bradley by name but not as members of the W.P.P. I never knew whether they were members of it (W.P.P.) by personal knowledge. I am not prepared to connect Dange or Joglekar with that party. I did connect Spratt and Bradley with it. I do not remember making up a little poem about them. I do remember making it now, after it was read out from Legislative Council reports.

REXXN. Nothing that has been shown to me in cross examination alters my statement about Thengde's views. [There is not apparently anything shown]. My statement about his views is based on personal conversation with him. [Ghosh asks for permission to ask further questions which he says arise out

of the Cross-examination. He has evidently no such right and has exercised his right of examining the witness already. Permission is not granted].

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

26-2-32.

D.W. 33.

Mr. D. Chaman Lal, on S.A. Barrister-at-Law. I have been connected with the A.I.T.U.C., since its inception in 1920. I was its founder and General Secretary for 3 years from 1920 to 1923. I attended the International Labour Conference at Geneva as adviser to the Indian Delegate in 1925 and as Delegate in 1928. I was present at the Labour and Socialist International Conference in I think July 1928, or it might have been August. I have seen volumes similar to D. 776 and 777 as reports of that Conference. [tendered as authoritative expositions of the current of thought of the 2nd International].

I was present at the Lahore Session of the A.I.T.U.C., presided over by Mr. C. R. Das in 1923. I cannot possibly say what was the central idea of his speech. (Ghosh seeks to elicit Mr. Das, ideas as to the future constitution of India. Ruled out as too far removed, from the matter in issue). I was not a member of the Independence League.

I was present at the A.I.T.U.C. Executive Council meeting held early in 1928 at Delhi in the Assembly Committee room. I remember 2 Committees being appointed to look into the condition of Unions in Bengal and Punjab. For Bengal I think Spratt was one of them. I think that must have been my suggestion. I first saw D. 393 a year or a year and a half after I delivered my Presidential address. I recognise the signature in D. 208 (1) as that of Mr. N. M. Joshi. I know of a News Service called the Orient Press Service in London. I know a Mr. Pulin Seal. He was running that service. The resolution passed at the Cawnpore A.I.T.U.C., regarding the Boycott of the Simon Commission as passed was I think my draft.

For Desai and Banarjee accused (by Mr. Sinha). In D. 691

and 692 I recognise the signature of Mr. Lindsay Indian Trade Commissioner and in D. 690 his writing and signature. I know him very well. I know his writing as I have often had correspondence with him. In D. 778 I recognise the signature of Sadanand Proprietor of the Free Press. He has written to me off and on during the last few years and I have written to him. About D. 689 I can only say that I think it bears the signature of Lord Olivier but I have only had a few letters from him in reply to letters written by me.

By Mukerjee. Accused wishes to put P 1414B to witness and examine him as an expert to give an opinion whether this programme is in accordance with the creed of the 2nd International. I do not accept him as an expert on the evidence already given by him.

By Gauri Shankar accused. I appeared as Counsel in the Sessions Court in appeal on behalf of persons convicted in the Garhmuktesar Riot case in 1928. It was Gauri Shankar accused who engaged me.

No other accused wishes to examine witness as his witness.

XXN. No accused wishes to cross-examine the witness.

By Crown Counsel. D 190 (95) shown to witness. I remember very well receiving this circular because it was a matter I had dealt with myself previously in London. In July 1927 I was at Lahore and Spratt accused was I think staying with me. I do not actually recall a discussion with him on this subject but we discussed many matters and I might have discussed this with him. Some time that Summer I went to Peshawar to defend one Fazl Elahi. I did not charge fees for that but I got my expenses. I went to England in 1925. I do not think I met Desai accused in 1925 but I think I did so in 1926 when I was in England for about 3 weeks. He came to me as a correspondent of the Bombay Chronicle. Added: it might quite easily have been 1925. I know Arthur Field. Witness asked about East West Conference in 1925; and shown P. 1843C: I do not remember actually signing such an invitation but I remember being consulted about it and asked to support it. I do not remember what happened about it finally.

I know Shapurji Saklatwala very well. I do not remember his trying in 1925 to arrange for me to go to Russia. I and Messrs Goswami and Joshi wanted to visit Russia in 1925 and it

is possible that we may have spoken to Saklatwala about it. I do not know anything about any arrangements being made or not.

I do not know anything about Evelyn Roy except that in Paris in 1925 on my way back from Geneva I was told by someone, that a lady called Evelyn Roy was waiting downstairs and would I like to meet her. I said I had no intention of meeting her or Mr. M. N. Roy. (Dange objects to this as hearsay. No hearsay evidence is contained in this statement. Objection overruled). It was not Mr. Joshi to whom I referred as the person who told me. He was with me in Geneva but not with me in Paris. We met again in London.

(Witness shown P. 2375). Volunteers. I wish to say that I took Spratt accused with me to Peshawar in order that he should take notes of the case and for no other purpose.

REXXN. Nil.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

29-2-32.

D.W. 34.

S. Sadanand. on S. A. Brahman. Residence Bombay. I am Managing Editor of the Free Press of India News Agency. I am also Editor of the Daily paper called the Free Press Journal. I have known Desai accused since some time in 1928 soon after his return from England. When I first knew him he was employed in the Bombay Chronicle. I think some member of my staff introduced him to me. I knew Desai's paper called the Spark. I first heard of it in the latter half of 1928, some time before it was started. If I remember correctly Desai was then on the Herald staff. There was some trouble on the Herald and after that I remember there was some discussion between me and Desai and some friends in my office about starting the Spark. He asked me advice on the business and financial aspect of the paper. My recollection is that I was in favour of his starting the paper and gave the advice that if it was economically run it ought in due time to pay its own way. I dont

remember anything more then. I think we sent out a small news paragraph that a paper entitled Spark would appear shortly. I forget the exact terms. The file of that period does not now exist. I also remember sending out as a news paragraph an extract from the 1st editorial of the Spark stating its aims. I gave my new service to Desai. The arrangement was that the service should be given free for some time and after that at concession rates. It was only to be given for the night preceding publication. The service was given free after the first issue appeared. I was a regular reader of the Spark. It is my impression that I gave the service free for a number of weeks but I cant say if it was for the whole life of the Spark. D. 778 is a letter from me to Desai and bears my signature. D. 780 bears the signature of Mr. B.G. Horniman which I recognise. I have often received articles in manuscripts in his hand and exchanged correspondence with him. The Indian National Herald continued to appear till the 1st week of April 1929. I dont remember circulating through my news agency a statement of Mr. Saklatwala's views about Mahatma Gandhi, without seeing the statement. I do not possess files of the year 1929. I cant remember if the para 'What Sak thinks' in Spark No. 6 page 1 was issued from my Agency. I remember some opinions of Saklatwala on Gandhi's arrest in connection with bonfire at Calcutta were wired but I cant say if this was that paragraph. I have no files of the messages sent by my agency at the time of the Communal riots in Bombay in 1929. I was at the time in charge of messages on that subject sent from my office. I remember distinctly sending the first message quoted on page 1678 of Desai's statement shown to me and can say that messages similar to the 2nd and third were also issued.

By Ghosh accused. I have known Ghosh accused for 7 years. I think I met him at Calcutta in his capacity of Assistant Editor of the Amrita Bazar Patrika. I know of Miss Agnes Smedley by correspondence only. She was the correspondent of the Free Press Agency for some time. I had read her articles in the Modern Review, Forward and another paper before I appointed her as correspondent. I had also recommendations of her from Jawahar Lal Nehru, and others. I remember discussions with Ghosh at Calcutta about the establishment of an Eastern News Service for news from China and Japan. Ghosh was representing the Indian Journalists' Association. I was at Delhi in February 1928. I know Mr. N. C. Chandra an M.L.A. at that time. I think I met Ghosh at his house in Delhi then. More discussion about this News Service took place then.

No other accused examines Mr. Sadanand as his witness.

No accused wishes to cross-examine the witness.

XXN. By Crown Counsel. I dont remember anyone called Nambiar who had an agreement with the Free Press Agency unless I have more particulars. Nambiar is a common name. I know of Mr. A.C.N. Nambiar of Berlin. (Note: in reading over witness says it should be A.C. Nambiar and not A.C.N. Nambiar). My impression is there was correspondence with him about his being correspondent for the Free Press but that it came to nothing. I conducted the correspondence. (Item No. 120 in searchlist P 1240 is shown to the witness). I dont remember the address of Nambiar in no. 21 in that notebook but the name and initials A. C. Nambiar are correct. No. 38 gives correctly the name and address of my London correspondent referred to in D 778. I dont know whether these names and addresses are in Desai's writing. I dont know Desai's writing. I cant say definitely that I have never received a letter from Desai. I dont even know his signature. I dont remember ever to have written to him, or to have ever seen any of his manuscripts. I cant remember the details of the conversation about the financial prospects of the Spark. I have heard of No. 19 in this same notebook Singaravelu Chetty but not of no. 20 (Krishnaswamy Iyengar) or his address. I cant say whose is the other handwriting in this note-book referring to subscribers nos. 41 to 47. (Mr. Sinha objects that the note-book which is marked P 2617 is not properly proved. Crown Counsel will argue that it is from Desai's search and in his hand. Noted). I know one Mr. Dhairyawan of the Bombay Chronicle but don't know his initials or address. Witness is shown P870. I cant identify the pencil writing in this, as my impression is that Nambiar's letters were generally typed and only signed. I think they were seized when the Free Press office was searched on 20-3-29.

From 1923 I am associated with the Free Press. Before that I was with the Associated Press in 1919 and 1920. In 1921 I was Manager of the Independent at Allahabad, and in 1922 doing some other work, and in 1923, I was Editor of the Rangoon Mail. I was convicted under section 124A in Rangoon, and sentenced to 2 years R. I., but sentence was suspended after some 4 months on an expression of regret by me.

Copies of news messages which are broadcast are usually kept for about a year or in some cases 18 months and then destroyed. I received no payment in respect of the 2 messages relating to the Spark.

REXXN. For Desai. We are usually paid by the Newspapers who receive news messages and not by the persons mentioned in those messages. Such messages are sent according to their public interest.

Read and admitted correct,

Sd R. L. YORKE.

9-3-32.

Printed by O'Brien's Press, Meerut

D. W. 35.

Mr. R. R. Bakhale on S.A. For Banerji and Desai.

I am one of the 3 Labour members of the Bombay Legislative Council. I am now the representative of Labour on the Indian Franchise Committee. I have been connected with the A.I.T.U.C. from 1925 to 1929. I was Assistant Secretary all that time. Most of that time Mr. N. M. Joshi was General Secretary. I was also working with him in some of the Trade Unions in Bombay. I attended most of the Sessions of the T.U.C. between those dates. I attended the Jharia Congress in 1928. Mr. Joshi was not present at that congress. I acted as the Secretary there. For most of the proceedings it was I who took down notes. D. 305 the official report was printed by me as keeper of the Press. It was also prepared by me. I think it is a correct report of the proceedings. Generally I issued the delegation cards for the Jharia Congress. With a view to issuing these cards I used to obtain from the Unions concerned letters of authorisation containing the names of the delegates they had appointed. These letters used to come by post or if it was too late were handed to me by an official of the Union concerned at the Congress itself. I used to keep these letters in my file and issue the delegate's tickets. After the session was over the file used to be taken to the Bombay office. I think that representatives of the East Indian Ry. Union attended the Jharia congress. There was a contest that year for the post of President between Mr. Jawahar Lal Nehru and so far as I remember Mr. D. B. Kulkarni. I opposed Mr. Nehru and I cant say whether I supported or opposed Mr. Kulkarni. If I remember aright I think the E. I. Ry. Union representative voted in favour of Pt. Jawahar Lal. The message from Mr. Andrews which appears on page 54 to 58 was either given to me by him in England or sent by him to me.

I was in Bombay in January 1929. I know Desai accused

I remember to have met Desai once probably in January 1929. I think he came to me and asked me to give him the names of foreign labour periodicals as he wanted them for his own use as he was editing a paper at that time. I know a Mr. Gokhale who was Mr. N. M. Joshi's Secretary then. I think Desai asked me to contribute an article or two periodically to his paper and I replied that I was busy at that time but I would try.

By Ghosh. I attended the 3rd Congress of the Labour

and Socialist International at Brussels in August 1928. I think Mr. Chaman Lal was also there with me representing the A.I.T.U.C. D. 776 and 777 are the reports of that congress. The first time I saw these reports was some time early in 1929. I sent those reports to Ghosh accused. I also attended the 60th Session of the British T.U.C. at Swansea in 1928 as Fraternal delegate of the A.I.T.U.C. I spoke there. I sent the report of that congress to Ghosh accused. I dont remember if there was another Assistant Secretary at the Jharia Congress besides myself. There was another Assistant Secretary elected at Jharia along with me, namely Dange accused. The election was contested. The contest was between Dange and Joglekar. I remember to have had some conversations with Mr. P.C. Bose and Ghosh accused about that election. I think I told Bose and Ghosh that we should support Dange because I had had talk with Dange before leaving Bombay and he had agreed to act if he were elected. I also gave the reason that Mr. Joshi and I had pulled on very well with Dange as Assistant Secretary. I also made a public statement in the Executive Council to the effect that Dange had stated his willingness to act. It is a fact that Dange was entrusted by Mr. Joshi with the task of preparing a revised edition of the Trade Union Directory. I think he also paid Mr. Dange some money in advance from the T.U.C. funds for that work.

I was in Calcutta in the first week of January 1929. I then remember calling on Ghosh at his house with Mr. Shiva Rao. I think Mrinal Kanti Bose was with Ghosh at the time of the call. We had some talk on the Jharia T.U.C. Congress and the future of the T.U.C. It was general talk in regard to what took place there. I cant recollect anything particular about what Ghosh said. I think I remember Ghosh showing me a newspaper article. I think it related generally to what took place at Jharia and the meeting. I dont remember by whom that article was written. We did discuss the steps to be taken for the future. I think some reference to the organisation of Trade Union groups was discussed but I forget the details. I think the suggestion was made by Ghosh accused. I agreed with Ghosh in regard to his suggestion.

D. 208 (7) and (8) telegrams were both sent to me.

I was in editorial charge of the A.I. Trade Union Bulletin. D. 208 (6) was issued by me. I received the appeal from Pt. J.L. Nehru which is part of it. D. 208 (11) was written by me. There is a reference to a report about Bauria which was received from Ghosh. D. 285 (2) is that report. I was an editor of the T.U. Bulletin from 1924 to 1928 except for the period I was in

Europe in 1928. All those issued while I was editor will bear my name on them. D. 208 (23) bears my signature. I think 12 Dalhousie Square Calcutta was the office of Mr. Mukund Lal Sircar for some time. I have not read Leninism by Stalin.

By Mukherjee accused. I can recognise the handwriting of Mr. Citrine and his signature but that on D. 190 (20) is not his, though the postcard is from the T.U.C. I say this because my experience is that when Mr. Citrine himself does not sign a letter a gentleman Mr. H.W. Lee signs his name and writes initials H.W.L. below, as appears here. D. 781 (1) with enclosures, (2), (3), (4), (5), all bear my signature and were issued by me. Note. Papers of 1925.) D. 190 (98) was issued along with D. 781 (5). D. 190 (100) bears my signature as also (103). (104 was sent along with (103). D. 781 (6) bears the signature of Mr. N. M. Joshi.

No other accused will examine Mr. Bakhle as his witness.

XXN. By accused Nil.

By Crown Counsel. When I was asked the question which side the E.I Ry Union Representative voted in the contested election for President between J. L. Nehru and Kulkarni I looked through the report D. 305 and gave my answer. The reason for my answer was that on looking through the list on page 38 of affiliated T.U's to 41 of the Appendix. I had some faint recollection that some important unions from some province voted for J. L. Nehru. I found that there 3 Unions from Bihar and Orrissa and I recollected that these 3 Unions voted for Jawahar Lal. I can only remember a few important delegates such as K.L. Ghosh, K. C. Mitra and Joglekar accused. K. C. Mitra was from E.I.Ry., Joglekar was from some Bombay Union, G.K.U., or some other union, and Ghosh from Press Employees Association Bengal. (after consulting report.) I can give a few names of Unions which supported Jawahar Lal, such as Press Employees Union, Bombay Textile Labour Union (myself and others.) Madras Labour Union (Mr. Shiva Rao and some others). I forget whether it was a close fight in the voting but it was a hard fight. I cant say why I remember that about the Bihar and Orrissa Unions. The way it strikes my memory however is that Mr. Jawahar Lal Nehru had some Trade union connections with certain unions statement which voted in his favour such as the Jamshedpur Labour Association and the E.I. Ry. Union. I seem to remember some correspondence regarding grievances of the E.I. Ry. workers between K. C. Mitra and Pt. Jawahar Lal: that is the T. U. connection with E. I. R. U. to which I refer,

D 235 (2) is not the original report I received but appears to be a copy of the report which I received. The original should be in the A.I.T.U.C. files.

REXXN. By Mr. Sinha. Contradiction about his voting in the Presidential election pointed out to witness who says: what happened was that when the 2 names were proposed I was in favour of neither but in my speech I opposed the candidature of Pt. J. L. Nehru. I believe I suggested some other 3rd name being put up. When the actual voting came I had to make a choice only between those 2 candidates as there was no other in the field and I voted in favour of Pt. Jawahar Lal as against Mr. Kulkarni. I had no specific person in view for the 3rd candidate, and did not suggest any.

By Ghosh. I dont know where the papers of the A.I.T.U.C. are at present.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R. L. YORKE.

21-3-32.

D.W. 36.

Mr. C. F. Andrews, on S.A.

By Ghosh accused. I was in Calcutta in April 1928. I presided over a meeting at Wellington Square then. I think I was invited by the Bengal Federation of Labour. It had to do with the Lilloah Strike. I wanted to put before the meeting terms on which I would advise men to go back to work. I think also it was to collect funds for the strikers but I am not quite certain. I dont remember if I saw the Englishman the next day, with a report of the meeting. I attended a Send-off given by the Federation to Mr. Haq. and Mr. Bose when they were going to Geneva. I remember receiving an invitation card similar to D. 759. I dont remember whether Ghosh accused showed me a letter from the Agent E.I. Railway in regard to those terms. I remember that Ghosh and I were closely associated in the

matter of those terms but I don't remember any details. I remember that I went to an interview with the Agent. I cannot say if it was before or after the Wellington Square meeting. My only impression is that the Agent was unfavourable to the terms we proposed. I remember presiding over an Executive Committee meeting of the A.I.T.U.C., at Delhi in 1928. I was President. It was early in the year. One and I think the main question was that of the affiliation of the A. I. T. U. C. to the Amsterdam International. My attitude was that we should not affiliate the Indian T.U. Movement with either of the Internationals at that time. The E. C. accepted that view. I left Calcutta to go to Europe some time early in May 1928. Through-out April and up to I think May 4th, the date I left, Ghosh accused was active with me in working for a settlement of the strike. D. 207 (4) shown to witness. I remember to have seen this document before I left Calcutta then.

For Banarjee. I know Shib Nath Banarjee accused in Court. I cannot remember when I first met him. If I remember right he came to me with an introduction from Major Graham Pole. D. 698 is that letter of introduction. I don't know what happened to it after I saw it. The time I met Banarjee frequently was in the end of 1927. I cannot be sure whether I saw him in the interval between 1925 and then. I know of the Calcutta Tramwaymen's Union. Banarjee came to me to ask me to help in settling the strike on the Tramways and to get the men who had been dismissed reinstated. It was in Calcutta he came to me then. D 686 is a letter I wrote to Banarjee in connection with that strike. We tried to bring about a settlement of that strike. Banarjee was working with me to that intent. I remember trying to get up some subscription for the men to help them. I cannot remember if we succeeded. I asked the T.U.C. for help for the Tramwaymen and they give us some small amount. I was President of the Jamshedpur Labour Association at that time. It give I think Rs. 200 for the help of the men, at my instance. I think it was Banarjee who first came to me for help for the Lillooah workers. I was in Calcutta when he came to me. He wanted me to help to bring about a settlement of the strike. We discussed possible terms of settlement and I suggested certain terms on which I was willing to help and to approach Mr. Colvin the Agent. So far as I can recollect he agreed to the terms I suggested. Otherwise I would not have gone. I visited the office of the Lillooah Union. I think Banarjee took me there. I think we talked over the terms at the Union Office. By we I mean Shib Nath and I and one or two others. I knew K. C. Mitra of the E.I. Railway Union at that time. I met him

at the Union office and probably discussed with him. I feel fairly certain he also agreed. I think we went on with the negotiations on the terms I proposed without alteration and went to the Agent with them. I think but am not sure that I interviewed the Agent only once. I met the Magistrate of Howrah, Mr. G. S. Dutt, many times in connection with the strike, nearly every day. I don't know if Banarjee approached him or not. I cannot remember that I ever went to him with any of the office bearers of the Union. My negotiations with the Agent were unsuccessful. I saw the Agent's letter D 207 (4) just before I left Calcutta for Madras and did not carry on the negotiations. I stayed in South India for about a month and then went abroad. I remember a strike at Jessop's and Burn's connected with the Lillooah strike. Banarjee and others asked me to negotiate for a settlement and I went to both companies I think. I was not successful in those negotiations also. I did suggest terms in those cases also. They were accepted by the workers who authorised me to propose them. I met Banarjee frequently in the course of these negotiations. He helped me all the while more than anyone else. These negotiations means those in the Lillooah and Jessop's and Burn's strikes. I was absent from India and therefore unable to preside over the Jharia Session of the A.I.T.U.C. I sent a message to the Congress, which has been correctly reproduced in the report of the Jharia Congress D. 305 at page 54 to 58. Banarjee at once told me he had been to Russia when I first met him.

No other accused examines Mr. Andrews as his witness.

XXN. No accused wishes to cross-examine the witness.

By Crown. Nil.

Read and admitted correct.

Sd. R.L. YORKE.

21-3-32.

This closes the evidence of defence witnesses. The Court adjourns for the Holi and Easter Holidays and will sit again on Tuesday March 29 when the accused or their counsel will sum up their case (vide Section 290 C.P.C.).

Sd. R.L. YORKE.

21-3-32.

Printed by O'Brien's Press, Meerut.

24th June 1929.

Mr Longford James:

When I broke off on the last occasion, your Honour, I had attempted to sketch the origin, the objective and the organisation of this Third International and I had to some extent indicated the tactics which are advocated by it. I had read from books in support of my diagnosis on the first three points, and I note that one of my learned friends says that it is a fanciful point of view. It is unfortunately the point of view of this Third International.

Now this morning for a short time I must weary you I am afraid with their own statements with regard to the tactics which have got to be pursued, and when you come to see the tactics used by these accused you will find that they carried out very faithfully the advice contained in the official books of the International. I am reading now from the "Thesis and Statutes of the Third Communist International adopted by the Second Congress", which claim I believe to have been framed by Lenin.

On page 16 of that book they say:—

"In every organisation, union, association, beginning with the proletarian ones at first and afterwards in all those of the non-proletarian workers and exploited masses, (political, professional, military, cooperative, educational, sporting, etc.) must be formed groups or nuclei of communists, mostly open ones, but also secret ones, which become necessary in each case when the arrest or exile of their members or the dispersal of the organisation is threatened; and these nuclei, in close contact with one another and with the central party. Exchanging experiences carrying on the work of propaganda, campaign, organisation—adapting themselves to all the branches of social life, to all the various forms and subdivisions of the working masses must systematically train themselves, the party, the class, and the masses by such multiform work."

And on page 18:—

"In particular it is necessary for the Communist Party and the whole advanced proletariat to give the most absolute and self-denying support to all the masses for a larger general strike movement, which is alone able under the yoke of capitalism to awake, properly arouse, enlighten and organise the masses and develop in them a full confidence in the leading role of the revolutionary proletariat."

Again on page 20, after having pointed out the menace of capitalism and its use of newspapers, it says:—

"For the struggle against this state of things the Communist Party must create a new type of periodical press for Extensive circulation among the workmen:

(1) Lawful publications in which the Communists without calling themselves such and without mentioning their connection which the party would learn to utilise the slightest possibility allowed by the laws. (2) Illegal sheets, although of the smallest dimensions and irregularly published but reproduced in most of the printing offices by the workmen in secret, or, if the movement has grown stronger, by means of revolutionary seizure of the printing offices, and giving the proletariat undiluted revolutionary information and the revolutionary mottoes."

Then on page 26 they emphasise the necessity of attacking the bourgeoisie:—

"Wherever the followers of the Third International have access, and whatever means of propaganda are at their disposal, whether the columns of newspapers, public meetings, labour unions, or cooperatives, it is indispensable for them not only to denounce the bourgeoisie but also its assistants and agents, reformists of every shade and colour. Then on page 27. The class struggle in almost every country of Europe and America is entering the phase of civil war. Under such conditions the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois laws. They should create everywhere a parallel illegal apparatus which at the decisive moment should do its duty by the party and in every possible way assist the revolution in every country. Where in consequence of martial law or other exceptional laws the Communists are unable to carry on their work lawfully a combination of lawful and illegal work is absolutely necessary."

Then on page 45 we get this:—

"The elementary means of struggle of the proletariat against the rule of the bourgeoisie is first of all the method of mass demonstrations. Such mass demonstrations are prepared and carried out by the organised masses of the proletariat under the direction of a united, disciplined Communist Party. Civil war is war. In this war the proletariat must have its efficient political officers, its good political general staff, to conduct operations during all the stages of that fight. The mass struggle means a whole system of developing demonstrations growing ever more acute in form and logically leading to an uprising against the capitalist order of government. In this warfare of the masses developed into a civil war the guiding party of the proletariat must as a general rule secure control over all lawful positions, making them its auxiliaries in the revolutionary work and subordinating such positions to the plans of the general campaign, that of the mass struggle."

And on page 50 they say:—

"In the event of labour demonstrations in the streets or other revolutionary movements the communist members must occupy the most conspicuous place at "the head of the proletarian masses".

Then in the Official Account of the Thesis of the Fourth Congress they have developed that which you will find is more highly developed hereafter, the question of these tactics in the Colonies. Now what I have read largely applies to European countries, but it is realized that when you get to a country like India you will expect to find an additional factor, that is, you will find certain people amongst the population who are dissatisfied, who want independence or who want in some way or another to better themselves politically. Now these are referred to in these Theses as the nationalist bodies. They are anathema to the Third International, for obvious reasons. The nationalist body that you find in country like Egypt or India is likely to be—and experience shows, generally is composed of just those elements which the Third International desires to fight, namely, the bourgeois elements. The nationalist body in such countries is not likely to be the class-conscious body which the Third International desires to see top dog. Therefore a new problem arises and as these nationalist forces are likely to be useful for the end in view you utilise them at the start explaining all the while quietly that their ideology is wrong; and then when you have used them as far as you need, it is perfectly simple to throw them overboard in that great day when the proletariat will vanquish and will overthrow the bourgeoisie of this country, just as it has overthrown or planned to overthrow the bourgeoisie of any western country. But in these Theses you will find they emphasise the importance of *using* these national forces in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. There the task of the Communist International is two-fold: firstly, to establish and consolidate nuclei of the communist party which will work on its own lines for the furtherance of their main objective, and secondly, to give the utmost support to the national revolutionary movement directed against Imperialism and to become the vanguard of that movement they hope to develop the social movement within the national movement. In other words you put yourself at the head of the national movement saying that you want to see India governed by Indians, and all the time you mean nothing of the sort, you want the dictatorship of the proletariat all over the world and the transitional stage of government under Stalin at Moscow.

I now quote from the *Theses* is of the 4th Congress: Page 57.

“While the Bourgeois nationalists regard the labour movement merely from the point of view of its importance as a means for securing victory for themselves, the International proletariat regards the young labour movement of the East from the point of view of its revolutionary future.”

This points out somewhat cynically that the bourgeois nationalist rejoices to see labour commotions going on thinking that they will aid his needs, whereas of course it is he who is really being exploited by the other people. Then on page 58, it is emphasised again:—

“The communist and working class parties in the colonies and semi-colonial countries are confronted by a two-fold task: on the one hand to fight for the most radical solutions of the problems of bourgeois democratic revolution, directed to the conquest of political independence and, on the other, to organise the workers and peasants to fight for their special class interest, during which they must take advantage of the antagonism existing in the nationalist bourgeois “democratic camp.”

It is in fact the proletariat who are going to use the nationalist bourgeois—not the other way about. Then on page 59 :—

“While in the West amidst the conditions of the transition period, which is a period of organised accumulation of strength, the watchword of the United *Labour* Front was put forward, in the colonial East it is at present necessary to put forward the watchword of a United Anti-Imperialist Front.”

And it was precisely for this reason that the League against Imperialism was started as a camouflage body to do this work. Then on page 88, going back to the tasks of agitation, they say :—

“Every member of the Communist International must consider himself an agitator among the masses. This can always take place wherever and whenever workers usually gather, in the workshops, in the trade unions, at mass meetings in workers' clubs, in sport clubs, musical societies, tenants' and consumers' organisations, in peoples' houses, in workers' restaurants, in the trains, in the villages etc., and even in the homes of the workers (house to house agitation). The agitation shall always take as its starting point the concrete conditions and needs of the workers in order to lead them on the path of organised, revolutionary class war. One should not expound Communist Doctrines which would not be understood by the audience; one should always urge them to rise and fight for the immediate demands of the proletariat against capitalist and bourgeois class rule wherever it appears.”

Do not tell them the whole truth, because it will make them sick. That is what it comes to.

Then in the Fifth Congress—I will not trouble to read them to your Honour, but I will give you the reference, pages 29 to 33, where you have the whole things ummed up in little paragraphs in which they deal with all these various problems.

Mr. D. P. Sinha: I am sorry to interrupt, but in order that we may be in a position to judge the value of these things better may I know if these are the official reports of the Communist Congresses from which my learned friend is reading, or are then extracts from books taken from the possession of the accused?

Mr. Langford James: What I am reading from at present is the official account of these Congresses published by the Communist

International, but I am proposing to read—and I will tell you when I do—from books taken from the accused as well.

Mr. D. P. Sinha: That is subject to our objection.

Mr. Langford James: Oh, undoubtedly. I quite realise that. Well I won't read this now except to say that in a short way they summarise the various activities and problems, including this question of the bourgeoisie, the organisation of the peasantry, the fight against religion and this question of the colonies. In 1928 there was a very important pronouncement made with regard to tactics generally and the tactics in the colonies generally and the tactics in India in particular. Now this has been found with the accused, not only in the form of *Imprecorr*, the newspaper to which I have referred you, but also special typed copies have been sent out and they have been found with several of the accused. I should like to read you that passage—it is not very long—which deals particularly with India. I have already read to you two passages in which they discuss the proper way to fight the Swarajists and say that it is important "mercilessly to expose before the toiling masses the national reformist character of the Swarajist Wafdists and other nationalist parties." They lay very great stress upon that as a general tactic. I am sorry to use the singular, but it is more or less confined to the Bolshevik. He never uses the plural but always 'tactic' in the singular. And the general tactic with regard to all the East is that you should attempt to use the nationalist bodies and then mercilessly to expose them when the time comes apparently in the opinion of the Third International, as I will have to tell you later, the time has arrived, but when they come to India proper what they say is this:—

"The basic tasks of the Indian Communists consist in struggle against British imperialism for the emancipation of the country, for destruction of all relics of feudalism, for the agrarian revolution and for establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry in the form of a soviet republic. These tasks can be successfully carried out only when there will be created a powerful Communist Party which will be able to place itself at the head of the wide masses of the working class, peasantry and all the toilers, and to lead them in the struggle against the feudal-imperialist bloc."

"The strike movement of the Indian proletariat now taking place its independence from bourgeois nationalism the all-Indian character of this movement, its distribution over almost all branches of industry, the frequent and protracted strikes, the stubbornness and great resoluteness with which the workers have carried them on, the coming forward of leaders of the strikes from the midst of the workers themselves—all these things denote a turning point in the history of the struggle of the Indian proletariat, and prove that in India the pre-conditions have matured which are essential for the creation of a mass Communist Party. The union of all Communist groups and individual Communist scattered throughout the country into a single independent and centralised Party represents the first task

of Indian Communists. While rejecting the principle of the building of the Party on a two-class basis, the Communists must utilise the connections of the existing workers' and peasants' parties with the toiling masses for strengthening their own party, bearing in mind that the hegemony of the proletariat cannot be realised without the existence of a consolidated, steadfast Communist party armed with the theory of Marxism. The agitational work of the Communist Party must be bound up with the struggle for the immediate demands of the workers, at the same time explaining to them the general aims which the Communist Party sets out to achieve and the methods which it applies for their realisation. It is essential to establish nuclei in the various industrial and other enterprises, and these must take an active part in the Labour movement, in the organisation and conduct of strikes and political demonstrations. The Communist organisations must from the very beginning devote special attention to the training of leading Party cadres from the ranks of the workers.

"In the trade unions, the Indian Communist must mercilessly expose the national-reformist leaders and carry on a decisive struggle for the conversion of the trade unions into genuine class organisation of the proletariat and for the replacement of the present reformist leadership by consistent revolutionary representatives from the mass of the workers. It is especially necessary to expose the method so much favoured by Indian reformists of deciding conflicts by means of petition to the representatives of British imperialism, as well as to "impartial" courts for adjudication between workers and employers. In this struggle, it is necessary to push forward the demands for trade union democracy, for putting the trade union apparatus into the hands of the workers etc. The levers for Party work in the trade unions must be the Communists fractions as well as groups founded by the Communists and sympathising with them. It is necessary to utilise the present strike wave in order to organise the unorganised workers. The miners and engineering workers, the coolies working on the plantations and agricultural labourers in general, represent the least organised sections of the Indian proletariat and the Communists need to devote the necessary attention to them.

"The Communists must unmask the national reformism of the Indian National Congress and oppose all the phrases of the Swarajists, Gandhists etc., about passive resistance, with the irreconcilable slogan of struggle for the emancipation of the country and the expulsion of the imperialists."

Having used what they call the bourgeois national reformist parties, the time has now come to abuse them and show them up mercilessly.

"In relation to the peasantry and peasant organisations the Indian Communists are faced above all with the task of acquainting the widest strata of the peasantry with the general demands of the

Party in the agrarian question, for which purpose the Party must work out an agrarian programme of action. Through workers connected with the village, as well as directly, the Communists must stimulate the struggle of the peasantry for partial demands, and in the process of struggle organise peasant unions. It is essential to pay particular attention to make sure that the newly created peasant organisations do not fall under the influence of exploiting strata in the village.

(That means don't allow the present organisation to get into the hands of the Swaraj Reformists). "It is necessary to give to the existing peasant organisations a concise programme of concrete demands, and to support the activities of the peasants through demonstrations of workers in the towns. It must be remembered that under no circumstances can the communists relinquish their right to open criticism of the opportunists and reformist tactics of the leadership of those mass organisations for which they work."

I lay some stress upon that, because when I come to deal with the activities of these accused, you will find that they have worked on exactly these lines. They have introduced their nuclei nearly everywhere, and they have done their best, I must say, mercilessly to expose to some people at any rate their worst enemy, the reformist leader.

Now, I have said all that I intend to at this stage with regard to the Third International or Comintern, but I should like to say this. It is not necessary, in order to constitute an offence under section 121A or is it necessary to convict these accused of such offence, to prove that they belong to this Third International. If I show that they were carrying out the work on these lines, and at the behest of this Third International, that is quite sufficient. It is quite unnecessary to show that they were in fact members of a communist party definitely formed and affiliated to the Third International. I think that you will come to the conclusion that they were such a party, and if not actually affiliated, they were about to affiliate to the Third International. But I repeat that that is quite an unnecessary part of the indictment. If I show that they were following—to use the words of Mr. Spratt—the "Moscow road" and that for Moscow reasons, and that they were employing the Moscow method with Moscow money, I think that that will be quite sufficient for any court. As to that I hope to satisfy you that there is simply overwhelming evidence, I do not want to be understood to say that I cannot link up these people with the Third International. I think, and in fact I am quite sure that I can, but the point is that it is not really necessary, strictly necessary, to do so.

Now, this conspiracy in India is not, by any means, confined to India. It has been fomented, directed and financed from outside India. And a part has been taken in it by a very large number of persons outside India. I propose to give you, a list of the people, the known people, who have joined in this conspiracy from outside India. But generally you may say that the Comintern, by its appropriate body, whether it be the Ex-Com or the Praesidium, or the

Colonial Department, has been an active member of this conspiracy. The communist party of Great Britain and various persons in particular belonging to that party have taken an exceptionally active part. Then there are on the Continent of Europe various other people. There are the Secretaries of the League against Imperialism, whom I mentioned the other day, one of whom, Munzen berg is a well-known member of the Comintern, and there is Comrade Chattapadya. Then when you go to Hamburg you find a gentleman of the name of Carl whose other name is Inliere Lesse. There is a Julius and a Walter over there, and there are other people also living in France and on the Continent. I promise that I will give you, as far as I can, an exhaustive list of their names, at any rate before I finish this address.

One of the more important of these gentlemen whose name I have not yet mentioned is Mr. Manabendra Nath Roy, whose real name, I believe, is Bhattecharya. Now, Mr. M. N. Roy is a very well-known communist. The Communist International has taken a fatherly interest in India since the year 1922, or perhaps a little earlier, and the gentleman who was especially selected in those earlier days to look after the welfare of this land from the communist point of view was Mr. M. N. Roy. Opinions may differ as to whether he did his best or whether he did not. Perhaps some of the money stuck *en route*, anyhow there was in the year 1924 trial. I say nothing whatever about it, because it has nothing to do with this case, but there was a trial in Cawnpore of certain person. It is to the period after that trial that I am proposing to direct your attention. I shall call it the Cawnpore case, merely as a landmark. After this Cawnpore case it appears that the Third International for doubtless their own good reasons instructed the communist party of Great Britain to take a hand in this game, and it is from that time that you find the communist party of Great Britain interesting itself in the future education of India in communism and the future communist revolution which they wished to bring out.

Now the first gentleman that they sent out to this country, because they have sent out a certain number, the first gentleman they sent out was a Mr. Glading. He came out here and, following the then custom, he called himself Cochrane. No communist comes out here exactly in a free or aboveboard manner. They either change their names or they at any rate throw some doubt upon their occupations. Now Glading came out and returned home and reported that things were in a very bad way indeed in India from their point of view.

Mr. Sinha:—Which year was that ?

Mr. Langford James:—1925.

He made a report at a Conference held at Amsterdam on the 11th and 12th July, 1925. I am reading from that report to see what he had to say. The writer, Mr. Robson, a member of the Communist party of Great Britain, says :

"I arrived in Amsterdam Friday evening and immediately went to the address at which I was instructed to make enquiries, but was unable to get any reply.

On Saturday morning I met two trains arriving from Flushing, expecting to intercept Glading and others who were to be present at the conference, but as they did not arrive I again visited the contact address and discovered that Glading, Dutt and Upadhyaya (*three members of the communist party of Great Britain*) were already there, having arrived by an early train and gone to the meeting place immediately.

Later Roy arrived (*that is M. N. Roy*) and informed us that a meeting would take place at 4-30 p. m. A French representative was expected but nothing was certain."

They had their first meeting at 4-30 p.m. on Saturday, July 11th Comrade Sneevliet of the Dutch party presided and it was agreed that we should first hear Glading's Report".

Then there is a list of those present.

"Comrade Glading stated that he had not expected to be called upon to give a full report of his visit to India, and then gave the names of places which he had visited and people whom he had met. (*It would be interesting to see those names. I have seen some.*) He had not met any Communists and had finally decided that those with whom he had come in contact were useless so far as our Party work is concerned. He said that Calcutta, which he visited last, is the best place. (*I agree with him.*)"

Questions were then asked as follows:

"Roy: What opinion had the Calcutta trade unionists and nationalists of the big leaders? Glading stated that he had not ascertained this.

Sneevliet: Was Glading aware of any relations existing between the Indian leaders and Amsterdam? Glading stated that he was not aware of this." (*Of course Amsterdam is that horrible other International Congress which these accused have been so anxious to keep clear of.*)

"Sneevliet asked Glading why he made his investigations in Calcutta on a Communist basis. Glading replied that he did not do so. Roy then said to Glading: 'Is it true that Bell had said that the International Programme for work in India is 'all nonsense' and not justified by your report?' I then explained that a sub-committee of four, consisting of Dutt, Bell, Glading and myself had been set up to consider the International Programme in the light of Glading's report and that no such thing has been said by Bell, but that our attitude was that in the light of Glading's report, which stated that no Indian Communist groups existed at all, it was necessary to revise the suggested programme. Roy then stated that he had

documentary evidence that Indian groups existed but that these had been unable to make up their minds to see Glading before he left India for England."

Now it is quite clear therefore that Roy had been entrusted with the work of developing India on communist lines, and that he was somewhat hipped by Glading's report. But they on their side intended to do their best to put their house in order.

About this time this communist party of great Britain was turning its attention to corrupting the minds of the youth that Oxford, and what they were proposing to do was to have fractions or nuclei at the universities to teach communistic doctrines against the time that they came out to India. When we come to deal with Spratt you will see that I have very good reasons for supposing that he was a nucleus at the sister university.

Now I am reading to you passages from a report made by Comrade Ivan Thomas then at Merton College, Oxford, dated June 2nd, 1925:—

"Dear Comrade,

Comrade P. R. Stephenson and myself have been working regularly within the society of Indian students here—the Majlis. We have put forward the Communist viewpoint at debates and in private conversation with individual Indians! The result of our activity so far amounts to this: the Indians have been confronted with the existence of M. N. Roy's group and its definite programme of political and economic demands; they have had to recognise that the Indian people have interests that conflict with the interests of the Indian bourgeois and zemindar classes; and that Indian freedom can have another meaning than the opening of all I.C.S. positions to aspiring bureaucrats from the petty bourgeois intelligentsia."

Then he goes on to point out that—

"In these circumstances we think it is doubtful that we will be able to organise an extreme—Nationalist bloc with a programme of genuine anti-Imperialism and national-liberation. .

We do think, however, that we can get together a small and *secret* group of Revolutionary nationalists, who will meet privately with us to discuss the political situation and problem of the struggle for liberation. It may be best to make it a group of Asiatic Revolutionaries and so broaden the basis of our discussions. I am in touch with a Chinese revolutionary here, Ming Chak Lee, who would be prepared to join the Communist Party. The rest of the Chinese community here is hopelessly loyalist and pro-Imperialist.....More than anything we need *information* on the most recent development of Asiatic politics. Our work amongst the Eastern people cannot but be only moderately effective as we are not acquainted with the internal situation in India and China. Can Centre supply us *regularly* with *up-to-date* informa-

tion of this sort? "*Centre of course, is Moscow.*" We could make it the subject of resolutions and motions in the Majlis, and of our study and discussion in the Asiatic-Revolutionary group. Imprecor keeps me in touch with events: but Centre could help very much more if we were supplied with statistics and other data on the internal position of the British colonies and the political and economic relations of colonies and metropolis.

I have just received a booklet of M. N. Roy's from Comrade Pollard.....is it now possible to receive the Vanguard publications regularly?

The measures that are necessary to ensure the secrecy of our work are these:

(1) Indian members of the party will be known on the Party books under *English names* John X., Smith, etc. The bearers of the pseudonyms will be known under their real names only to those members of the Oxford local who are directly concerned with work amongst the Asiatics.

(2) The Indians will not be connected with the work of the Party in the town; they must be organised entirely apart from the local group and have no connection with it except that one or two of us will be members of both the town and the Indian group.

(3) Reports and communications from Oxford which mention work amongst the Indians will be sent to a non-Party personal friend of mine in London and will be delivered by hand at King Street.

(4) Instructions and communications from King Street, mentioning this part of our work, should be addressed to me and enclosed in an envelope sent to (*an address is given in Oxford, but which Comrade Pollard thought was of no use, because there is a note in his handwriting which says:—*

"This is no use. Comrade Thomas must make other arrangements. He will be in London on June 4th.)

This is the report of Comrade Thomas, and there is another one from Comrade Stephenson, which I don't think I need trouble you with exactly at this moment.

(Here followed a discussion on a protest raised by Mr. Sinha in regard to the relevancy of the letters read by Mr. Langford James).

This letter is a letter written by Graham Pollard to Dear Comrade, and it says is "As asked by Comrade Arnott. I visited Oxford during Whitsun week and got into touch with the two comrades who had been carrying on propaganda amongst the Indians there. These are Comrade Stephenson who was on the Executive Committee of the Queensland, Australia, Communist Party and Comrade Thomas. Both seem quite reliable. To Thomas belongs the

credit of having initiated and carried on the work alone to start with, but Stephenson has a better grasp of the party position and more capabilities in putting it forward. On the whole I think that as both comrades have rather different contacts it would be best if the work were entrusted to them jointly. I obtained the written reports of their work among the Indians from both the comrades and they are enclosed. The question of secrecy of the work and the necessity of keeping it separate from other party activities was fully realised. The actual position among the Indians appears to be as follows." There are 3 who will actually join the Communist Party (*and their names are given*). He goes on to say:—

"Their are various points which arise from the position at present. Are the Indians who are ready to join the English Party to be allowed to do so or are they to be kept an entirely secret group connected only with Centre" (*that is to say, connected only with Moscow*)

Mr. D. P. Sinha: Does that refer to Indians in England or Indians in India.

Mr. Langford James: You hear what Comrade Graham Pollard wrote: "Are the Indians who are ready to join the English Party to be allowed to do so or are they to be kept an entirely secret group connected only with the Centre" ? That is what Comrade Graham Pollard says.

Mr. D. P. Sinha: That does not affect Indians in India.

Mr. Langford James: It was suggested that these students who had been selected by Comrades Thomas and Stephenson-should have an interview with Comrade Sakalatvala also of the English Communist Party, and on the 23rd June, there is a letter from Comrade Bell of the Colonial Department of the English Communist Party to Comrade Sakalatvala. It runs:—

"With further reference to our letter of a few days ago concerning Indian students at Oxford, and the desirability of your arranging an appointment with certain of these will be returning to India in the course of a few weeks.

We have received a memo, dealing with the political composition of the Majlis, and we enclose herewith a copy of same for your information and desire to draw your attention particularly to the request on page 2, of the memo, that you should meet a number of these Indians during the course of the next few weeks".

That memo. was enclosed with that letter and it runs as follows:-

"The following are the dates when the Indians concerned will be in London and prepared to see Com. Sakalatvala." (And the dates are given). Above that you find:—

"It is important that Com. Sakalatvala should interview these

men before they depart. Naturally they would not come all together to interview him, and a tete-a-tete conversation would produce best results. We append our opinion of each of these men etc."

Diwan Chaman Lal: May we have the names read out if you have any objection to our having a look at the documents?

Mr. Langford James: You can see the documents. I will give to you now.

Mr. D. P. Sinha: We are entitled to see as soon as it comes into evidence.

Mr. Langford James: You are quite right. You need have no grievance. There are three documents here. (shows them). Just about that same date, there is another document which is found in the possession of the communist Party of Great Britain and which purports to be a brief survey of the progress recently made with regard to the Colonial work in India, Egypt, Palestine, Canada and among African, Negro and Chinese students and members of the Kuomintang in the East End of London. This shows the activities of these people at this particular time and it reads as follows:—

"The following is a brief survey of the progress we have made recently in connection with the Colonial work. As you know, there are present in London the following Indians: Charmon Lal - past Secretary of the Trades Union Congress, Member of the Legislative Assembly and member of the parliamentary Socialist Society"

I think this must be the gentleman whose name occurs over and over again in this case and who seems to have taken quite a prominent part in some of the activities in this case, as far as I can gather, his comrades do not seem to think that he is very much of a fellow. One man calls him vasilating Chaman, and another one is hard hearted enough to call him "the champion acrobat." The name is spelt differently here.

Diwan Chaman Lal: Are you tendering evidence to that effect too?

Mr. Langford James: Oh yes, that will all come in the evidence. He is spelt as Charmon Lal here in this letter but the acrobat is spelt Chaman Lal. Then they have got G. Goswami - but I think they must mean T. Goswami - "treasurer of the Swaraj party and close intimate friend of the late C. R. Das; also member of the Legislative Assembly and member of the Parliamentary Socialist Society - J. Joshi - secretary (I believe of the Jute workers' Union) and Government nominee to the recent Geneva Labour Convention from India".

You will see that they were rather setting their caps at these three excellent gentlemen but with the possible exception of Chaman Lal, they seem to have struck rather a bad patch, because this Mr. Joshi mentioned here is the man who is the bugbear of the present accused.

He is the Amsterdam man. Mr. Goswami is just an ordinary swarajist, I believe and Mr. Chaman Lal is the champion acrobat.

"We have had several conferences between them and members of our Colonial Department, and the following is an outline of the points we have covered.

(a) Oriental Congress. We have got them all to agree to attend this Congress of the East and West Circle in September.

Diwan Chaman Lal:—Who has written this ?

Mr. Langford James:—I cannot say. It is unsigned. It is found with the Communist Party of Great Britain.

(b) We have got from them a list of some 25 fairly representative Indians who might be invited to attend the Conference.

(c) Today these three, together with Horniman, Saklatvala and myself are drawing up the letter of invitation to be sent to these various Indians. Horniman has agreed to preside at the Congress and the letters of invitation will go out under the signature of Horniman, Saklatvala and Arthur Field." I do not think I need trouble you with much more on this point. I am only reading this as an instance of the activities of the communist Party in London just about this time and it is quite clear that they were trying to get round Indian students at Oxford to join this movement and to do propaganda for them in India when they got back. They were also trying to trap these three excellent gentlemen, Mr. Chaman Lal, Joshi and Goswami into joining with them. Just about this time also, this question as to what was to be the position of the Indians in England fell to be decided at Moscow. The idea was apparently that there should be an Indian group in England, but Moscow decided that every Indian who was actually living in England would have to join the English Communist Party although they might act as a group, and there is a letter dated Moscow the 15th of September, 1925, from M. N. Roy to C. P. Dutt, which says:—

"Dear Comrade, the communication dated the 6th July signed by yourself together with 8 other comrades has received the due consideration of our party. We are delighted to welcome you as members of our party. I hope you will excuse this unavoidable delay in reply. The programme outlined in the communication is generally acceptable. According to the Statutes of the Communist International, all the Indian communists resident in Britain should have their party membership transferred to the Communist Party of Great Britain during their sojourn in Britain. This rule applies to all the communists living outside their native country. The Indian Communist Group in Britain will therefore carry on the programme outlined in your communication in conjunction with the colonial commission of the Communist Party of Great Britain. It will be politically guided by the European Bureau of the Communist Party of India as well as the colonial commission of the

Communist Party of Great Britain. " This shows the arrangement, how the communist propaganda was to be done in India and how that was to be divided between these various bodies.

Then there is a letter from Roy to Dutt at the same time It said:

Enclosed herewith is the answer to the communication dated the 6th of July. Please make the comrades concerned acquainted with it. A copy is sent to the Communist Party of Great Britain for information. In order to decide, amongst other questions, that of co-operation between the Colonial Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain and the Indian Communist group of Great Britain, Comrade Macmanus and yourself were sent for to come here (that is, Moscow). The party writes in reply that until the Labour Conference, it will not be possible for Comrade M. to leave Britain and that steps taken in relation to your trip demands your presence in England."

Well, I think there is not much more in that letter which is of importance. That simply shows how this propaganda was divided up or arranged between these various centres, Moscow, the rest of the continent of Europe, and Great Britain.

Now, the next emissary from the Communist Party of Great Britain to arrive in India was a man named George Allison. He had the bad taste to arrive under a false passport which described him as Donald Campbell. He must have had sound reasons for concealing his identity when he came to India, and I am sure they were extremely good reasons. He is a prominent member of the Communist Party of Great Britain and had been to Moscow and taken part in the discussions of the Comintern at Moscow. He arrived by the S. S. Razmak on the 30th of April, 1926. He got into touch with a large number of these present accused, but he was arrested on a charge of travelling under a false passport. I believe he was arrested in Calcutta and afterwards sent on to Bombay. He was arrested before he had time to do very much. He helped to organise to some extent the body in Bombay which was then doing communist work under the name of the Labour Swarajist Party. I will not trouble you further with Mr. Allison although I shall have to prove more than that about him. It comes to this, for the purposes of my case, that I shall satisfy you that Mr. Allison was sent out to India by the Communist Party of Great Britain for the deliberate purpose of fomenting and stirring up this proletarian revolution which by this time I am sure you will recognise is the main objective of the Communist Party wherever you find them.

On the 31st December 1926 arrived the third emissary sent out from Europe in the shape of Mr. Spratt.

Mr. D. P. Sinha :—Spratt is No. 4.

Mr. Langford James :—Do you make it so? I said third and I think my arithmetic is right. Mr. Spratt arrived as a humble

bookseller. I think that every one knows the forms which one has to fill in at Bombay before clearing one's luggage. On that Mr. Spratt described himself as a bookseller and he came here under the guise of a bookseller. I do not think he has sold a book since he has been here, but that was the ostensible reason for arriving in India.

Diwan Chaman Lal:—What was his profession in England ?

Mr. Langford James:—His profession in England was communism. He was at the Downing College, Cambridge, and while there, he was a member of the National Minority Movement, which I will remind you, is a branch of the RILU as to which I need not repeat my previous remarks. In 1925, there was a search of the premises 16, King's Street, which was the location of the Communists Party of Great Britain and some people came to see what was happening, and took interest in it, and amongst them was comrade Phillip Spratt. I do not suppose for a moment that Mr. Spratt in this court or any other is going to say that he was not a communist and that he is not a communist. He has once said so. He wrote to the Times of India to explain that he was not a communist because he did not belong to a communist party. But I do not suppose that in this court he is going to deny that he is and has always been a communist. But I must prove it, and I am proposing to prove it. On his way from Paris, so I gather from Mr. Spratt's note book, he had a meeting with Mr. C. P. Dutt (who had the bad taste to keep him waiting for four hours at a particular hotel) and I think that it is perfectly clear that Mr. Spratt came out to India for exactly the same purpose as Mr. Glading and Mr. Allison came out. He came out to carry on the work of fomenting a revolution here in India. He was arrested in September, 1927, and he was charged under 124 A and was acquitted. But when he was arrested, certain documents were recovered from his possession. Among the letters recovered from his possession was a letter from Messrs. Birrel and Garnett, Foreign Booksellers. You will be surprised to hear that Birrel and Garnett is only another name for Graham Pollard. It says:—

“As Mr. Phillip Spratt is proceeding to India, we agree to engage him as our Agent and to pay him a commission of 5 per cent. on the gross value of all secondhand books, English or foreign, sold through his agency. Further more, we agree to pay him a certain proportion on new English books sold through him subject to the conditions of the net book agreement.”

It sounds very nice. It did not seem to come true somehow. In addition to that, we have another letter from Graham Pollard. May I remind you that Graham Pollard was the man who was taking in 1925 such an interest in the revolutionary movement at Oxford? He writes a letter to Dear Phillip.

“Thanks for your activities on my behalf. But I am afraid they have not yielded very much so far. I have sent back that book on Indian art as it seems to me too expensive and also some what difficult to sell, from its subject.”

This is simply to continue the camoflage of Mr. Spratt having arrived here as a bookseller. This is the last we hear of his activities in selling books. Then there is a letter from that other gentleman whom you will remember Mr. Page Arnott, who was also interested in the youth at Oxford. This letter says:—

“My dear Chaman Lal, I want to introduce to you Mr. Phillip Spratt, whom I have known very well ever since I made his acquaintance at Cambridge in 1921. He is in India on business, but he told me before he went that he would be very glad to do whatever work he can do for the Labour research department. For the last few years, both when he was at and when he came down from Cambridge, he had done a great deal of voluntary work for us and he is fully conversant with all methods of research. I have asked him to get into touch with as many Unions as he could find time to act as our representative in securing the affiliation of those Unions. He will be able to explain the Utility of affiliation both from the point of view of Union and also from our point of view, which is primarily not the small affiliation fee.....”.

There is nothing very much more, except that he notes further on:—

“I am writing to you because I am sure I can rely on you to give him every facility for meeting the various trade unionists. His time is limited of course and this will make it more difficult. But he will want lists of unions and personal introduction to Secretaries and Presidents, and if you can spare him the time to give him a talk about Indian Trades Unions, it would save him a good deal of weary journeying and investigation.

Yours fraternally,

R. PAGE ARNOT.

There were other letters found with him at the time of his arrest, among those letters of introduction from Comrade Saklatwala. Therefore Mr. Spratt, this humble bookseller, is sponsored into India by Comrades Saklatwala, Page Arnot and Graham Pollard. The position which Mr. Spratt found when he got to India with regard to Communist activity was, as far as I can make out, this. In Bombay there was a group known as the Labour Swaraj group that had existed for some little time and had been organised on orthodox lines—I suppose by Comrade Alison. In Calcutta there was another similar group but under the name of the Peasants and Workers Party. Now, if you are a Bolshevik you will know what a horrible misnomer that is. That shows completely wrong ideology. You should never call the the thing the Peasants and Workers' Party, because the proletariat are the leaders of the revolution and the peasants are merely their allies. If you want really to get a headache upon this subject I would ask your Honour to read “Leninism” by Stalin. You would find it excellently set out there. But this is the point. Whatever you are going to do with the peasants-

whether you propose to murder them *en bloc* or to neutralise them or to make allies of them—they are certainly number two. The proletariat is first. Therefore to call yourselves the Peasants and Workers is wholly wrong—bad form. What Mr. Spratt did was to form a Workers and Peasants' Party in Bombay, I should tell you another thing about this Peasants and Workers' Party of Calcutta. It had a declaration of its objects and reasons. That read, "The object of the Party is the attainment of Swaraj in the sense of complete independence of India based on economic and social emancipation and political freedom of men and women." And the means whereby this was to be attained was as follows:—

"Non-violent mass action will be the principal means for the attainment and realization of the above object and demand." Non-violent mass action. You will find that later when the Peasants and Workers, Party of Calcutta has been changed into the Workers and Peasants' Party there is no mention of non-violent mass action. Non-violence drops out. This particular document which I have in my hand is the copy which went to the Punjab, and there also there was formed a Workers and Peasants' Party, and I find that this document is altered in this way. The means are set out thus, "The attainment and realization of the above object and demands will be by illegitimate means". I entirely agree. I will tell you how I think it has happened. This document I believe to be in the handwriting of honest Josh. It was perfectly clear that the objects of this Party were to be attained and realized by illegitimate means as he has so put it down here. Honest fellow!

That is my view of it. The constitution of 1928 of the Workers and Peasants' Party of Bengal, instead of saying that non-violent mass action will be the principal means for the attainment and realization of the object, says that the "Rallying of the people to mass action will be the principal means for the attainment and realization of the above objects". I do not think the omission of the word "non-violent" could have been accidental—not certainly in view of the speeches and writings and actions of these accused.

To go back to Mr. Spratt. His first activity was the founding, on the basis of the Labour Swaraj Party, of the Workers and Peasants' Party in Bombay. I may tell you that Counsel's opinion was taken upon the question as to whether the programme of this Workers and Peasants' Party was a legal one. I think there was a Mr. Patel whose view was taken and his reply appears to have been that he could not say. It was either legal or illegal according to the whim of the Government. Now that was admirable. I venture to think it was an extremely good opinion. The programme and a statement of what the Workers and Peasants' Party stands (drafted by Mr. Spratt.) with rather non-committal. One can however see quite well I think what the Workers and Peasants' Party stands for. You can read between the lines and see what it really contemplated. But on the

whole they were comparatively non-committal. But at the same time Mr. Spratt also appears to have put down on paper a suggested syllabus for this Party, and I should like to read you some of that:—

“Politics—classes—national groups—state “Other party and class instruments—Why join the party to co-operate in the pursuit of certain ends.

What ends?—The interests of certain sections of society. What sections?—Nations or classes. What is a class?—A set of persons having approximately similar economic interests. What is a nation?”

And so on:—

“What is politics? - The struggle of classes or national groups. What do they struggle for?—Economic interests and sometimes as a means for the furtherance of economic interest for political power (power defined roughly). It will be for an individual to concern himself primarily with the affairs of his class, since in that modern world the immense majority of individuals cannot get away from their class limitation—they rise or fall with their fellows. But further, we have reason to think that the play of class forces and their development have enormously important influences on human culture and life generally.”

Then further on:—

“Politics is the struggle of classes or national groups. What then is political power? It consists in general of the most class-conscious (note—class-conscious), active, intelligent members of a class who take it upon themselves to do the class-thinking and to energize the rest of the class when necessary.”

This is the syllabus for the workers and Peasants Party, to show that they are a class-conscious party who are going to lead the rest of their class.”

“The function of the Party is leadership, Parties may “represent more than one class, coalesced or federated together for some more or less limited end, e. g. the national struggle. But the fundamental thing is the class-party.

“What are the parties in Indian politics? The non-Congress Parties. These are parties of that section of the bourgeois which has been won over by imperialism to side with it.”

That is the horrible loyalist. Then comes the next most poisonous.

“The National Congress Party. These are also mainly bourgeois parties who a few years ago were anti-imperialist, but owing to political lag still pretend to be. The Swaraj Party contains most of the representatives of the petty bourgeoisie, shopkeepers, minor bureaucrats unemployed university men whose education is bourgeois, but whose interests are not. The leadership of the Swaraj Party is bourgeois however.

And so they are No. 2 on the list. Then No. 3 is:—

“The Workers and Peasants Party, which represents the interests of these sections. It realizes that the industrial workers are the backbone of the movement and it must lead. But the interests of the peasantry are fundamentally similar and it is essential to get peasant support. It must oppose strongly the formation of a separate peasants’ party, since experience shows that these parties almost always fall under landlord leadership against the towns-bourgeois and proletariat, thus creating a thoroughly unhealthy and absurd social division.”

“The National Congress forms a sort of federated Nationalist Party.

As the workers and Peasants Party must support the national struggle, it must be a congress party, but will fight in the congress for its point of view.”

Then he has got a short summary of it:—

Suggested Syllabus.

“(1) Politics, classes- national groups—parties and so on.”

No (6) in the syllabus is “The party”

“Role of the Party—a working class organ ordinarily—in the national struggle and the class struggle. Organization of the Party. Contrast with the second International practice. Relative to the peasantry and the petty bourgeois—tactics etc.”

“(7). The revolutionary crisis. War—general strike—armed uprising—seizure of power—attitude to the state (destruction of the state machine and erection of a new one). Beginning of socialist reconstruction.”

You remember my reading that from the papers of the communist International—it will smash the existing state to pieces and erect a new one—the “beginning of socialist reconstruction.”

This is Mr. Spratt’s idea of the Workers and Peasants’ Party, and if he will allow me to say so, a thoroughly honest one. Then he has a general bibliography:—

Every member of the class must have read and if possible should read again during the course: Marx and Engels—“Communist Manifesto.”

Lenin—“State and Revolution”

“Left Wing Communism”

“The Proletarian Revolution”

“Imperialism”.

Stalin—“Leninism”.

R. Dutt—“Communism”

“Modern India”.

adek's—"Nicolai Lenin" also contains a good summary of Lenin's contributions to the subject."

This is Mr. Spratt's real idea of what this Party ought to be and in what it was.

Now I propose to show you, Sir, some of the, to me at any rate, prising correspondence which passed between Mr. Spratt, bookseller, his arrival or shortly after his arrival in India, and his friends in rope. Now this is a letter dated the 21st January 1927 to Mr. att and written by "Douglas". I have my views as to whom ouglas" is, but it does seem to me to matter very much. The letter s:—

ear Phillip,

"I was so sorry to hear that you have had trouble with your hth. I hope that you are now acclimatised and are in good form. e best thing, I believe, is to make sure that you take some exercise ry day, at least some walking if not physical jerks. Only you uld beware of getting into a perspiration, especially about the waist, l then cooling off. It is good to keep a towel handy for such ergencies.

"The business of a bookseller must be a rather wearing and icult occupation under new conditions, but I hope that you are king good according to your expectation. What ever you do, don't be rcome by the natural tendency to inertia in such a climate. I was Brighton a few days ago and old Walter was eagerly asking how were getting on. Unfortunately I had no news and only got r letter when I returned.

"I am glad to hear that you are at the Y. M. C. A. and I hope t you are making many good friends. Religion is a great standby, ; keep away from dogmatism. There can be good even in Methodism.

Will you please note that. That is the first remark in the main ly of this letter which is instructive.

".....There can be good even in Methodism. Unfortunately ny are inclined to be uncharitable, and you should not necessarily ept the statements of others at face value.

"It is a great pity that David is not in good health.

"It is a very depressing thing to be ill in a strange country. rhaps Baker can do something for him. I believe Ewan is still Dundee.

"The weather here has been wretched and everybody has been wn with 'flu. Still we hope to have a few bright days now, even t remains cold.

"Remember that every one is anxious to hear from you". May ust explain one or two things about this letter. "There can be good

even in Methodism." According to these people who use this sort of jesting religious language to express their views, the Methodist Church is what I may call a large camouflage body, as opposed to the Y. M. C. A., which is the real Communist party. I mention this here but in dealing with other letters you will see it much more clearly. Then "David is not in good health" refers to our old friend Donald Campbell. "Perhaps Baker can do something for him". "Baker" is our old friend Comrade Saklatwala. And therefore that passage means that Donald Campbell has been arrested on a charge and Saklatwala is to do something for him. Then "I believe Ewan is still in Dundee". I do not know who Ewan is but I do know that "Dundee" means Madras. I think it is a great injustice to Calcutta that it should be so. And Glasgow you will be surprised to hear means Bombay. And Manchester means Moscow which is sometimes also New York.

But the main interest about this letter is not so much what is said in the body of it as the invisible ink which appeared between the lines and which read as follows:— I think it begins about the place where he is warned to wear a bit of flannel next his skin or something like that. It reads as follows:—

"Letter perfectly good. Obtain no Herald for couple of months. Carry on. Dont prevent Y. M. C. A. Conference but secure the amalgamation.

May pan-Pacific lab, Conf. in Canton. Good India delegation essential.

Thengdi should go.

Tell Rhug to send few more copies of pamphlet.

When you become used to these somewhat simple transposition you know that "Rhug" means Shah.

"Get in touch with Ewan as best you can - e.g. by advert.

Do get me address for bibles. We have heard nothing of Victor.

I may tell you that Victor's other name is "Tab" and his real name is Fazl Ilahi and he is now doing time in the North Western Frontier Province under section 121—A.

"We have heard nothing of Victor. Look for letters at Cooks. I am putting Mss on both forms you signed. (I think you will agree with me that probably "Mss" refers to money.) Only just heard about Donald—doing what we can. Re Canton Conference David's job but perhaps you can help. Passage of delegation both ways will be paid. Get T.U.C. sanction but organise through our friends."

Now the next letter is a letter from Mr. Spratt. It is addressed to Harry Howell, 37-Lithos Road, Hampstead, London, England. It

contains also another letter, which I will quote. Meantime may I just ask you to see it. This is the letter:

"Dear brother in God,

I am some what disturbed on account of the absence of news from you. I trust that you are still enjoying your usual health and vigour.

I have seen Teb (*that is Victor, alias Fazal Ilahi*) who wishes me to send the enclosed. We had some considerable disagreement with him on the Church doctrines in which he was I suppose right in a theoretical sense. He wanted a Methodist Church similar in plan to that advocated by your brother to be set up at once, with the faithful scattered abroad and unknown within it. We differed and wanted the Church to hold its skirts rather higher, and to form itself on a narrower basis, in fact more or less to take the place of the old Y.M. In the end he agreed. He differed also on the attitude to the Church in the villages, but as the question is not of immediate practical importance, we agreed to let it lie for the time."

I pause for a moment to explain what this means. He wanted a Methodist Church similar in plan to that advocated by his brother. He wanted a largish party, the faithful scattered abroad and unknown within it. But we wanted a most select body practically a genuine communist party. One man said "Let us have a large body and nuclei. No-body knows who we are." The other man said, "No, let us keep the party practically all communists, to take the place of the old Y.M. The Y.M. or Y.M.C.A. you will find in these cryptic writings refers to the communist party. The letter proceeds:—

"The Universities Convocation is to be held next week. J. worked a dirty trick on us by suddenly deciding this. Our preparations had been made to some extent and we hope for the best.

The foundation stone of the future Church is laid here, and we are getting ahead with the work. Our University men are active to a gratifying extent, and show promise. They are mainly literary in their interests, but we have one or two Law men and Commerce students. Science men and Philosophers whom we badly need are difficult to get hold of. (*I think he is talking of the Workers and Peasants.*) We have started training, but unfortunately shall have to stop for a few weeks owing to the departure of Father Ambrose for the North (*and you will be surprised to hear that the Reverend gentleman is now in the dock. "Father Ambrose" is Mr. Spratt*) and the indisposition of David. (*Poor David, who is now under trial for travelling with a false passport.*) You might by the way let us have a miscellaneous collection of the more recent works of piety and devotion. They would be of great interest to some of our tyros. (*I can see the Reverend Father handing them out!*) It is signed by "Des" "Teb" or "Vic" had asked him to enclose a letter. This reads as follows:—

"30/22 29/2 37/13 35/4" and so on. There are lines and lines of it. Decoded it means this:—

The top part reads "Code is "Il Penseroso." That you read from after Bhentain. The first figure indicates the line the second figure indicates the letter in that line." You then turn to "Il Penseroso" for the reading of the remainder of the message. It reads as follows:

"Campbell was sent to Bombay but he could not execute the work properly. Program is confused, org- Functions unclear to the people here BWP congress had to take place on nineteenth. I ran away. No informations as yet. Leaving. Spratt will send letters. Shamsuddin is spy Qaum is to be watched. Victor." Quam is the brother of Mozuffer Ahmad. So that is the interesting row of figures inside this letter to his dear brother in God Harry Howell, which turns out to be information about Campbell and other information with regard to communist activities over here.

(The Court here rose for lunch at 10 minutes past 1 and met again at 2-15 p. m.)

The next is a letter dated 9th June, which runs as follows:

"Dear Appa,

How are you getting on? It is quite some time since I heard anything from you. You would like to be paying a visit to England in our present weather, though perhaps you would not think it hot enough. Anyway Whitsun has been fine on the whole and I for one had a very pleasant walk on the Sussex Downs. Are still in touch with the Methodist Times? It is worth examining for news of old friends. I understand that you did not receive any mss. (*Note the mss, which means money.*) from them. If I were you I should give them a reminder about it. It is good to get any useful greetings and messages. I believe your old friend Fh. knows someone in Colombo who would write something. It would be worth while arranging to get a short mss. from him. How do your arrangements stand about getting news like this in general?

Whenever I get the opportunity I study the press for what is happening in India and everything seems to come from Bombay. It must be the real capital of the country. I like to read the names of distinguished people who take part in public functions there.

Well, best of greetings and all that.

Let me hear from you,

Yours

(Squiggle)

which you will become well acquainted with in this case.

That is the letter itself and commenting on it I suggest, as you will see a little later, that "Mss" means money and "Fh." obviously by

this transposition code means "Gh." which stands for Ghate, and the suggestion is that money could be got in the meantime from somebody in Colombo.

The main interest in the letter is other than that, because in invisible ink, between the lines you will find the following message.

"Why did you not meet Ismail on the "Navasa". Send information about Bombay Seamen's Union. How are mss. arrangements. Nelson failed to go. Waiting for Hamid."

Hamid is in the dock at the present moment under the name of Ajodhya Prasad. I cannot tell you definitely at the moment who Nelson is, but I have my views upon the subject. But the interesting part about this letter is that it shows as indeed do other letters, and I am only giving you a small sample of it in this opening, that these conspirators have a regular system of communicating by means of lascars or persons who travel as lascars on board ships. you will note in this letter that the addressee is asked, "Why did you not meet Ismail on the Nevasa", and he said that Nelson failed to go, so he was waiting for Hamid to go, in order to send his communication or money.

The next letter is signed by "J" and it is written on the 25th July. It is written on a small bit of note paper and runs as follows:

"Dear Desmond, (*that, I may tell you is Spratt's name, whether because of his likeness to that famous animal Dismal Desmond I don't know, but he is called "Des" or Desmond by the elect.*) •

I have not had any news from you for more than a month. I hope you will let me know how things are going with you. What is the position with regard to mss. I hear of complaint that the Y. M. C. A. send no mss to you. (*The Y. M. C. A., as I have told you, stands for the communist party, and I have no doubt that in this letter it means the communist party in Moscow.*) That is in general correct, and the general decisions still stand, but you must use your discretion.

There should have been a conference to decide on all points, but it has not taken place yet. What about the all-India Methodist organ in English. That should be one of the next things. Of course it should really be preceded by an all-India conference.

I have sent letters to the only address you gave. In last I mentioned that your last letter was illegible just where most important. Can you try again? (*It was illegible you see because there was something in invisible ink written on it, which had faded. That is my comment.*)

The Bombay Methodist paper seems to be very good from opinions received. I saw recently an article of yours in I. N. H. (*that is the Indian National Herald.*) Which struck me as very good. I have given it to the Circular you use.

It is very unfortunate that Nelson is in no condition to travel. On the other hand there is an engineer who will be going to Glasgow soon, who should help the university there, as you will be glad to learn. *In these humble terms is announced the arrival of Bradley. The engineer is going to the university, that is the Trade Unions, in Glasgow, that is Bombay.*

Try sending a letter to me C/O H.W. Gardner, 88 Hatfield Road, St. Albans, with enclosure "for your college pal" on it.

The Methodists and Y. M. C. A. are becoming too much, two names for the same thing.

I have seen some interesting friends over here, and there should be a full dress discussion on the future very soon.

Have a talk with Musa."

And the letter is signed "Yours J."

You will note that the Methodist and the Y. M. C. A. are becoming too much, two names for the same thing. That means that the Workers and Peasants Party, are becoming exactly the same thing as the communist party. That is the point that is made in the letter and Desmond is asked to discuss the matter with Musa, who I think you will find is Muzaffer Ahmed. It is an interesting letter and it gives one food for thought as to why there should be a full dress discussion in England or Moscow, or wherever it is to take place, upon the whole of the future. It is interesting to learn that it was so unfortunate that Nelson was in no condition to travel, and equally interesting to know that an engineer is coming to the university at Glasgow.

The next letter is a letter from this man, whoever he is, who signs himself with that squiggle, and it is dated the 9th August, 1927 and it runs as follows:—

"Dear Des, I have received your letter dated the 14th of June not two weeks ago....."

I pause there to tell you that the letter is dated the 9th of August, but apparently, the letter dated the 14th of June did not reach the gentleman who signs himself with this squiggle until towards the end of July, and it is obvious therefore that it was sent by a messenger, one of the lascars plying to his side of the water. "Since then, I have not heard from you. I hope very much that it will be possible to re-establish communications on a better basis....." That is his instruction. The post office is useless. You must have your own method of communications between this bookseller and his friends in England.

"I hope you will have received the addresses of various friends with whom you ought to be in touch. Recently also, you may have received a note from me through M. M. with whom I hope you are acquainted. You inform me that Baker has been....."

I may remind you that Baker is Sakalatvala— ".....has been inclined to criticise the Methodist policy as adopted by the Church session at Bombay. I can assure you that he stands alone in this respect. He attempted to raise something of the sort but was decisively routed and it was agreed that he was not to make any attacks on the Methodists. So he had no business to go around criticising. I should like to hear more details of what he has done as he can do harm if we are not careful,

"I was sorry to hear that Hig. has been acting so badly, though you do not specify his crimes exactly."

Now, if you apply the code to Hig, he is the accused Iolekar.

"We must get sufficient number of people so that single individuals are not so important. This applies especially to the Methodists. There are all sorts of little groups more or less with us who ought to be linked up through the Methodists, but as far as one can judge no attempt is being made. Take, for instance, Rumbu: or even Zhuroegu. They ought to be brought in...." Well, now, Rumbu, according to the code, is Mr. Sambamurti and Zhuroegu, according to the code, is Barucha.

"....Have you any news about Don ?"

That is poor old David who is at this time in prison.

"....Nobody here seems to have heard anything of him or how to get in touch with him. Things are still very dull here. There will be a talk soon and then there should be a lot to write to you about. There might also be some suggestions about Ambrose...." (I think that must be the Rev. Father Ambrose.) "....I am inclined to think that he will be asked to say in his parish. I have heard there is a university fellow going out before long...." (referring obviously to Mr. Brady.) "I hope that M.M. will be able to get what we want. If you could use your influence in this it would be very good. He should try to follow the example of his friend who preceded him. That is the latest advice we have for him and I hope that you will be able to convey it. With regard to the Y.M.C.A., the situation is as you say, but it is not possible to do anything about it at present. Is there such a thing as a complete file of the College bulletin obtainable? If so, please try and send it. Also, could you send direct the published list of the colleges and their addresses- if possible noting any changes of importance."

With regard to Rev. Father Ambrose remaining in his parish, I think it must mean that this stalwart of the church is to remain in India. It is possible that it was thought that he might be well

employed in China but he is to be kept in India. However, he has remained.

If you bear in mind the note marked "J", the little one on note paper, and this last letter, you will remember that the note marked "J" mentioned the fact that the Y. M. C. A. and the Methodist church were getting too much alike and suggested that Spratt should have a talk with Musa and the last letter suggested that Rhumbu and Zhurocgu should be roped in. Bearing that in mind, this next letter will have some interest. When I give you a copy of it, you will appreciate that it is somewhat difficult to read. It is the draft of a letter from Mr. Spratt to "Dear Brother." Before I begin to read it, I would draw your attention to certain things written between the lines at the top which were obviously intended to be put in the fair copy in invisible ink and doubtless were. You will also find that this letter is an answer both to the letter signed by "J" and also to the last letter which I have read. You will further find that it is much concerned with the question of finance and on any sensible reading of the letter, it shows in my opinion, quite clearly, as I hope to be able to satisfy you is the fact, that the finances for this movement had been coming over the Northern Frontier of India. This is how the letter runs : I shall omit the portion between the lines for the moment.

"Dear Brother, I have had a chat with Musa. His chief point which you also put in your letter was that the methodists were becoming too like the Y. M. and in fact were largely the same thing. This is so in Bombay. 4 or 5 people run the whole show in congress, and although the Bombay methodists have now 20 members on paper, only some few do anything whatever. The others do not even pay subs. The idea of membership of a church organisation is yet absolutely not understood. Leq & Co. (which according to the code means Miraj ka) agree completely with this, but have been too occupied recently to take any steps to improve it. Your suggestion in 9-8-27 re. Rhumbu etc. is of course sound and at the last A. I. C. C. we had a sort of agreement with him. Such people cannot be organised in opposition however until the leading people in the Church go over more definitely. The next Church congress will probably be the time. (The Church Congress is the meeting of the A. I. C. C.) Now, then, about MSS (which I suggest is money) "Phusa spoke to me on the subject. I think his will be a good scheme. But finance at the moment..... (It does not seem to read). "Generally, things are bad. You spoke in a letter dated the end of May that I should send about 200..... (and then there is a word I cannot read) " to Baker. (I think it must mean that I should write to Saklatvala—about 200 pounds) "I have not done so yet. But in a month from now we shall be forced to or(or go (fut, I suppose). Absolutely necessary should by Musa. The general arrangements are not satisfactory yet. Actual sending is extremely difficult and each time some one has had to travel from Lahore (Lahore is cut out and kug is put above it) to Calcutta (above which is Bul) is better. Distribution is carried out according to the plan we sent. But there are always miscellaneous additions for travelling, etc.

Victors (i. e., Fazul Ilahie) has taken a good deal though of course Bhum was free. (Bhum, I am sorry to say, is my friend Chaman Lal.)

Diwan Chaman Lal: That is, he did the case free.

Langford James. yes.

“Re. All India English Journal, we have had an informal general conference. (Then there are code names for people—Ludjuch (i. e., Majid) and the other is Muzaffar Ahmed in Bombay. Have agreed to start as soon as arrangements can be made. It will not be official. In present circumstances it can be done by reducing the present Bombay organ to smaller size and devoting it mainly to univs. (You will remember that Universities are unions). That should be avoided if possible, and if it is avoided, more material would be required. We have therefore drawn up a possibly rather ambitious scheme for the whole country, which would resolve itself into a total, of nearly 200 a month. (£200 a month; you may omit this cypher sign here) i. e., an increase of 33½ for the Y. M. Lahore and Calcutta. alone. This is essential. The paper absorbs all that is at present allowed. (300 or it may be 800 a month). The rest is required for fares, etc. For a British weekly from Bombay, 500 a month; for Bombay paper 300. And all-India propaganda, a new and excellent suggestion. The released men especially should be enabled to tour the country and agitate, and one man should do so continually. We estimate 500 as ample for this. With 300 miscellaneous this comes to 2,400 a month. What do you think? Re. Colombo, at present it is not possible. Re Nuddx (*Paddy you have got his real name Upadya written then and scratched at we should like him to come, of course, but he is bound to go to jail. At least that is the view here. (I agree with it.) Probably not for more than 3 months, though. So again, what do you think? 50 for Y.M.C.A. 's office is ample.”

I will now read to you the invisible ink. But pausing for one moment, with whom is Mr. Spratt discussing finances for this movement in India? who is going to supply the 2,400 rupees a month necessary for an All—India Methodist organ? The Bomboy paper, the various released men and others touring the country for propaganda. who is producing this money? Is it not palpable that the communist Party, either in Russia or England or wherever it can, is going to finance and has been asked to finance and has agreed to finance this movement? Now, is it not palpable also from this letter that communications are passing to and fro by lascars and by secret means? Coming to another point, assumiug as I shall ask you to assume that MSS means money, why is it that some one has got to travel *from Lahore* to get this money? If the money is coming in through calcutta, Bombay or Madras, there is always the means of sending it by post. Why has some one got to go from Lahore to get it? Because, as I hope to satisfy you, people did go from Lahore and made trips to the Northern Frontier for this purpose. The writing between the lines runs as follows:—

“I am sorry I could make little out of the photograph you sent,

almost completely oxidised. It took nearly two months to get here (by the secret route, I suppose) and no intensification attempted was of any use. (I think that must mean as it says that the letter had invisible ink on it but it had faded Mr. Spratt he could not find out exactly what the writer meant.) I am not going at this stage to trouble you with this code.

I have taken those few letters because it seems to me that they throw an extraordinarily lurid light upon the activities of Mr. Spratt from the very commencement here in India. Meanwhile, Just before this last letter was written, "God's messenger" had arrived. (God's messenger is in the dock in the shape of Mr. Ajodya Prasad, alias Hamid) He was so announced by Murajkar writing to Mr. Spratt, I think, on the 21st of August, 1927. He said :—

"Last mail, I got some books from English friend and also two articles for kranti (that is one of their newspapers). The books are all important ones and will be of immense use. The articles I am putting in the paper. God's messenger has come from brother and wants to meet you here. He will go first week of the next month (5/9/27). Please come and meet him."

By almost the same mail, there was a letter from Mr. Shate to Mr. Spratt from Bombay. Mr. Spratt, if I am right, was in Lahore or thereabouts :—

"I am sending some copies of the "Masses" (that is, The Masses of India, which is a prescribed newspaper) that were sent to us through the boy who returned yesterday. I am sending a letter that he brought with him." So that, "God's Messenger" is one of those (I will prove this) who travel, in the guise of lascars between here and the comrades on the other side of the water.

The next arrival, as foretold in these letters to Mr. Spratt, was the Engineer Mr. Broadley. He arrived by the S. S. Rampura on the 23rd September, 1927. He posed as a gentleman who was travelling for selling patent underground drain tiles. I do not know whether he has sold any, or tried to sell any. He arrived on the 23rd September, and on the 29th of September, 6 days after his arrival, he wrote a letter to a friend. He wrote :—

(Dear Mac, I expect you are wondering when I am going to write you again. However, here it is."

I should like to say that Mr. Bradley writes excellent an excellent hand but he found necessary to print this letter. I shall quite satisfactorily prove that he posted it. "However, here it is. I am keeping well and have been very busy indeed. The banks have been busy in this proposition, I shall have to wait my chance to buy. I have been in touch with F. H. so that is alright. Well, I hope things are going well with you and that you are still keeping well. When you wrote me last, you asked if I had solved that puzzle. This my attempt.

Let me know what you think of it and don't laugh at the attempt is 6/1, 11/24, 18/1, 1/4, 5/8, 4/6 etc. The weather we are having is not so bad. A fair amount of rain to keep things cool. I will write you again soon. But I want to hear from you to know how things are going with you. Best wishes to you and all.

Yours
Leonard

P. S. Solve this:

8/7 8/1 4/3 2/5 12/6 1/10 etc."

Let us see whether we can solve it, and whether we can give any marks to Mr. Bradley for trying to solve that puzzle. The solution of the puzzle runs as follows:—

"R. K. Karanth - Gladhurst - Santa Cruz".

This is solved by applying your mind to another form in palgrave's Golden Treasury namely.

The solution of the P.S. is also to be found from Gray's Elegy, and it only means "Report follows". I have no doubt in time Mr. Bradley may explain who Mac is, why he should be given a secret cover addressed in Bombay and why report should follow. I do not think it could have been a report upon the underground tile market. I may mention that "I have been in touch with F.H." refers to Shate which agrees with the facts. Mr. Bradley immediately got into touch with Shate and the other communists. I have no doubt at all that R. K. Karanth must have received a great deal of interesting correspondence, but of course it was unknown to the police in those days. They are not infallible and so he received those he did. But on the 2nd February 1929, a lascar of the name of Abid Ali was searched in circumstances as to which I will give evidence on the S.S. Minora and on him was discovered a letter addressed to R.K. Karanth, "Gladhurst" Santa Cruz, Bombay. Inside the first cover was an envelope addressed to "Ghate", and inside that again was another envelope addressed to "Jack". One letter in three covers. This is what was in the letter:—

"Dear Friend,

We were very pleased to hear from you and to know that you had met our brothers. We regret that Arthur's spirits prevent him enjoying himself and we expect him back soon which is a pity as we thought there might be an opening for him. I hope he gave some attention to the work of the Salvation Army and the Theosophical Society.

The Bolshevic, as I explained to you, is of course out to destroy every religion in the world, perhaps that is why he mockingly uses these religious phrases when he wants to be cryptic.

"...George had two friends visiting the latter and they may have conveyed quite a wrong impression and so have been a bad influence. If you find time to read the papers you will have noticed a lot of discussion on a Commission to examine Mr. Roberts in which the gentleman who gave you introductions took a leading part. Perhaps you would notice report of a meeting at Brussels in which I believe Mr. Saunders played a leading role on behalf of European Societies whose idea is convening of a Constituent Assembly to act on behalf of Mr. Roberts. You may remember the pleasant people of Ireland operated such a plan after the war. Please remember the advice of your Chief that what happened in Manchester leadership will probably happen at an earlier stage with Mr. Roberts. Therefore it will be necessary from the beginning to make a direct appeal to the Brahmins at large to select their own priests. This movement will help us here in the present struggle against the opponents of Mrs Beasant.....,

Similarly this reference is cryptic. It really has nothing to do with that dear old Lady.

"...The papers will tell you how we are directing most sharply our exposure of false friends like Mr. B. at present on a visit to Mr. Roberts, who we hope will thoroughly understand his despicable purpose. We have spoken with a friend of Mr. Roberts whose name I think is Nehru who certainly is not a well-wisher at all but is angry with Mr. B. and all his associates and will be ready to come out openly against them on behalf of Mr. Roberts. He is much like Gandhi so far as the nature of Mr. Roberts' Temple is concerned. He thinks it must be different from "that of my publishers. So you will see that he and his friends cannot be relied upon exclusively as they are very much afraid of any really strong action by the Artists".

I suggest that these accused in the dock are the "Artists".

"Never the less an attempt should be made to get a public statement from him on his attitude. We will try to send through press further details of the line taken by Mr. Saunders and the European Societies for your guidance.

"We have read the declaration of the Brahmins of Bombay. It is very good and work along such lines should be followed up. We have not your present address but will send this by registered post and hope it will find you at the old place. We propose to send copy of your book to American Express Co. Bombay. Will you please write again soon, especially with regard to the two religious bodies which the brethren here are interested in "Salutations,

"Besants."

Well, it is not necessary at this stage to trouble you with all the meaning of this cryptic letter. But you can interpret "Mr.

Roberts" to mean India and you know "Manchester" means Moscow, and I think you know also that there was a meeting of League Against Imperialism at Brussels, and even without knowing who Mr B and Mr Saunders are you will get further light upon what the letter means. For instance, "George had two friends visiting the latter", the letter being the Theosophical Society—in 1937 there arrived at the all-India Trades Union Conference Mr. Purcell and Mr. Halsworth. George is of course our good King George, who had two friends, Purcell and Halsworth, visiting the Theosophical Society which means the All India Trade Union Congress.

Dewan Chaman Lal: What is the date?

Mr. Langford James: I cannot give it. The date is not here. And the letter says they may have conveyed quite a wrong impression and so have been a bad influence. Then it goes on to talk of the Statutory Commission when it says— "If you find time to read the papers you will have noticed a lot of discussion on Commission to examine Mr. Roberts." Then it goes on to refer to the meeting at Brussels of the League Against Imperialism where the suggestion was put forward of the Constituent Assembly. He refers to the fact that that was found a good manoeuvre in Ireland. Then he goes on to say most significantly, "Please remember the advice of your Chief that what happened in Manchester (i. e. Moscow leadership will probably happen at an earlier stage with Mr. Roberts," that is, India. Therefore it will be necessary to make a direct appeal to the Brahmins at large," which means of course the workers and peasants, "to select their own priests", which means that they should be induced to get their own leaders. "This movement will help us here in the present struggle against the opponents of Mrs. Besant." You remember that the Theosophical Society is used for the Trade Unions Congress up above, and "the opponents of Mrs. Besant" are the Yellow Labour people in England as opposed to the Minority or Red movement. Then when you get to the remarks upon "Nehru", you note that he is much like Gandhi so far as the nature of Mr. Roberts' Temple is concerned. That is to say it is recognised that Mr. Nehru—who I suppose is Mr. Motilal Nehru—is not at all on the lines of the writer of this letter. "He thinks it must be different from that of my publishers"; that is to say that Mr. Nehru's conception of the future of India is quite different to the conception of the writer of this letter, and the conception, as I suggest, of the whole of the accused in this case. He goes on, "So you will see that he and his friends cannot be relied upon exclusively as they are very much afraid of any really strong action by the Artists." I suggest that means that they are extremely afraid—as anybody would be—of anything in the nature of mass revolution. Then he goes on to say "We have read the declaration of the Brahmins of Bombay." It is clear the "Brahmins" mean the workers and peasants party.

Well, I have told you how that letter came into our possession, but there is yet another letter. This is a letter which I shall satisfy

you entirely was in the possession of Mr. Bradley, and curiously enough you will note that it is signed "J". It runs as follows:—

"Dear Fred,

I have received letters from you—dated 24 and 31 of March and 7 and 21 of April. That is all except for a report on the cotton market of 12 May. Can you let us know if any letters are missing.

The report on the cotton market is the report on the strikes in the cotton mills in Bombay.

"....I have at last been able to see Jack and I have had a long talk with him and others. You will be very glad to learn that at last it will be possible to go ahead and get something done. It is not possible to write you details of the discussions and proposals now but I hope that before long you will see some friend who will tell you everything. You will have received urgent messages about the New York meeting.

Now in this letter "New York" means Moscow.

"....You may also have met a young friend with a message on the same subject. I hope that something will have been done on this before you receive this, as the thing is of vital importance to us. If no one else is available I will have to use this young fellow Jhurdekuq....

His real name is Kardikar and I will tell you something about him in time.

"....But in that case it will be essential that the Social Service League give their consent. Possibly I will have wired you on this before you receive this. If this letter is in time and you agree that he can represent the League please wire at once to me that 'power granted'. Naturally it would be much preferable to have a real representative, especially as Jhu. does not really know anything about the League, have never been a member and is also not a worker. He is anxious to stay in New York.

He is in fact in New York, i. e. Moscow, now.

"....But the above disadvantages will tell greatly against him and I do not know what will be decided. I am wondering whether there was any special reason why no efforts were made to get him to join the S. S. League in your region. It will not be possible to get much going before the New York meeting is over, but if as I hope some friends come over shortly they will be able to give all details and help to get things started. Definite arrangements have been made for the supply of carbons, but just at the moment we are faced with difficulties re. despatch.

You remember what MSS¹ meant. I suggest "carbons" mean the same.

"....It would be good to get some idea how you use them also. Have you any news of Alec ? I hope that you will be able to see him. I do not know whether you have yet come across Nelson. I hope you will. On the whole the news of events in your region has been received with great satisfaction over here. I hope next mail to send you a long letter on this subject. The great thing is to get some real rank and file organisation out of it. With regard to the cotton shipments, I do not understand how this came to get into the hands of Joss and I am taking it up with the senders. I have wired for them to wire instructions to you about it.

I must stop to explain the terrible disaster about Joss and the cotton shipments. What happened was this. The International of Textile Workers of the World sent over 20,000 roubles, I think it was, to the textile workers of Bombay with cordial greetings, and it should have gone into the hands of Jhabvala—as another sum did. But most unfortunately Mr. Jhabvala instead of being the Secretary had been replaced by Mr. Joshi, and into the hands of Mr. Joshi—that terrible Yellow man—came this 20,000 roubles, meant of course for the betterment and amelioration of the textile workers in Bombay from their comrades and brothers in Moscow. And the writer is saying, "I do not know how it came into the hands of Joss and I am taking it up with the senders".

It got to the Yellow man instead of the Red and was used for a totally different purpose from that for which it was intended.

"....It is a pity that it has not yet been found possible to restart the paper. I had hoped that something of what Des has got might be available for this purpose.

"Des" of course is Father Ambrose alias Mr. Spratt.

Any way I hope you will keep preparations in mind so that the ground is prepared. By the way, whatever is possible for the New York July meeting, there must be no failure to have some one for the young fellows in August.

That is the Young Communists International at Moscow

".....The difficulty is that it should be some one close to us and yet if possible not one of the babus, but one who has been on the job. Also he must have definite authority from our fellows. Please do your best to get the likely material turned over and the best route looked into. The thing is of course very urgent for he should go very shortly after you get this."

"I am making arrangements for adequate supply of boost. By the by, it has been decided to discontinue the mail. That will have to be made up for by getting ahead with production inside and increased sending of raw materials from over here. This is another thing now in hand. I have not seen Patrick yet but I understand.....

"Patrick" is one of the Lascars I think or may be Padly
".....but I understand there was an unfortunate contretemps over your
way a little while ago when creditors descended on a concert performer
and skinned him of things intended for you....."

Do you know I really believe that "the concert performer" was
Abed Ali, who was descended upon by the police and that letter intend-
ed for "Karanth" was taken away from him, and I am strengthened
in that belief by the next sentence.

".....I am afraid that it means also that 8/13 7/2 5/5 5/1 2/1 1/2
is no longer good,

When you decode that by Gray's Elegy it works out as "Karanth
is no good". After Abed Ali had been searched and the things meant
for Fred had been taken away from him of course "Karanth" was no
longer any good. It was no use sending to Karanth as a cover address
any longer. Well, I have no doubt again Mr. Bradley will be able
to throw considerable light upon this letter.

Now I am not quite certain as to when the accused who is now
absconding, Amir Haidar, came into this country.

Mr. D. P. Sinha:—I do not quite follow. May I know how
many have been added?

M. Langford James:—Amir Haidar Khan—he has two names—
was added as an accused at the same time as Mr. Hutejinson. With
Amir Haidar has been found a letter of a similar nature. This letter is
dated the 18th December, 1928, Hamburg.

"Dear Comrade,

"This is to notify you that I have received your mail and
forwarded the same at once to the persons to whom addressed. I was
glad to hear some good news from you and also your friend from the
ship was very interesting. He seems to be a very able man to carry
on our work. If you could get about 2 or 3 good men more for our
communication work, so that we have 3 or 4 men on the run between
Bombay and Hamburg, would be quite sufficient for the time being.
This would give us about one ship every month. You always must
take good care, that your men get and remember their right number
when they are taking up connexions with us. *Then on this depends
the safety of our work. Therefore let the number be M 27 for your men
from the ship, and for our men here in Hamburg M-71.* You can
instruct your men that when they call at the International Seamens
Club, to ask for Carl or Walter or Jullus. Any of those comrades
introduced to your men would know the number M-71 and ask the men
of the ship for their number (M 27) are our comrades, to whom they
can deliver the mail, etc. and speak too freely. Further more it might
arise a situation that our International Club and Communist Party
become illegal institutions, being closed through police activities, so

that your men will find nobody there. Under these circumstances you will have to send your men to a private address, where they will meet some of us. For the time being I will give you Julius' address for this purpose, so whenever the situation should become acute, that there will be no stoppage in our work of communication work.....

Then he gives Julius' address.

"Also send me a good address from Bombay (*What does he mean by a "good address"?*) which I can use sometimes for direct mails to you. This is necessary, there might things happen which needs our attention and knowing about it immediately. As a Hamburg address for direct mail, you can use the old one where you lived, this one is very safe. With the next mail let me know your opinion on this matter or send me definite instructions."

There is a great deal more which I need not read now. I will go on to the end of the letter.

"Now, comrade, it is *Carl* who is writing this letter to you and I will sign all correspondence under the name of Robert Smith. In the matter of sending men to school to Moscow, I cannot do anything. You must write all your needs and wants straight to the EKKI. They are the people to decide on this matter."

The unfortunate thing is that we have not got the next page. We have only got these two torn pages, but I think it is perfectly clear that Ameer Haidar Khan had been in Hamburg and is definitely in touch with Carl, and that Carl has suggested that it will be much better to have three or four men on the Bombay-Hamburg run so that secret communications can go as regularly as if they were going by post.

As to where Carl lives or where the Seamen's Club is, appears from a map found at No. 2 European Asylum Lane. There is an admirable map of Hamburg with the International Seamen's Club in five languages on the top and an arrow which shows you how you get there.

Then I think in September of last year Hutchinson arrived and I shall hope to show you from his activities since he arrived that he has taken up this Communist work in good earnest. Even later than this Adhikari arrived. When he was arrested there was found this letter on him:

"Dear Friend,

Yours of Feby. 20th Received the following things from you (1) Anti-Kuusinen thesis, (2) art. about National Congress (3) about w. p. p., (4) German reconstruction, (5) Proletariat in national revolution. I am at present hard pressed for time and it is difficult also to get an opportunity to send anything safely. All things you sent, except (5) have been looked through by the police. I will try to send

the data you want. The New Era is published in Madras, Egmore, Post Box 752. Your warning is unfounded. He and another man from over there alone understand the necessity of having a disciplined and strong party. The Bombay group has achieved the following result. They have been successful in forming one of the biggest unions in the country. The men have tremendous enthusiasm. They are eager to learn and to act. But there is a lot of feudal reaction among them which has not been sufficiently strongly combated by our comrades. Conditions in the group itself are anarchic. It is at present nothing more than left-wing Trade Unionism. The "Times" and "Englishman" report are exaggerated. Yes, the objective situation is rapidly developing. But the vanguard is a rear-guard. Party-discipline!-? But where is the party? "Individuals like feudal chieftains from the basis of leadership here" says my friend against whom you warn. He asked me to tell you that "your men" attacked him over there without reason.—But the C. I. has cut his feet as well as yours. He has nothing against you. No body here is making any propaganda against you. In fact the question never arises. The party is a political nonentity at present. Want of propaganda among the petit-bourgeois intellectuals. Political and party education to the workers, Urdu paper is being edited by my friend. I write in the Mahratti organ."

Then he goes on to say about hunger in p. b. (i. e. polit. bureau) circle.

"We must work hard and quick - the crisis is ripening. Strong org. is needed if are to lead. The small man should immediately come if he is serious about work. Invaluable here. No job here - no time also for a job. Must live anyhow. So let him come to work and hunger."

Obviously this letter wants a little explanation. Before I try to explain it, would you look at the back of the letter. You will find that significant name "Robert" on the back of it. Now let me try and explain it. What happened was that Usmani with three others had gone to Moscow, and my case is, and I think you will accept it, that he was elected to the Praesidium as Sikander. Mr. M. N. Roy—incidentally I think we shall be able to show that Mozuffer Ahmed was jealous of him and was not on good terms with him. M. N. Roy was also of the opinion that Usmani was working against him (Roy) Adhikari who was the latest to arrive was like all new arrivals apt to be little critical of the organisation. "Oh" he says, everything is hopeless. There is no proper org. and so on. But Adhikari is writing back to Roy to assure him that he need not harbour any suspicions about Usmani, that he is not against Roy and he has not worked against Roy, and Adhikari goes further and says. "He and another man from over there alone understand the necessity of having a disciplined and strong party." I don't want in the least bit to enter into these dissensions amongst these people or to decide whether Roy is right or Usmani. That is what the writer of this letter is trying to

explain. There is another thing which wants some explanation. That is the reference to "the small man." The reference there is to Nambiar who it is suggested should come out and who must come out because the crisis is ripening. I may say that Mrs. Nambia had arrived previously together with Hutchinson, and I think that from one point of view you might look upon the Adhikari—Nambiar Hutchinson group as more or less a little group of their own. They certainly seemed to criticise the others when they arrived, but it is only fair to say that they backed up their criticisms with real hard work. As a matter of fact Adhikari brought with him a letter of introduction to Miss M. Chattopadhyaya who is the sister of Chatto.

"My Dear Ganu."

Just a line to introduce my very dear friend Adhikari. I should feel greatly obliged if you would befriend him and help him in all ways you can. He is a valuable worker.

Yours Nam.

So that in the opinion of Nambiar, whose heart is certainly in the right spot with regard to Bolshevism, Adhikari is a really good worker.

Now, Sir, I won't trouble you long with the evidence by which I hope to satisfy you that Usmani visited Moscow: though it is rather instructive in its way. On the 5th August 1928 Spratt received a telegram from "John" which ran as follows:

"Send urgently, preferably wire information, confidence placed Orm Mussel two others in Manchester", to which Spratt replied on the 10th "Telegram unintelligible, no confidence, suggest wire Bombay." Now I suggest in fact I will show that Orm=usm, and usm is Usmani and mussel is Nassim, but who the other two are is not apparent, until you get to another letter.

On the 2nd of August J, which I suppose is the same as John, writes to Spratt as follows:

"Dear Phillip,

I should be very glad to receive news from you.....Have you any knowledge about a couple of fellows in Manchester, Rhuden and Uke-Rhug. There are also two more whom you are likely to know. I ran across them the other day, and I would very much like to know if they have any authority and whether you would place any confidence in them.

If you decode Rhuden and Uke-Rhug you come to Shafiq and Ali Shah, so that the people who were, according to J in Manchester *i. e.* Moscow at that time were Orm who I suggest is Usmani, Mussel who I suggest is Nassim Rhuden who I suggest is Shafiq and Uke-Rhug who I suggest is Ali Shah. I think it is perfectly clear that those were

the four persons in Moscow at that time. There is another reference to this. Having received this telegram, Spratt in a letter which I need not trouble you with just now refers to it. It is rather instructive to note when you go into it that John telegraphed to Spratt about Orm, but Spratt in writing refers to him as Joe he says "Joe by the way wired to me some time ago asking about some people he had met. I replied in a rather noncommittal manner that I did not know much of them." So that John and Joe, according to Spratt are the same people.

Then there is another letter which throws some light on the subject. This is a letter written by Alf in London to J (who I am creditably informed is C. P. Dutt) in Moscow.

"Since I had your note I sent the wire away to Des. but had a reply saying that the thing was unintelligible, and upon further advice I sent it over to Fred. Up to the present I have had no reply." I don't know what Fred said in reply, and whether he said that he had any confidence in Orm, and the others or not but I don't think it will be seriously disputed that Usmani did go over to Moscow and was a member of the Praesidium.

I have spent some time in showing you that many of these accused are connected with Europe and that the conspiracy was to bring actively prosecution over them. I have also tried to show you that there have been regular communications by secret methods between here and Europe. I hope I have not left you with the impression that the letters I have referred to are all the evidence on this point because they are only a small portion of it, or that it will be considered that I in any way underestimate the activities which all the accused were carrying on here in India. That is a matter on which I shall have to address you tomorrow. (The Court then adjourned till tomorrow, 25th June, at 10 a. m.)

Tuesday, the 25th. June 1929.

Mr Langford James.

I remember that I said yesterday that at one time Mr. Usmani was somewhat an object of jealousy to Mr. Muzafar Ahmad and it would seem to be unfair to say so without indicating my reasons for saying so. I have here a letter dated the 8th September, 1928, from Mr. Muzaffar Ahmed to Mr. Soumandra Nath Tagore sent through Miss Agnes Smedley where he says this:—

"I have heard that some 3 or 4 persons had gone to Europe from India. If they try to join any labour organisation on behalf of our party, you should protest strongly against it. We do not wish that this sort of men should go to Europe as our representatives. There is lot of work in India. There is no need to go abroad. They did not do any work here. I am always talking about these labour organisations. But of the four persons "(he had previously said 3 or 4)" one is a suspicious character, but the labour organisations in Europe know him thoroughly well.

That was one indication. This was at the time when Mr. Usmani and these other gentlemen whose names I have spelt out of the code to Mr. Shafiq Ali Shah, and Nassim, were in Moscow. I have got here a long letter from Mr. Spratt writing to Mr. R. Page Arnot on the 22nd October, at which time Mr. Sparrt was living in Calcutta on good terms with Muzafar Ahmad and he says this:

"Joe by the way wired to me some time ago asking so far as I can make out about some people he had met. I replied once in a rather non-committal manner as I do not know much of them. I have enquired since, however, and concluded that they are probably all rogues though one or two might merely be fools. You might tell him if you can."

These are my reasons for stating that possibly this eminent member of the Praesidium was at that time not very popular in his own party.

I have sketched very very shortly some of the reasons which go to show that this conspiracy was being carried on not only here but also in Europe, in Moscow, England and elsewhere. In deference to my Learned Friend's suggestions I propose only to give you a very very brief outline of the activities of these persons over here in India, and when all the evidence is before you, Sir, and when you have had an opportunity of reading it, I shall ask you to hold that the activities over here in India faithfully proceed on the lines outlined both in the books of the International and also in the instructions which from time to time that body or some of its minions conveyed to the accused.

in this country. I have told you that Mr. Spratt assisted at any rate in the formation of the Workers and Peasants Party in Bombay, and from the letters which I read out. I think that it is clear that both the members of that party in Bombay and those who were interested in these matters in Europe were much concerned as to whether the party should be in effect a communist party or whether it should be a wider body having within it a certain number of communists, not necessarily known as such to the others but of course known as such to themselves. This was picturesquely put in the language of Mr. Spratt whether the Church should hold its skirts a little higher. It was decided that the Church should hold its skirts a little higher, and in effect, the Bombay body at any rate appears to have been a purely communist organisation. In Calcutta, that unfortunate nomenclature had been attached to the body, Peasants and Workers. That was put right. But I am not quite sure whether the Calcutta body was so purely communistic as the Bombay body. But with regard to the Punjab, I think I am right in saying that in April, 1928, there was a Workers and Peasants Party started, and I think its ideology was perfectly good. Three members of it are here in the dock, Mr. Sohan Singh Joshi, Mr. Sehgal, and Mr. Majid, and I am sure - at least I shall ask you to hold - that their ideology is perfect. The Workers and Peasants Party movement was extended to these provinces the United Provinces in the year 1928, and on the 15th of October, 1928, the Workers and Peasants Party for the United Provinces and Delhi was founded at Meerut. That body was organised on precisely the same lines as the Calcutta body, which by that time had the valuable assistance of "Father Ambrose" and which had put forth a manifesto under the caption of "A Call to Action" which is extremely eloquent of its intentions. The programme of the Calcutta body was accepted in toto by the United Provinces body, and so was the "Call to Action." At the Conference which was held here in Meerut, the appropriate resolutions were passed with the appropriate revolutionary slogans and the appropriate revolutionary phrases. I shall not trouble you with that, Sir, in this opening, or indeed possibly with any of the speeches which have been made by the accused persons. Several hundreds, or portions of them, will, I am afraid, have to be proved during the course of this case. Now, to push on only with the history for the moment. It had been the wish of the pioneers of this movement not to confine it to any particular province but that an All-India body should be formed, and in December, 1928, there was summoned at Calcutta the first conference of the All-India Workers and Peasants Party. In that conference, Mr. Sohan Singh Joshi was given the post of honour. He presided and I shall make an exception in his case and later on read to you such portions of his speech as appear to me to be peculiarly relevant. It is the fact, therefore, that ever since 1927, we find these two bodies carrying on their activities in the Bombay Presidency, and in the Calcutta Presidency and ever since early in 1928, they have been joined by another body in the Punjab, and since the latter part of 1928, they have been joined by another body in the

United Provinces. It will be necessary of course for the prosecution to prove the complicity not merely of all the bodies, but of each member of the accused with this conspiracy. As to that, I may say at once that the evidence, generally speaking, is overwhelming. Each individual accused's case will have to be carefully decided on its merits. With regard to all the accused, there is evidence of their meeting together, of their writing to each other, and of their jointly attending the activities of the conspiracy, and I hope to satisfy you that while there is a mass of evidence against some, there is good and sufficient evidence against all of them. Now, during this period of roughly speaking 2 years and a bit—1927, 1928 and the beginning of 1929 till they were arrested—they were carrying on openly their activities. I think that incommensurably the most important of their activities that which was taking the most of their time and attention, and probably attracted most public notice—were the strikes which raged in Calcutta and in Bombay. There is no necessity for me to prove that these strikes were instigated and carried on and prolonged by these accused, because it is their proud boast that such was the case. I will deal with that matter of strikes a little bit later. Along-side with strikes of course there were from time to time demonstrations. There were many demonstrations during the strikes. I am not alluding to those. There were demonstrations, some definite and some with not very definite purpose, but I propose to ask your attention very shortly only to those demonstrations which on the very face of them must be for a communist purpose and a communist purpose only. When I come to deal with them, I think you will see what I mean. Another activity is their attempts to capture that distressingly Bourgeois body, the All-India Trade Union Congress. The attempt was made in 1927, and it was renewed in 1928, and I am sure it would have been pushed forward actively in 1929 had time allowed. I shall trouble you very shortly with that activity. Coming along-side of that, there has been a persistent adherence to the Moscow creed upon which I laid some little emphasis when reading their documents, namely, that you should use the Bourgeois nationalists as long as they are any good to you and then as I understand throw them down the well. On that point I shall not trouble you by quoting any passages in my opening speech. You will see this point cropping up from time to time in various documents which I shall possibly have to allude on other points. I merely indicate it at this stage. You will see from a study of all the documents whether my contentions upon that fact are right or not. Then there is another matter with which I shall not trouble you in detail here, but which of course I think is of the very greatest importance. These gentlemen had all over the country in their various branches newspapers which were insidiously or otherwise everlastingly preaching the gospel of communism. That again is a matter which I cannot go into in length at this stage. If I were to take up half a dozen passages from, say the *Krantikary*, one of their newspapers I do not know if it would not be said that it is not fair to take a few passages from papers, and possibly I might be met with provincial jealousy and told that I had read none from the *Gunavani*,

But be that as it may, I am afraid I must warn you that I shall have to prove a large number of these newspapers and comment upon them as being part of the organisation and doing the propaganda part very strongly insisted upon by the authorities in Moscow. There is still another branch of activities which I shall allude to namely the efforts of these accused to poison the minds—I put it that way; they I suppose would say to instruct the minds—of the youth. That is a point which Moscow insisted upon very strongly. You should get the child from its cradle and teach it class war. It is most important to get at the youth. When I come to deal with that, I think you will see that these accused, rather busy as they have been on strikes, yet found time to apply their minds to this subject. Well, now, after I have finished with these activities, I shall have something to say upon another subject with which I won't trouble you now.

I will first deal with these demonstrations which I have said are definitely communist in their objective. Take for instance a demonstration on Lenin Day—which is designed to glorify the name and memory of Lenin. Lenin stands before the whole world as the exponent of this creed of class war and the dictatorship of the the proletariat. He does not stand for anything else. It is a desecration of his memory to suggest that he can stand for anything else. He would not wish to, and if you find persons definitely glorifying the memory of Lenin, whether they make speeches or not, they can have only one object in their minds. They can only have the object of asking the people to do as Lenin did and to follow in his footsteps, and that is precisely what they have done.

Mr. Chaman Lal: To honour the memory of Mohammad is to be a Mohammad, I suppose.

Mr. Langford James: Not always. Another of these demonstrations which to my mind can only be put down as a communist demonstration is the demonstration to celebrate the anniversary of the Russian Revolution. The Russian Revolution may be the finest thing that ever happened, and people are entitled to their opinions on that subject. But if you celebrate definitely the anniversary of the Russian Revolution, you must not be surprised if any sane man says that you are in favour of the Russian Revolution, and want to see the Russian Revolution repeated. That you would gather from the very fact that they had an anniversary. But if you get their speeches which definitely say that this is what they want, that they want the revolution to come here into India, well, the matter is set at rest. There is another one. There were two unfortunate people, Sacco and Peri Vansetti, who were executed in America. They may have been rightly executed or they may have been wrongly executed. I express no opinion upon it.

Mr. Chaman Lal: They were wrongly executed.

Mr. Langford James: I hear my Learned friend say. "They were wrongly executed". For the purposes of the argument I accept

it. Other people have been wrongly executed. But the reasons for celebrating the anniversary of the execution of Sacco and Vansethi is to laud them as martyrs to the cause of Marxism and Leninism. I can prove that this was so from the pamphlet which was discovered with these gentlemen, and it is obvious that it must be so from the speeches made. Finally, there is another demonstration which is not so definitely communistic by any means, and that is May Day. My Learned friend may chip in and say.....

Mr. Chaman Lal: I was thinking of an occasion when I attended a May Day celebration with Mr. Ramsay Macdonald.

Mr. Langford James: He has chipped in and said that he attended a May Day with a very well-known statesman of moderate views. That is precisely the point I was going to make. May Day, in my younger days, was a day of rejoicing at the May Pole. But in these go-ahead days, May Day is looked upon as a labour day, the awakening of labour. Whether you are red or whether you are yellow, you can celebrate May Day. But these gentlemen have celebrated May Day.

Mr. Chaman Lal: And therefore they are communists ?

Mr. Langford James: It is not a fact that therefore they are communists at all. But you have got to consider why they celebrated May Day and what they put forward in their speeches. I shall suggest to you upon the evidence that they have celebrated May Day for the purpose of pushing forward their communist propaganda. The first time Lenin Day was celebrated in Bombay Mr. Jhabwalla took the chair, and in the course of an eloquent and impressive speech he told the audience—I do not know if I am quoting you the exact words, but this is the sense—that where as Gandhi remains an idealist, Lenin went a step forward and put his things into practice and he urged upon his hearers to adopt Leninism and organise a thorough mass revolution against all tyranny whether it was capitalist tyranny or Imperialist tyranny and he was followed by the accused Joglekar who lauded Lenin and Lenin's views upon mass action, and finally, a resolution was passed. There was a letter written to the conveners of the meeting by a gentleman named K. F. Nariman who calls himself B. A., L. L. B., M. L. C., and he very much regretted his inability to attend the meeting. He said he was in full sympathy with the movement but he said he was suffering from a sore throat and had practically lost his voice. I am not concerned with this Mr. Nariman, whoever he may be but the letter was enclosed in an envelope. We have got the envelope here and on the envelope is written—I do not quite know for the moment whose handwriting it is—the resolution passed.

This is the resolution:—

“This meeting of the citizens of Bombay held under the auspices of the Labour Party of the Indian National Congress to celebrate the anniversary of Lenin the great leader of mass movement in Russia.

places on record the citizens of Bombay hearty prayer for the peace of the soul of the great martyr who during his life-time successfully carried out the Russian revolution to the great relief of the masses of that land."

Well now I feel really that that is rather hitting the great martyr below the belt. That prayers for his soul were most necessary, I entirely agree. But that he would have appreciated them I do not think is likely or at any rate he would not have appreciated them on this earth. But the point of course of this is, that however grotesque it may be to pray for the soul of Lenin the great martyr, this is intended to glorify Lenin as being the great leader of mass movement in Russia and as having successfully carried out the Russian revolution, and I shall be interested to know how these accused can explain the sentiments which were put forward in this resolution.

I have mentioned May Day as being a demonstration but that it does not mean that a man joining in it is necessarily a Communist. May Day was celebrated at Bombay on the proper date, the 1st May 1927, and a leaflet was broadcasted which I won't trouble you with now. It was broadcasted all over the place headed with the words "Workmen take a vow to fight". It was distributed broadcast by Mr. Spratt, by Thengdi, Mirjakar, Ghate and Nimkar. A procession was formed with red flags and with a caption "Workers of the world Unite."

Now in connection with that a document has been found written by Mr. Spratt upon the meaning of May Day, and it was intended I understand for this very meeting, because it began :—

"This year Bombay Labour for the first time in its history will celebrate May Day. Celebrations have been held in previous years in Lahore, but this will be the first time that important industrial centres, Bombay and we hear Madras, will witness them. It is desirable therefore to know something of the origin, history and meaning of the festival."

Well, there is a most learned disquisition upon the origin of this festival of May Day. Then it says :—

"In the years before the war when labour became a political factor of the first magnitude this internationalism was in theory well to the fore. May Day a preeminently the expression of class solidarity, bore a more and more marked international and anti-militarist character. The hollow and superficial nature of those sentiments was revealed when the war, long prophesied and feared, actually came. It is significant that during the war May Day was neglected, except for some feeble attempts in the few centres of class consciousness such as the Clyde. But with the growth of a healthier Labour movement after the war, May Day regained all its old importance and more. In the U. S. S. R. May Day ranks with November 7th—(That is the date of the Russian revolution) the anniversary of the seizure of power by the Petrograd Soviet, as the important festival of the year."

Then a little later:—

“The attention of the workers this year is directed mainly to China. For since the war especially the old slogan “Workers of the World United” has been amplified to “Workers and oppressed peoples of the world, unite”. It has been recognized that the struggle of the oppressed nations and of the oppressed classes is the same struggle waged against the same opponent, Imperialism, for the same object, freedom from exploitation.”

Well, that is very interesting when you think of the Theses which say although you have the “United Labour Front” in Europe, in the East and places like India that selection has got to be changed to the “United Anti-Imperialist Front”, and that is what is being said by Mr. Spratt here, but I will finish what he says. In the last paragraph he says:—

“The fact that the Indian workers are celebrating May Day this year is a most welcome sign that they are acquiring the strength and solidarity and class consciousness which are essential before they can achieve the tasks which confront them.”

It is perfectly clear is it not that Mr. Spratt is putting forward May Day as being a festival which is almost comparable with the anniversary of the Russian revolution and is pointing to China, which at that time was in a state of revolutionary ferment, with the intention that India should go and do likewise.

Then there was the Sacco and Vansetti demonstration there in the same year and I suggest with the same object. We there again have got the manuscript—I do not know the hand-writing of the resolution that was passed lauding Sacco and Vansetti:—

“This meeting condemns the action of American Imperialism in sending to death two innocent labourers, Sacco and Vansetti, in spite of the protests of the world proletariat, but again thanks American Imperialism for exposing the barbarism and ruthlessness of capitalism and thereby giving more impulse to the oppressed proletariat of the world to unite against Imperialism in every country.”

Well I think that bears out what I said with regard to the objects for lauding the memory of Sacco and Vansetti. It is not as two innocent men who were done to death wrongfully, but it is as two martyrs to this particular cause.

In the Secretary's report of the Bombay Party for 1928 it is recorded with much gusto that under the propoganda section that is, the Agit Prop.—“meetings, lectures, anniversaries, celebrations, publication were undertaken, apart from the sectional mass organization, by each section for its own particular work on hand.” Then it says, “meetings, Lenin Day, welcome to Saklatwala, May Day celebration, anniversary of the Russian revolution and the Sacco—Vansetti murder

condemnation". These gentlemen also joined in demonstrations against the Simon Committee. I lay no stress on that. Anybody is entitled to think what they like about the Simon Committee. But they took the opportunity of going out these anti-Simon Committee demonstrations with placards "Workers of the world unite." And they took the opportunity of burning an effigy of Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Macdonald and various other persons. All that may be reprehensible or not, but the point that interests me is this. They considered amongst themselves in their own committee as to whether they should have any demonstration against the Simon Commission or not. You see the Simon Commission, as far as I can make out, does not lend itself very much as a subject for preaching class consciousness, the class war and the dictatorship of the proletariat, but I am a *novice* in these matters and I prefer to take the views of Mr. Dange, who has been at it longer than I have. What I am reading from now is the Minute Book of the Workers and peasants' party, Bombay, of the 29th August 1928, and what it says is this:—

"Dange raised the question of hartal on the landing of the Simon Commission on the 17th October. He thought that the conditions for a hartal were non-existent as the Simon Commission had no more importance in view of the attitude of the other parties. The question was whether we should bring out the workers on a non-revolutionary political issue."

I quite see Mr. Dange's point. The revolution of the proletariat is his objective and he says, "do not let us bring out the workers on a point like this which is ideologically unsound". That was his point. Mr. Joglekar on the other hand scented a chance for making a little capital out of it. He said "he wanted to take advantage of the occasion for declaring a general strike on the railways." Well, there again I see his point. His point is that every time you have a strike of sufficient importance you are educating the proletariat for the great day. I see the point of both these gentlemen. In the end they could not resist having a demonstration and they had it. But I think the most interesting part about it is this discussion between these two Marxists as to the "tactic" to be pursued.

Then they held a Lenin Day demonstration in Bombay in 1929 and that is duly recorded in the Minute Book. They had very little time to get it going but they did their best. And on that occasion they had a leaflet which I think came from Calcutta which also found its way into the possession of Mr. Joshi in the U. P., with a photograph of Lenin—I do not know whether it is like him. This leaflet of course is lauding Lenin. It starts with the words "Workers of the world and the oppressed brothers, unite."

"Lenin's 5th Death anniversary celebration.

Brother Workers, do not forget this date.

NIKOLAI LENIN.

Lenin was the chief leader of the Russian Bolshevik revolution of 1917, and the Russian Bolshevik Party. Of the men whose thought and efforts were responsible for the overthrow of the tyranny of the Tsar and the abolition of the control of the wealthy and the zemindars, and where the

PEASANTS' AND WORKERS'

right to rule has been established, he was the leader amongst them all. He arranged to unite the workers and the peasants of the world by forming the international organisation known as the communist International. He was imprisoned while trying to establish the right of the workers and peasants. Suffered the pangs of an exile, and was even shot at the hands of the white guards who were against him'.

And they are asked to laud his memory.

Dewan Chaman Lal: May I suggest that these details be left out, only a reference being made to them.

Mr. D. P. Sinha: Who is the author of the leaflet ?

Mr. Langford James: I believe it to be Muzaffar Ahmed, but it has been found with very many of the accused. It appears to have originated in Calcutta. I find here a letter dated the 14th January from Muzaffar Ahmed giving instructions to Bombay as to the important points to emphasise. It says:—

Monday, 21st January is the 5th anniversary of the death of Lenin and should be observed by the Party, in conjunction with the communist Party, in a suitable manner. It is suggested that on that day (or if more convenient, on the day before) as many meetings as possible should be held, especially among industrial workers. It is desirable that these should be advertised previously by handbills, which should give the most essential points of Lenin's teaching and life.

The most important questions which should be stressed in speeches on Lenin Day are:—

- (1) his analysis of the nature of opportunism and reforms in the Labour Movement, and its role as the last line of defence of capitalism.
- (2) his teaching on the colonial question: the tactics and ultimately *the leading role of the working class in the colonial revolution.*
- (3) The significance of the Russian Revolution, as the first breach in the structure of Imperialism, and the U. S. S. R. as the "Father land" of the "Working Class," hence the necessity of the defence of U. S. S. R. against the war danger.

Well now Mr. Usmani on that occasion apparently took the Chair at the meeting in Bombay and he graphically described the

grief of the people in Russia at the death of Lenin, because, he said, he was there and witnessed it. And that called forth from Muzaffar Ahmad a letter to Ghate dated 11th February 1929, in which he says:—

“The following is the quotation from “Spark”:—“Shaukat Usmani, the president, graphically described the scenes of frenzied grief of the Russian people at news of Lenin’s death, to which he was an eye-witness.”

“Please ask Usmani to contradict it without fail and immediately. Lenin died on the 21st January 1924 on which date Usmani was a prisoner in Peshawar District Jail. I do not know through whose mistake such a report has appeared in the Spark. In any case Usmani must clear his position.”

Well, I hope it is now quite clear. But the rest of the speech was lauding the great leader of this Russian revolution. As my learned friend only wants me not to refer to the details, I might say that similar demonstrations were held in Calcutta and there they carried signboards with “Long Live Soviet Republic” on them and of course red flags. There were two large meetings on Lenin Day in 1929, the details of which I shall give in due course, but they generally follow the same line. The Pnnjab was by no means backward. There May Day was celebrated with Mr. Majid in the Chair, and Sohan Singh Joshi attended, and they made speeches in which they lauded the Government of Russia, and Mr. Majid said that he wanted to establish in India a Government of Workers and Peasants like the one which had been established in Russia and to separate religion from politics as had been done in that country. And both of them lauded the efforts of that body known as the Nau Jawan Bharat Sabha, which they said was taking a prominent part in pressing forward this revolution.

Now that Sir, will give some idea of the general lines upon which that point which I consider to be a very unequivocal point in this case will be proved.

Now I propose to give you, but once more very briefly, the sort of evidence which will be called upon the question of the activities of these gentlemen with regard to strikes. But when I come to ask you to appraise that evidence it will not be upon the number of strikes necessarily that I shall dwell but upon the object of them. To the Bolshevik there are two fundamental purposes in a strike or in strikes. One is to educate the masses to mass action and to provide, so to speak, a rehearsal for the general strike and the mass revolution. That is the first objective. The other objective is to glorify the members of the communist party and make them appear as the recognized leaders of the proletariat—the sort of man who gets things done for you. Well now it is extremely difficult and requires a good deal of tact if you have entangled yourself in a strike to get out of it with any sort of honour to yourself, and

that is a point which requires a good deal of attention. But the main objective of course is the education of the workers, and it is that point of view which ultimately I shall have to stress.

Now here I have a document written I believe by Mr. Spratt, and it is headed:—

“Lesson 6. Trade Union Work”.

“The functioning of the trade unions in the class struggle generally and in the national struggle in particular.

“The trade unions are the chief mass organisations of the working class. They teach the worker class interest, class discipline and introduce them to politics. They are schools of communism. How far can they take an active role ?

“General Strike Councils of action. They form the organisational basis of the Dictatorship of the proletariat in the national revolution. The working class must now take a leading part by party activity in the nationalist movement to trade union action. Hence trade unions are enormously important. They are active instruments of all struggle which we must direct and they are field for propaganda.

“Here we have to deal with a movement not nearly fully developed. A good deal of the actual work of organisation falls upon us. This is both good and bad for us. For our practical work we require a programme on which to base our action in regard to “the trade union congress.....”.

That is the movement as a whole. So that Mr. Spratt has recognized that object really of forming these unions and teaching them to strike is for the purpose of educating them. Now what happened in Bombay first of all was this. The object of these conspirators was to get hold in Bombay of all the important, what I will call strategic, points. They wanted to collar the Railways, the dockyards, tramways, and that which is also the life-blood of Bombay commerce—the textile industry, and so on. And they succeeded very largely in doing so. They proceeded upon exactly the same lines in Calcutta and they added to these what I may call public utility and transport companies, two other rather significant spots.

They captured the employees of the Ichapore Munitions Factory, and they captured the employees of the other arsenal at Kirkee. I do not think they had completed their work. They were anxious to do so I have no doubt and they made efforts to do so. They obtained a dominating influence on the Trades Unions concerned with those bodies and companies. That is what I mean by capturing, so that the workmen in those Trade Unions would act at the dictation of these accused.

I will show you from their own records that they boasted to have control absolutely or partially over a great many of these companies. Their intention was, I have no doubt, to get a strangle hold upon all means of communication throughout the country, and they attempted to do so at any rate up here in the north. It was only because Mr. Usmani either bungled his job or was unfortunate, that they did not manage also to capture the North western Railway, but they entirely dominated the E. I. R., the G. I. P., the B. B. & C. I., and the B.N.W. Railway (here in this province at Gorakhpore). They had also captured as I pointed out—I will give you the names in a minute—the dockyards in Calcutta and Bombay, and the Tramway Companies in both those places, and I shall ask you to hold upon a mass of evidence pointing in that direction that the intention of these accused persons was to bring about a general strike on an intensive scale on the 1st May. That was their immediate objective, that was the point which they had mainly in mind at the time when they were arrested.

From the Secretary's report of the Bombay Branch, from which I have already read—the report of 1927—he says this with regard to the Trade Unions:

“At present the party members are more or less connected with the Girni Kamgar Union (*now known as the Red Flag Union*), the G. I. P. General Employees Union, and directly are responsible for the Municipal Workmen's Union, the Dockworkers Union, the Pressworkers Union.”

That is all that he claims, but later on the list was considerably added to and there were brought in the B.B. & C.I employees, the B.I.S. N. Co's staff, the Tramway men's Union, the Bombay Oil Company employees, and as I said the Arsenal Labourers Union at Kirkee.

Now, in pursuance of a perfectly definite plan in Bombay, you may say that from April 1928 till October 1928 there was practically a continuous strike and a continuous general strike of the cotton mills. I believe I am right in saying that 82 out of 84 cotton mills went on strike. The other two are not really to be counted as within Bombay. During that time no less than 170 meetings were addressed by these Bombay accused, and you will have evidence as to the language which they used when addressing those meetings.

I have here a letter written by Mr. Potter Wilson, the Secretary of the Workers Welfare League of India to Bradley, dated 31st January, 1929, which summarises the position I think rather well.

“The decision of the A. I. T. U. C. to call upon the whole movement to prepare for a general strike in opposition to the reactionary trades disputes Bill is perhaps the most important decision taken by the Congress. If this is to be more than a vague threat it will require the most energetic measures to be taken in the preparation. At the

same time with the development of the situation unquestionably pointing to the rise of further big struggles, it appears that the T. U. C. is undoubtedly pursuing the correct policy in issuing the call for a general strike. Under this slogan the whole of the trade union work in the country will have to be orientated, if a successful stand is to be made. The utmost publicity will be required for the decisions and every section of the movement drawn into the preparations. I note that the proposal for a general strike also came before the A. I. R. F. and was only defeated by a small majority. It is inevitable that the matter will have to come up again as the policy of wait and see, reveals its importance. Last year saw many strikes deprived of the success otherwise possible owing to the lack of co-ordinated policy. If in the coming year it is possible to organise united action among different sections of workers a great step forward will have been made in developing class consciousness and gaining the aims of the Indian working class. You have a very difficult and responsible part, faced as you are with the implacable hostility of British Imperialism as well as the opposition of the reformists in the Indian trade union leadership, and I should like to congratulate you on the pains taking and excellent work which you have carried out."

The point of view of Potter Wilson is the point of view of the tactical advantages of these strikes to the cause of the party, their value to the movement.

In Bengal these gentlemen dominated and captured, if I may put it in similar fashion the following imposing list of Unions:—

- The Bengal Jute Workers Association, with branches at Bhatpara, Tittagar, Metiabruz, Budge Budge, Alambazar.
- The Bengal Paper Mills Workers Union.
- The Ichapur Ordnance Workers Union.
- The Textile Workers Union.
- The 24-Parganas Postal Staff Union.
- The Labourers & Cultivators Association.
- The Scavengers Union in Dacca.
- The Dhakeswari Cotton Mill Workers Union.
- The Workers and Peasants Party.
- The Angus Engineering Workers Union.
- The Lillooah Labour Union.
- The Bauria Jute Workers Union.
- The Howrah Scavengers Union.
- The Factory Workers Union.
- The E. I. Ry. Labour Association at Asansol and other places.
- The Indian Seamen's Union.
- The Scavengers Union of Bengal.

The Transport Workers Union (Kidderpore Docks)
The Calcutta Tramway Workers Union.

They had a series of strikes, one of which was started by other persons but continued and carried on by them. There was the Lillooah strike on the E. I. Railway which started in fact in December 1927 but which was actively carried on by the accused in Calcutta from 5th April 1928 till 9th July, 1928. There were two strikes of the Calcutta Scavengers. There were two strikes in two jute mills at Chengail and at Baurea, or rather there were strikes at Chengail and one at Baurea. The one at Baurea, lasted from July 1928 to January 1929. There was a strike at the Dhakeswari Cotton Mills, another at Asansol, Ondal and Burdwan on the E. I. R.

There is a long letter from Spratt to Page Arnott which I won't trouble you with now appraising the work done by the party with regard to these strikes and showing, as I shall submit, that all the strikes were merely meant to educate the workmen towards mass movement.

Now that is all I wish to say about this, I have treated it, in deference to my learned friend, very shortly. For that reason I do not wish your Honour to understand that it is not an extremely important point in this case, because I think it is one of the most important.

Another of the activities of these gentlemen was to attempt to capture the Trades union Congress. As I told you on the first day, I think there are two Internationals of Labour, one is the RILU in Moscow and the other is the IFTU at Amsterdam. Now the object of these accused was to make rather the Trades Union Congress affiliate to the RILU, and certainly to prevent them from affiliating to the IFTU. The next best thing to affiliating to the RILU, what has in effect I should think with the same result is to affiliate to the League against Imperialism. Now at the meeting at Cawnpore in 1927 an attempt was made either to affiliate to the League against Imperialism or to pass a resolution lauding the objects of the League against Imperialism. I am not quite clear which, but in any case whatever effort was made appears to have been defeated, according to these accused and those who think with them, by a Mr. Purcell, and Mr. Halsworth, who were out from England and Diwan Chaman Lall, and there are letters which I should like to refer to quite shortly which show that point.

Now this is a letter from Mr. Chattopadhaya, Secretary to the League against Imperialism, written to Mr. Dange. It says:

"We received some time ago an invitation from the General Secretary of the Trades Union Congress to send a fraternal delegate to the next Congress in Jherria. We are doing our very best to find a suitable Trade Unionist who can represent the League point of view before the Congress and at the same time save himself from deportation

until the new law which is likely to come into force before the end of November. (*It was a difficult task indeed to send anyone who could really represent the League point and escape deportation*). We are now depending upon you and other comrades to make sure this time of the affiliation of the Trades Union Congress to the League against Imperialism. Last year it seems to have been due chiefly to Purcell, Halsworth and to Chaman Lall's vacillation that the question of affiliation was put off. I have now spoken with Chaman Lall and obtained his promise (which I hope he will keep) to support the affiliation. We recognise the difficulties at home, but if you wish to prevent the Amsterdam people from obtaining control of our labour, it seems to us absolutely necessary that the Trades Union Congress should become an affiliated member of the League, since in the present phase of the movement, and under the difficulties created by the Government, it is not easy for the trades Union Congress to affiliate to the RILU."

So that you see Mr. Chattopadhaya, Secretary of the League against Imperialism, in effect says that of course the best thing to do would be to affiliate to the RILU, that is the Moscow body, but if you cannot do that, affiliate to the League against Imperialism. And he attributes the disaster of the previous year to the three gentlemen whom he names.

Now I have got a letter written by Dange to Mozuffar Ahmed enclosing a report of what happened at the Conference. I see under "Resolutions" in that report a resolution expressing sympathy with the aims and objects of the League against Imperialism and Colonial oppression was suggested, but was not allowed. The official party supported by Purcell opposed it on the alleged ground that the League was an offshoot of the Third International.

Then there is another letter written by C. P. Dutt to Dange, dated sometime, I think, in April, 1928, in which he says this:—

"Dear Comrade,

Many thanks for your letter of February 29th, regarding the Executive Council Meeting. I have arranged for a copy to be sent to the Rilu Congress, as I think it is very important and that they should know what took place." Then he goes on to say:—

The whole business, both as regards affiliation to Amsterdam and the cutting off the workers, Welfare League, savours very unpleasantly of intrigue since they are both subjects which should only properly be decided on by the full Congress and they were not raised in November at Cawnpore which was the proper opportunity to do so. You will have received copies of a letter from Comrade Saklatwalla on this subject.

These documents, I think, prove first of all that there was this attempt definitely made by these accused to get the congress affiliated to the League against Imperialism which was defeated, and secondly that they were sending minutes of meetings and resolutions and so forth to communists in Europe, which were being forwarded to the RILU in Moscow for their information. Now that was the position as regards the 1927 meeting.

We then come to the 1928 meeting, but that will take me perhaps a little longer, so I don't know whether Your Honour would like to rise.

(The Court here rose for Lunch)

The Court re-assembled after Lunch at 2 p. M.

Mr. Langford James :—I told you that there were attempts to capture these trade unions in 1927, and to have them affiliated to the League against Imperialism. In 1928, the attempt was repeated and you will have proved before you a document which is a manifesto from the Workers' and Peasants' Party, Bombay, to the Trade Unions and their executive committees. The draft has been discovered and apparently it is a composition of Mirajkar, Spratt and Bradley. I will say no more about it at this stage than that it argues against the Trade Union Council having anything to do with Amsterdam and strongly advocates that there should be affiliation with the Rilu. In this connection, I shall show that a small committee had been formed by the Congress with Mr. Spratt as convenor to consider a labour constitution for India, and I think also to consider what is known as the Nehru report. Mr. Spratt sent round a circular to the various members of that committee enclosing a scheme which he put forward. I will not trouble you with it at length at the moment. These words occur in it: "It is to be taken as granted that the ultimate object of the labour movement here as elsewhere must be the establishment of an independent democratic socialist republic and the only kind of constitution it can agree to is that of such a state." It goes on to advocate various things and I notice that under political demands, it advocates abolition of all feudal institutions, landlordism and the Native States, and the granting of the right of universal adult suffrage, freedom of assembly, freedom of press and speech, the right to organise and strike and the right to carry arms. The whole tone of this document goes to show that it is put forward in order to advocate the Russian method. The criticism on the Nehru report which I will not trouble you with at this stage is a wholesale condemnation of that Report on the ground that it is bourgeois and entirely reactionary. At that meeting of the Trades Union Conference there appeared two persons who were sent, as I shall submit, by the Communist International, with a definite purpose (1) Mr. J. Johnston, who represented the League against Imperialism and who had been in

Moscow just before, and the other was Ryan, sent by the P. P. T. U. S. and also member of the Labour Research Department of Australia, which seems to work on similar lines to the Labour Research Department in England. Both of these men delivered speeches which I shall ask you to say were distinctly communistic and in favour of the Russian system. The P. P. T. U. S. was then located at Canton. It has subsequently found refuge in its spiritual home at Vladivostok. That, very shortly put, is the case which will be developed in greater detail as to capturing this All-India Trade Union body.

I want to say just a few words upon the activities of these accused with regard to the youth movement. The youth movement I think, undoubtedly had its origin in Moscow and the importance of training the youth and the very young in the tenets of Moscow was early recognised. But I do not suggest for one moment that because people interest themselves in a youth movement, that that is ground for saying that they are carrying on Bolshevik agitation. It is the internal evidence as to the nature of the movement which they have carried on amongst the youth to which I wish to direct your attention. Two matters have to be kept distinct in this affair. The first is an attempt to capture all the known existing youth organisations and the second is the formation or training of what I will call a really Bolshevik youth movement. As an instance of the former, i.e., capturing an existing organisation, one may point to the Nau Jawan Bharat Sabha in Lahore, which whatever its origin may have been is now, as I hope to satisfy you, on the admission of these accused, entirely communistic in its outlook, although possibly, its ideology may at times be warped in favour of sporadic terrorism. But be that as it may, I think it is fair to say that these accused have captured entirely that youth institution. As further instances of attempts to capture the existing institutions, I wish to give you evidence of speeches made in Bombay and manifestoes put forward to the existing youth movements. On the latter point that is to say, the formation of a really Bolshevik youth movement to train the youth in Bolshevik methods and objects, there is also considerable evidence. Now, the position appears to be from that point of view as follows. On the 18th of March, 1928, in Bombay, there was passed a resolution that a Fifth Group should be added to the party organisation namely, a youth Group, and the Group leader selected for this purpose was Mr. Spratt. Mr. Spratt was absent from Bombay at the time, and he did not go back as far as I know until the next September, and then only for a short time. That resolution was apparently adopted also in Calcutta, but the accused's hands were so full with strikes and one thing and another that they were not able to give, as far as I can make out, sufficient attention to this youth movement in either place. In Calcutta they were more awake and there they succeeded in forming the Young Comrades League which undoubtedly was formed by this body, as to which I have got the admission of Mr. Spratt in his own handwriting, if indeed that was needed. The objects of the Young Comrades League are stated to be:—"to organise a radical and militant movement of the exploited and oppressed young men and

women for (a) the redress of their immediate grievances, (b) the establishment of the Independent Republic of India on the basis of the social and economic emancipation of the masses." You will also find that study circles were started under the superintendence of Mr. Spratt for the purpose of teaching the youth what they should know. The most important part about it is the books which they had to read and the lectures which were delivered. Here is one instance. Comrade Hazra reads an article on Imperialism in which he dwelt on the different means of Imperialism, by different schools of thought. He also showed the history and development of Imperialism and so forth. Comrade Spratt spoke something about Imperialism and tried to enunciate the view of Lenin about Imperialism, and if I know anything about Comrade Spratt, I think it must have been very instructive. That is only one instance, but there is a good deal of material to show exactly what these youths were being taught, and the books which they had to read. There can be no doubt in anybody's mind that intensive training was going on in order to teach quite young fellows in Calcutta the tenets and objects of Bolshevism. In Bombay, as I say, they had their hands fairly full. But I have here a document headed 'Youth' showing that the fundamental task of the Workers' and Peasants' Party is to bring about an organised mass movement of the workers and peasants for the attainment of freedom from Imperialism, democracy and the emancipation of the toiling masses from poverty, ignorance and oppression, and it dwells upon the importance of the youth in this movement and says that the most vital section which can do this is the youth who are free from obsolete ideas and modes of thought, and have the idealism and energy necessary to conduct a persistent campaign of agitation, education and an organisation among the working masses. This is found with the Bombay Party, and on the top in Mr. Spratt's handwriting, I find the following:—"Bhatt, State and Revolution. Adikhari Imperialism." Obviously, I think that this must have been written at the time of the meeting of all the branches in Calcutta in December, and then it was arranged as to who should carry on the work. If Mr. Bhatt is to lecture to the youth on State and Revolution—we know fairly well on what lines they were being educated, and when the case is developed against Mr. Adikhari who was to lecture on Imperialism, I think you should have some idea as to what views they were going to get from him. In the meantime, a Study Circle was started in the Khar Youth League under the accused Hutchinson and we found with him certain interesting books with regard to his study circle. The members of this study circle call themselves by quaint names. They were called Solidarity, Tenacity, Liberty, Fraternity and so on. Occasionally Tenacity was in the Chair, and occasionally Liberty was in the Chair. But as far as I can make out, whoever was or was not there, the training seems to have been very thorough and the book which they were concentrating upon at one time was that admirable book by Mr. Stalin on Leninism, and anybody who has read Stalin's Leninism will know exactly what news Tenacity, Sagacity, Equality and so on were imbibing. Mr. Hutchinson also has functioned among the youth

in Bombay when he addressed the Matunga Youth League on one occasion. Now, passing on to the U. P. the Youth organisation there seems to have been in the capable hands of Mr. Joshi and the objects for forming the Youth League were certainly wide enough. The object was "to prepare ourselves for creating a newer, better, and more youthful order of society". It sounds very charming, but when you come to his list of books which the youth have got to study, you will find once more that he selects largely from Bolshevik literature and you find amongst them the Communist Manifesto by Marx, the A. B. C. of Communism by BUKHARIN and Ten Days that shook the World by Reed, which is a book which purports to be a vivid description of the Russian Revolution but written of course from the Bolshevik point of view in order to fire the imagination of anybody who reads it. There is other Bolshevik literature also. That is sufficient, I think, to give you an idea of the evidence which will be led in order to show that these accused were paying attention to that branch of the propaganda laid down by the International.

Now, in December, 1928, there took place in Calcutta a general meeting of the All-India Peasants' and Workers' Party, and I think all the various provincial branches were represented there. At that meeting, or to that meeting, there was submitted a Thesis. There was also submitted a political resolution and a thesis on the Trade Union movement, and Mr. Sohan Singh Josh made the Presidential address. I see that my Learned Junior is anxious that I should show you this which was discovered with the Youth League in Calcutta. (Shows a big board with the words "Long Live the Soviet India"). As I was telling you, at this meeting in Calcutta, various theses and resolutions were put before the meeting and I will trouble Your Honour with just a few points upon them. This is the first thesis to which I should like to refer. (Hands a copy to the Court). It starts by saying that :—

"The Workers' and Peasants' Party, with the mass movement of which it is the most conscious section, arises from the condition of exploitation and political subjection in which the great majority of the population finds itself. Its function, in the most general term, is to achieve at least the essential preliminary step, i. e., the attainment of political independence, for the abolition of exploitation and political oppression."

Lower down, it says :—

"The policy of the Party is thus based on a materialist analysis of society, and the fact of class struggle between different economic classes." If you turn to page 4, you will find :—

"In its different conditions, it is inevitable that the Indian bourgeoisie should be far less revolutionary than the Chinese. That this is so in fact is shown by the history of the Non-Co-operation

Movement, which was betrayed by its bourgeois leaders because of the danger of its developing into a mass revolutionary upheaval."

Lower down:—

"The bourgeoisie must therefore be looked upon as definitely counter-revolutionary, and incapable of taking any part in a genuine movement for independence."

On page 5:

It should be emphasised that the Workers' and Peasants' Party does not deny the existence of considerable differences between the Indian and the British bourgeoisie, nor does it seek to minimise their political importance. But it maintains that these differences notwithstanding, the Indian bourgeoisie will never take part, but on the contrary will vehemently oppose, any revolutionary movement against imperialism, without which neither the independence of the country nor the welfare of the masses can be secured." It contemplates that the bourgeoisie will never join in this class war and mass movement.

On page 6:-

"On political and economic grounds also it is evident that participation of the masses in the Government while the British bourgeoisie remain in the country is impossible. The masses must therefore strive for independence from British rule."

And lower down:—

"The struggle against imperialism for the complete independence of the country is thus the central item for the immediate future in the programme of the masses and of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. The struggle, having as it does the object of destroying the imperialist control of India, must be a revolutionary one. Scepticism is very prevalent as to the possibility of revolution in India. The supremacy of a very efficient and autocratic Government renders the task of revolutionary organisation extremely difficult."

And then the writer comments on that and says that difficult it may be, but it is not impossible. And then he goes at the bottom of page 7 to say:—

"The illiteracy and general backwardness of the masses again are held by upper class prejudice to constitute an insuperable obstacle to revolutionary action on their part. But the masses of China and Russia, equal to those of India in illiteracy, ignorance and corruption, have organised on an enormous scale, and carried through almost equally difficult revolutionary tasks, and have further shown remarkable constructive ability in the post revolutionary period. It is a quite erroneous and defeatist idea to suppose that it is necessary to wait for improvements in the education or social or economic position of the masses before any serious mass movement can arise. Improvement in these directions comes only through the mass movement."

On page 8 it says with some significance :—

“The Workers’ and Peasants’ Party does not deny the general utility in Indian conditions of non-violence as a tactic, but maintains that it will not be necessary for the Indian movement to use this tactic at all times and in all conditions. And it is strongly opposed to raising non-violence to the level of a principle. It was on this pretext that the Non-Cooperation Movement was betrayed.”

On page 9, you will find an interesting paraphrase of the “horseless” peasant in these words :—

“The peasant cultivators and landless field labourers demand reduction of the tribute which they pay to the landlords.”

Then, on page 10, when discussing the petty bourgeoisie, it says:-

“In order that this class can take any part in the mass movement it must be freed from the political also from the ideological leadership of the bourgeoisie, and must learn the real identity of interest, both economic and political, between itself and the masses.”

At the bottom of page 10 you will find:—

“The line of action of the Party is to develop to the fullest extent the organisation and consciousness of the masses in a revolutionary direction. With the workers this is to be carried out by increasing by all means the strength and solidarity of the Trade Union movement on the basis of forward economic and political demands and a policy of direct action. The policy of reformism and the dominance of the reactionary Trade Union leaders are constantly to be attacked, and replaced by a militant policy and leadership. All occasions are to be seized to draw the workers into political action, by demonstrations, meetings, strikes etc.” On page 12, talking about how they should get their demands :—

“To enforce these demands, a mass movement, using the weapons of demonstration etc., and direct action, must be organised, leading up to a general strike of workers and a mass campaign of non-payment of rent and taxes by peasants.”

Nobody can read this without having ringing in his ears the Bolshevik literature with which I troubled Your Honour at an earlier stage. Then I do not think I will trouble you with this thesis on Trade Unions beyond saying a few words about it.

On page 1 is discussed the value of trade unions from the point of view of political action and revolutionary aims. You will find that later on it is suggested that it is to induce the mass struggle for independence under the aegis of the Workers’ and Peasants’ Party, and on the last page you will find the international motif introduced with of course a recommendation that all the trade unions should affiliate with the RILU and the P. P. T. U. S. The political Resolution is equally significant.

Then I must now direct your attention to some portions of Mr. Josh's speech on this occasion. Heaven forbid that I should read it all. But I will try and boil it down as much as I can. Pages 2 to 4 of this speech are occupied generally speaking, with an attack on the Congress and Mr. Gandhi is attacked, Mr. Das is attacked and Pandit Moti Lal Nehru—and very naturally so from the point of view of these gentlemen. Then he deals with the Simon Commission and he deals with the Nehru Report. I will just read a few words about the letter from page 5:—

“We had been hearing the word “Swaraj” from the lips of the congress leaders but we never understood its significance. This word has been so vaguely applied that one can make it mean anything one likes. To some it means Complete Independence, to others Dominion Status. None had defined it so far, so nobody was certain what our Congress friends, meant by it. Sometimes reactionaries manage, by jugglery of words, to pass as extremists. But time comes when they are revealed in their true colour. Many leaders had been posing as extremists under the cover of undefined Swaraj. But now that the Nehru Report has defined it, they are shown to be reactionaries. Not only do they wish to remain chained to chariot wheels of the Empire, but they wish also to leave armed forces and “Foreign Affairs in the British hands.”

He goes on like this for some considerable time and on page 7 he is lashed to indignation by the fact that the King, the Governor General and the Governors should remain in the Nehru scheme. Then on page 8 he gets on to another question, and that is the Independent League of India which I understand from the Comintern was started by Mr. Jawahirlal Nehru, and he is very upset about that. You will find at the bottom of page 8 that he says:—

“On the other side our party is carrying on an uncompromising campaign for Complete Independence, our Workers and Peasants' Party is an Independent party and our slogan is Complete Independence. Then what was the need of this new party? All people who believe in revolution and class struggle should join our party and placing before the workers and peasants a revolutionary programme should organise them to win freedom.”

His point is, “We are the real revolutionary mass party here in India. What is then Mr. Jawahirlal Nehru doing starting with another party”. Then he deals with the trade union point, and you notice that on page 11 he says:—

“But we must have an official agent in Great Britain who may give to the British workers true information about the Indian Trade Union movement. In my opinion we should select the Workers Welfare League of India, London, for this purpose, for it has proved by its activities its complete sympathy with the Indian workers cause and its readiness to help them in their struggle.”

Yes, it had paid Mr. Bradley £ 40 a month and also succeeded in giving useful information and advice. But I have missed something on page 10 in regard to the question of affiliation. He said :—

“I have been greatly pleased to see that the League against Imperialism is trying to organise the revolutionary workers and the national movements of the colonial countries on international basis, and the importance of its propaganda work can be judged from the fact that the literature produced by it has been proscribed under the Sea Customs Act by the Government of India. Because the League is out to abolish Imperialism from the face of the earth and we too have the same objects, we should therefore have no objection to have connections with it. Personally I wish, that if practicable, we should secure affiliation with the International of Moscow or with the Peasants International Kristentern, because these Internationals are the real supporters of the political, economic and social emancipation of the proletariat and have shown by their attitude that they have been unceasingly fighting against capitalism and Imperialism.”

Then on page 14 he passes on to deal with the question of the peasants, and he deals with the Bardoli question. Then on page 17 he comes to that slogan so dear to the heart of the Bolshevik, “The Coming War.” They wish you to believe that the capitalist states are arming against them for war, the “white terror” is arriving. And towards the middle of that page he says :—

“Russia and Great Britain are the representatives of these war preparations. Russia stands for liberty, equality and fraternity and Britain for Capitalism and Imperialism. Which means exploitation. A great rivalry exists between them. Russia does not want war in reality, nor can she gain by a war. But her existence means a massage of revolution to the poor workers and peasants all over the world. As long as the Russian Bolshevik Government exists it will be beacon light for the revolutionaries the world over. The people will imbibe revolutionary and communist ideas and will try by every possible means, to overthrow the existing order of things. But the Imperialist Government wish to crush the Soviet rule and replace it by one of their own kind and thus give a set back to the Socialist movement all over the world. For this reason it is that the Imperialist countries, especially Great Britain, are trying to destroy Russia.”

On page 18 there is an interesting passage under the heading, “Our Enemies”.

“Our enemies have begun to discredit us in many ways and alienate public sympathy from us by their malicious propaganda in the Press and on the platform, so that they may easily arrest and confine us. They dub us as Bolsheviks and Communists and the like, but we must not lose heart. Is it not a matter of pride to be called a Bolshevik? Because Bolshevik is one who replaces the present rotten order of things by a new and just system in which the wealth is distributed

justly where there are no poor and no rich classes, where there is no unemployment in which there is an end of the ruler and the ruled, oppressor and the oppressed, employer and the employee, landlord and peasant, where every one is prosperous and gets all he needs, where all live a happy and prosperous life. To speak my mind freely I am working to bring about such an order of things and because the Bolshevics of Russia have shown us the way in this respect, we are thankful to them. If our enemies call us Bolshevics, we accept the epithet, because we know that Bolshevism stands for liberty, equality and fraternity."

And there honest Mr. Josh speaks from his heart and I am quite sure he is honest about it and I am certain that he did want to bring this Bolshevik revolution into India. That is my case. He may have believed it to be a blessing in disguise but there cannot be any question as to the intentions of these gentlemen after passages such as these. Then he sums up his programme on page 19, and you notice what he wants shortly is:—

"First, that our programme should be based on class struggle. We should work for 100 per cent. organisation, we must see that all our members become class-conscious and know their goal and how to reach it."

Then the second point is that they want complete independence.

His third point is the abolition of landlordism and the Indian States.

The fourth is that we "should look sharp to secure international affiliations with all those parties who are bent upon destroying imperialism."

Fifth, "We should try our best to disseminate our ideas among the young men, because they are ever ready to give up old rotten ideas and imbibe the fresh and healthy ones. Besides young men are full of energy and enthusiasm and these are the qualities that will stand us in good stead."

He had a considerable number of young men in his audience because the "Young Comrades League" had been directed to send, as I find from the papers, a deputation of 50 delegates to this particular conference.

Then in conclusion he says:—

"I have taken a good deal of your precious time, a few words more and I have done. The age through which we are passing is the age of democracy, I do not want to be a prophet, but I say that the present century "will see Socialism and Communism governing the world. Kingship will wholly vanish from the surface of the earth.

Mussolinis that are now oppressing the poor and helpless humanity will be wiped off the world. Empires and imperialism will cease and the present rotten and unjust system will give way to a new and just systems."

Then he gets so worked up that he recites waving I understand a red flag the Internationale, and ends up with the slogans "Long live the Proletarian Revolution. Long live the Soviet Rule. Long live Marxism and Leninism. Long live the solidarity of the exploited people of the earth. Long live the workers and peasants party of India." And the room crashed with cheers, because Mr. Josh had exactly voiced the feelings of everybody in the room and certainly of all of the accused who were there. He had indeed nobly voiced their sentiments, albeit a little ingenuously.

That will give you some insight into the working of this All-India Workers and Peasants Party Conference and to show you what exactly it meant.

Now I come to another branch of this subject. As I have already said, I think the question as to whether these accused or any of them were in fact banded together into a regular Communist Party is not one which it is at all necessary for me to prove in this case. This court is not going to appraise the guilt or innocence of the accused in this case according to the extent to which they had graduated in Leninism or in the tactics of the Third International. The question in this case will not be whether any or all of the accused were orthodox members of an orthodox Moscow Communist Party. The test question really is whether the accused or any of them have conspired to deprive the King Emperor of his sovereignty and have conspired to do that by a class war and a mass revolution. It is not the orthodoxy of the ideology of any accused as a Bolshevik, that matters, but whether he has imbibed the Bolshevik objective and conspired to put the Bolshevik plan into action. That is the crucial point. As evidence of that his actions, such as those which I have just referred to, are extremely important. But in fact at the end, in fact just about the time when Comrade Josh was so eloquently voicing the opinions of all that assembly, just about that time, several of them were forming themselves into a definite Communist Party which was to be affiliated to the Third International. Now you will forgive me if I go back a little and tell you something about the previous history of this matter. You have noticed no doubt in Mr. Spratt's letters, or one of them, a reference to the old Y. M., when the question arose between him and somebody, I think Mr. Fazl Ilahi, as to whether the Church in Bombay should be founded upon the Methodist plan or whether it should as he put it hold its skirts a little higher and be in fact like the old Y. M. Well now the facts in so far as it is at all necessary to know them in this trial about the old Y. M. are these. In 1924, apparently there appears to have been a body which called itself the Communist Party of India. Dissensions arose in its midst and it is not for me to adjudicate upon them. Somebody bolted with the funds and other people captured the

institution. For the purpose of this trial I think it is sufficient to say that there was apparently an attempt to resuscitate this body in 1926, made I believe by Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad. But it was an entirely moribund condition. It apparently came to life for one brief moment in 1927 about May, when it issued a somewhat bombastic report. With the exception of issuing that report I cannot find that it ever functioned at all during the period which your Honour will have in review in this case. But it is well to bear in mind that there was such a body. Now early in 1928 Mr. M. N. Roy, who has continued to play a very large part in this conspiracy, sent a letter to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad. It never reached Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad because it was intercepted in route. When I say that Mr. M. N. Roy sent a letter I should be rather more precise in saying that a letter signed "J" which I shall convince you was written by Mr. C. P. Dutt, was sent to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad, and attached to it was a report unsigned reviewing the whole situation in India at that time. That report appears to have emanated from Mr. M. N. Roy. Now one interesting part about this document is that it was referred to in the Legislative Assembly. Promptly the workers and peasants party in Bombay took action upon it and they had a meeting to consider what was the best line to adopt with regard to this letter. Now they had never seen the letter. They knew nothing whatever about it, but of course knew all about Mr. M. N. Roy and C. P. Dutt. They decided instantly upon the line which they should take, namely that they should say and publish in the newspaper that this letter was a fabrication. And they did so. It must seem strange to any one that a letter which is addressed to Muzaffar Ahmad in Calcutta should be stigmatised as a fabrication by the Workers and Peasants' party in Bombay through Mr. Ghate, but such is the case. Now this letter I am afraid I must trouble you with in extenso, because it seems to me to be of extreme importance.

Mr. D. P. Sinha: Since this is a letter of very exceptional character, may I know in what way he proposes to make it admissible in evidence.

Mr. Langford James: This is a letter arriving in India from Mr. C. P. Dutt who is one of the conspirators outside this realm who cannot be put before this court, at any rate is not before this court; and it encloses a document which is either written by Mr. Dutt or by Mr. Roy and therefore under section 10 of the Evidence Act it is perfectly good evidence against the other conspirators here in the dock. That is the way it is made evidence. As for the proof of the letter you may take it from me that it will be proved how it arrived in India and how it was seized and so forth....

Dewan Chaman Lal: Mr. Dutt is not a conspirator.

Mr. Langford James: I have just said that Mr. Dutt is a conspirator and that is a fact to be borne in mind for the appreciation of section 10.

Dewan Chaman Lal: So far as this case is concerned, he is not a conspirator.

The Court: The petition of complaint is that the accused conspired with persons known and unknown. That gives a very wide latitude. At any rate they did conspire with other persons than themselves, and if Mr. Dutt and Mr. Roy are two of the known persons I suppose they are part of the conspiracy according to the prosecution case. I do not say anything about the admissibility of the letter now. That is a question to go into when the document is produced as evidence.

(Mr. D. K. Sinha objected further.)

I may state shortly the position. It is this. Roy is taking up the same matter which has been discussed between Spratt and Fazl-Ilahi and the communists in Europe, namely the composition of this Workers and Peasants Party, and the point, as I understand it, is that you must have for practical hard work a communist party. You cannot have in India a *legal* communist party. It must be illegal and therefore the best thing to do is to have a secret communist party, and he argues that a communist party can exist legally in India only if it abstains from the preparation to wage war against the King, on the other hand he is horrified at the idea that a communist party could possibly abstain from preparation to wage war against the King, and in effect he says that legality can only be had at the expense of the very *raison d'etre* of the communist party. The *raison d'etre* of the communist party is to destroy the rule of His Majesty, to deprive him of his sovereignty, and, therefore, if you have a *legal* communist party it is no use at all, it cannot function. That is primarily his point.

I have no doubt, following upon that, that these gentlemen when they were in Calcutta very carefully considered the question as to what was to be done for the future, and they came to the conclusion, as far as I can make out from the papers, that the Church must hold its skirts even higher, to adopt Father Ambrose's metaphor; if one may say so, that it should go into short skirts, and they actually did form their communist party. They were intended to receive at that time a document from the Executive Committee of the Third International. They were intended to receive this document at their Conference. I do not know when they actually received it but it is found with many of them. There were apparently several copies. This is an instructive document. It is dated 2nd December, 1928 and runs as follows:—

“To the All-Indian Conference of Workers' and Peasants' Parties.

The Communist International supporting every-where the revolutionary movement of the toilers and the oppressed, through your organisation, albeit not part of our international body, send its greetings to the workers and peasants of India now waging a heroic struggle against imperialist oppression and feudal reaction upon one of the most

important sections of the world front. The victorious progress of this struggle demands in our opinion, above all, the creation of an independent class party of the proletariat, the uniting and raising of the isolated actions of the peasants to the highest political level, and the formation of a real revolutionary bloc of workers and peasants, under the leadership of the proletariat not in the form of a united workers' and peasants' party, but on the basis of cooperation in deeds between the mass organisations of the proletariat on the one hand, and peasant leagues and committees on the other, for the overthrow of the imperialists and the destruction of the political and economic basis of colonial exploitation and slavery. The growing influence of the workers and peasants' parties and particularly the attendance of thousands of peasants at your provincial conferences, proves that the understanding of the necessity for this militant bloc is penetrating among ever larger masses of toilers,

Your Conference is taking place at a moment which may become the turning point in the history of the national revolution. The furious preparations of the British bourgeoisie for a new imperialistic slaughter, and the intensification of all forms of colonial plunder and terror, place the peoples of India in a position from which there is no other way out, but open and determined fight for the overthrow of the alien yoke. The revolutionary crisis in the country is maturing. In the strike movements various detachment of the working class (particularly the Textile Workers of Bombay) begin to come out as an independent force, conscious of the irreconcilability of its interests with imperialism and the chaffering bourgeoisie, and of its historic role as the champion of the national revolution. More painfully, and slowly, but with equal certainty, the oppressed ruined and disunited peasantry is entering the path of organised struggle. Growing unemployment, ruin and hopelessness stir also the town petty bourgeoisie to revolutionary activity. The pent-up discontent of the masses, the despair and the sublime hatred for the oppressors, is already breaking forth to transform these isolated and defensive actions into an aggressive fight against British imperialism and its native allies, that is the fundamental task before your Conference.

The main obstacle to the victorious organised struggle against British imperialism and its feudal allies—in the period of increasing terrorism and bloody repression—is the influence of opportunist bourgeois nationalism. Each day brings and will bring fresh proof of the treachery of the bourgeoisie, of its bringing before imperialism, of its intention to bargain and to come to terms with the latter behind the backs of the toilers of India and at their expense. Lately this treachery has assumed the character of the most cynical toying with the slogan of "independence" which the Swarajists now throw out to deceive the masses, now tucked away in their pocket (the Moti Lal Nehru Report), in order to penetrate into the Simon Commission, through the back stairs, and now raise again in a distorted shape, simultaneously with the "dominion status" slogan. However crude

downright dishonesty this game may be, the penal regime and bloody repression of any exposing criticism, particularly Communist criticism, create a state of things under which the fraud of bourgeois nationalism still keeps its hold on a considerable section of the toilers. The struggle against this fraud compels you not only to determined and relentless exposure of the bourgeois treachery, but also through systematic everyday activity to bring home this exposure, to the masses of the workers and peasants. The experience of the last movement in Bardoli showed how great the danger is still that not only the bourgeoisie, but even the usurers, who buy out the peasants' lands find themselves able to subordinate the movement of the peasants and to utilise it for their own ends. No declarations of readiness to combat opportunism have any revolutionary worth if there is no practical and actual proof of the waging of this struggle among the masses, and of the overcoming of the bourgeois influence is persistent every day work.

The greatest danger to the organisation of the masses, to the creation of a revolutionary bloc of the proletariat leadership in this bloc, consists not only in bourgeois nationalism as such, but comes from the organisations and groups of "prominent" petty-bourgeois intellectuals actually influenced by the former the "Independence League." The wavering and oscillating petty-bourgeois intellectuals of India are either tied up with the system of landlordism and usury and preach a return to obsolete forms of precapitalist exploitation idealised by them, or they reflect the interests of capitalist exploitation being the agents of the bourgeoisie within the national movement. In either case they deny the importance of the class struggle, and whilst claiming to be "at the head" of workers' and peasants' movement, they are fit in reality only to behead it. The better element alone of the petty-bourgeois intellectuals with a revolutionary frame of mind may rise to the proletarian class viewpoint, and become a positive factor in the national revolutionary struggle.

The "Independence league" at least in its present shape in fact assists official Swarajism in its nefarious play with the slogans of "independence" and "dominion status". Duly appreciating the very fact of the organisation of this League as proof that at the present time one cannot approach the masses without demanding independence and the overthrow of imperialism, your Conference at the same time cannot fail to disassociate itself from the confusion and twaddle which characterises the advertised League platform with its lavish promises.

The masses must realise that all the talk of the organisers of the League in their platform, about "nationalisation" and "socialisation" is an empty sound if in the same breath they recommend FOR THE PRESENT "impartial board for arbitration with a view to making strikes and lockouts unnecessary" (platform of the Bengal Independence League).

There cannot be a shadow of confidence in the verbal promises of the League generally, when in reality some of its leaders (the

chairman of the Bengal branch of the League, S. C. Bose) continue to play the part of black leg organisers (betrayal of the last strike in Jamshedpur). The masses want from the political leaders of the petty-bourgeoisie not words but revolutionary deeds. The more determined and outspoken your criticism, the sooner the League will either expose itself as the Left-wing of bourgeois nationalism, or having shaken off the politicians at the head, will join, for a certain period and within certain limits, the national-revolutionary camp (retaining, however, even in this case their incorrigible half-heartedness, chronic wavering, and inevitable confusion in the whole of their politics and tactics).

The experience of all revolutions shows that the peasantry is inevitably deceived and defeated if it acts without the alliance and the leadership of the proletariat. In explaining to the peasantry the need for the workers and peasants bloc it is not difficult at the same time to explain to them, upon the grounds of the severe experience of the Indian revolution, the need for the leadership of the proletariat in this bloc. The Indian proletariat has demonstrated to all the toilers that it represents the most revolutionary force in the country; it has shown that it will stop at nothing in this struggle neither in the town nor in the village, that it marches and will march, in the front rank of the fight against British imperialism, feudalism, and the reformist bourgeoisie. The proletariat is helping and will help the peasantry which has been thrust by imperialism into a singular condition of humiliation, disunion and barbaric exploitation, shrouded in the falsehoods of religion, caste and nationalism, to organise its force and to break the shackles of slavery, bondage, land hunger, and imperialist and feudal oppression. The leadership of the proletariat, as the more concentrated, united, enlightened and hardened section of the toilers in this struggle, will secure the victory to the workers' and peasants' bloc. It is extremely important to demonstrate to the peasants in deeds and practice the significance of fighting alliance with the proletariat in their everyday struggle, already now.

The organisation of the workers' and peasants' bloc is based upon the common interest of the workers, peasants, and the town poor, in the fight against imperialism and feudal reaction. Nevertheless, it does not eliminate the class differences, and therefore, it does not imply by any means the fusion of the workers and peasants into one PARTY. In the Great October Revolution the proletariat gained the following of the peasantry of all the nations which inhabited the former tsarist Russia just because it was organised into the independent Bolshevik Party, into a Party armed with the Marxian-Leninist theory, irreconcilable to petty-bourgeois waverings, disciplined, self-sacrificing, capable of screening itself underground from the belows of the tsarist terror, at the same time never ceasing to take advantage of all the legal possibilities. The Indian proletariat, we feel sure, will follow this path.

The Indian proletariat will be the champion of the national revolutionary fight and lead with to victory the peasantry, the town poor, and all the toilers, if it organises and consolidate sits vanguard—the Communist Party, which will educate the working masses in the spirit of a clear and unmistakable class policy, in the realisation of the need for tremendous sacrifices in order to overthrow imperialism and bourgeoisie. The existing (only on paper) Communist Party of India, since it does not show any signs of revolutionary life, has no grounds to consider and even to call itself Communist, although there are individual Communists among its members. Under the conditions of imperialist terror, by the feeble organisation of the Indian workers and the bullying of the reformist trade union bureaucrats, the task of building a genuine Communist Party will be considerable facilitated if at the same time broad revolutionary organisations of the workers are formed with the active participation of Communists, or a broad Left wing created in the trade union movement upon the platform of consistent class struggle.

We expect that your Conference will raise the question of participating in the building of such broad revolutionary mass organisation of the workers. These can be built only in the irreconcilable everyday struggle against imperialism and the bourgeoisie, as well as against reformism and the petty-bourgeois groups under the cloak of Socialism. The heroic stead-fastness of the Indian proletariat in the strikes, the rapidity with which it gathers its forces although as yet only locally, the persistent endeavours to promote strike leaders from its own ranks, - leaves no room to doubt that the elements for revolutionary mass organisations of the workers have matured.

We are convinced that your Conference will discuss, and severely condemn the grave opportunistic blunders committed by the representative of the workers' and peasants' parties in the leadership of the strike movement, particularly in connection with the heroic struggle of the textile workers of Bombay. The source of these mistakes is the insufficiently clear stand against the reformist black-legs (Joshi) the relentless exposure of whom is an indispensable condition for every victorious strike (and for strengthening the organisation of the proletariat in the course of its development.) Having yielded to the demand of the trade union bureaucrats at the commencement of the strike to refrain from exposing to the working masses the reformist treachery, the members of the workers' and peasants' parties had thus disarmed themselves also for the further struggle. Surrender to the reformists led inevitably to surrender to the employers, to the signing of the demands which were dictated by the chairman of the Arbitration Commission, the flunky of the Anglo-Indian bourgeoisie, a surrender all the more inadmissible since, as partial strikes which subsequently broke out proved the workers refused to give up the fight in spite of all their hardships. Only by learning from the severe lessons of the past struggle the working class will promote from its midst a consistent class leadership for the

imminent, even more decisive strikes of the textile workers, railwaymen, miners, and metal workers. With the growing intensity of, the revolutionary activity of the proletariat on one hand, and the bloody onslaught of imperialism against the workers' organisation on the other (the Trades Disputes Bill) the preparation and organisation of the general strike becomes the most urgent task of the current struggle. The Indian workers who performed wonders of endurance during the defensive fights in the fights of 1928 will show similar wonders of valour in the forthcoming aggressive fights.

In the work among the peasants the task is to pass from general slogans and to draw in the peasants to the real revolutionary struggle in the defence of the everyday interests of the masses. Your organisations cannot afford to wave aside even seemingly backward manifestations of the anger of the peasantry. You must endeavour in every manifestation of this kind to discover its revolutionary substance and to transfer it to a higher level of class consciousness. In view of the tremendous variety of forms of land tenure in India, and the multitude of forms pre-capitalist and semi-feudal bondage, the best way to embrace the peasant-movement in the various districts and localities is to organise from below peasant leagues led wherever possible by agricultural labourers and poor peasantry proved in the fight. It is necessary not only in words, but in deeds, to endeavour to raise the isolated actions of the peasants to the level of an agrarian revolution. Under the slogans of abolition of every form and vestige of feudalism and semi-feudalism, of confiscation of the land of Zemidars, usurers, priests and its transfer to the use of the toiling peasantry while securing in the first place the interest of the poor peasants, the agrarian revolution has been and remains the pivot of the national-revolutionary struggle in India.

In purging the leading bodies of your organisations from suspicious and unreliable elements, you, will, of course, above all, be guided by the criterion of loyalty and devotion to the cause of the workers and peasants, remembering that the petty-bourgeoisie, not to speak of the bourgeois intellectuals, are closely tied up with the system of big landownership so that they must by all means combat the developing agrarian revolution.

Concerning organisational forms, your Conference will have to discuss the question of separating the workers' organisations from the peasants' organisation, so that the former be ensured a clear cut and consistent class development, and the latter the full embracing of the struggling peasantry. Provincial workers' and peasants' parties, after an appropriate distribution of their branches and members upon this class basis, are bound to develop in the future in revolutionary mass organisations of the workers on the one hand, into peasant leagues, and committees on the other, which in turn will strive to gain the leadership inside existing peasant bodies or will build new peasant organisations. The periodical conferences and meetings of these mass organisations, called from time to time should constitute one of the

ns expressing the militant bloc of the worker and peasant masses. Your Conference accepts this point of view, it will put, before itself question of forming a Committee for the coordination of the activities of the local workers' and peasants' organisations, having in mind ally their independent revolutionary development upon the class s.

The Indian toilers, in their hard struggle, are nearing the fulfilment of their great historic task. The proletariat now organising itself can rely on the support of the peasantry, of the poor of the towns of all the oppressed and exploited of India for whom there is no salvation except as the result of the triumphant revolution. It can rely on the support of the proletarians of all lands and of the oppressed peoples throughout all the world. We appeal to your Conference to wage a determined fight against waverings and backslidings to criticise every opportunistic blunders, to work out the revolutionary tactics for forthcoming fights, to pass to such forms of organisation which, as international revolutionary experience has proved, open the possibility of winning the masses to the cause of the revolution.

Down with British imperialism.

Long live the revolutionary fight of the workers and peasants of India.

Long live the revolutionary rising of the colonies!

Long live emancipated Soviet India!

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL.

-I don't know how this got into the hands of the accused. I have a feeling that possibly Usmani, who was travelling from Russia about that time, may have brought it with him. It does not seem to have come by post. Now whether they got it before they took this step or not, they did on the 27th, 28th, 29th December in Calcutta hold meetings and definitely enter into the task of establishing or re-organising a communist party in India. They elected members to it and named an ECCI (and so forth) in it, and they subsequently in Bombay had meetings of that party on the very day before they were arrested on the 19th March. The manuscript records of their meetings are in my possession, and we have also found amongst their papers the constitution of this party this 1929 communist party of India. It starts off with the name of the Party shall be the Communist Party of India" and in brackets (Section of the Communist International).

That would seem to preclude, as far as I can see, anybody who had entered into that party from saying that he was not pledged definitely to the creed and objectives of the Third International. At the same

(34)

any one of the accused was a member of such a party. I have already intimated to Your Honour the test which I suggest should be applied, and which I propose to ask you to apply in this case, and speaking for myself, if anybody amongst the accused did not hold these Bolshevik views and did not desire to push forward this class war and Bolshevik revolution, I for one should be extremely sorry if I were the cause of his being convicted in this case, and so I am convinced would be the Government which instructs me.

THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE COMMUNISTS.

(An extract from a recent publication, for our guidance.)

The basic tasks of the Indian Communists consist in struggle against British Imperialism for the emancipation of the country, for destruction of all relics of feudalism, for the agrarian revolution and for establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry in the form of a soviet republic. These tasks can be successfully carried out only when there will be created a powerful Communist Party which will be able to place itself at the head of the wide masses of the working class, peasantry and all the toilers, and to lead them in the struggle against the feudal-Imperialist bloc. The strike movement of the Indian proletariat now taking place, its independence from bourgeois nationalism, the all Indian character of this movement, its distribution over almost all branches of industry, the frequent and protracted strikes, the stubbornness and great resoluteness with which the workers had carried them on, the coming forward of Leaders of the strike from the midst of the workers themselves—all these things denote a turning point in the history of the struggle of the Indian proletariat and prove that in India the pre-conditions have matured which are essential for the creation of a mass communist Party. The Union of all Communist groups and individual communist scattered throughout the country into a single, independent and centralised party represents the first task of Indian Communist. While rejecting the principle of the building of the party on a two class basis, the communist must utilise the connections of the existing workers' and Peasants' Parties with the toiling masses for strengthening **THEIR OWN PARTY, BEARING IN MIND THAT THE HEGE-MONEY PROLETARIAT CANNOT BE REALISED WITHOUT THE EXISTENCE OF A CONSOLIDATED, steady Communist party, armed with the theory of MARKXISM.** The agitational work of the Communist Party must be bound up with the struggle for the immediate demand of the workers, at the same time explaining to them the general aims which the communist Party sets out to achieve and the methods which it applies for their realisation. It is essential to establish nuclei in the various industrial and other enterprises, and these must take an active part in the labour movement, in the organisation and conduct of strikes and political demonstrations. The Communist organisations must from the very beginning devote special attention to the training of leading Party Cadres from the ranks of the workers.

In the **TRADE UNION**, the Indian Communists must mercilessly expose the National-reformist leaders and carry on a

decisive struggle for the conversion of the trade unions into genuine class organisations of the proletariat and for the replacement of the present reformist leadership by consistent, revolutionary representatives from the mass of the workers.

It is especially necessary to expose the methods so much favoured by Indian reformists of deciding conflicts by means of petition to the representatives of British Imperialism, as well as to 'Impertial' courts for adjudication between workers and employers. In this struggle, it is necessary to push forward the demands for trade union democracy, for putting the trade union apparatus into the hands of the workers, etc. The levers for Party work in the trade unions must be the Communist fractions as well as groups founded by the Communist and sympathising with them. It is necessary to utilise the present strike wave in order to organise the unorganised workers. The miners and engineering workers, the coolies working on the plantations and agricultural labourers in general, represent the least organised sections of the Indian proletariat and the Communists need to devote the necessary attention to them.

The Communist must unmask the national reformism of the Indian National Congress and oppose all the phrases of the Swarajists, Gandhists, etc., about passive resistance with the unreconcilable slogan of struggle for the emancipation of the country and the expulsion of the imperialists.

In relation to the peasantry and peasant organisations the Indian Communists are faced above all with the task of acquainting the widest strata of peasantry with the general demands of the Party in agrarian question, for which purpose the Party must work out an agrarian programme of action. Through workers connected with the village, as well as directly, the Communists must stimulate the struggle of the peasantry for partial demands, and in the process of struggle organise peasant unions. It is essential to pay particular attention to make sure that the newly created peasant organisations do not fall under the influence of exploiting strata in the village. It is necessary to give to the existing peasant organisations a concise programme of concrete demands and to support the activities of the peasants through demonstrations of workers in the towns.

It must be remembered that under no circumstances can the Communists relinquish their right to open criticism of the opportunist and reformist tactics of the leadership of those mass organisations in which they work.

P. S.

A book entitled "Joseph Stalin--'Leninism'—Translated from the Russian By Eden and Cedar Paul." Printed in Great Britain by Unwin Brothers, Ltd., Woking.

P. 9.

YOUNG COMRADES' LEAGUE

STATEMENT OF PROGRAMME AND POLICY.

1. **What is the Youth Movement?** Youth Movement has now been active in Bengal for some time, and has received much support and advice from its elders, but it has hitherto failed to establish itself. It has failed (a) to reach and establish contact with the masses (b) to conduct any campaign for the real needs and grievances of the youth (c) to break away from the ideas of the "elder statesmen" of the Congress, who in practice control most of the organisations, and to develop any new ideas of its own. A youth organisation is required which shall overcome these defects and shall do some real work on the basis of modern and correct social conceptions.

A Youth Movement has as its main functions (a) to combat the reactionary ideas which become crystallised in organisations run mainly by middle-aged or old men. The Indian National Movement is in its thinking many years out-of-date. It is the duty of the organised Youth to introduce to it ideas, policies and methods suitable to present conditions (b) to educate and prepare the youth for the political and social work of the future. (c) to defend the special interests and needs of the younger generation. A youth organisation which does these things is entitled to the position of a genuine representative and leader of the youth.

2. **Our Grievances.** We are called upon to defend the rising generation in this country from many evils and abuses. A civilised country takes special care of its youth. Our Government leaves them practically without protection to nature and the play of economic forces. Many matters require attention, among which the chief are:

(a) **Unemployment.** The effects of unemployment fall especially hard upon the youth, whether with school or college education, or forced to earn a living from childhood. (It is not only physically and morally harmful to the unemployed but also reacts to the detriment of the conditions of those at work.) Unemployment is a necessary concomitant of capitalism, and is especially severe in so ill-balanced an economic system as our own; nevertheless much can be done to minimise its evils. In England and other European countries the unemployed are supported by the State. Why not here?

(b) **Education.** The educational system of India is acknowledged to be most defective. Immense numbers of growing boys and girls receive no education at all. Even those who do, are trained by obsolete mechanical methods in useless subjects. Remember what Russia has done. A population which ten years ago was as backward

as that of India, is expected in three years more to contain no illiterate persons, old or young. Education is compulsory up to 14, and for town workers, part-time literary and vocational education up to 18. We do not want any longer to be educated in political subservience, or to be trained merely as clerks to our imperialist bosses. And our education must be universal.

(c) Working conditions. Young men and women before reaching maturity need special safeguards in their work. Yet boys and girls are made to work just as long hours as adults for far less pay. In Russia youths up to 16 work only 4 hour, and upto 18 only 6 hours per day. The rest of the time is spent in school. We need also the limitation of hours, proper pay, and other conditions improved for young workers

(d) Social customs. For the physical and mental health both of the individual and of society, it is essential that many ancient and harmful customs be abandoned. It is the function of youth to see that both in theory and in practice the customs of early marriage, purdah, untouchability, etc., are abolished.

For these and many other elementary demands the youth of this country has to fight. We do not need words but deeds. Active efforts, organisation, agitation, must be undertaken on a great scale, and we appeal to all those young men and women who know the difficulties and trials for the young of modern life, to come forward and join us.

3. What is the Remedy ? We propose to create among the youth a mass movement and agitation for the redress of many grievances. Some reforms may be won by the pressure of the organised masses. But we know that there is no ultimate solution under the present system. This is an exploiting system, which by its very nature cannot allow decent and proper conditions for all. While pressing for redress of our immediate wrongs, we shall never forget that greater than all these are our ultimate objects. We have to work for complete independence and for the emancipation of the masses from their position of economic and political subjection—complete independence of the country from the foreign exploitation which is the root of almost all our present ills ; and the complete emancipation of the masses, without which independence is both unreal and unattainable.

There are only two ways in which India can proceed, (and everybody must choose between them. Either we can join the capitalists and landlords, with their exploitation, swindling and jobbery, and help to fight against and suppress the movement of the masses, and therefore inevitably ally ourselves with imperialism ; or we may join the masses, and fight with them for the independence of the country from imperialist and capitalist exploitation. From these

two we must choose, and the young workers, peasants and oppressed and poverty-stricken of all kinds cannot but choose the path of independence and complete emancipation.)

4. The Ideas of Today. In addition to fighting for its own grievances and participating in the general struggle for freedom, the youth has a further important function. Youth is open-minded, it is free from the prejudices of the past, it can from and assimilate ideas suitable to the circumstances of today. It can see clearly the faults which prevented the past generations from succeeding, and it has the energy to remedy them. (Our country and our national movement are in the hands of old men, who are still in many cases living mentally in previous centuries, but whom the people still follow because of a harmful tradition of respect for the old and well-established.)

Youth, growing up in the twentieth century, in the "epoch of wars and revolutions", can discard these relics of the past. It brings with it, in opposition to the mentality of our older leadership.

(a) a true appreciation of our position in the world. It abandons the old seclusion of Indian nationalism, and its rejection of all modern thought and scientific progress. It recognises that the struggle of India is but part of a worldwide struggle for freedom, and that it cannot remain isolated from the movements of other countries. (It sees that India must learn to use theoretical and practical weapons which are found to be effective elsewhere. And it sees that the ultimate goal of the struggle of India for national freedom must be international.)

(b) a realistic revolutionism. It breaks away both from the timid nineteenth-century constitution-mongering of the dominant school in the nationalist movement, and from the romantic impossibilist revolutionary policy of the minority. Revolution is no longer the dream of a few isolated intellectuals, scorned by all political realists; it is an actuality, already taking place all over the world, and requiring scientific study and practical organisation.

(c) class-struggle as the man-spring of historical development, and the rise and organisation of the masses as the key to our problems. Denounced or ignored by the blindness of class interest of our old leaders, the class-struggle is to the realistic mind of youth an overwhelming fact. Before the rising organisation of the masses, our older leaders have hesitated between a policy of ignoring or opposing it, and one of exploiting it for the wrong ends. The youth sees in the class-conscious organisation of the masses the only force which can break through the obstacles to our national progress, and the only guarantee of a united peaceful future for the people of the whole world. The youth will throw itself into the struggle on the side of the masses.

(d) abandonment of the traditional attitude of hero-worship. Our movement has always paid exaggerated devotion to its leaders, and has often suffered heavily as a result. The youth will rid itself of this dangerous relic of bourgeois ideas, and will base its policies and actions upon principles rather than upon personalities.

(e) an active intolerance of the divisions and hostilities among ourselves, based upon ancient usages and customs having no reality or value at the present day. The traditional method of dealing with communalism has proved to be useless. It is absurd to intensify communal consciousness as a means of bringing about inter-communal unity.

Youth ignores communal divisions, and bases its policy upon the identity of the real interests of all the masses.

5. **What we shall do.** The young Comrades' League has been established to carry on the propaganda of these ideas and to form and lead a real movement of the exploited youth for the solution of its grievances and for the attainment of independence and freedom.

We appeal to all the young people of Bengal to join and help us in these great tasks. All around us we see poverty, misery, ignorance, unemployment, famine, destitution, insanitary housing, preventable disease, high infant mortality. We see the enormous wealth of our country monopolised and controlled by an unholy combination of our own and foreign zemindars and capitalists. They juggle with the nation's livelihood-with its very life. By the present system of legalised robbery they take from us the fruits of our labour, to drain it away to foreign countries or to spend it in riot and extravagance. At their whim we are evicted from our dwellings or dismissed from the possibility of obtaining our livelihood. If we resist we are met with the lock-out, the black-list, the lying capitalist press, the inequality of justice, the terrorism of the police force or the capitalists' or landlords' hired thugs. At their decree we are marched off to foreign lands to fight to the death against our comrades with whom we have no quarrel; if we resist we are condemned as traitors. Above all, dominating our whole life the embodiment and protector of capitalism and landlordism, the framework and backbone of the whole system, the instrument of foreign rule, stands the state.

The whole vast machine of exploitation and oppression, controlled by a small clique of imperialist magnates, to whom the millions of ordinary people are but instruments in their schemes of world conquest and spoilation, is a menace to the future of humanity, which must be fought and overcome by the people. Even now it is planning and preparing a new great war of conquest, against our comrades and friends of the Soviet Republics. In this war, which may now break out at any time, many thousands of young

men of India will be used as cannon-fodder. We must warn in time the nation, and specially the youth against the danger of this coming war, and appeal to all to resolve that no Indian shall disgrace himself or his country by taking part in it, directly or indirectly.

In war or in peace, Imperialism is incompatible with civilisation, with proper human relationship, with decent standards of life. we call upon all young people who feel that their lives and those of others round them are not what they should be, who are exploited or cast out to starve by an iniquitous economic system, who are denied the proper education which is the birthright of all human beings; we call upon all who want peace and not war, who want independence and not slavery, civilisation not Imperialism, freedom not exploitation:—Join the young Comrades' League and fight for them!

6. Our programme of practical work for the immediate future is as follows:

(a) to launch by means of public meetings and other propaganda a campaign for the following chief demands:

- (1) a living wage for all wage earners.
- (2) limitation of hours for young workers (6-hour day up to eighteen).
- (3) state support for the unemployed
- (4) universal primary education; compulsory physical and military training in schools; improved facilities for technical education.
- (5) abolition of the practices of early marriage, untouchability, purdah etc.

(b) to establish study-circles in economic and political subjects.

(c) to organise public meetings and debates and to publish material relating to our economic, political and social problems.

(d) to co-operate with the Trade Union movement in the organisation of young workers, and to initiate the organisation on similar lines of the youth of the villiages.

(e) To establish solidarity among the various youth organisations and to initiate united work for common objects.

(f) to publish and distribute an organ for the youth.

(g) to recruit new members.

(h) to study youth movements, the working and other conditions of young workers, and other political and economic questions, to collect data and form a Library.

Printed by N. SEN, at THE POPULAR PRINTING WORKS, 2, Ram Hari Ghose Lane,
and published by the same from the office of the Young Comrades'
League 78-1, Harrison Road, Calcutta.

P. 10.

A group photograph containing photos of 21 persons including Kishori Lal Ghosh, Muzaffar Ahmed, Dharanikanta Goswami, Shaukat Usmani, Gopal Chandra Basak, Shibnath Banerji, Bishwa Nath Mukerji, S. V. Ghate, S. A. Dange, S. S. Mirajkar and others.

P. 11.

Bengali notice announcing the holding of the First All India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference in December 1928 and explaining the benefits of such Conference.

P. 12.

REVOLUTION & INDEPENDENCE !!!

Is what everybody speaks of, to-day, and yet after years of agitation and organisation India is still a Slave Nation—is farther from Revolution. Why is this? India during the last war witnessed her sons moving heaven and earth to fight for freedom and so their revolutionary activities in Germany and other lands; Young Bengal was in gallows and Andamans in its attempts of guerilla war-fare; you have also witnessed the National Congress in its mighty role of rallying the exploited masses of India to fight against the British Imperialist and now the same Congress is divorced from mass support, supporting All parties Conference which claims to speak for exploited masses and what do they demand you think—?

You can have the clear consistent marxist analysis of it from—

CALL TO ACTION !!

As. 4.

your leaders invariably say one thing and do another ?

Dominion Status—a sharing of quota for the Indian Capitalists in the Exploitation of Indian Resources and Indian Labour (wage slaves)—Why all these phenomena ? Why do

Why do people claiming to be revolutionary don't support social revolution in India and speak of exploitation of man by man as something ordained by Gods or nature of their invention ?

In
TWO WORLD CURRENTS
COMMUNISM—FASCISM
by Dr. Bhupendra Nath Datta
M. A., Ph. D. will tell you of
it—

As. 2.

Comrade, S. A. Dange of
Cawnpur Bolshevik conspiracy fame in his
HELL FOUND tells you with
grim humour about the man-
slaughter house and abomin-
able jail methods. Re. 1.

Why do these people don't give you a clear account of the World Currents that are in conflict in Europe and Asia and that have a future role in India ?

Why do the British Imperialist find in communism—its mortal enemy? And how do a communist in India fare in the hands of the British Imperialist and in jail.

Krishaker Katha (in Bengali)—Com. Aftab Ally—gives you an elaborate picture with his foreign experiences of analysing this particular problem:
As. 3.

What are the draw backs of Agrarian organisations and how are the peasants the leading factor in the coming revolution are exploited?

For explanation of all these disturbing phenomena.

For clear conception of Marxist Theories ASK FOR SYLLABUS, LIST OF PUBLICATIONS AND THE BOOKS YOU CHOOSE from it from the VANGUARD LITERATURE CO; at 2/1 European Asylum Lane (Manager Gopal ch. Basak).

V. L. Co. is established to cater for the needs of worker-student and de-classed intelligentsia struggling for the mass-revolution in India.

VANGUARD LITERATURE CO.

—sells vangurds books produced by the great thinkers and by the vanguards of freedom and beauty.

—publishes varieties of labour books with life and its varied problems.

—suplies promptly all Literature for worker-student, whether published at home or abroad. Syllabus, Complete book list, particulars on application.

VANGUARD LITERATURE CO. 2/1 EUROPEAN

ASYLUMLANE, CALCUTTA.

Bani Press, Nawabpur, Dacca.

P. 13.

DO YOU WANT FREEDOM?

Do you want Independence for the many, not
Dominion Status for the few?

Do you want less say and more do?

Do you want scientific politics, not wordy sentiment?

Do you want a real People's Party to fight for
the masses?

If so, come to the

FIRST ALL-INDIA

WORKERS' AND PEASANTS' PARTY

CONFERENCE

At ALBERT HALL, College Square, Calcutta.

on December 21, 22, and 23, (1928)

Visitor's Tickets can be had at Rs. 5., Rs., 3., Rs. 2.
and As. 8

Students will have visitor's ticket at As. 4

For Particulars, tickets etc. apply:

RECEPTION COMMITTEE

2-1, European Asylum Lane, Calcutta.

P. 14.
THE
**BENGAL JUTE WORKERS'
ASSOCIATION**

Central Office-Bhatpara,

(24-PARGANAS)

No.....

Dated the 17th Dec. 1928.

Certified that Comrade Sibnath Banerjee
~~Radharanjan Mitra~~
has been selected as a member to the Executive
Council of the A. I. T. U. C. to represent The
Bengal Jute Workers' Association, and also as
a Delegate to the 9th Annual Sessions of the
A. I. T. U. C. to be held at Jharia.

(Sd.) G. CHAKRABORTY,

General Secretary.

Forwarded to

Comrade Sibnath Banerjee.

~~Radharanjan Mitra~~
Member, The Bengal Jute Workers' Asso-
ciation for information and necessary action.

P. 15.

RULES OF THE BENGAL TEXTILE WORKERS' UNION.

1. **Name.** The name of the Union is the Bengal Textile Workers' Union.

2. **Aims.** The aims of the Union are,

(a) to unite all the cotton factory workers of Bengal for the promotion of their common interests,

(b) to represent the cotton factory workers for the purpose of deciding with the owners or managers of factories the conditions of employment, and for the purpose of redressing workers' grievances,

(c) to take proceedings on behalf of workers to enforce the observance of the Factory Regulations and the Workmen's Compensation Act,

(d) to institute funds for the purpose of giving Death, Unemployment, Sickness and other benefits to members,

(e) to provide for the educational and social needs of the members by means of meetings lectures, library, the publication of journals, etc.,

(f) to cooperate in the establishment of an All-India Textile, Workers' Union.

(g) to further the interests of the working-class generally, both in India and in other countries, by cooperation and affiliation with organisations having these objects, as shall be decided from time to time.

3. **Membership.** All workers in cotton factories in Bengal or neighbouring provinces shall be admissible as members, and others who may be appointed office-bearers, as herein provided.

4. **Contributions** All members shall pay subscriptions to the General Fund, according to the following scale: Those whose monthly wage is Rs. 20 or under shall pay As. 2 monthly; those above Rs. 20 shall pay As. 4 monthly. Members other than workers, **outsiders** shall pay As. 4 monthly.

The E. C. is empowered to institute special funds for the payment of benefits to subscribers who must be members. Such funds shall be kept separate from the General Fund, and shall be used only for the purpose for which they are instituted. Branch

Committees shall also be empowered to establish such funds, subject to the observance of this rule, and to the permission of the E. C. Any one who is in arrears in payment of subscription of six months unless this is due to unemployment, shall automatically cease to be a member.

5. Victimization Benefit: Any member who in the opinion of the E. C. has been dismissed from employment on account of Union work, shall be entitled to benefit paid from the General Fund, which shall not exceed Rs. 50 or Rs. 100 per month for three months. This benefit shall be granted subject to the decision of the E. C.

6. Organisation.

(a) The office-bearers of the Union shall be a President, who shall also be Treasurer, Vice-President, General Secretary, any or all of whom may be outsiders, who shall be elected at the Annual General Meeting of the Union.

(b) The Executive Committee shall consist of the office-bearers, the branch secretaries, and additional representatives of the branches, elected annually in branch meetings on the following basis:—

Branches with membership of 100 to 500,	2 representatives.
” ” ” ”	501 to 2000, 4 ”
” ” ” ”	2001 or more, 6 ”

The E. C. shall hold Full Executive meetings quarterly, or at other times on the demand of a Full Branch meeting or by decision of an ordinary E. C. meeting, at which the quorum shall be half the E. C. members. Two weeks, notice of these meetings must be given to all E. C. members.

Between these, ordinary E. C. meetings shall be held at the Union H. Q. in Calcutta at a fixed regular day and time, and the quorum shall be six. Decisions, other than in regard to routine matters, taken at an ordinary E. C. meeting, shall not be binding upon branches which were not represented at the said meeting, until the agreement of these branch committees has been obtained by correspondence or otherwise.

The Full E. C. shall have power to replace any office-bearer to fill up vacancies among the office-bearers. Full Branch meetings may recall their representatives in the E. C. and may fill up vacancies among them at any time.

(c) Full Branch meetings shall take place at least monthly, at a regular date, time and place. One tenth of the branch membership shall be the quorum.

(d) The Full Branch meetings shall elect annually a Branch Committee, consisting of a Secretary, who may be an outsider, a Treasurer, and five to ten other members.

(e) A General Meeting of the Union shall be held annually, which shall be the deciding authority on all questions. It alone can alter the constitution and rules. Two months' notice must be given by the E. C. to branches of the Annual General Meeting, and resolutions for discussion must reach the E. C. one week before the A. G. M. Resolutions on matters of emergency may be brought up without notice, with the permission of the President.

Special General Meetings may be called on the decision of the Full E. C. Two weeks notice must be given at any time to branches. Decisions taken must be confined to the questions for which the meeting is called.

The branches shall elect representatives to the A. G. M. on the basis of delegate for each 50 members or part thereof. Such elected delegates alone shall have the right of voting in the A. G. M. Office-bearers and committee members of the Union and of branches may attend the A. G. M. and may speak, but shall not vote unless they are also elected delegates.

7. Finance. The branch committees are responsible for the collection of contributions, and must keep proper registers of members and payments, which shall be open for the inspection of any member of the branch, or of any E. C. member.

The branch Treasurer shall take charge of the funds, which shall be disbursed jointly by him and the branch secretary. Of the money collected monthly by the branch, 75 per cent. shall be forwarded to the Treasurer of the Union, who, jointly with the General Secretary, shall be responsible for it. The money received by the E. C. shall be used for administrative work including an allowance to the General Secretary, as shall be decided by the Full E. C., the travelling expenses of the delegates to E. C. meetings and A. G. M., the establishment of a reserve fund, Union affiliation fees, victimisation benefit, and other objects as may be decided. The money remaining with the branches shall be used for branch administration including allowance to the branch Secretary, as shall be decided by the branch committee, propaganda, local affiliation fees.

In case of the exhaustion of the Union funds during disputes, the E. C. is empowered to call upon branches to give any funds in their possession, and may also authorise special levies upon members not involved in the dispute.

The E. C. shall conduct an annual audit of the branch accounts, and the Union accounts shall be audited annually by some competent person appointed by the E. C. A full statement of Union and branch accounts shall be made to the A. G. M.

8. **Activities of Branches.** At each Full E. C. meeting, a report shall be given from each branch of work done in relation to employers, meetings of branch and branch committee, propaganda, recruiting, collection of contributions and other work. The E. C. shall issue general directions to the branches on the basis of the reports.

Branch committees shall be empowered to enter into negotiations with the management of factories in their jurisdiction, but they shall obtain the permission of the E. C. before concluding any agreement which infringes any of the standard conditions which may be recognised or established by the Union.

The E. C. has the right to withhold support from any strike which may be declared by a branch without its approval.

P. 16.

An account book of Dhakeshwari Cotton Mills Workers' Union in Bengali.

ORDER.

Nimbkar and Hutchinson accused applied to this Court for bail on the 20th January 1931; subsequently their applications were separated and were disposed of by me in two separate orders dated 27th January 1931. In those cases I held that they were not cases in which applying the general principles stated in section 497 (1) C. P. C. bail ought to be granted and secondly that there were no special grounds, that is exceptional circumstances such as would justify the grant of bail. I accordingly dismissed both applications. The accused concerned subsequently applied to the High Court where there applications came before a Division Bench. That Bench has by its order dated 23rd April 1931 allowed the applications of both the accused and ordered their release on bail on certain conditions.

In consequence of this order a number of applications for bail have now been filed. I have before me applications on behalf of (1) Thengdi, Benerji, and Desai accused (2) Ghosh and Mukerji accused (3) Dange accused (4) Joshi accused (5) Gauri Shanker accused (6) Kasle accused (7) Alwe accused (8) 15 accused, namely Adhikari, Ajudhya Prasad, Basak, Bradley, Shamsul Huda, Chakravarti, Goswami, Joglekar, Majid, Mirajkar, Muzaffar Ahmad, Mitra, Josh, Spratt and Usman, accused.

The first of these applications made to me was on behalf of Thengdi, Desai and Banerji on the 25th of April, when the learned Crown Counsel remarked that he did not agree with any of the reasons given in paragraphs 2, 3, 4, of the petition but that in regard to para 5 it was difficult to distinguish the cases of these applicants from those of Nimbkar and Hutchinson accused, and that if there was no likelihood of the applicants absconding and no likelihood of their continuing activities in connection with the Conspiracy then he could not find any distinction between their cases and those of Nimbkar and Hutchinson accused. He, however, pointed out that the discretion in the matter lay with this court, which could lay down conditions. In this connection he suggested a further condition, namely an undertaking on the part of the applicants not to correspond or communicate with anyone named as a co-conspirator. In view of this statement Mr. Sinha for the applicants pressed me to pass orders at the earliest possible date. On considering the application and the order of the Hon'ble Court in the cases of Nimbkar and Hutchinson however it appeared to me necessary that the applications should be argued before me in full as I felt considerable doubt as to the real effect of the High Court's order and the extent to which its findings on fact as distinct from the findings of law were binding on me, however, valuable they might otherwise be,

as being the opinions of two very experienced Judges on points of fact which it was necessary for me to consider in connection with the application of Thengdi etc.

All these applications have accordingly been argued before me in detail and the Crown has opposed them not in regard to the principles of law involved but in regard to the application of those principles to the present petitions.

Before I deal with the arguments on the present application, it may be convenient to refer to the orders of the Hon'ble High Court passed by Mr. Justice Kendall on the application to the High Court which Thengdi accused made following my order dated 14. 5. 30 on his former application to this court. In that order, as it appears to me, the Hon'ble Court in deciding whether or not to exercise its discretion under section 498 C. P. C. to order the release of Thengdi accused on bail applied the same tests as have been held to be the proper tests in the present orders of the Division Bench. The Hon'ble Court concluded by saying that it was convinced that there must be quite exceptional circumstances to justify a court in releasing on bail a man who was undertrial for an offence punishable with transportation for life and that no such exceptional circumstances appeared to exist in the present case. In the recent orders of the Division Bench on the applications of Nimbkar and Hutchinson accused it will be seen that while applying the same tests as guides in the matter of exercising discretion Mukerji, J. laid down certain further propositions or principles in the light of which he applied those tests. After examining the wording of sections 496 and 497 C. P. C. (I should perhaps note that the wording of section 497 (1) was not correctly quoted, but that is not perhaps, as learned Crown Counsel pointed out, a fact which would necessarily falsify the conclusion or generalisation) The learned Judge went on to say that in his opinion the general principle in regard to grant of bail which is to be deduced from the section is that the grant of bail should be the rule and the refusal of bail should be the exception. This proposition he stated twice and gave certain reasons why he felt convinced that it was a sound principle. He then went on to say that to the general principle there might be exceptions but he did not propose to lay down any cases because he did not regard the cases which were before the Bench as exceptions. Now as a mechanical generalisation based on mathematical calculation I feel no doubt that the principle stated is correct, but whether it is a genuine principle of law or not seems to me far more doubtful. It

is not a general principle of law of general application since it is one which the law itself does not permit Magistrates to apply: on the contrary the law by which Magistrates are bound is laid down in specific terms in sections 496 and 497 C. P. C. Is it then a principle of law by which superior courts are bound? I can not help feeling very doubtful about this also, for section 498 gives High Courts and Court of Sessions entire discretion in the matter of grant or refusal of bail, though of course both these courts are by virtue of their very nature bound to exercise a judicial discretion. If this so-called principle, which is now suggested, is binding on all courts subordinate to the Hon'ble Court as a principle and not a mere generalisation, then in all cases to which section 497 (1) applies it is only necessary in order to get rid of the effect of that section to go to a superior court, that is to apply first to the Magistrate who is bound to refuse the application and then immediately to put an application before a superior court which in the absence of exceptional circumstances would be bound to accede to the request for bail.

I have read through the judgment of Boys J. carefully with the object of ascertaining whether he has or has not assented to the principle or generalisation, as it seems to me to be, which is found in the judgment of Mukerjee.

It cannot be said that, unless silence gives consent, there is anything to show that he does accept that view. He proceeds to apply to the cases of the applicants nine considerations which it has been held in numerous cases should be applied in such matters. He does not say that he applies them on the basis that in the absence of exceptional circumstances the applications should be allowed, nor do I think that that view can be deduced from anything contained in his judgment. Whereas Mukerjee J. says that the main principle in regard to bail is that the grant of bail should be the rule and refusal the exception, Boys J. states, as if laying down these as the main principles involved, that the only legitimate purposes to be served by keeping a person under trial in detention are to prevent repetition of the offence with which he is charged, where there is apparently danger of such repetition, and to secure his attendance at the trial. (In argument repetition has been taken to include continuance.) Commencing with these two principles Boys J. has gone on to apply the 9 tests, taking all of which into consideration he held Nimbkar and Hutchinson accused entitled to release on bail. Mukerjee J., as far as I can see, applied the same tests, or at any rate, most of the same tests, in the light of the principle as it appeared to him, and the results of the application of those tests from his point of view were the same.

Now it seems to me that it does not make great deal of difference whether I am to regard the proposition stated in Mukerjee J's judgment as a principle or a mere generalisation. For the ultimate question in dealing with all these applications is not whether it is correct to say on the one hand that there must be exceptional circumstances to justify the grant of bail or on the other that there must be exceptional circumstances to justify the refusal of bail. The question is on the contrary whether in regard to the application of the tests which, as I have observed already, appear to me have been applied by both the learned Judges I agree with their conclusions and whether if I do not agree with their conclusions on the facts of this case or in the case of any particular accused I am bound by their findings.

This question whether a subordinate court is bound by what might be called provisional findings of fact of a superior court in the same case does not appear to have ever been the subject of any ruling. It has been argued most strenuously before me, perhaps because learned counsel or accused who argued their cases themselves thought that this court might be likely to take a different view since in some cases it had done so on a former applications, that this court was bound by the finding express or implied of the Hon'ble Court that, although the offence with which all the accused before me are charged is of a very serious nature and liable to be punished with transportation for life, the case was actually comparatively speaking, not serious and the punishment likely to be inflicted in case of conviction something very much less than transportation for life. Further it was urged that the danger of repetition could be disregarded or at any rate guarded against by the imposition of conditions, and that if the danger of absconding was not such as to preclude the grant of bail to Hutchinson and Nimbiar accused it could not reasonably be held to be such as to preclude the grant of bail in the cases of other accused.

Now in my opinion this Court is not "bound" by any findings of fact contained in the Hon'ble Court's judgment and I think it is a strong argument in support of this to point out that in the judgment of Mukerjee J. there is a mis-statement of some importance by which it would appear that the learned Judge had been misled in coming to one of his own finding of fact. Mr. Sinha admits that the mistake is there. He says that the point is unimportant but to my mind it is not so. Mukerjee J. was applying the consideration set out as point (a) of the matter for consideration to which Boys J. said he had given his attention, namely whether on the facts set out in the affidavit filed on behalf of the Crown and in the replies written and oral there is any reasonable ground for believing that the applicant has been guilty of the offence with which he is charged

Mukerjee J. did not set out the problem in this form, but regarding the question whether there were or were not reasonable grounds for believing that the applicants had really been guilty of the offence alleged to have been committed by them, he said in his order that "the learned Judge who has been hearing this case stated in his order refusing bail to the accused that he was not in a position to say definitely that there appeared (on the evidence before him) reasonable grounds for believing that the applicants had really been guilty of the offences alleged to have been committed by them". Mukerjee J. continued: "he said this because, as already indicated, the evidence is so voluminous and relates to.....so many accused persons that it would not be probably possible for him to pronounce a definite opinion till he has heard the whole case and until he has heard the counsel on either side and the accused persons who have no counsel. "Now it is an unfortunate fact that Mukerjee J. in this connection reproduced not what was actually contained in my order but almost the converse of what was stated in it. What was actually said in my order on Hutchinson's application was that in some sorts of cases, at the stage which had then been reached in *this* case, the Court might be in a position to say that there were *no* reasonable grounds etc: and to release an accused on bail on that account, but that this was a very big and complicated case and the evidence was so inter-connected and its volume was such that it would be impossible for me to take the case against applicant by itself and come to any such conclusion as was suggested. That is to say I said that it was impossible for me to come to a conclusion that there were no reasonable grounds, and not that I was not in a position to say that there appeared to be reasonable grounds. This mistake in reading my order further led the Hon'ble Judge to say that it was a pity that the applicants' application before the Magistrate's Court was not granted. This remark contemplates a finding by the Magistrate, who was bound by the provisions of sections 497 C. P. C. that there were no reasonable grounds for believing that the accused had committed a nonbailable offence but that there were sufficient grounds for further inquiry into his guilt. So far from being of that opinion the learned Magistrate came to the conclusion in the case of all the accused before him except one that there was a good prima facie case against them, which I think amounts to very much the same thing as concluding that there were 'reasonable grounds for believing that they had been guilty of such an offence'. From this it will be obvious that in exercising his discretion the learned Judge has been influenced on at any rate one point that is in applying one of the nine tests, by a mistake of fact. This court could not in respect of his finding of fact based on that mistake be considered bound. Nor can it be bound, as far as I can judge, to follow and be

limited in the exercise of its discretion by any conclusion of fact contained in the Hon'ble Court's judgment though it will necessarily treat any such finding of fact with respect.

In this connection I may also refer to 2 further points the judgment of Boys. J. contains the following passage: 'this cannot of course be taken to suggest for a moment that I am prejudging the case against the applicant. His guilt or innocence is matter for determination by the Trial Judge.

In a matter like the present, whether release on bail be refused or allowed there can be no ground for the suggestion that the case is being prejudged. The only case in which such an assumption could possibly be justified is where the applicant has satisfied the Court that on the evidence hitherto produced there is no possible case against him. Such is not the case here."

It is not absolutely clear whether in this passage the learned Judge was referring only to the individual cases against the applicants concerned: but in any event those cases are contained in the general case. This is therefore a plain disclaimer of prejudging the case, and if there is no prejudgment, as indeed it is hard to conceive there could be, then there can be no binding effect of the order save in so far as principles of law are laid down.

The second point is that in dealing with these applications before them the learned Judges were so far as facts were concerned acting on the materials set out in the Crown's brief affidavits which had been called for by one of the learned Judges in a preliminary order. Those affidavits are not before me. I conceive that in case I had to decide these present applications on the same materials as were before the Hon'ble Court it would not be legitimate for me to re-examine those materials and suggest that they might lead to different conclusions, but that is not the case here. The materials before me are different and in some respects more complete. This point I think is really conclusive on the point on which greatest stress has been laid in arguments before me, namely that, although the findings of the Hon'ble Court are not binding on this Court in the last resort, that is for the final decision of the case, they are binding for the limited purpose of bail. The corollary to that argument, which has been stated by almost every one who has argued on any of these applications, is that all this Court has to do is to decide whether the case of each and every applicant is more serious than that of either Hutchinson or Nimbkar accused, and if it is not then to order release on bail. On the contrary for the reasons given above I am of opinion that this Court is at liberty to act freely on

the materials before it and that if it does not do so it will not be exercising a judicial discretion as it is in duty bound to do.

So much for the general considerations which arise on these applications. I now turn to the application of the nine tests set forth explicitly in the judgment of Boys, and for the most part applied by Mukerjee J. though not explicitly indicated in his judgment. These are as follows:—

- (a) Whether in the case of each accused there is or is not reasonable ground for believing that he has committed the offence with which he is charged. This is the consideration suggested by section 497 (1) about which Boys, J. has said, "There is only this much ground for attaching special weight to this consideration that it is in certain circumstances the only one to which the Magistrate is entitled to give weight and to this extent the Legislature has indicated its view of its importance".
- (b) The nature and gravity of the charge.
- (c) The severity or degree of the punishment which might follow in the particular circumstances in case of a conviction.
- (d) The danger of the applicant's absconding if he is released on bail.
- (e) The character, means and standing of the applicant.
- (f) The danger of the alleged offence being continued or repeated assuming that the accused is guilty of having committed that offence in the past.
- (g) The danger of witnesses being tampered with.
- (h) Opportunity to the applicant to prepare defence.
- (i) The fact that the applicants have already been some 25 months in Jail and that the trial is not likely to conclude for a further period of several months at least.

Before I take up the consideration of these tests one by one I must observe that in regard to the risk of prejudging the case in the course of exercising its discretion to grant or refuse release on bail this Court is in a more difficult position than the High Court is. This Court consists of a single Judge only. There are some 12 Judges in the High Court and if by an unfortunate chance any two of them should find themselves in the position of having

prejudged a case in any respect that case need not come before them again. This Court has therefore to be specially careful not to run any risk of prejudging the case. Now the stage at which former applications were decided by me was that the prosecution evidence was proceeding. The stage at which it now stands is that the prosecution has closed its case and the whole of the prosecution evidence is before the Court. 10 of the 31 accused have now made their statements under section 342 C.P.C. That would seem to put this Court in a much stronger position for the decision of bail applications but it also increases the risk of prejudging some issue. Moreover the Court is really in a more difficult position than appears on the face of it. For though much of the evidence against individuals has been collated for the purpose of asking them to give the explanations of that evidence, I have still to collate the 'Conspiracy' evidence, and even if it were collated it would be difficult to come a finding on the nature and seriousness of the Conspiracy, with particular reference to the question of the sentence which might be inflicted in case of conviction, by reference to evidence so collated but not yet examined in the light of prosecution and defence arguments. In point of fact I do not remember in the course of 14 years as a Judge ever to have considered that question at this stage of a case. Nor do I think I could justifiably at this stage allow Counsel or accused to argue in detail on the facts as they affect the various items contained in the 9 tests. The method followed by the Hon'ble Court was to call for a very brief affidavit, but to say the least of it this is not a case which lends itself to brief affidavits. In these circumstances it appears to me that the only reasonable method to follow is to use the Magistrate's Committal Order as representing, as it indeed purports to do, the prima facie case against the accused. Incidentally I may remark that though inaccuracies and errors are present in that order and its conclusions have been criticised from time to time still the main evidence before me has not yet been shown not to justify the prima facie conclusions it contains. The Committal Order itself bears out what I have just said about the difficulty of explaining this case in a brief affidavit, for the statement of the general case as distinguished from the statement of the individual cases against the particular accused takes up no less than 178 octavo pages. To concentrate this into a brief affidavit which would give a fair idea of the nature of the case would, I think, be almost impossible. It is almost equally impossible to state the nature of the case in a comparatively short order like this and the only thing possible appears to be to select its salient features from the Committal Order. It will of course be obvious that a good many of the tests are inter connected one with another and that some of them relate other to the individual cases while others relate to the

general case and therefore equally to all the accused. I now proceed to apply to the best of my ability the 9 tests named in Boys. J's order.

The first point which I take into consideration is the fact that the applicants have already been some 25 months in Jail and the trial is not likely to conclude for a further period of several months at least. This is a fact about which there can be no doubt. The accused concerned in these applications were all of them arrested on or about 20th March 1929. Even if no defence witnesses were to be produced by the accused at all, the time occupied by the remaining statements of the accused, hearing of arguments and writing of a Judgment would presumably be in the neighbourhood of seven months. If defence witnesses are produced the duration of the case will naturally be longer.

As regards the danger of the witnesses being tampered with it has never been suggested in the course of argument on any application for bail before me that any risk of witnesses being tampered with existed in the past, and in any case as the Prosecution has now closed its case the risk of prosecution witnesses being tampered with no longer exists. These two items call for no discussion.

Coming next to the question of opportunity to the applicants to prepare their defence, considerable stress has been laid on this point in the course of arguments. In some arguments the main stress was on the difficulty of discussing with counsel the nature of the defence to be put before the court. I asked for some elucidation of the point as a whole. One aspect of it is that as long as accused are confined in Jail all their letters are censored and thus the intentions of the defence may come to the knowledge of the prosecution. That is evidently unavoidable under the present rules. There is some force in the point that a matter which can not be settled in a months' correspondence can often be settled in five minutes' conversation and that mis-understandings easily occur in correspondence which a few minutes' conversation would at once remove. Moreover, in case of gratuitous advice or assistance, it is practically impossible to obtain this when it is necessary for the friend concerned to come personally to the accused at the cost of a long journey for which he cannot spare the time, whereas in the same circumstance an accused on bail could during holidays go and consult his lawyer friend instead of it being necessary for the friend to come to him. Moreover it was pointed out that letters have a trick of being delayed and even of going astray and that a man who is on bail can without delay put in a

complaint which a man who is in Jail would hardly think it worth while to do. While I think that perhaps more is often made of the difficulty of preparing defence when an accused is in custody than is justifiable, at the same time I do agree with the contention that man who is in confinement is comparatively speaking hampered in the matter of laying his defence before the Court as compared with a man who is free to move about and to discuss his case with his friends or his counsel as and when he likes.

I come next to two connected matters, namely the nature and gravity of the charge and the severity or degree of the punishment which might follow in the particular circumstances in cases of a conviction. This is itself a matter which has a bearing on another test namely the danger of absconding. Now on this point great stress has been laid by learned counsel for defence and by the applicants themselves on the theory that the High Court has ruled in regard to the gravity of the charge in this particular case and the severity or degree of punishment which might follow in it in case of a conviction. The point of view expressed in the Judgment of Mukerjee J. is that (1) the accused have not been charged with having done any overt illegal act in pursuance of the alleged conspiracy, that is they have not been charged for example with possession of arms or making seditious speeches. The learned Judge was of opinion that all that the accused had therefore done was "to hold meetings, study the principles of Communism and probably also make an attempt to disseminate those teachings which are said to be dangerous to society and dangerous to the sovereignty of His Majesty" Boys. J., partly in this connection and partly in connection with the question of reasonable grounds, merely says that he does not lose sight of the gravity of the charge or of the nature of the evidence, from which it may be inferred that his view was that the gravity of the charge and the nature of the evidence both as to the nature of the case and the participation of the accused before him were not such as to preclude the grant of bail to them. Mukerji J. went on to say that in view of the admission on behalf of the prosecution in regard to the charge of doing any overt illegal act it was clear that "if there was any offence committed by the applicants in the shape of a Conspiracy of a serious nature the conspiracy has been almost nipped in the bud by the Police. In the circumstances the case is not one in which the accused persons would probably be sentenced to transportation for life. Although the maximum sentence is laid down as transportation for life, the case itself is of a much milder character, so far as I have been able to see from the presentation of it on either side" By saying that the case was of a much

milder character I understand the learned Judge to have meant that it was not of so serious a character as would make it likely to result in the infliction of the maximum sentence. Now this is a matter as I see it of very considerable difficulty. We have to consider first the nature and the gravity of the charge and then the nature and gravity of the actual offence. An offence under section 121 A is punishable with transportation for life and is, therefore, clearly regarded by the law as a very grave charge. In the nature of things the offence of conspiracy to deprive the King of his sovereignty of British India is a very serious offence for if the conspiracy is successful the offence of conspiring ceases to be punishable. But what is the criterion by which one is to distinguish between a conspiracy of a more serious nature and a conspiracy of a less serious nature? The judgment of Boys, J. gives no indication of the criterion applied by him. Only this much is clear that he regards the case as prima facie one not of prosecution for opinions and but of prosecution for promulgating opinions and endeavouring to persuade others to those opinions with a view to a resort to violence sooner or later to enforce those opinions. Mukerji J. on the other hand regards the case merely as one of holding meetings, studying principles of Communism and probably also making an attempt to disseminate those teachings. Both these provisional summaries of the nature of the present case appear to me inadequate. The findings of the learned Magistrate in which he sums up the case as he saw it and as it has been sought to be put before this court also are on pages 202 and 203 of the Committal Order. It may be that some of the points are not stated with perfect exactitude. A number of the accused for instance would object to the phrases exacting violent revolution, causing a revolution, fomenting a revolution, and the like because it is their view that the revolution is a historic phenomenon or a philosophic necessity or something of the kind which one does not create. It comes about of itself as the inevitable historical development which follows from the decadence of Capitalism. What the summary however does bring out is what is one of the most important points in the prosecution case, namely, the allegation that the conspiracy with which the accused or the applicants are charged is not one which is limited to India, started in India and having revolution in India as its be-all and end all. It is not a revolution originally devised in India (to this phrase again the accused no doubt would object) but one which is the subject of a much wider conspiracy and therefore of a much more serious nature. Moreover I feel doubt whether 'disseminating of opinions' and 'promulgating of opinions' are an adequate description of some of the acts described in the summary, namely the formation of the Communist Party of India, of Workers and Peasants Parties in four provinces and

of an All India Workers and Peasants Party, bodies whose policy is said to have been dictated by the Comintern either directly or through the Communist Party of Great Britain and the Comrades on the continent through communications conducted in a secret and conspiratorial manner. It is from this outside connection that the seriousness of the case to a considerable extent arises. No doubt a certain amount of the evidence in this connection will be criticised by the defence at the stage of arguments as not being proved, in some case as not being genuine, but as far as I have been able to see, as the documents were being put in from time to time, the great bulk of them will remain effective and will serve to establish the Prosecution contention that, whether it was to create a revolution or merely to help along one which is in their opinion predestined to come about, some at least of the accused have prima facie taken part in a conspiracy for the overthrow of the King's Government in India. I can not myself feel that if this prima facie view continues to hold good to the end of the case it would be possible to regard the offence as other than a very serious one in itself, quite apart from the seriousness of the section under which it appears to fall. If this provisional view is correct then it is impossible to feel any confidence at this stage as to what is the probable degree of severity of the punishment which might possibly follow. By this I do not mean to imply that I think it likely that in case of conviction so severe a sentence as transportation for life would be inflicted but merely that I think it premature and not justifiable as matters stand at present to lay down that no sentence as severe as transportation for life could possibly be inflicted.

Coming next to item (d) the danger of the applicant absconding if he is released on bail: this is a point with which the points just dealt with are intimately connected. It is a point with which I have already dealt in the case of the applicant Thengdi and one of some difficulty. The danger of any particular applicant absconding is one which is to be considered in the light of the case against the particular accused, the character, means and standing of that accused (that is item (e)) and the amount of the bail which the court may fix. I have before me the applications of no less than 25 accused. I have in my former order indicated reasons why I could feel no confidence that Thengdi accused might not abscond. It is, however possible that that risk might be minimized by assessing Thengdi's bail rather high. Another special case in this connection appears to be that of Ajudhya Prasad who according to the evidence has considerable experience of travelling about the world and would, I imagine, find little difficulty in

making himself scarce if he felt that course preferable to remaining and running such risk as there may be of conviction. Usmañi has also in one of his literary productions made some remarks about having begun to learn to abscond at a very early age, though I do not attach great importance to this. Gauri Shankar, Kase and Alve accused do not appear to be persons of any particular means and standing. As regards the rest there is not really anything much in the way of satisfactory material in regard to their character, means and standing which would lead me to suppose that the risk of their absconding was serious provided that bail be fixed at a suitable rate. Speaking generally with one or two exceptions I do not consider the danger of absconding is a serious one while it appears to me that the material available in regard to the character and means of the applicants is not such as either to help them very greatly nor yet such as need stand in the way of the grant of bail.

I come next to item (f), the danger of the alleged offence being continued or repeated, assuming that the accused is guilty of having committed that offence in the past. As regards the assumption, it would be sufficient to say that the mere fact of an accused having been committed for trial by an order such as has been passed by the Magistrate in this case is a reason for holding that there is reasonable ground for believing that he has committed the offence with which he is charged. With a few exceptions none of the accused now before the court offered any explanation in the Lower Court of the facts proved against him. This is a fact which can not but be slightly damaging in the cases of all those who reserved their explanations, for if an accused had a genuine explanation of all the facts I can see no adequate reason why he should not have given it then and there in the hope that it might be accepted and he might be released. One or two accused have offered detailed explanations in this court which if given in the Lower Court would have had a greatly enhanced value, even if they had not resulted in that accused's release as they did in the case of accused Dharamvir Singh. It is difficult to estimate the danger of repetition or continuance of the alleged conspiracy which might result from the accused being released on bail. The conspiracy as alleged is when all is said and done a conspiracy of organisation on the one hand and on the other a conspiracy which involves working in organisations (such as Trade Unions) other than those mentioned earlier, in the capacity of fractions. Mukerji J. speaks of the conspiracy as having been almost nipped in the bud while Boys. J. says that in view of the particular circumstances of the case and the nature of the evidence as to the particular conspiracy he does not consider there is serious danger of repetition. On the

other hand, it is in evidence that shortly after the hearing in this Court commenced a letter was recovered at Bombay which has been proved to be in the hand-writing of Dange accused and which internal evidence shows to have been written a few days earlier. The contents indicate that the Conspiracy though at the moment working under difficulties had by no means come to an end. Dange accused argues that the Hon'ble Court had before it the facts in regard to the case against the accused Hutchinson which would go to indicate that the conspiracy was continuing after the arrest of the other accused, and, if in the light of that evidence the Hon'ble Judge could say that he did not consider there was a serious danger of repetition, it was absurd to say that the letter above mentioned (P 2512) made the position in any way worse. But the stage at which Hutchinson accused continued his activities in Bombay was quite different from the stage at and the circumstances in which accused Dange wrote and presumably sent out P 2512. The question is whether assuming the conspiracy not to be at an end the release on bail of the applicants or some or any of them would lead to or facilitate the continuance of the conspiracy in a way which is impossible while the accused are detained in confinement. It appears to me to be impossible to say that the danger does not exist, for whereas control over the correspondence of accused in confinement is comparatively easy it is almost impossible in the case of accused who are on bail. Of course in certain respects continuance of the conspiracy would become impossible, for it is obviously not difficult to secure that meetings on a large scale are not held and speeches not made at any rate more than once. On the other hand the evidence in regard to the conspiracy in India consists to a considerable degree of correspondence and communications. Theoretically as long as an accused is in confinement his interviews except with counsel are supervised and in consequence conspiratorial communications with visitors are considerable hampered. It would be impossible to lay down any conditions which would have a similar effect for accused on bail. In point of the fact the suggestion that accused can be controlled by 'undertakings' appears to me to be unsound. It would be sufficient to include in the bail order a prohibition of taking part in public demonstration or agitation of any description or of making public speeches or contributing to the public press during the time they are on bail. In case of breach of any such prohibition the Court would cancel the bail. In this connection Dange accused argued that no question of repetition or continuance of the offence can possibly arise in his case, for he says that the accused contend that no offence has been committed and that it is their right to be Communists, to propagate communist opinions, and to organise a Communist Party. In order to establish this right he himself

would wish to take every step to give a proper defence and this fact would be the strongest motive in inducing him not to repeat the alleged offence and thereby forfeit his freedom. He argues that this is a crucial point of greater weight than any of the other points which have to be considered. In my opinion the argument is not conclusive. It bases compliance with the requirements of the Court partly on self interest and partly on the major premise that the accused expects to be able to satisfy the Court that he has the right suggested. Should he now or at any stage be of opinion that he cannot expect to satisfy the Court that he has this right then the main basis for his non-continuance of the offence disappears, since the only other way of establishing this suggested right is to carry through the conspiracy to a successful end. In the same connection it is also to be noted that if, as he contends, nothing of what has so far been done by him (or by others whose cases are parallel to his) is illegal or constitutes an offence then obviously it will not be any more an offence to repeat or continue these proceedings than it has been before. Repetition and continuance will in fact not make the case any worse.

This consideration of course has its main application in the case of those accused who purport to be Communists. A genuine communist may from the ordinary man's point of view do many things which are wrong but it is claimed that he cannot deny the fact that he is a Communist. "Communists scorn to hide their views" is a favourable slogan of Communism. The corollary to this is that any accused who does not put forward communist views and therefore on the one hand plead justification and on the other that what he has done is no offence under the law, cannot be a Communist. It is of the essence of the present case that the Conspiracy is a Communist Conspiracy and it will probably be difficult though I do not say it is impossible for the prosecution to argue that an accused who is not a Communist has really been privy to the present conspiracy because participation in the conspiracy does involve a considerable knowledge of what I may call the inwardness of the conspiracy. The effect of this has already been noticeable in the statements made by different accused. On the one hand Communists have taken up the attitude suggested above and on the other a certain number of accused have pleaded that their actions were neither conspiratorial nor in any way connected with a Communist movement. In the case of those accused the position as far as self interest goes will be very different. Any action or correspondence on their part subsequent to release on bail suggesting participation in a Communist movement will cut at the root of their defence whereas it does not cut at the root of the Communist's defence at all. For this reason those accused are in a different position.

In my opinion after giving careful consideration to all the 9 tests the position may be summed up as follows. There is on the Committal Order (and I have not found anything in the evidence which has been put before me to lead with certainty to a contrary conclusion in any case) a prima facie case against each of the applicants and therefore reasonable ground in the case of each for believing that he has been guilty of an offence punishable with transportation for life. Test (b) (gravity of offence) is definitely unfavourable to these applicants while in regard to test (c) (possible punishment) provisionally and on a prima facie view at this very premature stage I see reasons for hesitating to agree with the Hon'ble Court as to the mild nature of the offence judged both by the present scope of the alleged conspiracy and its ultimate intention. Tests (d) and (e) in the case of most of the applicants at any rate do not operate unfavourably while tests (g), (h) and (i) are favourable to them. The test which remains to be considered in individual cases is that of repetition or continuance which I have just been discussing in a general way above. On that test I think it is possible to divide the applicants into 2 groups, namely, first, those who are Communists or members of the Communist Party of India or closely connected either with Communists or the C. P. I. for whom repetition or continuance of the Conspiracy, regarded by them as it is, cannot logically make their position worse and secondly those whose defence will be damaged by any act savouring of Communist connection. In this connection the material available consists first of the Committal Order, secondly some of the accused have made statements in this or the Lower Court elucidating their position, and thirdly in some cases the nature of the papers the recovery of which from them they have got proved by prosecution witnesses helps to make it clear. On this basis I classify the applicants as follows:- The following applicants are shown by one document or another and in some cases by their own statements to be Communists and members of the Communist Party of India:- Dange, Bradley, Spratt, Usmani, Muzaffar Ahmed Majid, Joglekar, Mirajkar, Adhikari, Shamsul Huda and Sohan Singh Josh.

P. C. Joshi is clearly a Communist by conviction and was apparently a candidate for election to the Communist Party.

Goswami accused is alleged to have been proposed for membership of the Executive of the C. P. I. at the end of 1928: in his statement in this court he says it is not proved and that he has no knowledge of it but is a Communist by conviction. His work in alliance with Muzaffar Ahmed and others in the W. P. P. and the documents connecting him with the C. P. I. suggest at any rate

that if there was a conspiracy he was fully cognizant of it and place him prima facie in a category very close to that of the members of the C. P. I.

The same kind of evidence as that relating to the large group mentioned first shows prima facie that Ajudhya Prasad accused under his lascar name of Hamid was a member of the Communist Party of India and took part in the meetings at the end of 1928 (P 1295, P 1300, P 1303). Moreover the summary of his activities given in the Committal Order links him closely with Communists both in England and India and would appear to indicate his position. I have also already observed that in view of his history no court could feel much confidence that he would not abscond if opportunity occurred. Gopal Basak accused's main interest was in Workers and Peasants Party activities but as he says himself he is Communist by conviction. I do not think he has tried seriously to dissociate the Workers and Peasants Party's activities from those of the Communist Party. In fact P 391 would prima facie seem to indicate that he regards membership of the Communist Party as the logical promotion for a good W. P. P. working member. His defence is ultimately very similar to that of the members of the Communist Party of India, namely that whatever he has done he has done openly, and that it does not constitute conspiracy and he has committed no offence. Radha Raman Mittra himself says that he is a Communist by conviction but he also says that he never was a member of the Communist Party of India. In point of fact there is no evidence that he was. The evidence in regard to his membership of the Workers and Peasants Party is also not conclusive. The Magistrate's conclusion about him was that he was entirely at one with the members of the W. P. P. and was considered by them as one of their workers and that he worked with them, with their methods and for their objects. Speaking generally it is probably true to say that his defence is that he was working on the same lines as Communists (unplying that he would continue to do so) but was not a party to any conspiracy and in fact was not aware of the existence of the Conspiracy. But if there was such a conspiracy, and he is now aware of it from this case, and that conspiracy cannot be said to be at an end, what is the position of this accused in regard to the future? Now that he knows of the alleged existence of the conspiracy any work on the lines followed in the course of the conspiracy would be an act in furtherance of the conspiracy though not punishable in this case. I cannot help thinking that whether the accused Mittra has or has not committed the offence, his ideas and aspiration are so closely allied to those of the Communist accused that the danger of repetition in the sense of doing an act calculated to further the conspiracy cannot be ruled out in his case. In any case this accused does not

intend to produce any witnesses and I do not think that his release on bail for the sake of consultation of lawyers in regard to preparation of his defence can be regarded as very necessary.

Gopendra Chakravarti accused according to Basak accused is not an opportunist or a Social Democrat but sincere to the cause of Communism and Proletarian revolution. Up to the time of the split in the W. P. P. of Bengal he was closely allied with Muzaffar Ahmed, who is clearly a Communist. He himself says he is Communist by conviction aiming at the transition to a Communist Society through the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, but with national independence through a Mass Revolution as the immediate objective. In his view Revolution is inevitable. His position is essentially the same as that of the members of the C. P. I. and therefore does not rule out the danger of repetition or continuance.

Gauri Shanker and Mukerji accused are two accused who base their defence to a considerable extent on the Congress and on not being privy to or in sympathy with a Communist Conspiracy. Their position clearly makes it impossible for them to run any risks and though this is of course a question of self interest, at the same time it goes to the root of their defence. Any act linking them with the Communist accused deprives them of their main line of defence and puts them in the same position as Dange and others. The same may be said of Banerji and Ghosh accused though their main line of defence is rather Trade Unionist than Congress.

Alve and Kasle accused have not yet made their statements in this Court and there is therefore nothing more available on which to base a prima facie finding than is contained in the Committal Order and their statements to the Lower Court. No doubt neither was a member of the Communist Party of India but both were members of the Bombay Workers' and Peasants' Party. Their activities, as the Magistrate has said, were confined to strikes but they have both made speeches, some portions of which are quoted by the Magistrate, which may be taken to indicate an inn knowledge suggesting that they were privy to the plan of the Conspiracy. The danger of repetition or continuance can not be disregarded, while as both are labourers the danger of their absconding cannot be neglected.

The case of Thengdi accused has been dealt with at considerable length by the Magistrate and I have also dealt with it on a former occasion myself. Though he is not shown to be a member of the Communist Party of India the Magistrate points out that that Party claims him as their ally. The Prima facie case against

him is a full one and the only fresh question to be considered in his case is what if any danger there is of repetition. If he is not a Communist his proceedings seem to have been most unfortunately calculated to produce that impression. He seems by choice to favour a Communist atmosphere if one may judge from his own joyful looking forward to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, from his association with Saklatwala, the resolution he moved about China, the proposal that he should attend the P. P. T. U. S. Conference for which purpose he is alleged to have applied for a passport and lastly by the odd coincidence of his putting on the file in which he kept papers relating to W. & P. P. matters the title 'Communist File.' Moreover his last application for bail was to the High Court itself and was refused. I do not see how prima facie I can put him in any category but that of the Communists or how even if I were to classify him differently I could on the face of the High Court's order exercise my discretion afresh. No doubt it would be legal for me to do so if fresh considerations had arisen but as I have already indicated I do not consider that that is precisely the effect of the Hon'able Court's order.

I come last to the case of Desai accused in whose case also I have not very long ago refused to exercise my discretion. I do not at this stage propose to go any deeper into his case than I did before. It has been discussed at length on pages 262 to 271 of the Committal Order and it will be sufficient to say that the conclusion drawn is of a close connection between Desai accused and the Bombay Communists coupled with a prima facie inference that he is himself probably a Communist and was knowingly lending himself and his paper to the furtherance of the Conspiracy. This in effect puts Desai accused in the same class as the professedly Communist accused and I can find no adequate reason at this stage to classify him otherwise.

The upshot of the whole matter is that in my view taking all the various tests into consideration this Court would not be justified at this stage in exercising its discretion to allow these applications for release on bail except, and even in those cases with considerable hesitation, in the cases of Ghosh, Banerji, Mukerjee and Gauri Shankar accused.

The applications of all the remaining applicants are accordingly rejected.

Ghosh, Banerjee, Mukerjee and Gauri Shankar accused shall be released on their executing each a personal bond in Rs. 2000/- with 2 sureties, each surety to be in Rs. 2000/- and to be to the satisfaction of the District Magistrate of Meerut. While on bail these

accused shall not take part in any public demonstration or agitation of any kind and shall not make any public speeches or contribute any thing to the public press. They shall further not go out of Meerut at any time without informing the District Magistrate beforehand where they are going and for how long. This is necessary for the proper enforcement of the conditions already stated above.

(Sd.) R. L. Yorke

Dated 7th May, 1931.

Additional Sessions Judge.

- Saraswati Machine Printing Press, Meerut (U. P.) India.