



Contents of the Statement of S.A.Dange
in the Court of the Additional Sessions
Judge, Meerut Conspiracy Case, Meerut.

What I Believe in

Part I

The Phenomenon of Social Growth and the Class
struggle in the foreign countries, from which
Marxism is derived.

- Section 1 The birth of classes and rise of Capitalism-
Imperialism Para 1- 32/PP 1-101
P.2106
- Section 2 The class struggle of the Proletariat
against Capitalism in the period of the
1st & 2nd International Para 33- 45/PP 101-176
P.2154
- Section 3 The Russian Phase of the Class struggle,
from 1905 to 5 Year Plan. Para 46- 66/PP 177-326
P. 2191
- Section 4 The Direction of the Class struggle in
the Parliamentary Countries. Para 67- 72/PP 327-361
P. 2268

Part II

The Social Basis of the Class Struggle in India

- Section 1 Democracy & British Dictatorship
in India. Para 73- 81/PP 361-409
P. 2286
- Section 2 Relation of the Indian Bourgeoisie to
the British Dictatorship. Para 82- 89/PP 409-454
P. 2312
- Section 3 The Economic Basis of the Agrarian
Class Struggle in India. Para 90-100/PP 454-533
P. 2335
- Section 4 The Condition of the Petty-Bourgeoisie
& the Working Class - The inevitability
of the revolutionary class-struggle.
Para 101-105/PP 533-572
P. 2375

<u>No.of pages</u>	<u>PART I</u>	<u>Name of Heading.</u>
10	<u>Section 1</u>	1.Our object not the same as alleged by the Prosecution.
11		2. Fundamental Proposition of the Communist Manifesto.
14		3. Communism is neither German, Russian nor English.
15		4. Our aim - to replace world Capitalist Economy by a world system of Communism.
16		5. Existing system not eternal.
17		6. Its characteristics - Monopoly of the means of production.
19.		7. Monopoly brought about by force.
19		8. Capitalism civilises - Why then Rebel?
21		9. We appreciate progress under Capitalism
22		10. What makes it now incompatible with progress - nature and society - the process of production.
24		11. Technology, the material measure of progress.
26		12. Instruments determine ideas and classes - Their lay out - they produce a working class after their own image.
30		13. Instruments distribute men.
32		14. Distribution of Capital determines distribution of products.
34		15. Change in technology changes social structure.
35		16. The Superstructure - State, religion, art, etc.
38		17. Ideology.
41		18. Economy and other factors of social life - their relative importance - the view of the Indian bourgeoisie.

- 45 19. Marxism is concerned with changing the basis of economy, not merely the super-structure.
- 48 20. Dialectics.
- 49 21. Causes of the conquest of India as given by the Maratha historians - they are not causes but the description of symptoms and after effects.
- 52 22. Why Indian peasantry first fought against Moghal feudalism and then became cold - class oppression restored by their Marhatta feudal leaders.
- 55 23. The work of the British bourgeoisie - overthrow of feudalism.
- 57 24. The bourgeois revolution of 1793 - the role of the peasantry.
- 64 25. Productive forces developed and changed society but did not abolish classes - crises begin.
- 68 26. Development of British Capitalism - expansion of colonies - Capitalism becomes Imperialism.
- 72 27. Meaning of Imperialism - its five qualities.
- 75 28. Imperialist wars - a necessity, not a policy - results of last war - decline of Britain.
- 81 29. Rationalisation - increase in production - latest crisis.
- 86 30. Communist view of crisis - fetishism of commodities - contradiction of productive forces and production relations.
- 91 31. Monopoly of wealth, cause of crisis - monopoly in Britain, U.S.A. and France - share of wages in national incomes.
- 97 32. Distribution to be socialised - who will carry it out - Marxism is the theory of this - six deductions and three results.

- 101 Section 2 33. The early Proletarian Movements up to
Chartism.
- 109 34. Continental Movements - the Communist
League - 1848 Revolutions - The League
disbands - the Cologne Trial.
- 114 35. British Unions - 1st International -
Statutes.
- 119 36. The period of the First International -
American Civil War - Marxist address to
Lincoln, British workers' attitude then
and now.
- 127 37. The Paris Commune.
- 133 38. We stand by the Commune - the French
bourgeoisie killed the French Workers'
Commune.
- 137 39. The Commune and its decrees.
- 144 40. What did Marxism learn from the Commune?
- 149 41. Close of the First International period -
factions in the First International -
growth of the State machine - decline of
Blanquism and Anarchism - International
Congresses - literature of Communism -
works of Marx and Engels.
- 155 42. Founding of the Second International - its
period - The 1914 war and the Second
International.
- 161 43. What it did when war actually broke out -
the role of the Labour Party - the vote
for war credits in Germany.
- 166 44. Attitude of Communists to war - Lenin's
slogans - the work of Leibknecht and Rosa
Luxemburg - the perversion of Lenin's
slogans by the Social Democrats.
- 172 45. Zimmerwald and Kienthal Conferences -
proposal of founding the Third Interna-
tional - the Russian Revolution.
- 177 Section 3 46. Early Russian developments till 1905.
- 182 47. Rise of various parties - Economists,
Anarchists, Social Democrats etc.

- 186 48. Lenin opposes them - "What is to be done?"
- organisation of professional revolutionaries.
- 193 49. Social Democratic Party organisation -
the Zubatov Unions - January 1905 -
tactics of the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks
- announcement of the Duma.
- 198 50. Lenin and the boycott of the Duma..
- 201 51. The October General Strike - December
Rising - reaction- participation in the
Duma - the liquidators.
- 211 52. Stolypin's Agrarian Reforms - revival of
trade - strikes begin - parties during
reaction - isolation of bourgeois
parties - Bolshevik and Menshevik
divisions - philosophical struggle - the
problems of bourgeois revolution and the
peculiarity of the Russian Revolution.
- 221 53. Russia joins war - the crisis - the
February overthrow - Provisional Govern-
ment and the Soviets - Lenin's return.
- 227 54. The First Soviet Congress - Coalition
Government - July Demonstration -
Kornilov March - Masses turn Left -
Percentage of the Bolsheviks in the
Soviets - Lenin urges Soviets to take
power by peaceful revolution - then calls
upon Bolsheviks insurrection - Peasant
Congress and compromise with the Left
Socialist Revolutionaries.
- 235 55. Land Decree - Brest Peace - Sabotage of
the petty-bourgeoisie - Dispersal of the
Constituent Assembly.
- 244 56. What is International in the Russian
Revolution - tendency to partial acceptance
of Leninism - Lenin shows four specific
conditions of the Russian Revolution -
Leninism is not mere application of
Marxism - the eleven points that enriched
Marxism - Indian tendency to reject
certain points - accept whole or reject
whole - no non-party attitude.

- 254 57. Bolsheviks and Red Terror - how it arose - causes of Allied hatred of the November Revolution - the wild stories against the Soviets - Anarchism of the Bakuninist Anarchists - casualties in Petrograd fighting - no restrictions on political parties except the bourgeois - intervention in Civil War - the S.R. rising and attempt on Lenin's life - Red Terror instituted - Kautsky's books and Lenin's answer to him - formal democracy and dictatorship.
- 263 58. The difference between the economic and political content of bourgeois and proletarian revolutions - did Bolshevism introduce Socialism after October 1917 - October was not a Socialist revolution.
- 270 59. Economic developments and nationalisation - decline from March to November 1917 - arrested by the October Revolution - decline during the civil war.
- 277 60. Decline and war Communism - breakdown of economy - cessation of civil war - currency - agricultural production and wages.
- 283 61. Introduction of NEP - alliance with the middle peasantry - educative functions of the dictatorship.
- 286 62. Restoration of economy without foreign loans - scissors' crisis - solution by lowering cost etc - results as at the 14th Congress, May 1925 and 15th Congress, December 1927 of the C.P.S.U. regarding industry and agriculture.
- 292 63. Construction problems - whence to bring Capital - pre-revolutionary Russia built on foreign Capital - socialist rationalisation - Party Congress discussions to increase industrialisation - collectivisation of agriculture - premature scheme of the opposition - two deviations and the real equilibrium between town and country.
- 296 64. Indices of growth - rates of development high but not so the level of development - comparisons - areas under Soviet & collective farms - Distribution of National Income - wages - hours - no. of workers.

- 300 65. Preparing for war - anti-Soviet Propaganda - Indian bourgeoisie joins in - Paris International Chamber of Commerce on the causes of the world crisis - the Indian professors repeat them - Is Soviet dumping one of them - Litvinoff's reply.
- 312 66. India's trade with the Soviet - adverse balance of Britain - favourable balance of U.S.A. - India's gain of three crores suppressed in official statistics - Government Report and the Soviet Union Year Book - Indian bourgeoisie does not see its own interest - the petty bourgeois attitude - want of technicians in the U.S.S.R. - migration from U.S.A. - the fate of inventors under Capitalism and under the Soviet - wages of technicians - beauty under Socialism and Rama Nand Babu.
- 327 Section 4 67. Experience of Russia exceptional or general - will it be the same in parliamentary countries.
- 329 68. The German rising - murder of Liebknecht and Luxemburg - Republic with a Social Democratic Government - the conclusion from it.
- 337 69. The period of proletarian revolutions - revolutions in the smaller countries - France, the classical land of class struggle comes out as the hangman of revolutions - results of these revolutions.
- 341 70. The lesson of the British experience - struggles on the railways, coal mines etc. - the results of Commissions - Triple Alliance - fall in wages - unemployment.
- 347 71. British workers tried two weapons - Labour Government and the General Strike - the achievements of the Labour Government - its fall.
- 352 72. The Coal Crisis - the Samuel Commission - Government preparations and T.U.C. bungling - secret conversations - Soviet help refused - British experience confirms Russian experience - the vote can not stop attack on wages - that the general strike without a revolutionary party has no use - Leninism derived from history.

Part II

- 361 Section 1 73. Role of the individual in the Indian conquest negligible - conquest of superior social groups by the inferior - British not inferior - our standards applied to them are subjective and therefore wrong - no return to pre-British era.
- 366 74. Has Britain civilised us? - introduction of industries - feudalism not destroyed - degeneration of revolutionary slogans - 1857, fight of a revolutionary class under reactionary leadership - what we would have done in 1857?
- 371 75. Do we deplore British conquest? - effect of it - first Company loot - reasons for Crown control in 1858 - British Imperialism expands from the Indian base - commercial and legal forms of loot - why British writers expose British doings in India - sum total of the results of British rule.
- 378 76. Our reasons and policy of national struggle - gains of the British bourgeoisie from India - what loss our independence will cause to them - the basis of some of our resolutions.
- 384 77. All classes here tend to gain from independence - question of revolution raised by whom? - the state of British Imperialism - is it democracy or dictatorship - the apparatus of force - its costs - force matched against whom?
- 391 78. Share of the cost of the machinery of force in the total State expenditure - Dictatorship begins to assume constitutional forms - consolidation of the bourgeoisie - association of the feudal class in its work.
- 397 79. Development of the radical bourgeois and petty bourgeoisie - the influence of 1905 - attitude of the Dictatorship - evolving into a constitutional autocracy - difference between our "Democratic Dictatorship" and their "constitutional Dictatorship".
- 401 80. The formula of August 1917 - the hoodwinking inquiry - 1919 Reforms - wide basis of class alliance.

- 405 81. Enfranchisement does not give power to the bourgeoisie over the machinery of force - voted and non-voted budgets - certification by the Viceroy - 73 years of progress - Dictatorship the same.
- 409 Section 2 82. Attitude of the bourgeoisie - early Home Rule demand - loyalty to the Empire in the war boycott of the first Assembly - Swaraj Party and the second Assembly - Difference between their entry in the Assembly and that of the Bolsheviks in the Duma - wrecking the Dictatorship by the constitutional vote.
- 416 83. No-changers and Left liquidators not comparable and not correct - opposition gives way to cooperation and acceptance of office - by 1926 Indian bourgeoisie participates in the rule of Imperialism completely.
- 418 84. Simon Commission - repression and turn to the Left - revival of boycott fails - the talk of "action" of the Working Committee and the A.I.C.C.
- 422 85. Indian bourgeoisie and British Imperialism ask us to follow the constitutional example - what classes sit there? - legislation according to their interests - legislative gains of ten years - temporary policy of protection - Royal Commissions and Committees.
- 430 86. The Tariff Board and war policy - steel, chemicals etc - other big branches of production not in the hands of the Indian bourgeoisie - still their attitude to labour and peasant legislation hostile - success in furthering their class gain through the legislatures very poor - hence transference of the struggle outside the constitution and amongst the people.
- 437 87. The economic struggle even of the bourgeoisie necessarily becomes political - examples of the control of the Imperial Bank & Chartered Bank - deposits policy - refusal of further liberalisation of the Dictatorship forces the bourgeoisie into opposition.

- 443 88. Does it then lead to the revolution? - the idea of bourgeois independence - Canada and Britain as examples - is separatism a mere sentiment or a material objective necessity?
- 450 89. The nature of workers' and peasants independence as found in our programmes - can we not postpone the class struggle for a time till we have overthrown Imperialism - there is no rule for bourgeois development like that of England or Japan for our bourgeoisie - hence the class struggle is forced to the front.
- 454 Section 3 90. The bourgeois programme regarding removal of the poverty of the masses - the main points of the problem - the drain of wealth - high land revenue - debts - absence of rural banking - adverse currency.
- 460 91. The state of the Punjab peasantry as an example - what does increased productivity lead to? economic holdings will only displace two million peasants in the Punjab - where to find place for them?
- 465 92. Moneylenders - rural banking is money-lending - our fundamental problem - who swallows the surplus?
- 468 93. Stratification of the peasantry - concentration of land in the hands of the rich owners - where is the lost purchasing power locked? - an example under Batai cultivation in Lyallpur.
- 475 94. How landowners were imported in the colony to form a bulwark for imperialism - their increasing numbers - cause of peasants' indebtedness - capitalist rule and break up of village communes into individual holdings - money rent.
- 481 95. Effect of money economy as we read it - crops brought under the rule of the capitalist exchange market - the demand for reduction of land revenue and its meaning.
- 486 96. The land revenue in India - The two systems - what does our support to the demand for reduction of land revenue mean?

- 494 97. The class struggle inside the anti-Imperialist struggle in Bardoli - the Dublas and Dharalas - what it means in U.P. & Bengal? - rents and the feudal class - Indian bourgeois interest opposed to feudalism.
- 508 98. Pandit Jawahar Lal's opinion - his welcome to landowners - even if feudalism is substituted by capitalism - expropriation of the peasantry through the capitalist market remains.
- 516 99. Some utterances on the complete ruin of the peasantry and its inability to pay rent due to fall in prices - examples from U.P., Bengal, the Punjab and Karnatic.
- 524 100. The bourgeois intellectual will object to deduce from this that the bourgeoisie through its prices machinery expropriates the peasant.
- 533 Section 4 101. The position of the petty bourgeoisie - incapable of revolutionary struggle - not being a class it uses caste - the bankruptcy of their programme with regard to the masses - gives way to our programme.
- 544 102. The class of small traders and artisans - their programme of charkha revival - why we have disliked it?
- 554 103. The material conditions of the working class which force it into class struggle, economic and political.
- 564 104. Inciting class war - models of class war and other questions.
- 568 105. "Outside connection" - the unnecessary part of the indictment.

MEMORANDUM

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

In the case of King-Emperor versus P. Spratt & Others

Examination of S.A. Dange

accused under section 342 of the Code of Criminal Procedure,
1898, made before me R.L. Yorke Addl: Sessions Judge at
Meerut on the 26th day of October 1931.

My name is Sripat Amrit Dange; my father's name is
Amrit Raghunath Dange; I am by caste No caste; 31 years
of age; by occupation journalist and labour organiser; my
home is at Bombay; Police-station city of Bombay; district
Bombay; I reside at Bombay.

Q. You heard your statement in the Lower Court
P.2613 read out to you on 16.3.31. Is that statement
correct?

A. Yes.

Q. The following documents which are in evidence
against you may be described as Foreign Correspondence.
P.1869C, 2328P2, 1968, 1009, 1606, 1607, 1845, 1633, 76,
1348(34), 2408P, 1609 and A and 1807(1), 1610, 2215, 1208(1),
2419P, 2412P, 2409P, 2211, 2057P, 2413P2, 807, 1803 and
1203. Have you anything to say about this evidence?

A. Remark on the charge, its true meaning. Failure
of democracy etc etc.

Q. The following documents relate to your connec-
tion with the Communist Party of India:- P.1287(11), 1149,

1141, 840, 1605, 1207(1)(409), 989 Kranti of 4.6.27 and 18.6.27, 1684, 1285, 1287(2), (3), 2055C, 1295, 1300, 1310, 1296, 1208(3),(4), and 1574. Have you anything to say about this evidence?

A. In answer to a question of the Magistrate I had said I was a Communist. I affirm that statement now. But I will explain what I understand by Communism and what my aims and objects are.

Historical Survey.

My aim is to replace world Capitalist economy by a world system of Communism. Necessity for so doing.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

26.10.31

Economic thesis.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

27.10.31.

Thesis continued: largely historical. French Revolution.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

28.10.31.

Further historical survey: (with incidental references upto the present date). The Great War, Disarmament etc. Capitalism's troubles.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

29.10.31.

Present Economic Deadlock. Lengthy discussion of all aspects.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

30.10.31.

More European history: illustrating growth of labour movement. Chartist movement etc.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

31.10.31.

Historical survey continued upto 1870.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

2.11.31.

The Commune etc.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat: history of the idea. First realised in the Commune. End of 1st International. Foundation of 2nd International.

Sd. R.L. Yorke.

3.11.31.

Further development of 2nd International: the Great War and the changes in 2nd International. Krinthal, Zimmerwald. The Russian Revolution.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

4.11.31.

Russian history, internal. Development of Socialist theory. Lenin.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

5.11.31.

Historical development from 1905 continued.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

6.11.31.

History continued: the Revolution, the Provisional Government.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

7.11.31.

The Bolshevik Revolution. Its work in the countryside: among peasantry. Dangers it had to avoid. Difficulties about making peace with the Central Powers. Brest Litovsk 18.3.18. Progress in early years of the Soviet Republics.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

12.11.31.

Mainly theoretical.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

13.11.31.

Progress of nationalisation etc in early Bolshevik years. Difficulties. War Communism. NEP. The 5 years plan.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

14.11.31.

Reputation of various charges against Russia. Dumping. Wheat. Soviet Trade with Britain and others.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

16.11.31.

Art and inventors and Capitalism on one hand and the Soviet on the other. Ramanand Babu. Revolutionary movement in Germany.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

17.11.31.

Developments in Great Britain. 1st Labour Government. Criticism of Mr. MacDonald.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

18.11.31.

1925 Coal Crisis. The general strike of 1926. India and Britain: or Britain in India. Historical.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

19.11.31.

Indo-British history after the Mutiny and its results.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

20.11.31.

Further development in India: Congress. Curzon. Boycott. Developments upto and through the Great War Situation after it. Reforms and their effects. Certifications.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

21.11.31.

Historical continued. 1st Assembly. Analysis of constitutional progress etc.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

23.11.31.

Further internal progress: economic and political

struggle, inside and outside the Councils. Growth of forces of revolt. (against Imperialist and bourgeois Dictatorship).

Sd. R.L. Yorke

26.11.31.

Crown Counsel urges that the whole statement, headings and body, is all irrelevant to the issues before the Court. Accused replies that he is referring to exhibits all the way along, that he is meeting statements made by the prosecutions and indeed the whole case of the prosecution. The court feels the greatest doubt as to the relevance and value of the whole of this lengthy statement but considers it desirable, in order to avoid all possibility of the accused not having had a full opportunity to make their defence case clear, to allow accused to proceed.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

27.11.31.

Present day problems: impossibility of bourgeois development. Class struggle unavoidable. The Communist Party programme and its solutions versus those of other parties. Money lending etc.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

27.11.31.

Class struggle of peasants in Punjab. Indebtedness. Lyallpur Colony. Effect of money economy.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

28.11.31.

Zamindari and Ryotwari systems: often synonyms.
Features of their economy. Slavery conditions. Better
than those of tenancy. Peasants in Feudal Oudh.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

30.11.31.

The peasant or rather feudal problem continued.
Odds heavily against peasant in the exchange market, or
capitalist market. Results. He loses whether prices are
rising or falling.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

1.12.31.

Discussion of the position of the petty bourgeoisie.
Not a real class. The charkha.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

2.12.31.

Fallacies of charkha. Position of the working class.
Existence of material grievances. Government as bad as any
other employer. Class struggle a genuine fact, and only
means of progress.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

3.12.31.

Accused after some discussion of the charges asks
for the remaining items of documentary evidence to be put
to him.

Q. The following is (E. & O.E.) the rest of the
evidence against you grouped under its main heads :-

I. W.P.P. of Bombay. P.1373(6), 2137P. 230, 1015, 1358, 2311, 1685, 1375 Kranti of 3.9.27; 835, 1348(41), 993, 1353, 1343, 1348(16)(18)(19)(15)(24)(14)(7), 1373(11), 1348(2), 1624, 1373(13), 984, 981, 1492, 930 Kranti of 30.6.28, 986 Kranti of 5.7.28, 23.8.28 and 30.8.28, 930 Kranti of 12.7.28 and 2.8.28, 1602, 1344, 1365, P.W's 244 and 245, P.2242, P.1690, 1261, 1207(4),(3), 1170 and 431 Krantikari of 28.1.29, 1211, 1002D, 1207(5); Kranti 9.8.28, 23.8.28, 20.8.28, 2.9.28, 20.9.28, 27.9.28, 5.10.28, 13.1.29, 3.3.29, and 17.3.29. (to be found in different Kranti exhibits numbers.) P.987, 988, 1205, 990, 983.

II. W.P.P. of Bengal etc:- Bengal: P.52, 526(41), 1615 and 1855.

U.P. P.1619P, 1621P, 311 & 433, 526(6).

Punjab: P.526(24), 1408, 1409, 1393, 1608, 2051C, 1628, 1641 & P.W. 179.

III. A.I.W.P.P.: P.1373(2), 1613, 2024C, 1348(22), 1373(3), 1323, 1617, 1373(5), 1654P, 1611P, 1797P, 1348(35), 468(2), 978, 977 & 669.

IV. A.I.T.U.C.: P.W.119, P.10, 1965, 1966, 1967, 2138P, 2141C, 1878C, 1863P, 545(1), 1614, 1848C, 479, 526(34), 545(3), 545(8), 999, 1206(1), and P.W. 123.

V. T.U's & Strikes: P.819, 1625, P.W's 273, 276, 278 & 245, P.958, 944, 966, 967, 929, 985, 959, 949, 787, 786, 790, 792, 954, 1628P, 395(2),(1), 396,955(1), 964, & 986 Kranti of 12.8.28.

VI. Connections & : P.W's 244 & 218, P.1972, 1973, 1966,
 Miscellaneous
 2067(1)P, 1637, 995, 996, 1639, 2022C,
 957, 146, 525(1), 645, 980, 991, 997,
 1000, 1001, 1220, 1003, 1299, 1819, 1822,
 1885, 2213, 1207(2)(6), 1208(2), 1796(e),
 2512, and 975 and 1175.

Have you anything to say in explanation of this
 evidence.

A. The Bombay General Textile Strike. Result of
 circumstances.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

4.12.31.

Indian working class movement in last 15 years,
 especially Bombay: terrible conditions of life. Realisation
 of international interdependence. Strikes in 1924 & 1925,
 & afterwards. Their causes.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

5.12.31.

The opening phases of 1928 strike. Numerous facts
 ultimately demonstrating absurdity of proposition that
 accused were responsible for starting and maintaining the
 general textile strike.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

7.12.31.

Relations of G.K.M. to the strike. Affairs in the
 G.K.M. Part taken by W.P.P. Early stages of the strike.

Sd. R.L. Yorke.

8.12.31.

Further progress of strike. Question of Registration and Joint Strike Committee. Analysis of the different stages. The cotton shipments.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

9.12.31.

G.K.U. registered. Malaviya. Arrests of self and Nimbkar. Negotiations in July. Distribution of relief.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

11.12.31.

The Hidayatullah Conference. Its failure. Who were responsible for prolongation of the strike? Obviously the millowners, who agreed in October to what they refused in August. Their standardisation scheme a concealed wagecut: this was our view and was finally admitted correct. The Assembly letter and Public Safety Bill. No effect on us. The Mayor Relief Fund.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

12.12.31.

The Mayor's conference. Shaukat Ali. Our new proposals, alternatives. Discussions in September with millowners, Seth Mangal Das etc. Necessity of settlement from our point of view. Il faut reculer pour mieux sauter!

Sd. R.L. Yorke

14.12.31.

Conference on October 4, 1928 and strike called off on 6th. Responsibility for prolongation of strike Not ours.

Other charges of prosecution: use of strikes for educational purposes: rehearsal theory absurd. Speeches: the small percentage in evidence gives a wrong idea of the general intention of them. No incitement to violence. In fact crime fell off in the mill area during strike.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

15.12.31.

No incitement to violence in the speeches and no violence due to speeches or to the strike or such. Ideological aspect. Critical attack on the evidence of prosecution proving 3 speeches P.1701M3, P.2242 and P.2245. of responsibility for these speeches as they appear in evidence.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

16.12.31.

Foreign help for strike. True view about it. Help given inside India. After strike difficulties and tasks.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

17.12.31.

G.K.U's work after strike ended. Red Army: foolish idea of prosecution about this. A corps of volunteers not very different from those of Congress etc in appearance, but an underlying radical difference.

Difficulties with millowners: owing to breaches of the settlement. Subsequent strikes not due to us.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

18.12.31.

Same continued. Results of these subsequent strikes.
Mill Committees. Trickery of mill managements.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

19.12.31.

More about Mill Committees: why and wherefore. Training
of workers in Union work. Fawcett Committee. 1929 strike,
whether planned in 1928. Difficulties with G.K.M.,
B.T.L.U. etc. Firing of 12th December. Organisation and
finances of G.K.U.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

21.12.31.

More difficulties in the mills. The Pearl Mill Murder
and trial of Papa Mian etc.

The February Riots of 1929, Pathan Scare etc. The
report of the Committee and its obvious mistakes or mis-
statements. Correct version of causes of riots. Attacks
on G.K.U. Headquarters. Shaukat Ali and Mohd Ali and part.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

22.12.31.

Replies to attacks made by Alve and Kasle accused and also
by K. L. Ghose accused. Particular reference to Bauria
money and outsiders in the unions.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

23.12.31.

My work in the Bombay Tramwaymen's Union. Work in the
A.I.T.U.C. History of A.I.T.U.C. Interest taken in it by

National Congress. Hypocritical. Evidence about connection with A.I.T.U.C.

Exhibits and connection with W.P.P. and C.P.I.
Treatment of my applications in regard to Roy interview etc. Remarks on individual exhibits e.g. Gandhi Vs. Lenin, P. 2311, P.2512.

Delays in this case are due to the Prosecution and the Court and not to the accused. Length of statements: really not their length but show reporting is to blame!

Sd. R.L. Yorke

4.1.32.

General explanation of the intention of the above statement as a whole. A defence of right of every Indian to hold Communist principles and belong to a Communist Party.

Sd. R.L. Yorke

5.1.32.

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

In the case of King-Emperor Vs. P. Spratt & Others.

Examination of S.A. Dange accused under section 342 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, made before me R.L. Yorke Addl: Sessions Judge at Meerut on the 26th Day of October 1931.

My name is Sripat Amrit Dange; my father's name is Amrit Raghunath Dange; I have no caste as I do not believe in the caste system; 31 years of age; by occupation-Journalist and Labour organiser, my home is at Bombay, Police-station - City of Bombay, district Bombay, I reside at Bombay.

Q. You heard your statement in the Lower Court P 2613 read out to you on 16.3.31. Is that statement Correct?

A. Yes.

Q. The following documents which are in evidence against you may be described as foreign correspondence:- P 1869C, 2328P2, 1968, 1009, 1606, 1607, 1845, 1633, 76, 1348(34), 2408P, 1609 and A and 1807(1), 1610, 2215, 1208(1), 2419P, 2412P, 2409 P, 2211, 2057 P, 2413P2, 807, 1803, and 1203. Have you anything to say about this evidence?

A. I am technically charged with conspiracy to deprive the King of his sovereignty of British India. But as has already been said, I am being tried for subscribing to the principles of Communism, and thereby endangering not only

Government "but the whole of the established order of society". (Mr. Kemp's speech in the High Court). Sir James Crerar in his speech on the Public Safety Bill in September 1928 wanted the suppression of Communist views to save the "established order of society". The Viceroy in a speech in Calcutta at the end of 1928 referring to us said, "While every allowance must be made for the genuine grievances which the labouring classes feel there can be no doubt that the unrest 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. The 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." (Exhibit P 1206) So on 20th March 1929 the Government removed 32 centres of its anxiety and locked them inside the Meerut Prison. For three years "this insidious danger" has been locked inside the prison by the big round-up and locked outside India by the Public Safety Ordinance and Sea Customs Act. I would have been quite pleased to stay in if I had been shown that excellent "established society", "culture," "religion" etc. which we were threatening had now improved for the benefit of mankind and contributed to the happiness of the millions of workers, peasants and soldiers. The element of disruption being

removed, stability and happiness should have grown.

But the sovereignty of the representative of His Majesty was challenged most unceremoniously and His Excellency speaking at the Associated Chambers of Commerce said (15th December 1930) "An unkind friend reminded me that when I addressed your meeting two years ago I ventured on the statement that the general position gave good ground for sober optimism For a year or so after that meeting of 1928, it is true, the position showed no great change for the worse, but the Wall Street Collapse of October 1929 proved to be the beginning of an acute world depression." That unkind friend forgot to tell the Viceroy that the locking in of Communists in Meerut Prison was not going to help his established capitalist society. Capitalist society was crumbling down under the weight of its own contradictions and it was not "the insidious danger" of Communism that had any hand in it. The foreign editor of the Journal De Geneva writes, "The world never had institutions which seemed to be more firmly established than the Parliament at Westminster, the British fleet and the pound sterling. The peoples were wont to consider these as the chief pillars of International life. The Parliament was the prototype of Democracy, the fleet was the guardian of the security of the sea and the pound sterling was the world currency par excellence.

In less than three months the British nation has

abandoned the traditional Party politics of its Parliamentary institutions, it has witnessed a formidable mutiny among the crew of its fleet and now it is assisting with a hardened heart, the fall of the pound. These are great trials hard even for a people with soul so well seasoned." These are great trials hard even for a Capitalism so well seasoned with 4,000 million pounds of foreign investment. To boast before the world of an "Ideal Democracy" and yet to suspend it and pass a budget by means of an ordinance (order in Council) is not a great trial, but a great revelation to those who are enamoured of Parliamentary Democracy. When Imperialism is fooling the Indian bourgeois patriots with discussions over the skeletons of Parliamentary structure and teaching them schoolboy stories of Robert Bruce it is a humiliation for it to appear next minute with an electioneering campaign that openly asks for a Dictatorship, to save the nation - that is Capitalism. Democracy, Parliament, established order of society and His Majesty's private purse in the bargain, are being assailed by the international bankers' cabal while adherents of the Communist International in the Empire do not number more than a few thousands. The overthrow of British Imperialism is not an act of Communist Conspiracy. It is already going on before our very eyes for the last ten years. And a man, who helped that Imperialism with crores of the Indian workers' and peasants' money, when he was the Finance Member of the Government of India, in

order that "established order", Sovereignty, and the sovereign may not go down, has lost his faith in his own Capitalism and says, "I am not sure that we do not need a new political and economic technique to deal with the situation. I am not sure we should not be wise to take a leaf out of the books of both Italy and Russia in the matter of organised thinking and planning." (Times of India, 18th July, 1931). Sir Basil Blackett, who says the above, has purposely confused Fascism with Bolshevism but the yearning of this Director of the Bank of England for "a new political and economic technique" is unmistakable. Capitalism is bankrupt and looks everywhere, even to Bolshevism, to lift it out of the grave it is sinking in. We Communists are accused of planning the ruin of all Capitalists. But the most brainy fellow of British Capitalism, Professor J. M. Keynes, proposed that very thing, by which of course, he thinks he can re-organise Capitalism. "Individually we should all be 'ruined' but collectively we should be much as before. Perhaps indeed it is an attractive alternative, this committing of suicide by the Capitalists. For under the pressure of hardship and of excitement we might find out some much better ways of managing our affairs." The great economist is quite sure that the "suicide of Capitalists" is attractive. We agree with him in his literal sense! But with all his cleverness, he is only fumbling for a way. He is not sure and looks to "some much better ways", and he of course, does

not know who will show it. It is we Communists, it is Marxism-Leninism, the Communist International which has the better way - Overthrow of Capitalism, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, then orderly economic planning of socialist life and thus freeing the world from anarchy and chaos. That is the "much better way" - the only way.

The British Empire, that Sovereignty against which we are said to be conspiring is nearly half conquered and is no longer sovereign. It is a colony of American Imperialism. When we speak of making India and Britain, a Soviet Republic, you falsely accuse us of bringing in Russian rule, and supplanting the Empire. But when thieves fall out they let out their secrets to their victims, so is your secret out. Henderson goes out telling the world, "We were told that the country would not have Russian Dictatorship, German Dictatorship or for that matter even the Dictatorship of the British Trade Union Council. But the so-called National Government is prepared to accept the Dictatorship of American bankers at the cost of the British working class." Yet with the backing of the two mighty Imperialisms of U.S.A. and France, British Capitalism cannot stave off its ruin. What better authority can there be on this point than the brilliant Governors of the Bank of England, Mr. Montague Norman? In a letter to the Governor of the Bank of France, M. Moret, he writes "Unless drastic measures are taken to save it, the capitalist system throughout the

civilised world will be wrecked within a year. I should like this prediction filed for future reference," (quoted by Mr. Wilfred Wellock, M.P. in a recent issue of the New Leader). Mr. Norman himself made very drastic aeroplane dashes to the Financial Capitals of Europe and America to save the credit of the pound and of the Bank of England, which is the essence of British Capitalism. But he failed. The pity of it is that after 12 years of governorship of the financial operations of British Capitalism, Mr. Norman still hopes to save it. The Capitalist system throughout the civilised world is incapable of any "drastic measures" because those very measures that are proposed to save it, hasten its downfall. The only "drastic measures" to save, not Capitalism, but society, is that the Dictatorship of the bankers has to be replaced by the Dictatorship of the working class. But this is not "prediction to be filed for future reference," but an urgent necessity to be worked out in reality, if society is to be saved from a return to barbarism and destruction of all its achievements.

If Capitalism is collapsing in Britain, it is not more stable in India. That "established order of society", which the knights of a declining Imperialism have come forward to defend by our arrest, has escaped their control. We were said to be the cause of industrial ruin and unrest. We were removed and 2½ years after, Sir George Rainy comes before the Legislative Assembly and tells them "the present

economic depression in India is beyond the control of the Government." (September 10, 1931). The State of the bourgeoisie is impotent to save its own class. The champion of parasitic landlordism, Sir Fazle Hussain supporting the spokesman of Imperialism said, "It was equally true that no Local Government could put the matters right in a couple of years," and as if to hearten his class he went on, "It was also not right to get into the mood that India was the only country that was badly affected." He showed by way of illustration what sort of conditions existed within the British Empire. Imperialism-Capitalism were bankrupt not only within India but in the whole Empire. Their conspiracy of bankruptcy had a 'foreign part' and an 'Indian part'. Poorly Fazle is optimistic and thinks his class can get up after two years. So they used to say about dead Czarism also! You may have a short flutter of life again, but you have to make way for Communism, for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. It is rising from the ruins of your own economy. The Capitalist State is crumbling and even if all the Mahatmas collect all the taxes from the peasantry for you, the State is collapsing.

Like mean demagogues, our accusers misrepresent us before the people and tell them that we are out against culture, against their family and happiness and the nationalist patriots join them in that game. I can only throw in their face their own report and the admission of

their own men. An official report quoted by the Times of India (17th October 1931) says, "In several features traffic in women resembles cattle-theft To indulge in it brings no disgrace in the eyes of the public." "At one place men were caught kidnapping by pushing along a handcart containing a concealed double compartment into which they put likely looking girls whom they espied in the street." That is the value of women in your society. You have to set up a commission of the League of Nations to stop the International Capitalist trading in girls. Yet the hireling intellectuals of Capitalism are not ashamed to say that it is Communism that abolishes family. Mian Shah Nawaz said in the Assembly (31st March, 1931) that "he knew from his own knowledge that men were driven to selling their daughters in order to get money to pay their obligations in the shape of land revenue and the moneylenders' interests." Who is thus abolishing the family? We or Capitalism? All the patriotic bourgeois and Imperialists stand for the maintenance of this "established order." When they find they cannot do it, they wreak their vengeance on the heads of the revolutionary workers and peasants who fight under their vanguard, the Communist Party, and on the heads of those revolutionary intellectuals who refuse the Mahatmic compromise and surrender to Imperialism. But that is not going to help. Capitalism leads inevitably to Communism. It is a necessity if society is to be saved. It is not a criminal conspiracy but a scientific system of social reconstruction.

I.H.K.

Part I

What I Believe in

26/10/31 (Evening Part II).

Q. The following documents relate to your connection with the Communist Party of India:- P 1287(11), 1140, 1141, 840, 1605, 1207(1)(409), 989 Kranti of 4/6/27 and 16/6/27, 1684, 1285, 1287(2),(3), 2055C, 1295, 1300, 1310, 1296, 1208(3),(4), and 1574. Have you anything to say about this evidence?

(1) Our object not the same as alleged by the Prosecution.

A. In answer to a question from the Magistrate in the Lower Court, I had said that I was a Communist and I affirm the statement now. I will explain what I understand by Communism and what my aims and objects as a Communist are. I do not want to do this in order to mark myself off, by any special interpretation of "my own", from the already existing authoritative expositions of the aims and objects of Communism, found in the works of Lenin and others. Till the epoch of Proletarian Revolutions and a certain building up of Socialism is over, the necessity of materially enlarging the details of the further aims of Communism will not arise. For the present period the guidance of Leninism is quite sufficient. Therefore, I could have disposed of the whole question of my aims by

pointing out to the most authoritative works of Marx and Lenin. Some of these are put in as Prosecution exhibits also - viz. "The Communist Manifesto of 1847" (P21), "Capital" (P 455), "The Civil War in France" (P 1179), (D 409), "Imperialism" (P 528), "State and Revolution" (P 1092), "On the Road to Insurrection" (P 979), "Left Wing Communism" (P 975), Bukharin's "Historical Materialism" (P 864). So also the several theses adopted by the World Congresses of the Communist International. In order to convince the Court about the aims and objects of the Communists and to show that they are quite the same as they are represented by the Prosecution to be in their complaint, they (the Prosecution) have exhibited more than a hundred books, and after the digest of so many volumes they have formulated a complaint and delivered an Opening Address to the Court which shows they have either not understood our aims or have purposely misrepresented them. I am not prepared to believe that the Prosecution, represented by the best available brains of bourgeois culture are incapable of an intellectual understanding of the literature. I would rather say that their class duty dictates to them the latter course. Therefore my aims as a Communist are not the same as shown by the Prosecution nor is their interpretation of my activities correct.

(2) Fundamental Proposition of the Communist Manifesto.

The theory and practice of Communism which is also

known as Marxism and Leninism was first scientifically formulated by Marx (1818-1883) and Engels (1820-1895). Both Marx and Engels were Germans; both of them in their early life took part in the revolutionary upheavals in Germany; both were champions of the working class and peasantry and were therefore expelled from Germany. After expulsion, Marx and Engels lived in England, the classical home of Capitalism. While there Marx studied the development of Capitalism, how the working class creates the wealth of society and how it is appropriated by the Capitalist class and how at a certain stage of development it becomes necessary to overthrow Capitalism and establish Socialism. He observed how that Capitalism developed in England and the Continent, the displacement of handicraft production of English artisans by English Capitalists; owning the newly invented machinery, the capture of political power from the hands of the old feudal lords and merchants by the new bourgeoisie. He saw how in this struggle the working class and peasantry was used by the rising bourgeoisie to fight its class battles and was after the struggle exploited by the bourgeoisie and he formulated the fundamental proposition in the Communist Manifesto - "that in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange and the social organisation necessarily following from it form the basis upon which is built up and from which alone can be explained the political and intellectual

history of that epoch: and consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles forms a development in which a stage has now been reached, where the exploited and oppressed class - the proletariat - can not attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class - the bourgeoisie - without at the same time and once for all emancipation society at large, from all exploitation, oppression, class distinction and class struggle." (P. 21). The proposition states that the classes arose from the dissolution of the primitive classless society, when private property arose. One class was of those who owned the means of production, land etc and another of those who worked and gave the surplus to the owners. The exploiting class dominated and governed society in its own interest. The conflict of economic interests has led to a continuous class war (sometimes violent, sometimes peaceful) and now in the present epoch of Capitalism a stage has come where society can not move forward without once for all overthrowing Capitalism and establishing a classless society that is Socialist society. This is historically inevitable. After the episode of the Paris Commune, Marx emphasised the Dictatorship of the Proletariat as a transitional stage.

Thus in fact all the fundamental principles of Communism were formulated by Marx and Engels in the period 1842-1895 including the now universally famous slogan "Workers of the World unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains, you have a world to win", which appeared for the first time in the Communist Manifesto issued by the Communist League from London in 1847 and which was also printed as a guiding principle of the first Marxist paper "The Communist" issued in September 1847 by Engels.

(3) Communism is neither German, Russian nor English.

There is a lot of talk going round about "Moscow Road" and "Moscow Ideas". It is said that Communism is a Russian growth unsuitable to any other soil and especially the Indian. I may point out that neither Marx nor Engels were Russians. By birth they were German, by long residence they were English and their study and writings were done in England. Communism would be German according to the birth of its founders and English according to the place of its formulation and publication, French according to its first experiment and Russian according to its second and successful experiment. But such a labelling is absurd and unscientific. Marxism has no nationality because it is a science of social construction. The fundamental proposition of Marxism applies to every social group wherever it exists. The differences in its application arise, not from differences

of nationality, religion or caste, but from differences in the economic development of the particular social group in a particular historical epoch. In the present epoch of Imperialism the application of Marxism to Russia, India, and China will be predominantly similar, not because Lenin was a Russian and the Communists in India and China follow Leninism and observe "Lenin Day" but because these three semi-continentals are similar in economic development, that is they are predominantly agrarian and feudal. While the application of Marxism to countries like England, Germany and America will be somewhat different because of the high industrialisation there. But it must be remembered that these differences will not be very emphatic. In its main outlines, the line of advance will be highly similar. Thus when I follow Marxism, Leninism or Communism, I am not following a method of this country or that but the method of reconstruction of society which is proved historically to be necessary and correct.

(4) Our aim - to replace world Capitalist Economy by a world system of Communism.

My aim as a Communist is to replace world capitalist economy by a world system of Communism. Now the necessity for this arises out of the historical development of modern society which threatens to degrade and even destroy the human race if capitalist economy were not overthrown. This necessity has nothing to do with the question whether

individual capitalists are charitable and very religious men or most hateful pack of scoundrels. Even if they were most "ideal men" living on two penny a day and eating from iron utensils, in their private life, the capitalist economy would have to be overthrown and replaced by a socialist economy because the former is no longer compatible with the growth of society. So when Communists speak of their aim they do not speak of it, as if it is ordained by some holy book descended from heaven or because it is preached by an extraordinary genius like that of Marx or Lenin, such as are cast forth by Nature once in centuries. Their aim is a historical inevitability, the inexorable demand born out of social growth of centuries. "The theoretical conclusions of Communists are in no way based on the ideas or principles that have been invented by this or that would be universal reformer. They merely express in general terms actual relations springing from an existing class struggle, from a historical movement going on under our very eyes." Wrote Marx himself in the famous Manifesto of 1847.

(5) Existing system not eternal.

The existing capitalist economy governing the whole world did not exist from time immemorial. It is a wellknown historical fact that Capitalism arose after the mechanical inventions, the great changes in the technique of production,

exchange and transport, and the social revolution following from them. It is a common place lesson of every school textbook of history that the modern capitalist economy and the industrial powers in the world were born from the industrial and technical revolutions of the 18th and 19th century. We all know that formerly there were barons, landlords and kings on one side and small towns and castles, artisans and handicraftsmen, handloom weavers and the small merchants on the other; that all these have vanished. In their place have sprung up big industrial companies, huge cartels, finance, kings and banks on the one hand and a huge army of workers and petty bourgeois employees on the other. An unlimited accumulation of wealth at one end of the pole and accumulation of misery at the other. This development has been going on under our very eyes, giving birth to new forms of class struggle. The changed conditions, the new bourgeois economy, was the outcome of the new technology of society and the new instruments of production and exchange, that are being daily perfected more and more.

(6) Its characteristics - Monopoly of the means of production.

The characteristic features of this capitalist economy which dominates the world today are these:- The monopoly ownership of the most vital means of production of social necessities by the capitalist class and big landlords, the

existence of a propertiless wage earning class which being deprived of the means of production is compelled to sell its labour power to the capitalist class; the production of commodities for profit and linked up with all this the planless and anarchic method of production as a whole.

The characteristics of capitalist economy are to be found in their highly developed form in those Imperialist countries where Capitalism has been developing in the 19th century. The monopolisation of the means of production by the capitalist class and a whole propertiless population at their mercy are a condition at their highest point of development in America, England, France, Germany, and Japan. Though these countries by themselves are not a very substantial part of the world either in territory or in population, yet their economy, the Imperialist economy dominates the whole world in all its branches of life.

The monopolisation of the means of production by the capitalist class has not been brought about by what is called the accumulation of the honest returns of enterprise, the abstinence of the capitalist class in not spending away all its profits but charitably and most humanely re-investing them in industry so that the poor may get work and be fed and humanity attain happiness. Such an idea of capitalist process is reserved for the priest to preach from the pulpit to the gullibles, and the school master to the pupils so that they may not revolt against bourgeois property.

(7) Monopoly brought about by force.

The monopolisation of the means of production by the capitalist class has been brought about by violent robbery and forcible expropriation of the artisans of the middle ages, the violent expropriation of the peasantry and the feudal landlords by the new bourgeoisie and by wholesale robbery of such feudal nations like India and China by the capitalism of Europe and America. The primary accumulation of feudal property and afterwards of bourgeois property is a tale of nothing but bloody violence on English farmers by English landlords, of opium wars, the spoliation of Begums and Nawabs, of rate wars and wars for concessions of exploitation and finally Imperialist world wars. Accumulation of Capital in the hands of the bourgeoisie is accompanied by the ruthless exploitation of child and woman labour, by horrible atrocities on a rebellious working class, trying to get a few more rupees and a few less hours of work. "Capital is born into the world creaking with blood from head to foot", so said Marx.

(8) Capitalism civilises - Why then Rebel?

But an objection may be raised that these are stories that belong to the dead past. Why unearth them now? Today at least Capitalism is trying its best to give better conditions of work to the workers, who would be nowhere if Capitalists were not to run their factories. Are not the capitalists taking you by their side on the highest ruling

authority of the Empire - the British Cabinet? They are instituting great welfare schemes for the workers. They are prohibiting child labour in factories and woman labour in mines. In the best capitalist countries they are spending millions to feed the unemployed. They why complain against Capitalism?

If capitalists have the monopoly of the means of production, of the great wealth producing factors, why grumble against that? Has not Capitalism developed the whole world from marshy jungles into wealth producing populated countries with culture, civilisation and all the best things that could be obtained under the sun? There are some defects in the Capitalist system; no doubt about it. It has its bad features as every thing else in the world has. But then the Communists alone have not the monopoly of the best means for removing these evils. There are others also who are as much anxious about society, workers, and all. They too are trying to remove social evils. Let us "all" unite for the good of humanity. Such are the arguments of many petty bourgeois reformists.

D/27.10.31.

Evening 1st Part.(9) We appreciate progress under Capitalism.

We cannot afford in the first place to bury the hatchet and forget history. History is a great account-book and balance-sheet of every epoch of the class-struggle, of the great concern called society. When a great concern is failing affecting the lives of 2,000 million people it is impossible to take over charge of it and reconstruct it without its previous account-book. Up till now in all the historical epochs, all the misery has been credited to our side while all the good things of life have been pocketed once by feudalism and next by the bourgeoisie. But even supposing for a moment we consent to forget history, consent to let bygones be bygones, even supposing that the whole bourgeoisie has been overtaken by a complete "change of heart," we cannot pull on with Capitalism. Even if every bourgeois were to turn out tomorrow in the coarsest Sabarmati cottons, begin to live on goat's milk and cucumbers and call his workers and tenants "my dear brother" while keeping intact the present property relations, still Capitalism must be overthrown.

There is no school of thought in the world which appreciates and assesses the world of Capitalism at its true and highest value as much as Marxism does. "The bourgeoisie during its rule of scarce one hundred years has

created more massive and colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjugation of nature's forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalisation of rivers, whole population conjured out of the ground - what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labour?" (Manifesto - Marx). This was written in 1847 by the founders of Communism. Since then subjugation of nature's forces to man has gone still further. Railways are superseded by air-ways, canalisation of rivers is fading into canalisation of oceans, if they dare to obstruct man's traffic. From electric telegraphs we have moved into television and the old feudal soldier of the Bikaner desert is not now surprised to see his son jump from the jerking dromedary into the giant dirigible. The bourgeoisie has done all this and that is why it is time now for it to be overthrown, just as it overthrew its predecessor; because it is no longer compatible with further progress.

(10) What makes it now incompatible with progress - nature and society - the process of production

What is it that has made the system suddenly incompatible with further social development, when for so long it worked so hard and so nice and created a new world? The

element that has made it so, we call "the contradiction between the productive forces and production relations." What does it mean?

Human society ever since it began has had to abstract material energy from Nature; without these loans it could not exist. Society best adapts itself to Nature by abstracting (and appropriating) more energy from Nature; only by increasing this quantity of energy does society succeed in growing. "Every child knows that any nation would perish of hunger, if it should stop work, I shall not say for a year, but only for a few weeks." (Marx's letter). Men cultivate the ground, raise wheat, rye, maize; they breed and graze animals. They satisfy their demands for food, clothing and shelter.

In order that society may continue to live, this process of production must be constantly renewed. If we assume that at any moment a certain amount of wheat, shoes and shirts have been produced and all these are eaten up and used up, in the same period, it is clear that production must at once repeat its cycle; they have to be reproduced. The raw material like cotton and also the instrument which made it into cloth, all deteriorated and have to be reproduced. In this process of production and re-production, the balance between what you have been able to produce and what you have spent or it has been necessary for you to spend is the decisive element in the growth of society.

For example, a certain society, like that of the aboriginal Bhils or certain groups closed in the interior of Africa, which must devote all its working time to covering its most rudimentary needs, will consume all its produce as rapidly as new products are produced. If half the year it gathers mulberries and half the year it spins on a takli it will have spent its old mulberries, by the time it has spun some cotton for itself, and by the time it gathers new, it has worn out its takli product and must spin again and so on. This society will remain at the same low level of existence.

(11) Technology, the material measure of progress.

But if by reason of machinery and tools, the same quantity of necessary produce is obtained in half the time, that society will get time to devote the saving in time to "culture" or obtaining other useful products. Society will grow. So the growth of society depends on the productivity of social labour. It means the relation between the quantity of product obtained and the quantity of labour expended. Obviously the productivity of labour is precise measure of the 'balance' between society and nature. The expenditure of labour consists of two components; the labour that is crystallised and transferred into instruments of production and the "living labour" i.e. direct expenditure of working energy. The material factors of the productivity of labour as a quantity are the quantity of

products obtained; second, the quantity of instrument of production; the third, the quantity of the productive forces, i.e. living workers. All these taken together become "the material productive forces of society." If in the case of a certain society we know what kinds of instruments it controls and how many, what kinds of workers and how many, we shall also know the productivity of social labour and what will be the degree to which that society has conquered nature. For example if we know that a Sabarmati-Ashram-Society on an all-India scale requires a hundred million taklis with hundred million spinners to provide the necessary yarn for cloth working at 12 hours a day and side by side with it Soviet Indian requires with ten million spindles with 20,000 spinners working at 7 hours a day only, it can give us a precise material measure for the stage attained by them in the conquest of nature and social evolution.

In trying to change nature with the help of instruments of production (which also determine the distribution and consumption) man changes himself also. If the handloom is evolved into a power loom the handicraftsman will vanish and the skilled powerloom weaver will come into existence. Motors will produce motor-drivers. Thus instruments and persons are not merely aggregates but they stand in deep interconnection, in a system, all persons and things standing in a definite relation to each other. This technology

of society is the material indicator of the relation between society and nature. It is the fundamental characteristic which differentiates one social group from another.

For example, the Moghul Emperor Aurangzeb in the days when printing was not known, used to copy the Kuran in handwriting and sell it, which was prevalent mode of producing books. It took days to make one copy and cost one guinea. Today, the same copy is produced on the lithograph by a thousand per hour costing a few annas. Technology has advanced and indicates our higher stage of evolution.

(12) Instruments determine ideas and classes - Their lay out - they produce a working class after their own image.

The instruments of labour not only determine the type of labour; they also produce a system of ideas. Human beings are not like tools. They think. But this thinking is also governed by technology and the consequent social structure following from it. The elements in society would therefore be (1) things (2) persons (3) ideas. These elements stand in definite relation to each other. Everyone knows that the instruments of production do not stand merely in certain places but in a certain order. At any given moment if we study society functioning, we can find this easily. For example, the textile ~~mills~~ mills in Bombay and their looms and spindles are arranged in a definite order,

in a definite proportion, so many carding machines for so many spindles, so many spindles for so many looms. Then again mills have a definite relation of the coal or electricity they consume, the cotton they require, the iron and steel factories they want for meeting their needs of machinery. The relation inside a single factory is fixed. But the relation between one branch of technology, say like textiles and another, say production of cotton, in the unorganised capitalist society, depends on blind forces while in an organised socialist system it depends on conscious direction of forces. But still a relation does exist in all society. This relation between different branches of social production and their proportions, also determine the structure of human relations of that society. For example, we take textiles. In the feudal days, when manufacture of cloth was done by spinning on charkha and weaving on wooden handlooms, the nature of technology determined the order of human relations. Cotton was produced in small patches on village lands, ginned and carded in the cottages and distributed to spinners. The spinners' product was either woven in the same family or given to the village weavers. What was the structure arising from this? There would not be a Central Cotton Committee as we have today in India presided over by a cotton magnate. There could not be a Cotton Exchange because no cotton came to the market operating on an international scale. There

could not be mill-owners owning millions of spindles as millions of spindles could not be fixed in a steel-frame running a thousand spindles at a time and making the instrument so costly and so efficient that necessarily the village spinners could not buy it nor could compete with it. There were of necessity small cotton patches, cottage spinners and weavers unconnected by any market on a large scale and not subject to a factory system. Similarly in the case of building. The Moghuls could build the beautiful Taj Mahal. Capitalist technique today can produce a like one or even a better one. But the Taj Mahal remains a wonder. To whom? To the villager because it is so magnificent. But for the modern men, the men of cities like London and New York, it is also a wonder. Their wonder consists in the question, how could the technique of those days produce such a structure? A large part of the wonder consists not in what thing is produced but how it is produced. The Moghul Emperor took five years and 20,000 to produce it. The technology of the time required hundreds of separate artisans, employed thousands of slaves to chisel out the masonry and raise it in months and months. But modern technology would cut the stone with huge electric iron saws, raise it with cranes, get the whole thing planned by delicate instruments and finish the job with a few hundred skilled workers in a few months. The two technologies produce two different labour relations,

types of labourers and the order in which they stand to each other. Slaves are incompatible with delicate machinery. The technique determines the organisation of labour, in the productive process. The poor technology of ancient times produced things on small scale resulting in a poor exchange process. The economy remained mostly economy in kind. Modern technology makes it possible for a Capitalist manufacturer to produce, say, shoes by thousands. As he cannot wear them all, he throws them on the market. He produces "commodities" which is a consequence of the change in technology.

In the nationalist literature of India today we find often a reference to the fact that India produced fine muslins in ancient days. The thumb-cutting of Dacca weavers is a famous example which millions of orators today use to illustrate the ruthless suppression of Indian industry by Lancashire. They say that if violence had not been used against these weavers they would have competed against the finest of Lancashire cloths. There is no doubt about the fact that Dacca weavers produced fine goods and that they were forcibly suppressed. But that does not alter the fact that the social technology of India of those times was poorer than that of Lancashire or India today. As is said above the question is not what things were produced but how they were produced, which shows the stage of social evolution. Dacca muslin of 110 counts requires a weaver to

cultivate a peculiar kind of nails and dexterity of fingers over long years. The social time necessary to produce ten yards of that muslin was several hundred times more than what the modern spindles and looms will require. A saving in social expenditure of energy on the same product caused by the two different techniques constitutes our advance. Even the violent suppression and conquest of India was due to the higher technology of Britain, and we would be unfair to the British bourgeoisie if we were not to mention the fact that it suppressed the British weavers also as ruthlessly as it suppressed the Indian.

(13) Instruments distribute men.

If we observe the relations of men in the productive process we find that the groupings of men are not accomplished in such a manner as to cause the various groups to lie in a horizontal line, but rather in a vertical line. For example in the conditions of serfdom of the ancient Hindu caste system we find at the top the owners of the estates, sharing their power with the theological autocracy which at the beginning had an economic content. Then we find ministers, petty merchants and at the bottom the peasants; all of them again standing over the heads of the aboriginals, jungle-cleaners and marshy place cleaners, the vanguard of the colonising groups of Kshatriyas. In capitalist production relations, men are not only distributed as machinists, railwaymen, textile workers etc, all

of whom in spite of great difference between their tasks are working along the same line occupying the same relative station in production. But above them we find overseers, master mechanics "salaried employees", then the agents, managers, owners and capitalists. So we find differently constituted relations between persons at work. All of them participated in the labour process. In classifying we may do so by trade or calling and also according to classes. On the basis of occupations we shall have smiths, carpenters, weavers etc. Then in the higher class we shall have supervisors, engineers, jobbers etc. It is quite obvious that the smith, the fitter or the weaver are in a class different from that of the engineer, the supervisor or the jobber. And distinct from them all is the Capitalist, who has control of all. In spite of the difference in work of the members of the first category they all stand in the same relation in the labour process. But their relation to the Capitalist is quite different. The greatest differences here are in the productive function, in the significance of each in the productive process.

I.H.K.

27/10/31 (Evening Part II).

The capitalist in his factory distributes and arranges his workers just as he might his tools and machines; but in the Capitalist system, the workers can not distribute the capitalist. This is a relation of "master and servant with Capital in command". The basis of division of men into different social classes lies in thier different function in the productive process.

(14) Distribution of Capital determines distribution of products.

The process of distribution is governed by the process of production. The former is not independent of the latter. As I have already said, in modern technology, each establishment produces a special product and its distribution takes the form of exchange. The manner of production determines the manner of distribution of its products. But in the process of production itself are involved two "distributions", firstly the distribution of persons in the process and secondly, the distribution of tools amongst these persons. The varying distribution of persons as we have seen is again connected with the distribution of the means of labour. The capitalist and the landlord control the means of labour, factory, land etc; while the worker has no instruments of labour apart from his labour power. The

slaves and peasant serfs - like Dublas in Gujarat - do not own even their bodies. It is therefore obvious that the varying function of classes in production is based on the distribution of instruments of production among them. Engels says, "Economy deals not with things but with relations between persons and in the last analysis between classes; but these relations are always bound up with things and appear as things. For example, the current class relations in capitalist society, namely the relations between capitalists and workers are bound with a thing, the instruments of production owned, controlled and used to obtain profits for the former. These instruments, like the mills in Bombay, are not merely for producing cloth. They also have a special, social significance. They are instruments of exploiting wage labourers. The capitalist obtains profits because he owns the means of production which ultimately means Capital. Thus the distribution of the means of production determines the distribution of the products. The owner of the means of producing cloth has all of it while to the share of the worker falls little of it. It is these class relations which determine in the first place the outline of society, its economic structure.

In a complicated society like the modern, the relations of production and consequently of distribution are very complicated and interwoven. But the fundamental scheme of all is the relation between the great groups known as

Social Classes. The system of society will depend on the classes included in society, their mutual position, their functions in the productive forces, the distribution of the instruments of labour. We have a capitalist society if the capitalist is on top; a slave system if the slave owner is on top and in control of every thing; and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat if the workers are on top.

(15) Change in technology changes social structure

The form of social classes depends on production relations, which in turn depend on the technology of society. So if technology changes, the social classes also must change. Fifty years ago in India large scale production was unknown. The means of production had not advanced beyond simple tools which depended on the skilful use of the workers who wielded them. As the instrument of production was subject to the skill of the worker, production was scattered, and technique could not give birth to large scale production concentrated in a factory and consequently to the class of proletarians of modern capitalist society. With the change in technique the artisan class is being destroyed and a proletariat is in the process of formation. The merchant guild master is vanishing and is being replaced by the modern banks and capitalists. Class relations change with the changes in the productive forces. "These social relations between the producers and the conditions under

which they exchange their activities and share in the total act of production, will naturally vary according to the character of production. With the discovery of a new instrument of warfare, the firearms, the whole internal organisation of the army was necessarily altered, the relations within which individuals composed an army and can work as an army were transformed, and the relation of different armies to one another was likewise changed. We thus see that social relations within which individuals produce, the social relations of production, are altered, transformed with the change and development of the material means of production, of the forces of production". (Karl Marx "Wage Labour and Capital"). This in other words is the proposition which I have already quoted. The totality of production relations is the economic structure of society or its mode of production.

(16) The Superstructure - State, religion, art etc.

The question then arises - are the other phases of social life a product of these production relations or are they an independent growth? These other phases are of a varied character, some of them appearing to be so far removed from a direct relation with the economic structure of society that they take up an appearance of an independent growth. But Marxism states that all the social, political and cultural aspects including religion art manners, customs, philosophy etc, are conditioned by the economic

structure of society.

In the modern Imperialist epoch it requires very little argument to prove that the State conforms to the economic structure. In capitalist society, the capitalists control means of production, naturally they control the State also. The fusion of the activities of the great banks and trusts with the actions of the State is so naked since the world war, the governors of big metropolitan banks controlling currencies and economic operations of several States at a time illustrates the fusion to such an extent, that none now can sensibly challenge the proposition that the State is controlled by that class which is dominant in economy - today the bourgeoisie.

Religion is one of the phases of social life that is supposed to be independent of the economic structure. But in this case, the example of the ancient Hindu States will prove our proposition. In the ancient Hindu States and in fact in all medieval States, religion and its theological heirarchy was completely identified with the State, which was controlled by the dominant class in economy, the land owners, slave owners and barons. Naturally all the actions of the dominant class which were also the actions of the State found sanction in the religion of the time. An excellent example of this is the Law of Manu. In a clear cut manner and quite ruthlessly he prescribes the law, religion, customs and morality once as applicable to the

dominant class or caste (which at that time were interchangeable categories and not rigid and devoid of their economic content as today) and then as applicable to the suppressed class of peasants, serfs or slaves. He frankly says that unless it was so the suppressed class would become dominant and try to alter the relative position of the classes in social life (including the economic) causing a great "disaster". These social standards of the dominant class were to be forced on the subject class by force and violence and the king who would fail to do it would be dethroned by the dominant class. The State, law, morality, religion, all conform to the needs of the dominant class in the economic structure of society. They abide so long as they are necessary to maintain a certain equilibrium between the contradictory class interests in the structure. It is on the basis of the economic condition that they are evolved and with it they change and disappear. This is formulated by Karl Marx in another place thus :- "In the social production of their lives, men enter into specific necessary relations, independent of their wills, production relations, which correspond to a certain specific stage in the evolution of their material productive forces. The totality of these production relations constitutes the economic structure of society, the real basis over which there arises a legal and political super-structure and to which there correspond specific social forms of consciousness.

The mode of production of material life conditions the social political and mental life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary their social being that determines their consciousness." (Critique of Political Economy: quoted by Bukharin in Historical Materialism).

[italics)

(17) Ideology

This super-structure consists of various human organisations, vague non-coordinated thoughts and feelings and an "ideology". Generally we find several vague thoughts, ordinary feelings common to a whole society, which may be called social psychology. The social psychology involves two principal elements. First there are general psychological traits found in all classes of a given society; because the situation of those classes may have certain common elements in spite of class differences. For example in the feudal times a common trait is submission to authority, routine and traditional practices. The peasant serf is ruled by the lord. Yet, he also has got the same trait and in his turn expects submission from his family. Both enjoy unlimited authority, one on his estate and the other in his family. That trait begins to disappear in the city life of a worker, which breaks the family and consequently the authority of the "head of the family". Hence the psychology of the old men of the countryside conflicts

with that of the younger sons from the city, and in despair, they wail "it is the power of Kali Yuga" !

The second element is class psychology which is produced by the aggregate conditions in which the class is stationed in the economic and socio-political environment. Class psychology assumes very intricate forms and does not many a time lend itself to a direct interpretation through its economic content. It can always be explained by the concrete environment of the specific class. Besides this there are vocational types of psychology also; viz. that of the lawyers and the jurists. All law and jurisprudence have a solid economic content yet to a jurist the law appears to be every thing and many a time, a whole lot of them, due to their vocational psychology which shuts them up within the wheels of law and its own logic, develop theories or view points which may conflict seriously with the existing property relations. In such cases the correcting agency of the State steps in and the "rulings" that conflict in such a glaring manner are set aside by legislation.

A systematised class psychology becomes ideology. For example, in the early stages, the workers' discontent against the capitalist order is a vague general dissatisfaction. It is not ideology. Later however the vague tendency to have some other system becomes definitely formulated.

A set of demands, programme or platform arises, a definite "ideal" begins to appear. Hence we get an ideology. We often hear of ideological deviations and corrections. Because as Engels says, "Ideology is simply occupying oneself with thoughts as with independent entities developing independently subject only to their own laws." Naturally a correction of them is to expose their conflict with their fundamental basis - the economic content of their class.

D/28.10.31

Evening 1st Part.

(18) Economy and other factors of social life - their relative importance - the view of the Indian bourgeoisie.

The insistence that is laid so long upon economy does not mean that it is the only true element while all others are vague mists. The theory of historical materialism does not deny the importance of the superstructure but explains it. It does not consider the various factors of the structure from the point of their unequal value; whether literature is more important than science, or science more than politics. Such a gradation of the relative importance is dangerous. The trigger is as important as the barrel in a rifle. But certainly economy is more important than dancing. But we reject considering the scales of importance of these 'factors'. They are not independent factors as such at all but the whole is synthesis, all the elements being necessary to maintain the equilibrium and continuity of society; at the same time all these elements are conditioned by the material productive forces of society.

It has been necessary here to show that the fundamental basis of all society is its economic structure because in India today in the political and cultural movements, the champions of those movements consider that their particular movement is conditioned by the causation of its own

ideological system and it is unconnected with any other basis. As already pointed out this is always the case when people try to deal only with the superstructure and do not know the real basis. For example, the liberal bourgeoisie in India says, "It would accept everything that is best in British culture." The petty bourgeoisie revolts and says that India has her own culture and we shall have nothing from the British culture. Such statements come from two purely isolated fights between two ideological schools. But as we have seen above these attitudes follow necessarily from the production relations of the class, to which the contending sections belong, in the production forces of Indian society. The liberal bourgeoisie being completely interlocked in Industry, Banking, Government posts etc. with the British bourgeoisie it has made its own the British culture which in its turn is the culture of the industrial bourgeoisie. But the case with the Indian petty bourgeoisie is different. It is not yet organically fused with the liberal bourgeoisie. It still depends on petty trading of village products, on petty farming rents which are threatened by the British expropriators. A large section is still governed in its life more by the customs and laws of Manu than the ideology of Mill and Bentham. A section it, drawn from the families of the feudal landholders expects to see the return of the "old glorious times." Therefore, it thinks

India has a special culture, which means a specific type of feudal culture, which is not yet completely destroyed because its basis the feudal productive forces are yet dominant to a large extent.

Not knowing historical materialism of Marx, the scholars of the Indian bourgeoisie run hither and thither to explain these "special cultures" and "special messages" of India. The various "popular parties" not based on the scientific historical materialism of Marx are easily deluded into thinking that the ills of India can be cured by simple readjustment in the superstructure of the State, law etc. Even a great scientist like Sir C. V. Raman proposed that if Government were to give him ten lakhs of rupees to establish experimental laboratories for research and training in industrial Chemistry, the ills of India's Industry would be cured. This was a glaring example of Engels' definition of ideology as being simply "the occupying oneself with thoughts as with independent entities developing independently, subject only to their own laws." The expert forgot that industrial Chemistry does not arise unless there is first a modicum of Industry as a basis for it, unless there is a certain accumulation of Capital in the hands of the bourgeoisie and the State power is in harmony with the development of the productive forces of the country.

The thorough grasp of historical materialism is therefore absolutely necessary to show that the present clashes in politics, in culture, in education etc are disturbances in the superstructure of society caused by the disturbance of the equilibrium in the productive forces and production relations of the classes of our society, some on world scale and some limited to the Indian field. When this is accepted it naturally follows that the political and cultural warfare is not all in all and no "compromise" or "understanding" in the field of the superstructure; viz. a conversion of reserved subjects into transferred, a free distribution of the copies of Gita instead of the Bible, appointment of Indian Governors and Legislators instead of the British, will restore the equilibrium unless there is a readjustment or revolution in the production relations, the property relations of the social classes. Therefore, it is that the statute of the International Workmen's Association which comprised the vanguard of the Proletariat, says, that "The economic emancipation of the working class is therefore the great aim to which every political movement must be subordinated." At the same time it is necessary to give a warning here that this is not to be understood in the sense that the movement in the field of Economy alone is important. That leads to the deviation of "Economism" and ultimately "welfare-work-reformism" which neglects the political

task of the working class. The economic emancipation is the fundamental aim. But politics as a means to achieve it is the most important and the first and supreme weapon in the achievement of that aim.

(19) Marxism is concerned with changing the basis of economy, not merely the superstructure.

We know from History that revolutions have occurred, as recently as 14 years ago and that revolutionary upheavals have been going on almost in every country of the world since the close of the Imperialist world war. What has been the outcome of the victorious revolutions? Firstly a different political power. Secondly, a different place of classes in the process of production, different distribution of the instruments of production. Why? We know that all the means of human life are procured with the aid of these instruments. Through the long process of history into the details of which we cannot go here, the distribution of these products takes place according to the distribution of the means of production among the social classes. As the ownership of the means of production is in the hands of the capitalist class or the feudal class the largest share of the products is appropriated by this class. So long as this accumulation of social necessities into the hands of a class does not become a complete hindrance on further production the discontent

of the actual producing class, the workers and peasants, does not take the form of a violent conflict. But so soon as a further development becomes impossible the conflict breaks out in a violent class war. As the dominating class fortifies its economic powers through the State, in the final analysis, the highest form of action of class war is a political revolution, the capture of the State power. "Politics is the concentrated expression of economy", but not every conflict between the productive forces and production relations results in a revolution of this type. Bourgeois writers of History depict every change of a king or constitution as a revolution. Every street rising leading to a displacement of one party by another is called by it a revolution. But that is not the kind of revolution which is aimed at by Communists. A dethronement of the present monarchy by the present Labour Party or the Liberals may not mean a revolution at all, so long as the present property relations between, say, the miners and the mine owners, remain the same. The mere disappearance of King Alfonso from the throne of Spain is not what we might call a revolution. Because it does not alter the relative position of the social classes in production and the consequent appropriation of the products. The working class continues to produce surplus values for the dominant bourgeoisie. Thus

a change in the personnel of the bureaucratic system of the State or the change from monarchy to Republic or from one bourgeoisie to another since it does not affect the fundamental character of the production relations, is not a revolution. Such changes have their importance in so far as they are attempts to lessen the intensity of the contradictions and bring about a readjustment of the equilibrium with us the same socio-economic structure. For example, the Chartist Movement in England threatened a revolution, against the bourgeois order but did not develop into one because the forces of production had not exhausted all their possibilities of growth. The discovery of mines and new regions and a consequent migration of the discontented labour force reduced the pressure of the contradiction; the productive forces developed still further. It was an adjustment within the same socio-economic structure. "The cause of revolutions is the conflict between the productive forces and production relations as solidified in the political organisation of the ruling class. These production relations are so emphatic a break on the evolution of the productive forces that they simply must be broken up if society is to continue to develop. If they cannot be burst asunder they will prevent and stifle the unfolding of the productive forces and the entire society will become stagnant or retrogressive, that is it will enter upon a period of decay."

The signs of the revolutionary upheaval begin to appear first in the ideological change of the oppressed class, which is ripening for a revolution. The ripening of the bourgeois French Revolution first found expression in the philosophers of the revolution, in the new ideas about State, democracy, Reason etc. The next step was the political seizure of the State apparatus and thirdly re-arrangement of economy. The feudal barons were destroyed and the bourgeoisie controlled the State, developing the productive forces on capitalist lines whose growth was hindered by the feudal order, by its tithes and taxes tying down the serfs to the land and thus depriving the growing industrial workshops of a free supply of labour.

(20) Dialectics

This in short is the Marxist method of reading history. This is what is called the materialistic interpretation of history or historical materialism. It should be noted that this is not identical with materialism as popularly understood or misunderstood. This method views society in dialectical motion and not as a static permanent thing. Such a viewpoint is opposed by the bourgeoisie in the present period though the method of dialectics was evolved in its essence by a bourgeois philosopher, Hegel. It is opposed because the bourgeoisie wants to tell the revolutionary proletariat that a capitalist system is a permanent and immutable state. Dialectics in essence is

revolutionary as it measures progress by the development of contradictions, resulting in a higher form of motion. It views, when applied to History, the feudal order as a higher form than the primitive one; the bourgeois economy or social order as a higher form than the feudal whose contradiction it is. But the bourgeoisie wants to stop here. While the Marxists proceed and state that the same dialectical motion of society shows that the socialist order is a higher form than the bourgeois and the highest because it will have no class contradictions at all. Historical materialism is this law as applied to social growth and explains the past and enlightens and moulds the future.

(21) Causes of the conquest of India as given by the Maratha historians - they are not causes but the description of symptoms and after effects.

The History of the conquest of India by the British bourgeoisie is represented in many fantastic colours by the historians, whether of the Indian bourgeoisie or the British. Prominent writers like Mr. N. C. Kelkar and Mr. V.V. Khare attribute the failure of the Indians (and the Marattas especially, because it was with them that the last decisive fights were waged by the invaders) to put up a proper resistance mainly to the following causes:-

- (1) General absence of the feeling of nationalism.
- (2) Absence of a habit of cooperative working.

(3) Absence of an institutional life, with its accompaniment of elective principles.

(4) Absence of superior weapons of war.

Mr. Rajwade, the most brilliant research scholar of Indian and Hindu history and of sociology in one of his articles finds the cause of British victory in the superior weapons of war of the British. British historians very rarely speak seriously of the whole thing and say that the British won because the Indians lost! But both sets of reasons are shallow and unable to explain why the Indians had not those four attributes in the same period in which the British had then. Others would not like to admit the first three reasons but would content themselves by saying that it was a huge military bungle on the part of Indians.

We say that all these reasons are merely symptoms, a description of the superstructure of the social groups in India of that time but do not explain anything. The conquest of India by Britain was a conquest of Indian feudalism by the forces of the British bourgeoisie, and it was an inevitable happening because everywhere the feudal order has always succumbed before the new superior order of bourgeois industry. The four reasons shown above were not characteristic of India as such but generally of all feudal systems, because they are the outcome of feudal economy. The characteristics of feudal economy are that production is carried on in isolated scattered farms by a

peasantry, which is personally bound to the feudal lords who appropriate the whole surplus produce, according as they like. Production of other necessities is carried on on small scale in homes or small workshops with handicraft tools and as the productivity of labour is not great, very little of market relations prevail. A hereditary bureaucracy, stagnant life, wealth and ease for the dominant class and complete subjection including personal subjection of the vast peasantry, isolated production, such are a few of the characteristics. Isolated handicraft production is quite the reverse of modern factory production which is based on a cooperative principle i.e. each process in production and naturally the worker depending on another process. There is an active exchange of goods on the market in bourgeois economy which is lacking in the feudal. There is absence of a contact in the latter. Hence the absence of any active feeling of "nationalism". Nationalism is a bye-product of the bourgeois structure of economy. Constitutional working is also a product of the new productive forces. The new technology requires the pooling of capital of millions of persons, which necessarily introduces a constitutional working and is incompatible with absolute autocracy and the purely personal power of the feudal nobility.

I.H.K.

28/10/31 (Evening Part II).

Lastly we come to the weapons of war. The weapons used by the British were, in the later period, used by the Indian feudal nobility also, when it came in contact with the French and British armies. There is evidence of a gun factory at Agra and of ordnance batteries in the Marhatta armies but where was the basis of production, of the technique that would supply them continuously? It requires a certain amount of iron and steel industry, of the requisite fuel supply, which can develop only in conditions where the means of production have advanced to a stage of swift turn over, with an economical expenditure of energy with the aid of advanced instruments. In the absence of steel and mining industries the Indian army could not be equipped with a continuous supply of weapons used by their opponents. A technology that imports steel for its swords from Turkey could not be expected to produce a continuous supply of a phalanx of batteries!

(22) Why Indian peasantry first fought against Moghal feudalism and then became cold - class oppression restored by their Marhatta feudal leaders.

Moreover the Indian peasantry was not interested in fighting for its feudal nobility and no where has the peasantry done so. There is a class contradiction between

the feudal class and the peasantry. As producers on the soil they create wealth which is appropriated by the feudal lords because they own the means of production - the land; and have fortified their power through the State and the clergy. The class war of the peasantry in Europe was fought in many a peasant wars, one of which has been brilliantly studied and depicted by Engels in his "Peasant War in Germany" (Ext. P 1183 - D.407). In the ancient history of every country there are records of attempts of the oppressed class to end the unequal division of wealth. In India one of the biggest upheavals of this kind was, in my opinion, the Buddhist Revolution. But in the latest period of feudal India, the flaring up of an unmixed class war was to a certain extent prevented by the invasions of Muslim feudalism. The Hindu feudal lords succeeded in working up the religious feelings of the peasantry, which was led to believe that a fight with those invaders would improve their condition. The class struggle was canalised into a religious struggle, which in fact was a struggle between two feudal groups, each of which exploited its own peasantry for its own class interests. But after each such struggle, the peasantry found that its condition remained just the same. The great revolt of the peasantry which had intensified during the twelve years' famine of the fourteenth century, and which at last took the form of a religious movement of reformation under the leadership of

the "saints", who had been harassed by the theological hierarchy or were ruined petty merchants of the city (like Tukaram) was also canalised into an impotent wailing against stone walls or a fight against the Mohammedan barons. Still, it retained its peasant character till the organised risings and successes of Shivaji. The forces of this popular hero of the present nationalists and Hindus of the Deccan were mostly led by the rank and file peasants, which left its traces on the administration also. One of the most significant characteristics of this was the attempt made to discontinue hereditary services and grants of land. But after the successes, when the old feudal elements entered his forces, the movement deteriorated. In the Third Reign, when the leaders of the rank and file peasants who had fought were themselves created feudal lords and hereditary grants of land etc. were introduced; the peasantry became again apathetic. The same old stagnant life, galvanised into activity only where famine lashed it into invasions, the same old surrender of wealth to the parasitic class was restored. The ideological discontent could not mature in any class demand, aiming at a change in the distribution of the means of production, because no new forms of economy had been generated within the womb of the old. The ideology and political superstructure had to conform to the productive forces, the technology of their time. There was no new invention, no

advance in technology; therefore the repetition of the old production relation, or reproduction of the old contradictions and stagnation could be the only result, though accompanied by a little shifting of some groups but always within the same socio-economic structure.

(23) The work of the British bourgeoisie -
overthrow of feudalism.

It was quite a different case with the British at this time. When the Moghul feudal nobility was invading India, the German peasantry had fought out an unsuccessful class war with its nobility, which was helped in the ruthless suppression of the peasantry by the traitor Martin Luther, who in history is painted as a saint of a reformed religion but in reality was the leader and exponent of the ideology of the new mercantile bourgeoisie. When Jehangir was trying to speed up feudal justice by a chain of golden bells (a fine symbol for Justice indeed!), the British bourgeoisie had fought out one revolution and beheaded its feudal king, thus removing the feudal fetters on its economic development in the towns. By a series of historical and natural circumstances, Europe had moved out a bit and had possessed the mobile gold and silver resources of America which were profitably turned into mercantile Capital, expanding production, and creating new instruments of production etc. When the two warring feudal groups in

India were entering a peace pact and partnership guaranteeing their respective rights and share of exploitation of the peasantry, the British mercantile bourgeoisie, though weak, was forging ahead and assuming the new capitalist form of a Company. Feudal India was being opposed not by a feudal king but by the East India Company. That alone sums up the relative position of both, in the development of the productive forces. The new productive forces ripened within the womb of feudal economy but the production relations, the property relations, which were in favour of and under the control of the feudal nobility would not allow them to grow unless they yielded the surplus product to them just as they appropriated the surplus values produced by the serfs. For example one bale of cotton to pass from the field of one noble, where it was produced, to the workshop in the town, if the states of twenty nobles intervened, had to pay twenty tolls, which naturally hindered the growth of production and led to conflicts. Those fetters were removed by the overthrow of feudal power by the bourgeoisie, with the help of the peasantry which also was the enemy of feudalism. When we were here forming confederacies of barons, Britain had carried out the two bourgeois revolutions of 1648 and 1689 which curtailed the power of the land owning bourgeoisie and France had carried out a thorough destruction of all

relics of the old order in the prolonged and ruthless revolutionary struggle of 1789-93.

(24) The bourgeois revolution of 1793 - the role of the peasantry.

School textbooks of the bourgeoisie in all countries suppress the revolutionary role of the peasantry, in the these revolutions and their subsequent betrayal by the bourgeoisie. The bourgeois revolutions of the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries were the joint attacks of the peasantry and the town petty bourgeoisie against the feudal order, under the leadership of the bourgeoisie. The peasantry had tried single-handed to rise against feudalism but had been mowed down by the nobility whose rights and unlimited privileges over the peasant serf, including his wife and daughters, were threatened. The peasantry was incapable alone to lead the struggle because it was under the influence of the clergy which was an ally of the nobility; it was isolated and scattered and therefore could not make concerted attacks like the nobility; its demands were not consciously revolutionary. They only asked for less exploitation and not abolition of exploitation. There was no considerable town proletariat to give them lead. With the rise of the bourgeoisie the position changed. The feudal fetters on bourgeois production had to be broken but alone the bourgeoisie was not capable of accomplishing this. It allied itself with the peasantry. The greatest

and most thorough bourgeois revolution was that of 1793. All the literature on which we are fed by the bourgeoisie about this period paints it as the struggle for the splendid ideas of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, propounded by the French philosophers. But these are merely the ideological expressions of the real conflict of the bourgeois productive forces against the feudal production relations, which kept the bourgeois forces under "fetters, inequality and class untouchability..." Bourgeois historians also suppress the role of the peasantry, which has been brought to light by the Marxist writers in its true significance. I shall give only a short picture of the part played by the peasantry.

The revolutionary action of the peasantry commenced in the beginning of 1789 when France was only just making preparations for the Election of the States General. Already at that time the peasants had refused to carry out various services imposed upon them by the landlords. The movement grew still larger in the summer of 1789. The vanguard of the movement was the village Poir. The peasantry formed detachments with whatever weapons came to hand, marched to the castles of the nobles and demanded the surrender of all the deeds and documents upon which the feudal landlords based their claims to exploit the peasantry. If these documents were handed over they were immediately burnt. If the landlord refused the peasants

attacked the castle and burnt it to the ground, sometimes massacring the owners. According to the historian Taine, during the four months preceding the capture of the Bastille, there were four hundred peasant outbreaks of this kind. While the bourgeoisie was opposed to feudal property, it was a fanatical worshipper of its own property; but feudal property is also a form of private property and had it become the fashion to treat feudal property with disrespect, the danger would have arisen on bourgeois property being treated with the same disrespect later on. For that reason the bourgeoisie were displeased at first with the revolutionary conduct of the peasantry (just as the Indian Congress is here displeased). The Deputies of the National Assembly began to complain, "property of every kind is being subjected to most outrageous plunder. Every where castles are being burnt down, monasteries are being destroyed, estates are being plundered. The law is powerless, the authority of the courts no longer exists." Hence a section of the National Assembly proposed that these acts of violence be condemned and the peasants should be told that this kind of conduct was against the law and they must wait patiently for what the National Assembly would do for them (almost the appeals issued by the Congress in India asking the United Provinces peasantry to wait patiently for the Round Table Conference and abide by the Gandhi-Irwin Pact!).

But the peasant movement developed so rapidly that it was hopeless to believe that it could be stemmed with promises. Moreover the bourgeoisie dared not repel the peasantry (unlike that in India) and the revolutionary conduct of the peasantry forced the landlords to make some concessions. On August 11, 1789, the National Assembly abolished feudal regulations. But it would not abolish feudal rights. For that they wanted compensation. This did not satisfy the peasantry. Then the Constituent Assembly again took up the question and tried some reforms, which kept in a large measure the rights of the aristocratic land owners. They fixed the compensation at 2½ billion francs. The peasants of the Department of the Loire-Et-Garonne wrote to the Assembly, "You proclaimed the abolition of the feudal regime but in fact you have done the very opposite, for we shall always have to call those whom we have hitherto rendered service, our seigneurs, for we shall never be able to pay the compensation you have fixed." The peasant revolt became more intense and the nobility also refused to make any concessions to the bourgeoisie. The result was that the Assembly confiscated property of the Emigre aristocrats which was also a half-hearted measure. Only when power at last passed into the hand of the real revolutionary petty bourgeois - Jacobin Party did the Convention repeal the half-hearted measures of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies. On July 17,

1793, the Convention abolished all feudal rights and services. A Decree on June 10th, restored all the common lands to the peasantry and permitted them to be distributed which was in the interests of the small and middle peasants.

The characteristic feature of the whole course of the Great French Revolution was that in its fight against the nobility and the survivals of feudalism, the bourgeoisie succeeded in rallying the masses of the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the rising proletariat. The bourgeoisie succeeded in taking the lead, in securing the hegemony of the revolutionary movement and directing it in accordance with its own interests. Very unwillingly and only under the pressure did the bourgeoisie make any concessions to the peasantry. It directed the revolution along the path that corresponded to its interests and turned all the gains of the revolution in its own favour. It was only the prolonged character of the revolution that permitted the peasantry to display its revolutionary energy, deliver heavy blows against its old enemy, the big aristocratic land owners and convert France into a country of small proprietors.

D/29.10.31

Evening 1st Part.

The mighty campaigns of Napoleon rested on the peasantry as the basis of the armies and the new bourgeois economy and technique supplied the heavy artillery. Napoleon was the genius of the bourgeoisie working with the strength of the revolutionary peasantry, whose newly won lands were in danger, if the expelled feudalism were to succeed in restoring its rule. (References P 1186).

In Germany and Austria the situation was the worst. In these countries the revolutions of 1848 owing to their relatively short duration did not give the peasantry the opportunity to exert that pressure which was done by the French peasantry in 1789. Though some of the feudal relations were swept away, the land owners succeeded in retaining many of their privileges and large estates even till 1918. And when during the world war, the German bourgeoisie called on these interests to make sacrifices, they refused. The cleavage was one of the reasons of the failure of German-Austrian Imperialisms against Allied Imperialism, which was not suffering from such a drawback. Thus in all the three bourgeois revolutions the peasantry comprised the fighting armies and it is the peasant class which became ruined after the success of these revolutions, as an inevitable economic consequence of the victory. One hundred years after the victory of Cromwell, the British

Yeomen had completely disappeared, although it was due entirely to the intervention of the Yeomen and the plebeian elements of the towns that final victory was won and Charles I brought to the scaffold. The result of the revolutionary struggle of the peasantry allied with the bourgeoisie was the victory of the bourgeoisie - the establishment of the domination of Capital in place of the domination of feudalism.

An excellent study of the ideological expression of the bourgeois revolutions, the projecting of bourgeois production needs into the domain of the religious and philosophical field, can be found in Engels' "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific" and "Feurbach" which are available in English translations.

After the overthrow of the feudal regime, the peasantry took to peaceful farming. The appropriation of the whole of its surplus by the nobility being removed for a time, it was allowed to improve its position. The bourgeoisie took to capitalist manufacture on an expanding scale with the basis of the new peasant proprietors as their home market. During the 19th century, the brunt of exploitation fell on the working class and whenever it tried to rise against the bourgeoisie, it was either not supported by the peasantry or actively opposed by it, because it was through the bourgeoisie that the peasantry had received its lands and emancipation from feudal oppression.

(25) Productive forces developed and changed society
but did not abolish classes - crises begin.

The development of productive forces under the new production relations was helped by the inventions of the 18th and 19th centuries. These inventions increased the productivity of labour, that is it also increased the surplus values yielded by them. For example, if with the old means of production, a worker in a guildshop or cottage produced a hundred units of a useful product and received 80 units back as the necessary minimum for the replacement of his exerted labour power, the worker with the new means of production produced one thousand units in the same time and received 80 or 100 units back - thus leaving 900 units surplus to the owner of the means of production, whereas before he could leave only 20. The rate of surplus value, that is the rate of exploitation, increased, leading to a rapid accumulation of wealth in the hands of the bourgeoisie, which centralised and concentrated it leading to even more expansion of production of commodities. When the production of commodities expanded beyond the capacity of home markets, the export of manufactured goods began and with it was felt the necessity of foreign markets and colonies. It is to these mighty efficient expanding claws of the productive forces of bourgeois economy, bourgeois interest, that Indian feudalism

and peasantry fell a victim. It became a "colony", a market. The iron forges of the British bourgeoisie had seized the golden bells of Indian feudalism and converted them into a mobile gold currency for its commodity circulation. Marx in his Manifesto summarises the results thus:-

"We see then : the means of production and of exchange on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself up were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged the feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one word, the feudal relations of property, became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they were so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder. In their place stepped free competition accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted to it and by the economic and political sway of the bourgeois class."
(Ext. P. 21).

The change, however, had not abolished classes nor emancipated the whole society. One species of class society was replaced by another. The bourgeoisie which had been revolutionary against feudalism ceased to be so and considered its rule as final and permanent. It formulated its position in the slogan "Whatever is has reason to be",

but refused to see the further implication that "Whatever is exists so long as it is necessary". The bourgeois property relations and order have reason to be so long as it is necessary to develop the productive forces of society. But so soon as it will become a hindrance like its predecessor it will have to vanish. Capitalist social order is no more free from the law of dialectical development than was the feudal order. Only the manifestation of its contradiction would be different according to the different productive forces. The bourgeois intelligentsia tried to hide this. Though dialectics in the modern form was formulated by the bourgeois philosopher, Hegel, and applied by the bourgeoisie in its other scientific achievements, yet its concrete application to social development, the bourgeoisie opposed vehemently, because it meant admission of its eventual overthrow by its contradiction - the Proletariat.

This was thoroughly exposed by Marx. Even before the bourgeoisie had scarcely established itself in a few countries, its contradictions began to appear; the conflict of its productive forces and production relations began to appear in their most glaring form, the periodical epidemic of over-production. Says Marx, "A similar movement is going on before our own eyes. Modern bourgeois society with its relations of production of exchange and of

Z 2, 5(W) - 7. N 29
G 3 - 1.1
24108

property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer, who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgeoisie and of its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodical return put on its trial, each time more threateningly, the existence of the entire bourgeois society. In these crises the great part not only of the existing products, but also of the previously created productive forces are periodically destroyed. In these crises there breaks out an epidemic that in all earlier epochs would have seemed an absurdity, the epidemic of over production. Society suddenly finds itself to be back into a state of monetary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed; and why? Because there is too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property. On the contrary they have become too powerful for these

conditions by which they are fettered and so soon as they overcome these fetters they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endangering the existence of bourgeois property. The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them. And how does the bourgeoisie get over these crises? On the one hand by the enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces; on the other by the conquest of new markets. And by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to day by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises and by diminishing the means whereby crises are lessened."

(26) Development of British Capitalism - expansion of colonies - Capitalism becomes Imperialism.

Crises of over production, the disparity between production and consumption began as early as 1830 and 1840 and were responsible not in a small measure for the Corn law agitation in England, the Chartist Movement and the revolutionary upheavals of 1848. As soon as there was a crisis, the low grade concerns collapsed, the stronger ones beat them, production was centralised, costs reduced by a number of ways and a further impetus to trade was given. When such centralisation resulted in unemployment, it was very soon absorbed by the expanding production or the pressure was drained off by emigration. In the development of capitalist production. England was ahead as it had

accomplished its bourgeois revolution far earlier, almost a century, than the continental countries. This was in some measure due to the weakness of its feudal mobility which was exhausted by a long war of the White and Red Roses. That is why the British bourgeoisie has the largest reserves, has been the first Imperialist power, has been the stock exchange and money market of the whole world and the largest colonial power. The development of the production of the means of production (production of heavy machinery etc.) is a sure index of the growth of industrial Capitalism. That England was forging ahead was seen in her iron output which was :-

16 Mil. Tons in the period 1831-41
18 Mil. Tons in the period 1841-50
32.5 " " " " " 1851-60

I.H.K.

29/10/31 (Evening Part II).

Whereas in her neighbouring countries it was the export of British Steel and Capital that built their first railways. Britain had 49 million tons of coal production in 1850 which jumped up to 82 millions in 1860. Her export of goods of 70 million pounds in 1850 was 164 in 1860, i.e. it had more than doubled. The pressure of population, of ruined artisans and of unemployment was drained into emigration. The discovery of mines in California took away 250,000 men. From 1830-50 there was a steady stream of emigration of about two million persons. The other countries also followed but very late. They had to deal with their feudal fetters.

Crises of overproduction occurred every ten or twelve years or sometimes less. In the 19th century as shown above by Marx these were overcome by conquest of new markets and a more thorough exploitation of old. This is reflected in the colonial expansion of the big industrial Powers of the world. Lenin quoting an American writer sets it out thus:-

COLONIAL POSSESSIONS

	Britain (Millions)		France (Millions)		Germany (Millions)	
	Sq. Miles	Popula- tion	Sq. Miles	Popula- tion	Sq. Miles	Popula- tion
1815-30	-	126.4	0.02	0.5	-	-
1860	2.5	145.1	0.2	3.4	-	-
1880	7.7	267.9	0.7	7.5	-	-
1889	9.3	309.0	3.7	56.4	1.0	14.7

For Britain the period of vast colonial conquests is between 1860-1880 and also the last 20 years. For France and Germany, the growth was mainly or entirely in the last 20 years of the 19th century. This was not an isolated development, due to the caprice of adventurers and heroes, as the bourgeois historians would like us to believe, (though we acknowledge the fact that individual qualities did play a part in it). The expansion was throughly correlated with the new development of the productive forces. Each crisis of overproduction was leading to what Marx called concentration and centralisation of Capital, leading ultimately to the monopoly form of Capitalism, represented by international cartels in the economic field and a fierce race for colonies by the respective States of the competing bourgeoisie, in the political field. The crises of 1847 and 1860 had their repercussions on Franco-Italian politics and also the Russian feudal nobility, which had to consent in some measure to the emancipation of the serfs in 1861. After this, Lenin marks off the periods in the development of the old Capitalism based on the entrepreneur into that of the monopoly stage based on the almost hidden, impersonal and uncanny power of "Finance-Capital", thus: -

(1) 1860-70, the highest and final stage of the development of free competition, the beginnings of monopoly may just be discerned.

(2) After the crisis of 1873, a period of wide development of cartels, still unusual and transitory: they constitute a transient phenomenon.

(3) The boom period at the end of the 19th century and the crisis of 1900-3. Cartels become one of the basic features of economic activity. Capitalism has become Imperialism.

(27) Meaning of Imperialism - its five qualities.

The aim of Communists is the overthrow of Imperialism and Capitalism and the immediate aim of the Communists in India is the overthrow of British Imperialism. (Ext.P 2339). It appears that many people misunderstand what we mean by Imperialism. Some think it means the rule of the Emperor and therefore think that only monarchies are Imperialisms. What we really mean is a certain type of capitalist economy with its political accompaniment. The description of this type is authoritatively given by Lenin thus : "Imperialism emerged as the development and direct continuation of the essential qualities of Capitalism in general. But Capitalism became capitalist Imperialism at a definite and a very high stage of its development, when certain of its essential qualities began to be transformed into their opposites, when the features of a period of transition from Capitalism to a higher social and economic structure began to take shape and be revealed all along the line, the feature that is economically essential in this process is

the substitution of capitalist monopoly for capitalist free competition. Free competition is the fundamental quality of capitalism and of commodity production generally. Monopoly is exactly the opposite of free competition but we have seen this latter beginning to be transformed into monopoly beneath our very eyes, creating big industry and eliminating small, replacing big industry by still bigger industry, finally leading to such a concentration of production and capital that monopoly has been and is the result; cartels and combines and trusts are fusing with them the power of a dozen or so banks manipulating thousands of millions. At the same time monopoly that has arisen from free competition does not drive the latter out of existence, but co-exists over it and with it, thus giving rise to a number of very acute and very great contradictions, antagonisms and conflicts. Monopoly is the transition from Capitalism to a more highly developed order."

The above economic features are well known to the Indian bourgeoisie in the tremendous power wielded for example by the Swedish Match Trust, the Oil Syndicates etc. The five essential features of Monopoly Capitalism or Imperialism are :-

- (1) The concentration of production and capital, developed so highly that it creates monopoly which plays a decisive role in economic life.
- (2) The fusion of banking capital with industrial capital

and the creation on the basis of this finance capital, a financial oligarchy.

(3) Export of Capital which has become extremely important as distinguished from the export of commodities.

(4) The formation of international capitalist monopolies which share out the world amongst themselves.

(5) The territorial expansion of the whole earth completed by the greatest capitalist Powers.

It is this economic and political structure we want to overthrow and replace by still higher form, the socialist structure, whose forces have ripened already within the womb of monopoly capital. The Imperialist stage of Capitalism is a stage of decay, because the contradiction of productive forces and property relations have now no room left to mitigate their intensity. The disparity between consumption and production and the crisis of over-production formerly led to colonial expansion, export of goods, either consumption goods or capital goods. Expansion led to a still further increase in production and development of technique. But this process had come to its last point by 1914, because by that time the whole world had been completely partitioned. In the absence of new regions the only way was to redistribute the old regions over again, forcibly destroy the means of production and begin the cycle again. This in other words meant forcible seizure of

the territories of one Imperialism by another and the destruction of productive forces of one bourgeoisie by another - in short a world war. We got one in 1914, when the world stood partitioned amongst the six Imperialist Powers, who fought the war or rather made their working class and peasantry fight it for them.

For the pre-war period details of the formation of international cartels in the most important industries like Iron, Steel, Electricity, Oil etc and the banks behind them, the consequent export of capital, the partition of the world amongst the various Imperialist Powers and the impending world war as the only solution that Imperialism would attempt, can be found in the most learned work of Lenin entitled "Imperialism - the last stage of monopoly Capitalism".

(28) Imperialist wars - a necessity, not a policy - results of last War - decline of Britain.

Imperialist wars are thus not dependent on the murder of a prince or the will of a military genius. Neither they can be scrapped simply because some well-intentioned polished saints want peace and love in the world. They could not be scrapped by scrapping of a few old ships and the reduction of a few battalions. War is not a policy with Imperialism but a necessity, which arises from the increasing productive forces and the inability of Imperialism

to dispose of them because they are to be disposed of on the condition that they yield profits - which however are not obtainable within the markets of the same Imperialism. One Imperialism has naturally to invade the markets of the other, destroy the productive forces of the competing Imperialism and thus try to insure the return of its own profits. That is Imperialist war. Armaments are merely weapons, not foundations of Imperialism. Militarism and wars are the superstructural attributes raised on the fundamental contradiction between the worldwide productive forces developed by society and the appropriation of their products by the Imperialist bourgeoisie to the exclusion of three-fourths of society. Unless this is abolished, Disarmament Conferences are merely smoke screens for the preparation of more armaments.

The Imperialist bourgeoisie of the belligerent Powers assembled the resources of the whole world in their war of graft and plunder, a war designed to destroy the productive powers that create useful values for society and not a war to increase the sum total of useful values for the benefit of society from nature. The war was unprecedented in its dimensions, in its destruction, because the growth of human powers was unprecedented. There never was a world society before like this interlinked in all its parts by the swiftest means of transport and maintaining complete contact through the vast apparatus of capitalist

markets. Not one country, not the smallest corner of the globe was left untouched directly or indirectly by the operations of the Imperialist War. During the four years, 1914-18, the mobilised population was 70 millions, out of which 9 millions were killed, 19 millions were wounded and 4 millions permanently disabled. The most gigantic apparatuses of destruction were being produced daily. Five million workers in Great Britain, U.S.A. and France alone were engaged in the manufacture of war material. The British and French bourgeoisie were sinking millions of their accumulated wealth robbed from the peasantry and workers solely to blow up men, women and children, to dig the mineral wealth of the globe not for the service of human beings, but to manufacture guns and ammunition, to blow up their skulls. The two countries alone put up on the field 48,000 guns, 112,000 machine guns, 106,000 planes and 6018 tanks. In the report made to the Third World Congress of the Communist International, July 1921, it was shown that at the time of the war, the national wealth of the warring nations was 2400 milliard gold marks, of which 1200 milliard was destroyed during the war. In addition the yearly decrease in production was 100 milliards. So that after the war the wealth remaining was 800 milliard gold marks. The bourgeoisie was trying to overcome its crisis by "the enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces" Marx had said in 1847 (References Ext. P. 2491).

Did the Imperialist slaughter and destruction of productive forces cure Imperialism of crisis and contradictions? Did the war result in a better world, living in peace and contentment, "self determining" its life with the vast amount of good things, that it had powers to produce from nature? No. As a result of the war a re-partition of the globe took place amongst the victorious Imperialisms. But that did not cure capitalism of crises and conflicts. The wiping out of Central European competition did not improve the position of Allied Capital. On the contrary the oldest Capitalism of the world that of Great Britain was outstripped by American Imperialism; in fact the whole of the bond-holding States of Europe, the moneylenders and financiers of the world fell in bondage to American Finance. At the end of the war American finance was a creditor to the Allies for 11872 million dollars to be paid by annual instalments over 62 years. Sir Charles Hobhouse in an article in the July number of the "Contemporary Review" gives figures which show the immensity of European indebtedness to the United States and the vast amount which Germany has to pay to the Victorious Powers. He writes :-

"The capital indebtedness of Europe to America being in round figures, £ 2,250,000,000, it will require a total eventual sum of £ 4,300,000,000, to discharge this obligation. Germany's share of these sums at 66 per cent amounts

to £ 1,500,000,000 and £ 3,000,000,000 respectively, only to be obtained at the expense of the foreign trade of her own creditors. These latter in addition owe £ 1,000,000,000, to Great Britain and a trifle of £ 40,000,000 to France. How long can International commonsense tolerate the continuance of such illusory assets and debits?"

The crisis became chronic and more accentuated, during which the decline of British Imperialism, the oldest in the world was brought out in the most vivid colours in the course of the post war twelve years.

D. D/30.10.31 Evening 1st Part.

The second result of the war was the establishment of the Soviet Union, the First Workers' Republic, which had overthrown its Imperialism and using all the productive forces developed under capitalism, had solved its contradictions by abolishing capitalism and forcing them to produce things not for profits but for equitable distribution and use of the workers and peasants.

The third result of the war was the increasing strength of the revolutionary movement of the workers and their progress towards an organised attempt to overthrow capitalism in their own countries.

The fourth result of the war was the rise of the revolutionary movement in the colonies and conquered countries of Imperialism - a movement of national emancipation from parasitic Imperialism and also of capitalism, in their own countries.

The advance of the new capitalist powers outside Europe is illustrated in their production of goods. United States production of industrial goods increased between 1914 to 1924 from 24 to 43 billion dollars or 78 per cent; Australian production between 1913 and 1923 from 161 to 348 million pounds or 160 per cent. Canadian in the same period from 1393 to 2781 million dollars or 99 per cent, South

African between 1915 and 1920 from 40 to 98 million pounds, Japanese between 1913 and 1919 from 747 to 2630 million yen. All these increases are considerably in excess of any allowance to be made for reduction to gold values in the case of some countries and of the general increase in world prices (about 50 per cent). In the same period British industrial production in 1913 values is estimated to have fallen 12 per cent to 20 per cent (Lord Weir's estimate) and her export of goods according to the Balfour Committee of 1926 has fallen by 27 per cent. This led to European politics being dominated by Anglo-American rivalry and new groupings of Imperialist powers.

(29) Rationalisation - increase in production - latest crisis.

Immediately after the War Europe and consequently other parts of the world suffered from a crisis of under production, which was the first of its kind since the rise of capitalism, which has always given birth to crisis of over production (vide report of the Third World Congress of the C.I.). The situation in Europe was growing revolutionary and the Proletariat attempted the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism in many countries. But they were suppressed and continental capitalism started to rebuild itself. The legacy of the war - the burden of reparation and debts hampered the rebuilding. German Imperialism was thoroughly fleeced of the most important colonies, of its

iron and coal mines and plants, of its reserve of goods. This threatened a complete collapse of Germany, while it did not help the allied powers much, as their loot was to a great extent drained into America to pay for the War debts. Currencies of every continental country began to fall, famine and bankruptcy stared in the face. Ultimately American Imperialism helped with its war accumulations; the central European powers were put on their feet again on the basis of the Dawes Plan. A partial restoration of production took place. The Dawes Plan brought to Germany 1750 million dollars of credit, which Germany of course imported in the form of goods. To that extent Germany constituted a good market for U.S.A. and other exporting countries. But when it came to repayment of the loans it was bound to take the form of export of goods leading again to a conflict of German goods with those of the victorious bourgeoisie. They were thus confronted with a contradiction again. They must either give up the debts and reparation claims and even converted the Dawes Loan into a gift or consent to receive it in the only form in which it can be paid i.e. export of goods, which are bound to lead to competition with the lending countries. The extent of this competition can be gauged from the fact that Germany has to pay 2,500 million gold marks per year for reparations. The bondholders could not consent to cancel their war bonds and idle incomes nor could they

afford to let their industry be engulfed by the incoming goods payment from Germany. But there was no way out - a blind alley of depression and crisis!

However partial stabilisation was carried out by thorough rationalisation, wage-cuts, suppression of the revolutionary Proletariat and application of new technique to industry. The result was that according to the "Financial Times" of 22-1-29 the comparative index figures of production for the first eight months of 1928 in the leading countries on the basis of 1913 as 100 showed that every leading country except Britain had surpassed the pre-War level of production. According to the memorandum on world production and trade issued in June 1930 by the economic section of the League of Nations, the world's production of food stuffs and raw materials increased between 1913 and 1929 by 25 per cent, of food stuffs by 16 per cent and raw materials by 40 per cent. As regards industrial production the figures given by the League show a further rise except in the some cases as follows :-

	Index of Production. 1913--100	In 1929.
	First 8 months-1928 According to "Financial Times".(D.22.1.29)	According to the Economic Section of The League of Nations
U.S.A.	166	154
France	122	130
Germany	113	122
Western Europe	111	...
Britain	90	112
Sweden	...	127
Poland	...	138
Soviet Russia	...	140

	Index of Production. 1914 -- 100.	In 1929.
	First 8 months 1928. According to Financial Times. (D. 22.1.29)	According to Economic Section of The League of Nations
U.S.A.	166	154
France	122	130
Germany	113	122
Western Europe	111	...
Britain	90	112
Sweden	...	127
Poland	...	138
Soviet Russia	...	140

Though in this table the United Kingdom is shown to have gone above the pre-War level it is noteworthy that its percentage of recovery is the last in the rank.

An ordinary man is puzzled to see this vast increase of food stuffs, raw materials and production of industrial goods taking place in the whole world on the one hand and to see unemployment, poverty, retrenchment, reduction of wages, strikes, risings and shootings going on in every country of the world, on the other. A crisis of over production has again overtaken the whole capitalist world. There is abundance of everything you want. But it cannot be sold; prices have fallen but things cannot be sold. There is plenty to sell and millions of men to buy, but things cannot be sold. The capitalists want to sell them, but they cannot be sold. World capitalist economy is in the grip of crisis. The whole world has produced more and more, even gold and silver but are agreed in saying that

there is no money to buy with. It is a deadlock. What are the characteristics of this crisis? Firstly the present is a crisis of over production. Secondly the crisis is the first world economic crisis since the war. It is a world crisis not only in the sense that it embraces all industrial countries of the world, it is a world crisis also in the sense that the industrial crisis has coincided in point of time with an agricultural crisis, embracing the production of all forms of raw materials and food stuffs in the principal agrarian countries of the world. Thirdly though the crisis is general in character, it has developed unequally. The industrial crisis began first of all in Poland, Romania and the Balkans. It developed there during the whole of 1928. Obvious signs of a commencing agricultural crisis could be seen in Canada, U.S.A., Argentine, Brasil and Australia by the end of 1928. All this time industry was climbing up in the U.S.A. By the middle of 1929 industrial production in the U.S.A. had achieved almost a record level. Only in the second half of 1929 began the turn of the tide, after which there developed a headlong crisis in industrial production which threw back the U.S.A. to the level of 1927. Then came Canada and Japan. Then followed bankruptcies in China and India and other colonial countries, where a crisis is aggravated by the fall in the price of silver and where a crisis of over production is combined with the destruction

of peasant economy reduced by feudal exploitation and overwhelming taxes to a state of complete exhaustion. The crisis struck the colonial countries and Western Europe with full force in 1930.

(30) Communist view of crisis - fetishism of commodities - contradiction of productive forces and production relations.

We generally hear from all non-Marxist writers, that the phenomenon is due to the absence of purchasing power amongst the masses i.e. the consumers of world production. But this does not explain where the purchasing power has gone. In fact except the parasitic classes, who form a very small minority of the world population, the majority, more than 90 per cent, are producers of these very goods which we see are "over-produced" and are not being sold. If the majority of world population is producing these goods, why has it not the power to consume them? The cause of it lies not in the answer that it has no purchasing power, which means simply begging the question; but in the production relations, the property relations of capitalist society. The property relations are capitalist relations. It means that all instruments of production, distribution and exchange are owned by the capitalist class. All the land and factories etc. are owned by them. The working class has to sell its labour power to the capitalist class

in order to get a living; and the capitalist class buys its labour power to be used in running the means of production solely on the condition that the whole process yields it a profit. The working class produces surplus values i.e. more goods than are paid back to it as its wages. This principle also holds in agriculture. In short the result is that if the worker or peasant, with the aid of the means of production, produces say 100 units of goods, he is paid his wages in 30, 20 or even 10 units, which then is his purchasing or consuming power. Even if it is a peasant the same process works in his case, the surplus being taken from him through the means of rent, taxes, interest and the market, where he sells his product. Thus every year, the balance of units, after their reckless waste, destruction, and consumption has been allowed for, goes on accumulating, in the form of money, capital, goods etc in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Until after a period of 10 or 12 years or even less, the capitalist class finds itself in possession of so much surplus goods that it does not know what to do with them. There comes then the crisis of over production. It is not that suddenly in one year too much production has been done. The crisis mainly comes as the accumulated effect of several years, of disparity between the consumption allowed to the working class and peasantry by the capitalist class and the produce taken from them in return for that. Cannot the working class and

peasantry consume the whole of it? "Consumption has fallen", "there is over production", does not mean that the masses have been so much overfed that they all have got constipation and therefore cannot consume more. The word "over production" is a deceptive word. It hides the content of accumulation by a class, the withholding and accumulation of goods in the form of capital, wealth, money, gold and actual goods by a small class of parasites to the exclusion of the masses. The word very successfully transfers the evil arising from this fact of property relations to some imaginary quality in the commodities themselves, which have suddenly become so mysterious, so naughty, so "sluggish," so "depressed" that they would not move on the market, refuse to be consumed. But this is all nonsense, which appears to be sense because capitalism through its organisation of the exchange market, through the money form in which all exchange is done, hides the real content and creates what is called "the fetishism of commodities", which causes a definite social relation between men to assume in their eyes the fantastic form of a relation between things. There is no "over production" as such in relation to the physiological needs or consuming power of the world's population. The world can consume not only what is produced, but even more if all the productive forces of society were to be used to the full extent. Things are not exchanged, are not sold because this

capitalist class wants its tribute, the surplus, the profit locked in them. In other words it is not "profitable to sell", "the prices are ruinous" to the bourgeoisie. In the meantime further production is curtailed, retrenchment and rationalisation are undertaken, wages and salaries are reduced. What does it mean? It means more people are deprived of their power to consume goods which intensifies the crisis. When capitalism was ascending i.e. there were people still left to approach and tell them to take the goods in exchange for theirs, these periodical crises were overcome. Formerly when there were retrenchments or cuts of wages and rationalisation, when the reduced cost had yielded more surplus to the bourgeoisie the men so thrown out were absorbed in new factories and on new lands. In the Imperialist stage there are no new lands left; productive forces have developed so much, technique is so advanced, monopoly so widely organised on world scale that there is no "absolute" increase in employment in several countries. There is a chronic or permanent unemployment of millions, a chronic going down of consumption, a chronic crisis, which becomes accentuated at even shorter intervals than before on world scale and in fact never vanishes from the world as a whole at any single point of time.

I.H.K.

30/10/31 (Evening Part II).

The intellectual agents of the bourgeoisie hide this simplest of all propositions, the contradiction between productive forces and production or property relations, which are the cause of the whole capitalist muddle in all sorts of mystifying talk of the "eternal" law of supply and demand, of the "scarcity" of money, of disparity of gold distribution, and such other things. Now all these mystifying complications arise from the capitalist relations and defy solution and understanding so long as the fundamental proposition of the appropriation of surplus value created by the toilers is not grasped. This situation is described in practically identical terms by all the leading spokesmen of Capitalism. The British President of the Board of Trade declared in 1925, "every country has far greater industrial capacity than before but in a far poorer world". (Sir P. Cunliffe - Lister, House of Commons, 6/7/25). He was echoed by the German Chancellor, Luther, addressing the German Annual Trade and Industrial Congress in 1926. "It is a phenomenon of the war and the post war period that the total productive capacity of the world has risen far above the demand." (London Times 29/4/26). In November 1926, the German Industrialist, Felix Deutch, estimated the world's industrial capacity at 40-50 per cent higher than before the war; but actual production was only

just approaching the pre war level at that time. If this phenomenon is not considered from the revolutionary class point of view of Marxism one would be lost in confusion to find 50 per cent higher capacity to produce the good things of life and yet "a far poorer world". In fact the world is not poorer, it is the working class and peasantry, the real producers and main consumers that are poorer.

31. Monopoly of wealth, cause of crisis - monopoly in Britain, U.S.A. and France - share of wages in national incomes.

The sole monopoly of the increasing wealth and capacity to buy and consume is held by the bourgeoisie, which can be definitely proved in the figures of the increasing accumulation of wealth by the capitalist class and the loss of wages and falling shares of the working class and peasantry in the national produce, in all the countries including those which are supposed to be prosperous. The British workers lost to the extent of 5000 million pounds by aggregate wage reduction between 1921-26. This fall is not covered by the fall in the cost of living. In the same period the profits of industrial companies as shown by the figures in the "Economist" rose year by year, the average dividend on ordinary shares being :-

1922	8.4 %
1923	9.3 %
1924	9.8 %
1925	10.3 %
1926	11.3 %

Moreover the return on all capital bearings, on fixed interest like Government loans, debentures, royalties etc increased by the return to gold standard, which increased the value of the pound. The Labour Research Department estimated that between 1900-1925 the real income of the working class in England has gone down by 20 per cent. An article in the "Daily Herald" of London by Mr. F. Brockway which was reproduced in the Indian Press in May 1931 discusses the latest official figures on this question. During the past ten years according to Mr. Graham, President of the Board of Trade, the annual income of the workers has fallen by 700 million pounds. Mr. Graham supplemented his statement about wage reductions by pointing out that during the same ten years the national income has not fallen. It has remained stable at 4000 million pounds a year. But Mr. J. M. Keynes says that the national income is actually increasing at the rate of 100 million pounds a year. The average dividend for 24000 typical limited liability companies was 9.8 per cent in 1930. Incomes from land increased from £ 300 millions to £ 415 millions since 1922. Since 1920 the interest paid on war loans has increased in real value from £ 300 millions to £ 750 millions per year. In one of the months at the beginning of 1931 the capital lying idle in one bank alone was £ 360 millions. The latest Inland Revenue Returns for the year ended March 1930 showed that there

were 437 millionaires whose income for the year was 49 million pounds. At the same time out of the whole population of 48 millions there were only 2½ million persons chargeable for Income Tax. i.e. having an annual income of £ 135/- which is the exemption limit. Mr. Brockway says "If the incomes of the working class are falling and the national incomes are not falling, the incomes of some other section of the nation must be increasing." Yes, the bourgeoisie is increasing its wealth.

It may be said that this is the position in England because it had been involved in a ruinous war and has to compel her workers to share the burden with the bourgeoisie to meet competition and War Debts. But other figures show quite clearly that the process of impoverishment is a pre war phenomenon also. However take a country like that of U.S.A. which has gained everything by the war. Capitalist propaganda has created an impression in the world that the U.S.A. is the ideal land of prosperity, high wages etc amongst all the countries in the world. The U.S.A. has the biggest and most highly organised productive forces. With a population which is 7 per cent of the world and with a land area which is 6 per cent of the whole world, it produces 25 per cent of world's wheat, 52 per cent coal, 75 per cent grain, 40 per cent steel and iron, 60 per cent cotton, 40 per cent silver, 20 per cent gold, 72 per cent oil and 85 per cent automobiles. It is completely free

from any survivals of feudalism, unlike the European countries and has been the home of cartels and trusts. Who commands all this wealth? The Federal Commission Report on Wealth and Income of the United States says that 13 per cent of the population owned 90 per cent of the total wealth in 1926. The aggregate income of all wage earners including even some of the parasitic services, comprising 63 per cent of the population amounted to 39.5 per cent of the total national income according to Government statistics of Income for 1924. Between 1890 and 1914 there was no improvement in real wages but actually a fall. If we take into account the rise in real wages between 1914 and 1925 and make allowance for the fall on the previous period, the rise in real wages, comes to 10-14 per cent between 1890 and 1925, while the wealth of the nation increased 263 per cent, exports increased 207 per cent, value of manufactured articles increase 388 per cent and bank clearings 420 per cent. After allowing for the change in money values, the "real wealth" of America increased between 1900-1924 by 96 per cent while real wages increased by 14 per cent. On the basis of the official figures of the International Labour Office, 1926, it is found that in 1925 the average worker's wage was 20-30 per cent below the official subsistence minimum for a family of five. The average wage of industrial workers in 1919 was 1155 dollars while the minimum necessary "to maintain a family of five

at a level of health and decency" was officially computed to be 2262 dollars. This difference of 51 per cent led to upheavals and consequently slight wage increases, but the difference still remained at 30 per cent and increased in the depression of 1930 when the unemployment figure rose to 8 or 9 millions and the biggest and most prosperous industrial combines announced wage cuts.

Another illusion with regard to America is that her peasantry is rich and is out to beat the whole world in production by scientific methods of agriculture. Here also it should be noted in the first place that monopoly syndicates rob the peasantry by their price policy. The price of agricultural goods in 1926 November was 130 on the basis of 1909-14 as 100 while the non-agricultural products stood at 161. The difference between the two reveals the increasing exploitation of the farmers by the single factor of monopoly price. The farming population which is 26 per cent of the working population receives 13.8 per cent of the national income. For example, three million acres of land in the State of Texas were liable to be seized for arrears in interest and debts and were to be sold by auction if payments were not made by 1924. A Government Inquiry in the State of Missouri showed that 28500 or 9 per cent of its farm estates were vacant as they could not be profitably cultivated. In Canada also, a report says that in the Province of Saskatchewan the most

fertile of all the provinces, the indebtedness of the farmers amounted to 440 dollars per head about the year 1922.

The national wealth of France for 1909-13 was 225,000 million francs divided amongst 11,634,000 persons. But half of this was owned by 98,243 persons, each of whom possessed more than 250,000 francs.

A study of all other countries would reveal the same state of affairs : there is a growing concentration of national wealth in the hands of a small minority of the nation, the capitalist class, while a fraction of the national income is distributed over millions. These few illustrations show that workers' wages are attacked by British Capitalism, which is in a decline, as well as by American Capitalism which was said to be still ascending. It shows that the weaker Imperialism is made to surrender its loot to the stronger through payments of war loans, reparations, Dawes Loans etc. And all Imperialisms strong and weak unitedly exploit the working class and peasantry, national and international. All the productive forces of the world are dominated by the bourgeoisie of the world. Naturally the whole distribution of products is dominated by it. It refuses to produce or distribute the produce except on the principle that it gets back more than what it gives. It has all the ownership of buying power,

therefore others cannot buy; it has all the commodities therefore others can not consume unless by labour they yield to it more than what they get. The private property relations, the capitalist system, therefore is at the root of the whole trouble. It must be overthrown, if society is to survive and progress, just as the bourgeoisie had overthrown the feudal order and rescued society from stagnation.

(32) Distribution to be socialised - who will carry it out - Marxism is the theory of this - six deductions and three results.

Who will carry out this task? Marxism answers this question dialectically. The feudal order produced in its womb its own contradiction, the bourgeoisie, which overthrew the obsolete class. Marx says, "The weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself. But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons - the modern working class - the proletarians."

The productive forces developed in bourgeois society are worked and wielded by the working class. Even that individual bourgeois manufacturer who in the initial stages of capitalism was directly associated with the process and

direction of production has vanished, except in small negligible units. He has been replaced by the impersonal power of the banks, by finance-capital, which many a time is seldom aware where on the surface of the globe, the forces of production "owned" by it are in fact working. The ownership of things produced is completely divorced from any participation of the owners in the production of things. Production is already socialised on an international scale. The weapons are wielded by the proletariat. What remains to be done is only to socialise distribution, that is destroy the ownership of the means of production, to overthrow the capitalist order based on private property in the means of production, distribution and exchange. This can only be done by the class which actually works the whole apparatus that is the working class aided by the peasantry. Communism is the revolutionary theory of the working class which strives to rescue society from the destruction of its productive forces, which would inevitable if they are allowed to be imprisoned within the stifling envelope of capitalist private property. It is the theory which reorganises society on a higher plan and removes the contradiction and misery from which it is suffering today. Every advanced revolutionary class must have a revolutionary class theory of its own.

D/-31.10.31

Morning 1st Part

The revolutionary theory of the bourgeoisie when it was an advanced class as against feudalism was provided by the bourgeois economists and philosophers of the British and French Revolution and before them it was religiously clothed in the Protestant Reformation. The revolutionary theory of the working class, which is now revolutionary as against the bourgeoisie, is provided in Marxism-Leninism.

I have sketched in brief the position prevailing in the Imperialist countries in general, because the full implications of the Indian situation and the position that Communists adopt cannot be understood without it. The conditions sketched so far will show that the national or bourgeois viewpoint which pits one country as a whole against another is misleading. Within each country there are "two nations", one pitted against the other. That all the exploiting classes of all countries though competing against one another are united in exploiting the working class and peasantry. Therefore Communists do not look at an Englishman as an Englishman or a German as a German, but view him from the class point of view. We consider the worker Englishman our ally and comrade as against the bourgeois Englishman. Secondly, it shows that in spite of the highest development possible under capitalism the real

mass of the population is in no way better off; in spite of the tribute of the whole world pouring into the Imperialist countries the working class and peasantry are still poverty-stricken. That helps us in exploding the illusions prevalent in some of the revolutionary parties in India that a capitalist free India would be a paradise for the masses in whose name they always speak. Thirdly, it shows that poverty is not a permanent or unchangeable factor, that wealth grows according to the growth of technology. But its monopoly by one class makes poverty for another compulsory in spite of the increase in wealth. That the solution of the problem of poverty is the solution of the problem of private ownership of the productive forces. Fourthly it shows that social development being a dialectical process, this problem is inevitably solved by the rising class, the Proletariat. Fifthly it shows that the problem is not an isolated one limited to one country but one affecting world society, which for the first time has come into existence as an effectively inter-linked unit in the epoch of Imperialism. Sixthly it shows that having accomplished its fullest possible development, the system is now in decline and awaits being overthrown and superceded by the higher socialist order, for which the productive forces are ready and also the revolutionary class, which is to use the weapons, on the basis of an advanced revolutionary theory. Besides these conditions

and deductions, there are three more factors which influence and are a guide to the Indian struggle against Imperialism and capitalism. One is the experiences of the proletariat of the Imperialist countries against their bourgeoisie and the present condition of their class-struggle. The second is the general revolt of the colonial countries against their Imperialist oppressors, of which the Indian struggle is a part. And the third is the Soviet Union, the emblem of the victory of the Proletariat and the vindication of the correctness of Marxism-Leninism. The essentials of all these factors are all involved in this so-called "conspiracy" as stated in the Public Prosecutor's address. I shall briefly treat the first and the third now and then come to the colonial, specifically the Indian question.

Section 2

(33) The early Proletarian Movements up to Chartism.

In proportion as the bourgeoisie i.e. Capital is developed, in the same proportion is the Proletariat, the modern working class developed, a class of labourers who live only so long as they find work and who find work only so long as their labour increases Capital. These labourers who sell themselves piecemeal are a commodity like every other article of commerce and are consequently exposed to all the fluctuations of the market. The Proletariat goes

through various stages of development. With its birth begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie. At first the contest is carried on by individual labourers, then by the work people of a factory, then by the operatives of one trade in one locality, against the individual bourgeois who directly exploits them. They direct their attack not against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production themselves; they destroy imported wares, that compete with their labour, they smash to pieces machinery, they set factories ablaze, they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the workman of the Middle Ages.

At this stage the labourers still form an incoherent mass scattered over the whole country and broken up by their mutual competition. If anywhere they unite to form more compact bodies, this is not yet the consequence of their own active union, but of the union of the bourgeoisie, which class in order to attain its own political ends is compelled to set the whole Proletariat in motion, and is moreover, yet for a time, able to do so. At this stage therefore the Proletarians do not fight their enemies but the enemies of their enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the land owners, the non-industrial bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie. Thus the whole historical movement is concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie; every

victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie. Modern capitalist industry had its birth in England. Therefore the first struggles of the working class began in England. The echoes of the French Revolution were not heard amongst the bourgeoisie, which had already received a share in the political power with the fast declining feudal class. Some societies of workmen were founded having sympathy with the revolutionary principles of the French Revolution and aiming at the radical transformation of the British political system. Bread riots broke out in 1790 and the Government fearing a revolutionary movement, transported the radical leaders of Edinburgh (1793), suspended the Habeas Corpus Act (1794), passed a seditious Meetings Act (1795). In 1797 a mutiny took place at Nellore which led to the prohibition of what we now call the right of free assembly. In 1811 a sect of Luddites started attacking and destroying machinery. In 1819 a large assembly of workers at Peterloo was set upon by the military and a general massacre like that of the Jallianwala Bagh in India was carried out and the movement suppressed. The repressive Legislation was repealed in 1844; still a great restriction was exercised on the Trade Union Movement.

At the same time the middle class petty bourgeoisie had not received the desired share of the political power, which was still dominated by the land owners combined with

the big bourgeoisie of that period. The result was that the petty bourgeoisie seemingly fought for the workers' right and the workers' movement was led into the channel of the struggle for Parliamentary vote. The Reform Bill of 1832 gave much to the petty bourgeois middle class but nothing to the workers, who then turned to industrial action. Just after the Reform Act there was an industrial crisis and the workers forming themselves in Trade Unions, established the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union (1834) and planned a General Strike. The employers attacked the workers before the strike could come about by involving them in sectional disputes. The aid of bourgeois law was invoked and in 1834 a group of six workers in Dorchester were sentenced to seven years' transportation on the plea of taking illegal oaths i.e. joining the trade unions. Thus the first phase of the Trade Union Movement ended in a failure. This period was dominated by the Utopian Socialism of Owen St. Simon and Fourier who thought that model experiments in humane capitalist management or cooperative production imposed on society by determined pioneers who are out to change society, would be sufficient. These theories certainly criticised the existing capitalist structure; but the secrets of that structure were not yet understood by them. Because as yet the mode of production and with it the antagonisms between Labour and Capital were incomplete. They could not see

that the stage was historically inevitable, neither could they discern its roots.

The period of trade union outburst was followed by Chartism in 1838. The movement got its impetus by the crisis of production and marketing in British industry. The workers drafted a petition to Parliament in which they asked for (1) Equal Electoral Districts (2) Universal male suffrage. (3) Annual Parliaments (4) No property qualifications for M.P.'s (5) Vote by ballot (6) Payment of members.

This was the "Charter" they wanted from the Parliament of the bourgeoisie. A great agitation was raised throughout the country and all the revolutionary energies were directed in obtaining signatures explaining the points and forming a Convention to adopt a Charter and send it to Parliament. A million and a quarter signatures were obtained and the petition sent to Parliament, which kept silent over it for some time. Chartism gathered strength and became more expressed as regards its aim. It was not to be a harmless petition asking for voting rights. The more energetic and rank-and-file leaders like O'Brien and Julian Harney who was later on associated with Marx for a time, wanted political power, social equality and almost an imitation of the French Revolution. The Parliament rejected the petition and the advanced proletarian section of the Convention wanted to take direct action, though

it contained strong elements who wanted to rely on "moral force". The Convention was overtaken by hesitation. It wanted to call a General Strike, gave notice of it and then withdrew it. Amidst differences it adjourned and ended. But one revolutionary section, the Welsh Chartists prepared for an armed rising, which was suppressed. The leaders of Chartism were transported in 1840. When the movement subsided some of the leaders were released. In 1842 the movement revived and another petition this time with three million signatures was sent. Again the movement was confronted with the question, 'what is to be done next, if the petition is rejected.' The leadership could not think beyond strike action. Armed uprising was opposed by a section. A strike ultimately did take place. But the trade being bad the employers simply shut their factories and waited. The strike collapsed due to exhaustion. After this there was confusion within the ranks of the leadership. O'Connor, the organiser of the movement, took to the fantastic scheme of independent communes on land settlements built by floating workers' companies. The gradual disillusionment coming to the workers through the failure of Utopian schemes, Parliamentary petitions and unorganised strikes was leading them to the undiluted class outlook which found expression through the columns of the "people's Paper". The revolutionary upheavals on the Continent in 1848 blew a breath of life into the

Chartist Movement, there was a demonstration in London, where an attempt was made for the new concentration of forces. But removed as it was from the large working-class centres it collapsed without any achievement. Remnants of the movement persisted, though it was in a decline due to the industrial situation becoming favourable.

I.H.K.

31/10/31 (Evening Part II).

The discovery of new regions of mining outside England fostered emigration, which drained off the youthful forces that were behind Chartism. Earnest Jones, a far more revolutionary agitator than the previous Chartists, carried on the movement based on the textile struggles in Preston and Wigan in 1853, formed a "Mass Movement Committee" and worked for the establishment of the rival Parliament, "The Labour Parliament" at Manchester. The Parliament was still within the confines of utopian ideology. It wanted to collect national revenue by a levy on wages, support strikes and settle the unemployed workers on land, without any programme of political power. Of course the scheme could not but collapse. But it was a landmark in the Labour Movement. Marx in his letter to the Parliament dated 9/3/1854 says, "the mere assembling of such a Parliament marks a new epoch in the history of the worldThe labouring classes have conquered nature; they have now to conquer men. To succeed in this attempt they do not want strength but the organisation of their common strength, organisation of the labouring classes on a national scale, such I suppose is the great end aimed at by the Labour Parliament. If the Parliament proves true to the idea that called into being, some future historian will have to record that there existed in the year 1854 two Parliaments : a

Parliament at London and a Parliament at Manchester - a Parliament of the rich and a Parliament of the poor - but that men sat only in the Parliament of the men and not in the Parliament of the masters."

(34) Continental Movements - the Communist League - 1848 Revolutions - The League disbands - the Cologne Trial.

On the continent of Europe the Workers' Movement had not taken any organisational shape as there capitalist development had not taken place on such a large scale as in England. There the working class was fighting the battles of its enemies, under the leadership of the petty bourgeoisie, who betrayed the workers after each fight. The struggles of 1848 however finally disillusioned the workers and freed them from petty bourgeois leadership though not from its ideology. The February Revolution in France and the March Revolution in Germany in 1848 were the first great battles between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. On 24/2/1848 Louis Phillipe was driven out of Paris and the French Republic was proclaimed. On the 13/3/1848 the people of Vienna broke the power of the Austrian monarchy. On the 18th the people in Berlin rose in arms and after an obstinate struggle of 18 hours had the satisfaction of seeing the king surrender himself into their hands. All these upheavals were in fact the urge of the petty bourgeoisie towards political power for its own class, a desire for

freedom to develop Capitalism and enthrone it in the State in place of the feudal class that held power. The petty bourgeoisie on the basis of the great revolutionary energies of the young working class of the cities had succeeded in defeating the feudal aristocracy. But when once feudal aristocracy was removed the further revolutionary steps that the working class wanted to take for its class emancipation alarmed the petty bourgeoisie. In Paris, Vienna and Berlin along with the petty bourgeoisie the working class was also armed. When the revolutions expelled the aristocracy from the big cities, the petty bourgeois shopkeepers suffered in trade and the workers were thrown out on the streets. Now as regards the political and armed control, the working class helped by 4000 students in Vienna was strong enough to overawe the petty bourgeois section of the revolutionary front. They had borne the brunt of the fight. They wanted the unemployed to be maintained by taxing the cities, that is taxing the petty bourgeois traders and merchants. This naturally alarmed the petty bourgeoisie which was already alarmed over the loss of trade due to the flight of the nobility. Capitalism had not yet become so consolidated as to flourish on the markets of an independent petty bourgeois farming class, the largest and the real market of capitalist trade. The clash between the petty bourgeoisie and the workers came to a head in Paris. "It could be fought in

France only; for France, as long as England took no part in the revolutionary strife or as Germany remained divided, was by its national independence, civilisation and centralisation, the only country to impart the impulse of a mighty convulsion to the surrounding countries. On June 23, 1848, the bloody struggle began in Paris, between the mass of the working people on one side and all the other classes of the population on the other. The counter revolutionary forces succeeded after a severe fighting. The working class was crushed by the petty bourgeoisie whom it had raised to power. The French example encouraged the petty bourgeoisie in Berlin and Vienna. In Berlin they prayed only for a constitutional monarchy; in Vienna when the counter revolutionary nobility was at the gates they remained passive. Naturally the counter revolution smashed the working class forces that offered resistance. The revolution had never changed the old state machinery. Not even the old officers of the army were dismissed and when the counter revolutionary attack commenced the old state officers turned traitors from inside. The result was the immediate restoration of the monarchies in Germany and Vienna. It took some time in France, till Louis Bonaparte could muster the peasantry in his favour and carry out the coup in 1852. The petty bourgeoisie that had been frightened by the strength of the working class, had betrayed it and cheated it out of power, was itself overthrown by the counter revolution.

The revolution fell because there was not as yet a solid class organisation of the workers, under their own banner, and for their own class programme. The proletariat was not yet internationally united, just as the bourgeoisie too was not yet internationally developed and interconnected. Thus in the words of Marx, "every victory so obtained was a victory for the bourgeoisie". In France, the bourgeoisie had succeeded in rallying the peasantry to its aid, for reasons which we have already noted before (Para 24). This period is described by Lenin as "the first period in the birth of socialist ideas and the germs of the class struggle of the proletariat. This is the period of the preparation and birth of Marxism, the only doctrine of Socialism which has stood the test of history."

The gradually developing class consciousness of the workers in England, France and Germany found its expression in the formation of the Communist League, a working class association, which was first exclusively German, but later on international. It had its roots in Paris and Berlin, its activities were directed first from Brussels and then from London. The moving spirits of the League were Marx, Engels, Karl Schapper, Moll, and Harney of the Chartists.

The Communist Manifesto, now the most famous and classical document of Communism, was issued on behalf of this League, which in its London Congress in November 1847

had directed Marx and Engels to prepare a complete theoretical and practical Party Programme. The Manifesto is the first clear and comprehensive statement of the ideals of the working class, as a class and is the first formulation of the slogan of the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat". The Manifesto was drafted in January 1848 and was in the last stages of publication when the February Revolution occurred in Paris. The League could do very little in the revolution as the active sympathisers of the League in Paris were in the ranks of the Blanquists. After the defeat of all the revolutions the members of the League had to seek refuge in the various lands. Men like Schapper and Willich still dreamed of fresh revolutionary outbreaks. An attempt to link up with Germany was made but failed. Soon after in May 1851 the raid on the Central Committee in Cologne took place. The arrested persons were kept in prison without trial for seventeen months. The trial began on 4/10/1852 lasting upto 12/11/1853. Seven of them were sentenced to from three to six years. During that trial the capitalist counter revolutionary prosecution and the court behaved as they are accustomed to behave under the bourgeois system. During the trial the principal forgerer witness admitted that the evidence which he supplied to the Government was forged in London at the instructions of Government. When the defence tried to procure evidence from London, the counsels' correspondence from Cologne

with the London Communist refugees made openly with the knowledge of the court was treated as complicity in the alleged plot!

(35) British Unions - 1st International - Statutes.

With the development of industry, the proletariat not only grows in number; it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels that strength more. The collisions between individual workman and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. The workers combine and give fight. Sometimes they are victorious, but only for a time. However, the real fruit of their battle lies not in the immediate result but in the ever expanding union of the workers. This union is helped by the improved means of communication created by modern industry.

Altogether collisions between the classes of the old society further, in many ways, the course of development of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie finds itself involved in a constant battle; at first with the aristocracy then with certain sections of the bourgeoisie itself and at all times with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries. In all these battles it sees itself compelled to appeal to the proletariat, to ask for help and thus drag it into political arena. The bourgeoisie itself therefore supplies the proletariat with its own elements of political and general

education, in other words it furnishes the proletariat with the weapons for fighting the bourgeoisie. Further entire sections of the ruling classes like the petty bourgeoisie and tradesmen are, by the advance of industry, precipitated into the ranks of the proletariat or at least are threatened in their conditions of existence. These also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress.

After the failure of the Chartist Movement the trade unions revived in England on a national scale. In 1850 the Amalgamated Society of Engineers was followed by other trade unions. In 1858 the Trades Councils were started to temporarily unite all the local unions in towns (The Bombay Trades Council was formed in 1928 - 70 years from London to Bombay!). The progress of trade unions evoked an attack from the employers, to counter-act which a general conference was convened in 1864. Lockouts and strikes followed, as the trade crisis deepened. The attempt to suppress the movement did not succeed. Moreover the expansion in trade, the fall in prices and such other factors had created an aristocracy which in no way adhered to the revolutionary traditions of Chartism. In order to buy this off into peaceful parliamentary bourgeois methods, the Reform Act of 1867 gave voting rights to households in towns and thus split off a section from the lower ranks of the proletariat. In 1868 the first regular

Trade Union Congress met. The Criminal Breach of Contract Act (which prevailed in India till 1923) was repealed and the Trade Union Act was passed in 1871 (a measure which appeared in India in 1926).

At this time under the inspiration of Marx the English and French workers founded the International Working Mens' Association or the First International in London on 28/9/1894. This First International inherited all the spirits of the Communist League, which later passed on in unbroken tradition to the Third Communist International. The aims and objects of the Third International are essentially the same as those of the First International. The statutes of the First International which were drafted by Marx and adopted with minor alterations by the Association stand as follows :- "That the emancipation of the working class is to be attained by the working class itself. That the struggle for the emancipation of the working class does not mean a struggle for class privileges and monopolies but a struggle for equal rights and equal obligations, for the abolition of every kind of class domination. That the economic subjection of the workers under the monopolists of the means of production that is of the sources of life is the cause of survitude in all its forms, the cause of all social miseries, all mental degradation, and political dependence.

That the emancipation of the working class is therefore the great aim which every political movement must be subordinated to. That all endeavours for this great aim have failed as yet because of the lack of the solidarity between the various branches of industry in all countries, because of the absence of the fraternal tie of unity between the working classes of the different countries. That the emancipation is neither a local nor a national problem but a problem of social character embracing every civilised country and the solution of which depends on the theoretical and practical cooperation of the most progressive countries. That the actual simultaneous revival of the workers' movement in the industrial countries of Europe, on the one hand awakens new hopes, whilst on the other, it is a solemn warning of the danger of relapse into the old errors and an appeal for the immediate union of the hitherto disconnected movement.

D/2.11.31

Evening 1st Part.

The statutes are dominated by the thoughts proceeding from the experiences of 1848. The Proletariat then had depended on the petty bourgeoisie. The workers in Vienna did not know what their comrades in Paris did, so successful was Metternich in isolating them ideologically. Moreover there was a danger of the workers busying themselves with constitution-making like the bourgeoisie and forgetting its fundamental, economic and social aim. Therefore the warning was sounded. It can be seen from this that if the Proletarian Parties of today - the Communist Parties unite internationally in a centralised Communist International they are avoiding the blunders of 1848 and are following the directions of the First as much as of the Third International. If confiscation of bourgeois property along with the destruction of the bourgeois State looms so large in the Communist programme, it is the outcome of the betrayals of 1848 and 1871. We are following the First as much as the Third International in this also. To the philistine bourgeois brain this "conspiracy of ideas" begins with the Third International. Unfortunately for them, their list of "co-conspirators", is sadly incomplete. This "conspiracy" began in 1847 is cemented by the blood of the heroes of 1848 and corrected by the subsequent experiences of the working class. We have been affiliated internationally

in the ideals and statutes of 1864 of which 1919 is merely a repetition in a different epoch. Our chains are soldered with those of our Cologne comrades of the First Communist Trial eighty years ago. But we are more fortunate than they. Behind Cologne stood the unsuccessful June Rising of the Parisian workers, before it swung the future corpses of the heroic Paris communards. But behind Meerut stands the 12 year old Proletarian power of the Soviet Union and before it swings the sweep of the mighty Indian revolution.

(36) The period of the First International - American Civil War - Marxist address to Lincoln, British workers' attitude then and now.

The period of the First International was the period of great upheavals and crises. It was the period when the Italian petty bourgeoisie was fighting its class battles under the bourgeois republicanism of Massini, ultimately to end in monarchy supported by the former Commander Garibaldi. A revival of revolutionary activity was seen in France. In Russia under the influence of the bourgeois democratic ideas of its Western neighbours the incapacity of absolutely feudal conditions of production to stand in competition against the production of the Western peasantry working under freer conditions, and the pressure from within of the ripening bourgeois economy led the autocratic Czar to decree the emancipation of the serfs in 1861, but it was niggardly carried out and defeated by the land owners

till 1905; still not until 1917 was serfdom fully uprooted. In 1861, the Civil War in America began, the war for the extinction of slavery. Bourgeois history clothes this war in a lot of sentimental stuff about the humanitarian feelings of the North as against the slaveholders of the South that wished to retain the slaves. Most of our petty bourgeois intelligentsia who do not view this episode from the dialectical point of view are cheated by the manner in which the bourgeois historians present this episode and point with pride to the great achievements and civilising role of the "West". But in fact the bourgeoisie in England played the most reactionary role in this Civil War. The Southern States of America rested on the production of cotton through slave labour, while in the North the bourgeoisie was developing an advanced economy based on free labour and farming carried on by independent farmers on their fields. The existence of the Southern slave system depended on its expansion to larger territories. America with its vast virgin land provided good field for such an expansion. The expansion of slavery of the South meant the extinction of the freedom of the Northern farmer and with it of the bourgeoisie and working class. "The present struggle between South and North is nothing but a struggle between two social systems, the system of slavery and the system of free labour. Because the two systems can no longer live peacefully side by side on the North American

Continent, the struggle has broken out. It can only be ended by the victory of one or the other." (Marx, 7th November 1861). The Civil War was fought on these issues. The bourgeoisie of the North, suffering from the corruption inherent in the class took up the question in a lukewarm manner. It was even prepared to compromise with the South. In his letter to Engels dated July 1, 1861 Marx says, "I found that the conflict between the South and the North - after the latter had been degrading itself for the last 50 years from one concession to another - finally came to blows through the weight cast into the balance by the extraordinary development of the North-West States. This population richly mixed with fresh German and English elements, besides that, essentially self-working farmers, was naturally not so inclined to be intimidated as the gentlemen of the Wall Street and the quakers of Boston." The population of these North-West States was 7,870,869 as against the 5,000,000 of the seceding slave States. The corruption in the bourgeois management of the war was overcome by the revolutionary elements of the farmers and workers and the war was won.

The First International on its foundation sent an Address to Abraham Lincoln, congratulating him on his re-election to the Presidency which he had held during the anti-slavery struggle. Marx, the founder of Communism,

which is the enemy of the bourgeoisie sending an address to the President of the bourgeois Republic! Why? Because historically a bourgeois republic involving the destruction of the slave oligarchy is a forward step in the progress of society to a Socialist revolution. Enemy of all slavery, Communism considers the wage-slavery of the modern worker as a higher stage in the social advance to freedom. Hence the address. But the address itself is not a piece of vulgar sycophancy, as is found in the innumerable addresses that are presented by the Indian bourgeoisie to their Imperialist masters or its patriotic agents. The address did not want the American people to be lost in wage slavery after overthrowing chattel slavery. It wanted death to all forms of slavery. "We congratulate the American people on your re-election by a large majority. If resistance to the slave power were the reserved watchwords upon your first election, the triumphant war cry of your re-election is 'death to slavery'. From the commencement of the Titanic American strife the workingmen of Europe felt instinctively that the star-spangled banner carried the destiny of their class. The contest for the territories that opened the dire epogee, was it not to decide whether the virgin soil of the immense tracts should be wedded to the Labour of the immigrant or the prostituted tramp of the slaveholders? When an oligarchy of three hundred thousand slaveholders dared to inscribe for the first time

in the history of the world, slavery on the banner of armed revolt, when on the very spot where hardly a century ago an idea of one great Republic had first sprung up, whence the first declaration of the Rights of Man was issued, and the first impulses given to the European revolutions of the 18th century; when on those very spots counter-revolution, with systematic thoroughness gloried in rescinding the ideas entertained at the time of the formation of the old constitution and maintained slavery to be a beneficent institution, indeed the only solution of the great problem of relation of Capital to Labour; and cynically proclaimed property in man the corner stone of the new edifice; then the working classes of Europe understood at once, even before the frantic partisanship of the upper classes for the Confederate gentry had given its dismal warning, that the slaveholders' rebellion was to sound the tocsin for a general holy crusade of property against labour and that for the men of labour with their hopes for the future, even their past conquests were at stake in that tremendous conflict on the other side of the Atlantic. Everywhere they bore, therefore, patiently the hardships imposed upon them by the cotton crises, opposed enthusiastically the pro-slavery intervention importunities of their betters and from most parts of Europe contributed their quota of blood to the good cause. While the workmen, the true political power of the North, allowed slavery to

defile their Republic, while before the negro mastered and sold without his concurrence they boasted in the highest prerogative of the white-skinned labourer to sell himself and choose his own master, they were unable to attain the true freedom of Labour, or to support their European brethren in their struggle for emancipation; but this barrier of progress has been swept off by the Red Sea of Civil War.

The workmen of Europe feel sure that as the American war of Independence initiated a new era of ascendancy for the middle class so the American anti-slavery war will do for the working classes."

The attitude of the European workers and especially of the British and French, referred to above, affords a strong contrast to the attitude that they are now asked to adopt towards the Indian and colonial struggle for emancipation. The American Civil War stopped the exports of cotton which was supplied from the Southern plantations to the British textile mills. The import of raw cotton fell from 1140.6 million pounds in 1860 to 309.3 in 1862. Thereby 60.3 per cent spindles and 58 per cent looms were rendered idle. Mills were closed down and workers in England and also in France were thrown out on the streets. A similar result has happened due to the revolutionary situation in China and India. In 1862, the workers in spite of starvation supported their comrades in the North,

because the Civil War was a crusade of slave property against free labour. The British bourgeoisie whose profits were threatened by the closure of mills, though at home it had voted 20 million pounds for the liberation of slaves, sympathised with the Southern Slave holding States. "The entire official English Press," wrote Marx to Lassalle on 29th May 1861, "is naturally for the slaveholders. They are the same fellows who have tired the world with their anti-slave-trade philanthropy. But, cotton, cotton!" The bourgeoisie tried to incite the workers to demonstrate against the North and bring pressure for compromise. But it failed. And today the same tale is repeated. The whole bourgeoisie is trying to suppress the movement in China, India and the Soviet Republic and inciting the workers to side with it in its counter-revolutionary activities by telling them that they are losing their bread due to the revolutionary activities of the working classes in other countries. What a strange contrast the attitude of Lancashire workers of 1862 presents to that now adopted by their Trade Union bureaucracy, that allows gun-boats to be manned by the British workers against the Chinese and Indian workers? The International solidarity of the working class written on the banner of the Comintern is thus a principle which in history has brought freedom from slavery to the whole American Republic and will now bring freedom from wage slavery to the whole world. We are but

continuing the traditions of the Lancashire workers of 1862, when we ask them to keep "Hands Off" the revolutionary working class and peasantry of India and China, who are waging a war of freedom from slavery to Imperialism and capitalism.

I.H.K.

2/11/31 (Evening Part II).

(37) The Paris Commune.

The period of the First International was enriched by another experience, very valuable to the proletarian class struggle. That was the lesson of the Paris Commune. With the establishment and fall of the Commune closes a period, which completes the task of laying completely theoretical foundations of Marxism, ideologically tested in the revolutionary struggles of 1848 and 1871. With the fall of the Commune ideological bondage of the European working class to the glamour and promises of bourgeois democracy also fell. With the fall of the Commune, the highest experience of the First International, the International also collapsed. But it left a complete system of Marxism, a complete and scientific understanding of the foundations of the bourgeois order that killed the Commune and a formulation of the proletarian revolutionary movement that would resurrect the Commune the ruins of its murderers on a colossal scale.

On the eve of the Franco-German War of 1870, the Paris members of the First International issued a Manifesto "to the workmen of all nations", in which they said, "brothers of Germany our division would result only in the complete triumph of despotism on both sides of the Rhine ...

workmen of all countries! Whatever may for the present become of our common efforts, we, the members of the International Working Men's Association, who know of no frontiers, we send you as a pledge of indissoluble solidarity, the good wishes and the salutations of the workmen of France". (Ex. P. 1179 - D 409). The workmen of Paris and Germany protested against the war, under the leadership of the International, but the forces of reaction had their game alright. At the commencement of the war, the German Emperor and Bismark had made it appear that for them it was a war of defence. But when after the battle of Sedan, the rottenness of the "Second Empire" of France became visible, the war was turned into a war of annexations. Germany asked for "guarantees" from France (just as today France asks "guarantees" from Germany). The guarantees were the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine and indemnity of five milliard francs. On hearing of the defeat and the news that the German armies were marching on Paris, the workers of Paris overthrew the Empire and declared a Republic on 4/9/1870. In this rising the workers were led by the secret organisations of Blanqui, the most redoubtable and uncompromising leader of the revolution, and also by the representatives of the First International. Though this time, as in every other case, the workers were the revolutionary forces, the actual Government was set up by "a Cabal of place hunting barristers with Thiers as their

statesman". The Blanquist and Marxist sections, though quite aware of the reactionary bourgeois character of the Government so formed, allowed it to function as the Prussians were at the gates of the Republic to drown it in blood. Blanqui wrote, "all opposition, all contradiction must disappear before the common need. There is only one enemy, the Prussia and his allies, the partisan of the fallen dynasty, who wishes Prussian bayonets to restore order in Paris." But the new Government was a hive of treacherous fellows who under the cloak of putting up a defence of Paris against the invaders were in fact trying to sell it. "Paris, however, was not to be defended without arming its workers, organising them into an effective force and training their ranks by the war itself. But Paris armed was revolution armed. A victory of Paris over the Prussian aggressors would have been a victory of the French workman over the French capitalist and his State parasites. In this conflict between national duty and class interest, the Government of National Defence did not hesitate one moment to turn into a Government of National Defection." (Here one may as well be reminded of the refusal of the Indian bourgeoisie to draw the revolutionary working class and peasantry in India into a direct and active conflict with Imperialism. The victory of the Indian workers and peasants over Imperialism is a victory of the Indian workers over the Indian bourgeoisie. In

this conflict between national duty and class interest the Congress of national independence does not hesitate one moment to turn into a Congress of national defection by the Gandhi-Irwin Agreement).

The Republican Government was headed by Thiers, that monstrous gnome who had charmed the French bourgeoisie for almost half a century, because he was the most consummate and intellectual expression of their own class corruption. Before he became a statesman, he had already proved his lying powers as a historian. The chronicle of his public life is a record of misfortunes of France. Scenting a popular commotion in the February Revolution of 1848, he had declared "I shall always be of the party of the revolution". When the revolution came and the working class instead of changing one ministry for another superceded Louis Philippe by the Republic, Thiers was disappointed and carefully hid himself, forgetting that the contempt of the working men screaned him from their hatred. After the June Massacre of the revolutionary workers, he became the leading mind of the "Party of Order". Fond of brandishing with his dwarfish arms in the face of Europe, the sword of the first Napoleon whose historical shoe-black he had become, his foreign policy always culminated in the utter humiliation of France. Despite his versatality of talent, and shiftiness of purpose, this man had his whole

lifetime been wedded to the most fossil routine. To him the deeper under-currents of modern society remained for ever hidden, but even the most palpable changes in its surface were abhorrent to a brain, all the vitality of which had fled to the tongue. Thus he never tired of denouncing as a sacrilege any deviation from the old French protective system. When a minister of Louis Philippe, he railed at the railways as a wild chimera; and when in opposition under Louis Bonaparte he branded as a profanation every attempt to reform the rotten French army system, Thiers was consistent only in his greed for wealth and his hatred of the men that produced it. Having entered his first ministry under Louis Philippe poor as Job he left it a millionaire. A master in small State roguery, a virtuoso in perjury and treason, a crafts man in all the petty stratagems, cunning devices and base perfidies of parliamentary party warfare; never scrupling when out of office, to fan a revolution, and to stifle it in blood when at the helm of the State; with class prejudices standing him in place of ideas, and vanity in place of a heart; his private life as infamous as his public life was odious - even when playing the part of a French Sulla, he could not help setting off the abomination of his deeds by the ridicule of his ostentation. This Thiers along with his "Cabinet" which was composed of Jules Favre, who by forgeries, proved in court, had become a rich man, of

Ernest Piccarb, who in conjunction with his brother, a man who was convicted of theft of 300,000 francs from the banks set false news going about from his Home Office to contrive the Stock Exchange rates to suit his speculation and such others, sat about electing a bogus Assembly and in its name convincing Paris and France of the necessity of surrender to Bismark. By their conspiracy and treason the Fort of Metz fell. When the workers of Paris heard this they attempted on 31/10/1870 to drive the Government out. But they did not succeed. The forces led by Blanqui recoiled before the idea of turning the national war into a civil war which alone was the guarantee of success of the national war. Blanqui yielded and a compromise again took place. It was agreed that the old Government should return, should hold new elections and make no prosecutions. Thiers consistent in his treachery, carried out the first two conditions but arrested as many opponents as he could. Elections were bound to be as desired by him, as one third of the territory was under the Germans, and the capital was cut off from the provinces. Thiers fooled the peasantry by the most lying statements about the revolutionary workers in Paris. A show Assembly sat and decided on capitulation on 27/1/1871.

The workers of Paris who were the real revolutionary sections behind the Republic were now confronted with the treachery of the bourgeoisie, which had surrendered to the

enemy because its class interests were threatened. Paris had either to lay down her arms at the insulting behest of the rebellious slave holders of Bordeaux and acknowledge that her revolution of 4/9/1871 meant nothing but a simple transfer of power from Louis Bonaparte to his royal rivals; or she had to stand forward as the self sacrificing champion of France whose salvations from ruin and regeneration were impossible without the revolutionary overthrow of the political and social conditions that had engendered the Second Empire and under its fostering care matured into rotteness. Paris emaciated by a five months' famine did not hesitate one moment. The civil war was opened by Thiers who sent some regiments to seize the artillery of the National Guards. The attempt failed, the usurpers were driven up. Thiers and his gang fled to Versailles. On 18/3/1871 the glorious workingmen's revolution took undisputed sway of Paris. The Paris Commune, the first embodiment of Marxism, of Proletarian Revolution, came into existence under the shadows of the frowning artillery of the Prussians and the treacherous French bourgeoisie at Versailles calling itself the National Government.

(38) We stand by the Commune - the French bourgeoisie killed the French workers' Commune.

Who had overthrown the corrupt debt-ridden Empire of Louis Bonaparte? The working class. Who were fighting uncompromisingly against the Prussian army? The workers.

What were the patriotic bourgeoisie led by Thiers doing? Arranging the terms of capitulation and the massacre of revolutionary Paris. In spite of exasperation, the workers so long as capitulation was not a fact, bore with the Government of patriotic forgerers and Stock Exchange robbers, in order not to hamper the defence of France. It is not they who started the civil war. It was the patriotic and treacherous counter revolutionary bourgeoisie, who, with the aid of the invaders' guns, attacked Paris in order to make the revolutionary workers agree to the Thiers-Bismark Agreement. "The Paris workers were putting the 'pact' in danger," so cried Thiers, and his patriotic gangs. "The Pact is in danger," so cries Mahatma Gandhi with his patriotic gangs, sixty years after the Commune, in a different part of the world. Thiers, that monstrous gnome called in the aid of the Prussian enemies' bayonets to compel revolutionary Paris to observe the "pact" and pay five milliard indemnity to the German King. Gandhi, the Mahatma and his patriotic bourgeoisie helped the British bayonets, realise from the revolutionary peasantry forty crores of the annual British land revenue loot. In subjective idealism Thiers was corruption and cowardice. In subjective idealism, the Mahatma is self-sacrifice and heroism. But though in personal character, the two are poles apart, objectively, the effect of the actions of both is the defence of the reactionary exploiting interests

of the bourgeoisie. Success of the Communards meant the repudiation of the huge national debts held mostly by the patriotic French bourgeoisie. Success to the revolutionary peasantry in India means the repudiation not only of the national debts but also of the six hundred crores of peasant debts held by the patriotic moneylenders in India. Thiers asked Bismark to lend the Prussian guns to support the "pact". Gandhi asks the Irwin to lend his "goodwill" to support the "pact" - the good-will behind which stand the good and willing bayonets of the Empire.

3.11.31

Evening 1st Part.

Thiers was not a Mahatma. When his counter-revolutionary forces entered Paris on the corpses of the workers, he left them to rot and stink and buried them even half alive. But the Congress of the Mahatmas is more subtle. It emasculates the revolutionary peasantry with slogans of peace and love, conferences and talks; disarms the revolution before it is bayoneted and afterwards provides "ambulance cars", a box of medicines and a box of Inquiry Committees, to inquire whether revolution clad in the rags of the starving peasant was shot with or without a warning of a Magistrate. Sixty years of Imperialist culture have given the patriotic Indian bourgeoisie a sense of humour, of which Thiers, the French Sulla, had not the advantage.

In this case we are alleged to have conspired with the Third International to establish a regime in India on the Soviet model. We are said to have received fantastic ideas and inspiration from "the penny yellow books found at the rickety bookshop windows in India, eagerly devoured by the sex hungry youths of India", as Miss Mayo likes to put it. But unfortunately the blood-hungry historians of Imperialism have forgotten history. Before the Soviet was born, there was the Paris Commune. There was the First International that embodied all the ideology of the Commune,

before the Third International contained the ideology of the Soviet. Gentlemen of the bourgeoisie, we uphold the principles of the Communist League classically expressed in its Manifesto of 1847; we are descended from the First International of 1864. We wave the banner of the Paris Commune of 1871, drowned in the red blood of the Paris workers by the patriotic French bourgeoisie and unfurled again 40 years later by the working class and peasantry of Russia. Our parentage is more ancient and nobler than the degenerate historians of the bourgeoisie think.

(39) The Commune and its decrees

What was the Commune? In what way did it distinguish itself from the Empire or the Republic. The Commune was that form of the State which the working class was trying to find and had failed to find since the February Revolution of 1848. On 18th March, the Central Committee in its Manifesto said, "Proletarians of Paris, amidst the failures and treasons of the ruling classes, have understood that the hour has struck for them to save the situation by taking into their own hands the direction of public affairs They have understood that it is their imperious and their absolute right to render themselves masters of their own destinies by seizing upon the Governmental power." But the Governmental power of the working class essentially differs in form and content from that of the bourgeoisie. "The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made

State machinery and wield it for its own purposes". The working class had made three revolutions and each time they had surrendered the State power into the hands of the bourgeoisie, who centralised and perfected the State machinery in order to suppress the working class and peasantry and exploit them with greater violence. In the 19th century took place the development of "the centralised State power, originating from the middle ages with its ubiquitous organs, standing army, police, bureaucracy, clergy and judges." With the development of class antagonisms between Capital and Labour, "the State assumed more and more the character of a public organisation for the oppression of labour i.e. of a machine for class domination. After every revolution marking a certain advance in the class struggle the merely oppressive character of the power of the State became more and more apparent. The State after the revolution of 1848-49, becomes the natural weapon of Capital in its war against Labour. The Second Empire had consolidated this. The Commune was the direct anti-thesis of the Empire. It was a definite form of a Republic which was to abolish not only the monarchical form of class rule but also class rule itself (References Exts: P 528 and P 1179). The Commune was not a change over from the Government of a Conservative Party of the bourgeoisie to the Government by a Labour Party of His Majesty, the bourgeoisie. It was not a change over from the

Government of Mahatma Irwin to the Government of His Excellency Gandhi. It was aimed at the fundamental alteration in the production relations of society. It was the transference of the productive forces held by the bourgeoisie to the direct administration of the producers. It was not a change merely in the superstructure but in the basis also. Therefore the Commune could not halt only with the expulsion of Thiers; it had to destroy the bourgeois State machine and replace it by one in which the working class was organised as the ruling class.

The first decree of the Commune was the abolition of the standing army and its replacement by the nation in arms. The Police, until then merely an instrument of the Government, was immediately stripped of all its political functions and turned into the responsible and at any time replaceable organ of the Commune. The same was applied to the officials of all other branches of the administration. From the members of the Council of the Commune down to the humblest worker everybody in the public service was paid at the rate of workman's wages as ordinary workingman. All privileges and representation allowances attached to the high offices of the State disappeared along with the offices themselves. Having got rid of the standing Army and the Police, the material weapons of the old Government, the Commune turned its attention without delay to breaking the weapons of spiritual oppression, the power of the

priests. The judicial functionaries lost their sham independence. In future they were to be elected openly and to be responsible and revokable. The Commune realised that ideal of all bourgeois revolutions, cheap Government by eliminating the two largest items of expenditure - the army and the bureaucracy. But neither cheap Government nor the "true Republic" was its ultimate aim; they were its mere concomitants. Its true secret was this. It was essentially a working-class Government, the produce of struggle of the producing class against the appropriating class, the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economical emancipation of Labour.

The Council of the Commune consisted of Municipal representatives elected by universal suffrage in the various districts of Paris. They were responsible and could be recalled at any time. The majority were naturally working-men or acknowledged representatives of the working class. But this form of the Commune is not to be confounded with breaking up of a centralised apparatus into decentralised piecemeal social groups of Communes or Panchayats (as dreamed of by the reactionary Utopian petty bourgeois). Modern methods of industrial production and planning rule this out. The decentralisation as it appears is merely an instrument to bring out the great initiative of the Proletariat and to associate it directly with every function of the State authority of its own class. In spite of

deciding once in three or six years which member of the ruling class was to represent the people in Parliament, universal suffrage was to serve the people, constituted in Communes, as individual suffrage serves every other employer in the search for the workman and manager in his business. The Commune was to have been not a Parliamentary but working corporation, Legislative and Executive at the same time. Its special measures could not but betoken the tendency of the Government of the people by the people. Such were the abolition of the night work of journeymen bakers; the prohibition under penalty of the employers' practice to reduce wages by levying upon their work people fines under manifold pretexts - a process in which the employer combines in his own person the parts of Legislator, Judge and executioner, and filches the money to boot. Another measure of this class was the surrender to associations of workingmen, under reserve of compensation, of all closed workshops and factories, no matter whether the respective capitalists had absconded or preferred to strike work. The Commune relieved the middle class of Paris - shopkeepers, tradesmen merchants - of the ever recurring cause of dispute, the debtor and the creditor accounts. This was the first and the last revolution in which the working class was openly acknowledged as the only class capable of social initiative by the great bulk of the middle class. The Parisian middle class unlike that of Soviet

Russia, due to its circumstances under the Empire, the robbery and suppression it had to undergo then in the interest of the big capitalists, stood by the Commune.

The Commune declared to the peasants that "its victory was their only hope". The bourgeoisie in 1848 had burdened him with additional taxation and wanted to shift on his shoulder the indemnity. The Commune declared that the peasant would be relieved of the blood tax and transform his blood-suckers, the notary, advocate, executor, and other judicial vampires into salaried communal agents elected by and responsible to himself. The French peasantry was thoroughly debt-ridden and was getting ready to overthrow its oppressors. The bourgeoisie at Versailles saw this already and they cut off Paris from the peasantry, spread lies about the Commune and massacred the Commune before the peasantry could come to its aid.

Since the establishment of the Commune, whilst robbery and thieving had left Paris along with Thiers and the bourgeoisie to reign at Versailles, there were no massacres or murders in Paris under the Commune. Though Thiers was sending spies to provoke attacks and pogroms, the Commune used the bullet on very few occasions. While Thiers was everyday shooting the national guards and Communards that strayed by chance in his range, the Commune did not shoot the hostages retained by it as guarantee.

for its men held by Thiers. On the very day when the Commune's Red Flag was raised Thiers arrested Blanqui and hurried out of Paris with his valuable prisoners. The Commune negotiated for exchange of prisoners, offered to release and give every man of Thiers in exchange for Blanqui. But the Versailles bourgeoisie replied "to give Blanqui to the Commune is to give it a head." Blanqui was imprisoned in a fortress with death sentence hanging over him for the rising of October 31, for daring to oppose the sale of France to Prussia by the patriots.

The Central Committee of the Commune elected on 26th March 1871 consisted of 92 members of whom 72 were socialists. Amongst them the Blanquists were in a majority while only 17 were Marxists, i.e. members of the First International. All of them were not men of calibre. Some were pure boasters and talkers. But that was inevitable in view of the youth and inexperience of the working class of that period. The Commune had failed to seize the Bank of France, a fatal mistake which embarrassed it financially. On the 18th March when Thiers fled to Versailles the Commune did not attack Versailles and break the counter-revolutionary stronghold which, if done, would have prevented the subsequent isolation of the Commune from the peasantry. When the spies of Thiers and his agents entered the Commune, sufficient Red Terror was not established against them. These mistakes, the mistakes of the youthful

for its men held by Thiers. On the very day when the Commune's Red Flag was raised Thiers arrested Blanqui and hurried out of Paris with his valuable prisoners. The Commune negotiated for exchange of prisoners, offered to release and give every man of Thiers in exchange for Blanqui. But the Versailles bourgeoisie replied "to give Blanqui to the Commune is to give it a head." Blanqui was imprisoned in a fortress with death sentence hanging over him for the rising of October 31, for daring to oppose the sale of France to Prussia by the patriots.

The Central Committee of the Commune elected on 26th March 1871 consisted of 92 members of whom 72 were socialists. Amongst them the Blanquists were in a majority while only 17 were Marxists, i.e. members of the First International. All of them were not mean of calibre. Some were pure boasters and talkers. But that was inevitable in view of the youth and inexperience of the working class of that period. The Commune had failed to seize the Bank of France, a fatal mistake which embarrassed it financially. On the 18th March when Thiers fled to Versailles the Commune did not attack Versailles and break the counter-revolutionary stronghold which, if done, would have prevented the subsequent isolation of the Commune from the peasantry. When the spies of Thiers and his agents entered the Commune, sufficient Red Terror was not established against them. These mistakes, the mistakes of the youthful

working class in the face of the bourgeoisie that commanded a huge military machine and all the roguery and treachery of years of bourgeois State-craft, were great mistakes. The bourgeoisie consolidated its position and attacked the Commune. The heroic Communards, workingmen and women fought to the last. The last fortress of the Commune fell on 29th May. The bourgeoisie shot and massacred thousands of men and women first in the battle and then in the orgy of judicial murders when the bourgeois Government was restored.

(40) What did Marxism learn from the Commune?

The experience of the Commune completed the part of Marxian theory on the question of the State. The Commune fell on 29th May. Marx considered the Commune such an important event in history that the very next day he read in London before the General Council of the International his thesis "The Civil War in France". (P 1179). The work is not only a theoretical exposition but a defence of the Commune, a classical and most brilliant account of the whole course of events and the only true and correct account of the Commune up till now.

As early as the Manifesto of 1847, Marx had come to the conclusion that the whole course of development must lead to the seizure of political power by the working class which then becomes organised as the ruling class. The

experiences of the revolutionary period of 1848-51 had shown that after each revolution the workers were armed. Consequently the first commandment of every bourgeois at the head of the State was the disarmament of the workers. Accordingly after every revolution won by the workers a new struggle arose which ended with their defeat. The oppressing class did not leave arms with the oppressed class. It perfected the machinery of oppression the more, irrespective of the fact whether the form of the State so established was monarchy or a Parliamentary democracy. Naturally the working class when it becomes the ruling class must suppress the overthrown bourgeoisie. This suppression is not the same as the suppression of the working class and peasantry by the bourgeoisie. The former is a suppression of a parasitic minority by the majority, the people, who are producers of wealth. The latter is a counter-revolutionary suppression of the majority, the people, by the minority, the bourgeoisie, in order to continue the appropriation of wealth socially produced by the majority. As this oppression and exploitation of the working class is upheld and organised through the State, the working class has to destroy this bourgeois State. Marx had not yet found what the working class will substitute in its place. The idea of a Dictatorship of the Proletariat was born in the forties but its form was not clear. Marxists are not speculators or Utopians. Marx waited for history

to give the answer. The Commune was the answer. The working class does not set up a Parliamentary democracy of the bourgeois type. The working class cannot continue with the old bureaucratic machine. The bourgeois State, i.e. its bureaucracy, Army, Police, Judiciary has to be replaced by the Commune State, now called the Soviet State. That was the form "discovered at last" by the working class to administer its Dictatorship during the transition to Socialism.

I.H.K.

3/11/31 (Evening Part II).

The new State administering the Dictatorship of the Proletariat for the minority composed of the parasites, who are now deprived of their political power and therefore plot the counter revolution with tenfold intensity, is not a "State in the proper sense of the word" because it is no longer an organ of an exploiting class to hold down by organised violence the exploited class. The petty bourgeois writers fail to understand this character of the new State. And some of them think that whereas formerly the capitalists exploited the workers, now the workers will exploit the capitalists. Such thinking betrays a lack of understanding of the essence of the social relation of classes in economy. The essence of capitalist economy is that a parasitic non-working bourgeois class by its ownership of the instruments of production which is fortified by its militarism organised in the State extracts surplus values from the working class and peasantry which is compelled to sell its labour power to the bourgeoisie, and appropriates it for its own class interests. That is exploitation of one class by another. In the proletarian State, the working class organised in the State "owns" the means of production and "employs" itself to work them. The surplus they produce is not surplus value in the former sense, that is it is not produced by the sale of wage labour of one class to another

class and is not appropriated by or for that parasitic class, to again become capital, that is a further means of extracting more surplus value. Now in such a State if the former dispossessed bourgeoisie is forced to work in the factories and fields, it is not selling its wage labour to any parasitic class in order to produce profits for that class, because the bourgeois turned into a workman is now his own employer a member of the working class. It is obvious that we can not be said to "exploit" ourselves when we work to produce values, which come back to us in another form and are not appropriated by a parasitic class. The bourgeois State and the feudal State, were organised to uphold the "exploiting" and "exploited" relations between two classes and to keep the exploiting in power and exploited in subjection. Since the economic category of exploitation which is the basis of all the previous States vanishes when the proletariat abolishes private ownership and appropriation of social necessities, the proletarian State ceases to possess the essence of the former State. Therefore it is no longer a State in the proper sense of the word.

Neither the Commune nor the Soviet resembles the parliamentary institutions of the bourgeoisie. The parliamentary institutions as found in the bourgeois State are merely a screen to delude the working class and peasantry into thinking that they themselves determine their own fate

through the suffrage, that in spite of this, if their poverty is not removed, the evil lies in the "eternity of poverty" or an "unknowable force". The Commune or the Soviet differs from the parliamentary institution in that it is a "working institution". It undertakes both the executive and legislative functions, is directly engaged in the production and distribution of commodities. The Commune or Soviet is also based on the elective principle. Only so long as a former dispossessed bourgeoisie is not rendered harmless the suffrage is restricted to the workers and poorer peasants. The Soviet is the present form of the Commune which accomplishes in the best available manner the association of the producers directly in the administration of things.

(41) Close of the First International period - factions in the First International - growth of the State machine - decline of Blanquism and Anarchism - International Congresses - literature of Communism - works of Marx and Engels.

The fall of the Commune closed one historical period in the growth of the bourgeoisie as well as of the proletarian class struggle. As we have seen earlier (para 26) the bourgeoisie embarked on a period of large scale production, trustification and colonial expansion. The capitalist State became more centralised, more perfected in its technique that is its bureaucracy, military, police

prisons, etc. This made it invulnerable to Blanquist corps or anarchist (Bakunist) attacks. It was not possible any longer to overthrow the bourgeoisie by the strength of a secret "Society of Seasons" in the absence of ^{an} all national crisis. With the expansion of Capitalism and conquest of colonies, a section of the working class began to be bought over and turned into an aristocracy of labour amenable to bourgeois influence. The continuous fall in prices led to a more or less general increase in real wages and reduced the incentive to risings. The strong wave of repression that was set in motion by the bourgeoisie, alarmed at the Commune and all that it signified, rooted out many a revolutionary working class group and the working class transferred its struggle to the industrial front.

The experiences of the Commune completed the revolutionary theory of Marxism especially on the question of the bourgeois State machinery. But with the fall of the Commune also fell the International. The International was not a strong party organisation exclusively of Communists or Marxists as the Third International is. The First International served as a federation of trade unions as also an organisation of revolutionaries, who took their stand on Socialism as their final aim. This was due to the fact that the bourgeoisie, and the petty bourgeoisie especially, had not yet perfected their political domination

as against the feudal elements and were therefore compelled to call the workers into directly political conflict which led to the trade unions being participants in purely political action. The rigid limitation of trade unions to industrial action was a growth of the later period when the sharp division of classes led to the system of party, each class creating its own political party, which of course, was bound to rest basically on the economic organisation of the particular class. The socialism of the revolutionaries in the International, though one in its main outlines and agreeing with Marxism, was not agreed as to the correct methods of its achievement. There were in the International Proudhonists, Bakuninists, Massinists, Blanquists and Marxists, all with different ideas regarding the course which the revolution ought to take, the role of the State, the nature of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and such other vital questions. The Proudhonists thought that with their very radical description of property as theft they were Socialists, while in practice and after a further elaboration of theory they were found to be merely against the excessive concentration of property and upheld the small Capitalists. They were opposed to strikes also. It was the "Socialism" of the shopkeepers. The Massinists shouted for God and thus made room for the clergy under whose ample cloak masqueraded mammon. Massinist's bourgeois God was pounced upon by the

Bakuninist's campaign against "God and State". And the latter would even bring the forces of the nether world to smash the state "now and at once, in any way you can, wherever you can." Smash the State and society and its economy will take care of itself. He also considered the petty bourgeois middle class a stronger revolutionary element than the working class. The Blanquists were nearest to the Marxists but they believed in the secret society and the military coup by the workers, as the sole form of revolutionary action for establishing the Dictatorship of the proletariat. Marxism included and was greater than Blanquism, had nothing in common with Bakuninism, except the final stage of society wherein, both agreed, there would be no State. It was absolutely marked off from the Proudhonists and the Massinists. The Commune precipitated these differences into active demarcation. The strongest quarrel was waged between Bankuninists anarchists and Marxists, wherein the latter won in all the Congresses of the International and the Bakuninists were expelled in 1872 at the Hague Congress. But this was not the real cause of the break up of the International which could have continued to work with greater vigour, with the disappearance of non-Marxist elements. The real cause, as noted above, is the change in the material conditions of the workers and the objective situation which grew less favourable for a proletarian revolution as Capitalism

ascended and grew.

The achievements of the First International were mainly amalgamations of national socialist parties into a centralised body and building a revolutionary Marxist basis for them. It also introduced international trade union unity. The General Council resolution of 1866 on the Austro-Prussian War, directed that the national war must be used by the workers for advancement of their struggle for emancipation. The Lausanne resolution of 1867 said that wars are not prevented merely by the abolition of the army but it requires a change in the social system. The Brussels resolution of 1868 recommended that "workers down tools in case of war breaking out in their countries, for war today is civil war, workers fighting against workers." This famous attitude was adopted by the Second International but betrayed by it in the Imperialist war of 1914. And it is the same attitude which is being insisted upon by the Communist Parties of the world today. (References Ex. P 527).

After the dissensions of the Bakuninists assumed an acute form and they were expelled, and the other parties especially the British Trade Unions grew cold, the Head Quarters of the International were transferred to New York. After two years it was disbanded in 1874.

The revolutionary philosophy of the working class which was formulated from the "existing class struggle,

from a movement going on before our very eyes", and which was tried, tested and enriched by the revolutionary experiences of the workers of 1848-51 and of 1871 received the most brilliant and profound expression in the works of Marx and Engels. The theory of class struggle was already advocated before them. But the fundamental proposition of historical materialism was Marx's own discovery as also the theory of surplus value. Side by side with the organization work carried on by Marx he supplied the movement with the rare productions of his genius, which carried Socialism from a realm of utopianism on to a scientific basis. Marx's outstanding works are the "Manifesto" (1847) - Ex. P. 21; "The Critique of Political Economy", (1859); "Capital" (1867, 1885, 1894) - Ex. P. 455; "Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte" (1851) - Ex. P 1193 - D 408; "The Civil War in France" (1871) - Ex. P 1179 - D 409. Engels collaborated with Marx in many of his writings. The work "Revolution and counter revolution" which goes in the name of Marx was written by Engels. Engels edited the two volumes of "Capital" after Marx's death. He also wrote the most popular exposition of Communism, "The anti-Duhring" (1877) when the German Professor Duhring, who, though blind, was a brilliant and learned author, had undertaken the work of smashing Marxism. Engels' most original study is the "Peasant war in Germany" - (Ex. P 1183 - D 407). Both in their life

had become the acknowledged leaders of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. Marxism had become the basis to which most of the parties in Europe were veering.

(42) Founding of the Second International - its period - The 1914 war and the Second International.

The disbanding of the First International did not mean the breakdown of the working class socialist parties or their international alliance. Some sort of international contact was maintained by the Bakuninists, who, when expelled from the First International, after its disbanding, continued to hold International Conferences calling themselves the real First International. These conferences ceased in 1881 on the death of Bakunin and the ebb of anarchism in the Continental countries due to the growth of class consciousness amongst the workers and all the socialist parties. Each country was building a strong socialist party of its own, the strongest being the Social Democratic Party of Germany, which was declared illegal by Bismark in 1879. It continued to function, issued a newspaper from Switzerland, scored heavily at the elections and was legalised in 1890 when Bismark was removed. The socialist organisation of the German working class was far ahead of the other countries and remained so for a long time till the Russian Communist Party outstripped it. In England the Social Democratic Federation was formed in 1881,

the Fabian Society in 1885, the Socialist League in 1885 and the Independent Labour Party in 1893. In 1889, on 14th July, fell the 100th Anniversary of the capture of Bastille, the first rising of the workers which began the French Revolution. On this occasion delegates from all the Socialist Parties assembled in Paris for the celebration of the anniversary and it was decided to form the Second International. There it was also decided that "at a definite moment a wide scale international demonstration is to be organised in such a way that in all countries and all towns simultaneously on a definite date the workers submit to the State Power the demand for the introduction of the eight hour day and proclaim aloud the other decisions of the International Paris Congress". (References Ex. P 2491).

D. D/-4.11.31 Evening 1st Part.

The American Federation of Labour had fixed the 1st of May 1890 for such a demonstration even before this Congress had met, so the Second International adopted that date. Thus the May Day came into existence. It is not a day of merriment but a day of demonstration of the International class solidarity of the Proletariat, a day to summarise each year's experiences of the class struggle and to formulate and propagate the demands of the Proletariat. (References P 2491).

The Second International was born in a period when the national bourgeoisie of the big capitalist powers was partitioning the world amongst themselves, and bringing the loot to the home countries. On the basis of this colonial loot, the bourgeoisie succeeded in bribing sections of workers with high wages and ameliorations. It resulted in deflecting the working class on to a policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie and renouncing the path of class struggle. The Trade Union struggle for partial demands, for less hours and higher wages, for Parliamentary suffrage became the leading issues before the workers. The effect of this was that a tendency arose to "revise" the revolutionary side of Marxism. The "Revision Movement" was undertaken by Bernstein, an

engineer and a brilliant pupil of Engels, who, at the time of his death, had entrusted all his library and papers to Bernstein. Bernstein belonged to the German Party, was exiled by Bismark, went to stay in England, after a short stay in other countries and remained there for several years. While there, he came under the influence of the British bourgeoisie and the aristocracy of Labour which had become "responsible" and "reasonable" by the share in the colonial loot. The cardinal point of the "Revisionists" was that it was not necessary, after all, for the working class to seize and smash the bourgeois State by a violent revolution. A gradual transformation through the Parliamentary and other institutions would do the task. "Co-operate with the bourgeoisie", "industrial peace", etc. were naturally the slogans of the new pseudo Marxists and Socialists. The worst danger was that they justified all this by reference to Marxism itself.

The Second International became a loose Federation of all sorts of Socialists, who were agreed that capitalist society should be superseded by Socialist society and that the political struggle was a necessity for the workers. It is interesting to note that amongst the adherents of the Second International in India, who have since the growth of the Communist Movement found themselves suddenly in love with the Second International or the Indian National Congress, there are several groups, who would not

like the workers in India "to dabble in politics". But the Second International in 1891 and 1893 emphasised the importance of the political struggle, and debarred organisations which did not recognise this from entering it. But having no really Marxist or revolutionary basis, the individual sections deteriorated and in France the "Socialist" Millerand joined the French Ministry of the Waldeck-Rousseau Cabinet. This was the first betrayal by a National Socialist Party and created a storm in the Socialist Parties of the world. The Paris Conference of 1900 and Amsterdam Conference of 1904 by a majority decided that Socialists should not join a bourgeois Government but those who had already done so refused to resign. So in 1904, Millerand, Viviani and Briand were expelled. In 1907, at the Stuttgart Congress the opportunists moved that the Trade Unions should not be controlled by the Social Democratic Parties, thus trying to rescue the mass organisations from the direction of their revolutionary sections organised into parties. The increasing hunt for colonies and the clashes of the Imperialist powers over them, the testification of industry and frictions arising from international cartels and their division of the world into reserved markets led to threats of war and a tremendous increase in militarism. The war danger became very imminent by 1912 when the International crisis threatened Imperialism. The crisis was getting more and more acute

since 1910 and England was in the grip of a big strike wave. The reason was that while the period before 1900 was one of falling prices the growth of monopoly in all its forms had checked that tendency and prices were rising steadily from 1900 to 1910 leading to a fall in real wages. In England the seamen and dockers struck in 1911 and won. They were followed by the railwaymen. 1912 saw a great miners' strike. In 1913 the Dublin Capitalists locked out their workers. It was followed by a building workers' strike in 1914. If the War had not broken out, 1914 would have seen a tremendous All National General Strike with revolutionally consequences in England. The workers in Russia who had been suppressed after the revolution of 1905 had begun to rise again with the Lena Gold-Fields Massacre. The atmosphere was filled with the talk of war and strikes.

What was the reaction of the Second International to this rising revolutionary wave? The International had already failed to keep the Social Democrats from joining bourgeois Govts, because joining a bourgeois Government means aiding the bourgeois State in its function of suppressing the working class. When War was threatened, the International in its Congress at Stuttgart (1907) and Copenhagen (1910) considered the question and betrayed its opportunist character. The Left Wing at this Congress headed by Keir Hardie of the British Labour Movement and Vaillant, a French Socialist (not the Bakuninist anarchist)

advocated that if a war broke out, the workers of all countries should immediately declare a General Strike as the war would be a war of Imperialists. This proposal was rejected by 131 to 51. The International abandoned its character of an International of workers and left its Parties to fight for their own bourgeoisie in case of war.

(43) What it did when war actually broke out - the role of the Labour Party - the vote for war credits in Germany.

When the War actually broke out the Socialist deputies of the Second International sitting in the Parliaments of their respective countries voted for the war credits. All the talk of preventing war by a General Strike or by any other means "most appropriate" was thrown overboard. The Socialists of the Second International led the workers to fight the battles of their bourgeoisie. The heritage of the First International, the lessons of the Paris Commune, of Marxism, were forgotten and the betrayal was great because the Second International influenced a membership of 12 millions from 27 countries. The International crisis threatening capitalism was jumped over by the war. The patriotic mania, the supposed danger of being wiped away from the face of the earth that was held by the bourgeoisie of each warring nation, before its workers and peasants, the false propaganda of the bourgeois Press and the

cooperation of the leaders of the working class with the bourgeoisie, set aside the strike wave, the militant action of the working class against the capitalist system, in the belief that the war would solve the problem of poverty. The working class and peasantry of each nation was led to believe that the defeat of the bourgeoisie of its enemy would mean victory for itself. The exploitation of India at present is being directed in the interest of British Imperialism by the so-called Labour Party. The Indian bourgeoisie and its petty bourgeois intellectuals grasped the Imperialist nature of this "Labour Party" only when it hit them by an ordinance in 1924, and its policy in 1929 and 1930. But the Communists have exposed the opportunist and Imperialist role of the Labour Party since the War, when it joined hands with the Imperialists of its country. When Australia declared war on July 25, 1914 the Parliamentary Labour Party expressed its gratification at the "peace efforts" of Sir Edward Grey and asked all Labour organisations to "watch events vigilantly so as to oppose if need be in the most effective way any action which may involve us in war." On August 1, the British section of the Bureau of the Second International issued a manifesto over the signatures of Keir Hardie and Arthur Henderson calling upon Labour "to hold vast demonstrations against war in every industrial centre." "Combine and conquer the militarist enemy. Down with class rule."

Two days after this the British bourgeoisie declared war! The anti-war resolution of the Second International at Basle called for every means to prevent war, having regard to the sharpness of the class struggle and the general political situation. What was the position of the class struggle in England at this time? Mr. Sydney Webb now the bulwark of the Imperialism, says, "The number of disputes culminated in the latter half of 1913 and the first half of 1914 in the outbreak of something like 150 strikes per month. British Trade Unionism was, in fact, in the summer of 1914 working up for an almost revolutionary outburst of gigantic industrial disputes which could not have failed to be seriously embarrassing for the political organisation to which the movement had committed itself, when in August 1914 war was declared and all internal conflicts had perforce to be suspended." Webb omits to mention that the suspension was not voluntarily done by British Labour but under the false leadership of its Labour-Imperialists. The Basle resolution declared that "should the war none the less break out every effort must be made to utilise the crisis and hasten the fall of capitalist domination." The leadership of the British workers failed to carry this out. On 7th August 1914 the Labour Party decided to make no pronouncement on the vote of war credits. On August 29, the E.C. of the Party "agreed with the policy of the Parliamentary Party in joining the campaign to strengthen

the British Army," and promised the support of its organisations! The betrayal was made complete by sending the Secretary to the Party, Mr. Arthur Henderson to enter the Cabinet in July 1915. On August 24, the Trade Union Congress, the General Federation of Trade Unions and the Labour Party decided to terminate all the existing trade disputes. Fearing that the workers would denounce them, they also cancelled the T.U.C. Session. In March 1915 the T.U. leaders entered into an agreement with Lloyd George by which the workers surrendered every right of theirs. Holidays and the eight-hour-work day were abrogated, employment of women and children in mines was introduced, all former wage agreements were suspended and the workers were not to get even overtime pay or compensatory allowance for all these sacrifices to Imperialism. (Webb's history of Trade Unionism). The Munitions of War Act of 1915 prevented a worker from leaving his work without the consent of the employer. The result was that wholesale robbery of workers' wages was practised by the employers and if they protested, they were sent to the Army.

The Indian bourgeoisie draws a different lesson from this. It asks the Indian workers and peasants to emulate the patriotism and self-sacrifice of the British workers in stopping class war when threatened by an enemy from outside. But it fails to mention the role of the British

bourgeoisie. It was the workers who were killed on the battle-field. On the economic field it was the workers who bore the war burden. The bourgeoisie bought war bonds and is even now after 12 years living on the interest. The war profiteers in every country are well-known to the workers. The bourgeoisie in every country reaped a harvest of wealth from the war while the workers were thrown in the harvest of tornadoes of high prices, disease and massacres.

It is wrong to suppose that British workers did not strike for wages during the patriotic war. The engineers, miners, armament workers, all had to strike for higher wages as the prices were rising. The employers called for Government intervention but the workers refused to be intimidated and in some cases they won. The Clyde workers in a manifesto, denounced the Trade Union officials' support to the Government as "an act of treachery to the working classes". With the sanction of the treacherous leadership, the workers' leaders in the armament works were deported in March-April 1916. Thus throughout the 1915-1916 the workers were carrying on class war on the industrial front while the bourgeoisie and the opportunist Second International leadership of the British Labour Party, the I.L.P. and the T.U.C. were cooperating against the British workers to carry out an Imperialist war. It was the natural outcome of becoming renegade to Marxism. (References Ext : P 127C, "The Communist" - January 1928).

The Social democratic deputies in the Reichstag voted for war credits. The French deputies did the same. In Russia, the Duma copied the betrayal. The International solidarity of Labour against the bourgeoisie was forgotten.

(44) Attitude of Communists to war - Lenin's slogans
- the work of Leibknecht and Rosa Luxemburg -
the perversion of Lenin's slogans by the Social
Democrats.

But was there none in that huge organisation of 12 million workers of 27 countries to oppose the war, to denounce it and give the correct Communist lead to the working class of the world? Was none so courageous and faithful as to stand out in that International fever of patriotism fanned by the Imperialist Press in every country and give the slogan of the Proletarian Revolution? There was; and it was the small Left Wing section of the Second International under the leadership of Lenin, Luxemburg and Leibknecht. We have already seen the revolutionary attitude to war as indicated by Marx and the First International. The same attitude was endorsed by the Second International but whereas the Paris Commune carried out its revolutionary duty, the Second International failed to do so. The attitude of the Communists of the Third International to the question of war is a continuation of the Marxist attitude and a continuation of the Leninist preaching during the last Imperialist war.

The Leninist attitude to war is determined from the class point of view. Is the war waged in the interest of the working class by the revolutionary working class? Is the war a progressive one leading to a further unfolding of the class struggle or is it reactionary? For example, the wars waged by the bourgeoisie in the 18th and 19th centuries were progressive wars. Because they were wars waged by the bourgeoisie against the absolute feudal order, thus leading to the development of capitalism, the development of productive forces and of the Proletarian struggle bringing the whole epoch nearer to the fight for Socialism. The war waged by the Indian or the Chinese bourgeoisie would be a progressive war in the same sense.

I.H.K.

4/11/31 (Evening Part II).

But the war of 1914 was a reactionary war. It was a war of Imperialist Powers, who fought in order to destroy the productive forces of one another as there was no room for further expansion or growth. An Imperialist war signifies the end of the progressive growth of Capitalism and is therefore a sequel for proletarian revolution. It shows decline, not progress. This has been amply proved by the post war experience. In Europe, the Franco-German War was the last national war. Today in the world, the wars waged by the colonies for Independence from the Imperialist yoke can be said to be progressive national wars. So also the wars waged by the Proletarian Soviet State against an Imperialist State would be a revolutionary progressive war.

In the second address of the First International to the workers, Marx therefore asked the workers to do their duty as citizens, but at the same time to consolidate their position as workers. In 1848, he also advised a war against Russian Czarism, in order to weaken the reactionary feudal forces, which every time suppressed the progressive forces of the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry and workers from developing. But the same position did not remain in 1914 when German and Russian Imperialisms fought each other. Because now both of them were ripe for being overthrown and there could be no preference. The productive forces in

both had reached their maximum within the bourgeois structure and could be pushed further only by being liberated from the shackles of private ownership. Hence Communists oppose the Imperialist war but support the revolutionary war of one proletarian State against the bourgeois State, or of the colonies against their Imperialist masters or of workers against the bourgeoisie. Our anti-war attitude is not that of pacifists or humanitarians; it is a class attitude. The Social Democrats in the Second International failed to see this. Outwardly every Imperialist State called the war one of "defence". But in fact every Imperialist State wanted to destroy the other, with the net result that one Imperialism is substituted for another; one reaction for another reaction. It was not a question of substituting Feudalism by Capitalism or Capitalism by Socialism.

There were some sections of Social Democrats, who took the slogan of "Neither peace nor war". This attitude also was wrong. If the war was reactionary it had to be opposed. Such an opposition could not be neutrality like that of the pacifists. When the bourgeois State forced the working class to fight its war, the opposition to the fight could only be a civil war. This was the attitude adopted by the revolutionary wing of the Second International under the leadership of Lenin. The Social Democratic Labour Party of Russia in its manifesto in November 1914

said "It is the task of the Social Democrats in every country to wage in the first and foremost place a fight against Chauvinism in their respective countries. The overthrow of Czarism, the United States of Europe, erected on the ruins of Russian, German, Austro-Hungarian monarchies the Socialist Revolution in the advanced countries, the Democratic Revolution in Russia, were to be the aims of the struggle. The transformation of the Imperialist war into civil war, such was to be the road." On 15th July 1915 writing in the "Social Democrat", the paper of the Russian Party, Lenin wrote "During a reactionary war the revolutionary class can not but desire the defeat of its own government. (References P 2391). Revolution in war time is civil war and the transformation of the war of State into a civil war is facilitated by military failures (defeat) on the part of the Governments of the States. It is in fact impossible to bring about such a transformation without encouraging defeat." (Ex. P 247 page 58). Against the Imperialist slogan of "Save your country", the Bolshevik slogan was "Welcome defeat" - "Change Imperialist war into civil war". Any body who has lived through the war craze can see what tremendous revolutionary courage was required to stand in the centre of Europe and issue such slogan when even the mightiest Second International leaders had joined on the side of the war in their respective countries.

The Imperialists tried to pervert the slogan. In Russia they argued that Lenin wanted Germany to be victorious. But this was not so. The slogan was to be acted upon by the workers in every country. So there could not be a question of wishing the victory of the Imperialism as against another. Some Social Democrats formulated the question that if the workers and peasants of one country misled by its bourgeoisie did attack another, where the workers were not in a position to overthrow their bourgeoisie, should the social democrats simply see their workers and peasants massacred? The answer is that whatever be the position of the party it can not support its bourgeoisie in the war. It must oppose it. Secondly the attack on the bourgeoisie affects the bourgeois State, which is bound to arm the workers and peasants for the war. So the question of impotent massacre is ruled out by the bourgeoisie itself. The Party has to utilise this position, overthrow its bourgeoisie and then if peace becomes impossible to conduct a revolutionary war. That is what the Russian Social Democrats - the Bolsheviks - did.

The Social Democratic members of the Russian Duma refused to sanction war credits - the Bolsheviks were not opportunists like the Labour Party. In Germany the banner of revolt was led by Leibnecht in the German Reichstag. At the first voting, he was led by the idea of party discipline and as the German Social Democrats had decided

to vote for war, Liebnacht obeyed the mandate. But later he rebelled and in March 1915 he voted against war. He was immediately drafted as a common soldier in the army. Exactly the Leninist attitude was taken by the great Irish leader James Connolly who was not in touch with Lenin at all. Connolly advocated that the Irish workers must begin the war of national Independence immediately, taking advantage of the Imperialist carnage. The most consistent and virulent opposition was organised by the Bolsheviks in Russia and Liebnacht and Rosa Luxemburg in Germany. At first the British, French and Russian Imperialists applauded the "German" Liebnacht and Luxemburg for taking up the slogan of "Civil War". The German Imperialists cheered the "Russian" Bolsheviks for advocating the overthrow of Czarism. Thus the Imperialists of every warring country wanted to use the Communists in the enemy countries for their own victory. While the Communists in all the Imperialist countries wanted to unite internationally for the overthrow of all the bourgeois States by using their mutual military conflict.

(45) Zimmerwald and Kienthal Conferences - proposal of founding the Third International - the Russian Revolution.

For three years the struggle did not bear fruit. The masses had not yet been convinced by their own experience

of the correctness of the Bolshevik lead. Without such an experience, the finest theory and leadership fall flat. For two years the Left Wing of the Second International could do nothing except issuing manifestoes to the workers, forming propaganda centres wherever possible and organising fractions. The greatest work in this direction was carried on by Liebnicht in Germany and the Leninists in Russia. Within the Second International a revolutionary Left Wing had been growing since 1907 under the leadership of Lenin and Luxemburg. In 1910 they tried to organise a Conference of the revolutionary Left Wing but did not succeed as the members were afraid of the powerful International throwing them out. In the quarrel between the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, the International sided with the Mensheviks. After the war, opportunism became still more vivid. So when a Conference was held at Zimmerwald in September 1915, the Leftists formed the Zimmerwald Left and issued a manifesto against the war calling upon the workers to turn the Imperialist war into a civil war. Both at Zimmerwald and Kienthal the Left were not in a majority. Though they were not full congresses of the Second International yet they were congresses for all purposes of its adherents. At these conferences, Lenin brought forward a proposal of founding the Third International. Every one except a few members considered it a mad proposal. It was unthinkable that

any one could propose a Third International against the most powerful Second International of twelve million members. Even within the Russian Bolshevik Party the proposal was considered to be too radical. Lenin wanted the Party to break with the Zimmerwald platform and form a Third International. The majority opposed and the Bolsheviks remained in the Second International. According to Zinovieff, the nucleus of the Comintern was begun since 1907, the proposal made openly in 1915 and carried out in March 1919, after the Russian and German Revolutions. Three years of the Imperialist war convinced the workers that "one's enemy is in one's own country". That the Imperialist war must be turned into the civil war.

The exhaustion was felt first in the country which was the least strong in its organisation, where the Imperialist chain was the weakest and the workers' revolutionary party strongest. It was Russia. The shortage of bread, the mismanagement of munition at the front exasperated the workers and soldiers until the revolutionary tide could not be stemmed. The Czar was overthrown and a provisional Government was established in March 1917. The tide was rising in Germany also. On 28th June 1916, 50,000 workers in Berlin struck work for Liebknecht's release. Next day Brunswick joined it. It was the first political strike in Germany. But the revolution there took time to mature. It was one year after the Russian

Revolution that the Kaiser fled, on 9th November 1918.

The two Russian Revolutions of 1917 and the subsequent revolutions in the Central European countries were the direct outcome of the Imperialist war. But in the former, there was a party and a proletariat schooled in the experiences of the revolution of 1905. In the latter, there was no such party nor a proletariat that had gone through a revolutionary baptism, showing it the treacherous role of the pseudo revolutionary petty bourgeois parties. Moreover the Russian proletariat had the unique fortune of possessing the extraordinary genius of Lenin. The Russian Imperialist system was not so strong as the German or British. These and other factors gave birth to a successful proletarian revolution in Russia, while the proletarian revolutions and revolutionary attempts in other countries were betrayed and drowned in blood.

The Russian Revolution ushers in an epoch of proletarian revolutions and the emancipatory wars of the colonies. The Russian Revolution has been inspiring the world revolutionary movement of the workers for the last thirteen years. We stand here charged with advocating the same ideals and the same methods as were used by the Russian working class and peasantry in their fight against Czarism and Capitalism. Every bourgeois leader in India today tries to frighten British Imperialism with the

prospect of the Indian Bolsheviks getting stronger if Dominion Status were not given to the Indian bourgeoisie. There is a worldwide war against the Bolsheviks. We will therefore see what the Russian experience teaches us and what lessons we draw from it for the proletarian struggle in India.

D/5.11.31

Evening 1st Part.(46) Early Russian developments till 1905.

The development of capitalism began in Russia, later than in England, France, and Germany. While Europe and America as a whole were going swiftly on the road of capitalist development, the peasant was still a serf in Russia. The incapacity of feudal economy to compete with products of capitalist economy, the effects of the Crimean war and such other factors compelled the Czar to decree the abolition of serfdom in 1861. But the "abolition" was such that the peasant had literally to buy his freedom. If he wanted to cultivate his land as an independent peasant, the feudal lord demanded a price that he could never pay or if he could pay, he was given such a piece that he had to hire himself out to the landlord for more money as the small piece was insufficient to meet his needs. Thirty years after the emancipation, the peasants were still being flogged and sold as serfs. However, a certain stratum of small peasants and "free" labour was created. A part of the peasantry when completely ruined went to the town industry.

The republican ideas of the French Revolution had their influence upon the small middle class in Russia. Discontent against the Czarist system grew amongst them. When many of them, tired with the conditions in Russia,

went abroad for education and "Western" acquirements, they came in contact with the adherents of Marx and Bakunin, and imbibed their teachings, especially of the latter. The Russian intelligentsia was already filled with the Slavophilmania, that is, the notion that the Russian Slavs have special message to give to the world, (just like the Indian Rabindra Nath Tagore and Gandhi wandering about to give the "special message" of India to the world). There was prevalent in Russia the "Mir" an ancient system by which land was held in common by the village. The intelligentsia idealised the "Mir", idealised the peasants. The whole literary activity of the 1860s was full of an idealisation of the peasants. Bakunin gave the slogan "To the people". "Go amongst the peasantry, teach them, do good work for them and society will be cured of all ills including Csarism." One of the advocates of this movement, Pisarev added one more slogan - that the intelligentsia must undergo the same physical inconveniences as the peasantry, as a means for genuine approximation to the people. The Csar fearing the growth of revolutionary tendencies amongst the immigrant students called them back and threatened banishment if they did not return. They came back and went to the "people", started schools, became doctors, teachers and preachers and began to mildly stir up the peasants. Even this peaceful welfare work was not tolerated by the Csar. The natural reaction was

that they determined to leave "peace and welfare" and take to the road of violent terrorism. Terrorist activity was ^{its} at/height during the period of 1870-80, its greatest action being the assassination of the Czar Alexander II in 1881. The reaction of the Government to this was an increase in the secret Police force (the Okhrana) from whose operations even the members of the royal family were not left free. According to Masaryk, the average duration of the life of the Russian terrorist was two years. During the years 1860-92 the number of victims of the terrorist revolution is stated to have been 30,000 (Masaryk, "Spirit of Russia", Volume II). The presiding genius of Russian anarchism was Bakunin. It was not the anarchism, as we find it in India, the only factor common between the two being the name and terrorist attack against the members of the bureaucracy. Bakunin's mature philosophy was summed up in two words "against God and the State". Russian anarchism was atheistic, while the Indian is crudely superstitious, religious and even communal. The Russian anarchists were in fact anarcho-Communists, i.e. they wanted to abolish immediately the State, and institute Socialism, something of the Mir type. Therefore they asked for "Land and Freedom," of which only the latter is heard amongst the so-called Indian anarchists.

The absence of any outlet for the middle class intelligentsia in industries, the absence of liberal

bourgeois Parliamentary institutions combined with the monstrous rigour of repression made Bakuninist anarchism strong. But when during the latter part of the 19th century, capitalism began to develop in Russia, conditions altered. A stable Proletariat began to grow and with it the influence of Marxism also. In 1883, Plekhanov, Vera Zasulitch and Axelrod formed the first Communist Group that began popularising and applying to Russian conditions the theory of Marxism. These pioneers of Communism in Russia were drawn from the disillusioned ranks of the "Populists" (as the anarchists were called because of the slogan "To the people"). By 1895 there were three political groups contending for the leadership of the movement - one was the liberal bourgeoisie only supplicating for a constitution; second, the Populist socialists advocating destruction of autocracy and feudalism to be followed by a return to the old social life of the village Commune; third, the Social Democrats or Communists whose ultimate aim was a Communist society and immediate demands were the overthrow of Czarism, destruction of feudalism, a Constituent Assembly and the minimum demands of the workers; in fact a bourgeois democracy such as was obtainable in Western Europe.

Russian capitalism grew very rapidly between 1890 and 1900 whereas the rate of increase in the other countries was slowing down and they were hunting for division of the world markets. The impetus to this production was given

by the growth of railways which were needed for the movement of the grain trade of the land owners. Railways which were 1488 versts in 1860 increased to 4171½ by 1900. Along with them rose allied industries. The cheapness of labour brought in French and German Capital. The development took place mostly on large scale production, from the very beginning, as it was built on the technical experience of the Western bourgeoisie.

But side by side with this development there existed, unlike France or England, the all powerful land owning class whose parasitic demand of rent did not allow the growth of a middle peasantry but impoverished the whole strata. Between 1888 and 1898 in 50 provinces of European Russia, the number of horses owned by the peasants declined from 19.6 millions to 17 millions and cattle from 34.6 millions to 24.5 millions. The peasantry was destituted, cruelly exploited, flogged and shot for disobedience or refusal to do any serf labour. Its condition can be compared with that of our peasantry under the Talukdars of Oudh. The growth of industry on the one hand and complete ruination of the peasantry on the other was bound to lead to depression in trade and industry which set in at the beginning of 1900 and lasted in a more or less degree till 1910 and was the cause of the revolutionary upheavals slowly breaking out in 1901 and culminating in the revolution of 1905. (References P 247).

(47) Rise of various parties - Economists,
Anarchists, Social Democrats etc.

Petrograd was the first centre of railways and industry and therefore first of strikes also, which had begun as early as 1875. With the development of capitalism, the Proletariat began to appear on the scene as the separate force and claim attention from the revolutionary schools of thought. The Marxian viewpoint found adherents amongst the intelligentsia through the activities of the Pakhanov group. But Communists thought was as yet confined merely to the intellectuals and had not yet become the basis of Proletarian struggle. This was the first task carried out by Lenin. The economic struggle of the workers for wages and hours with their employers had attracted many intellectuals to the industrial centres for conducting the workers' movement and amongst them had sprung up various shades of thought. The activity of even the most mild welfare workers being forbidden by the Czarist Police, most of these circles were secret and Lenin worked amongst one of them. He had mastered Marxian Economics and political theory in his college days and was already under Police surveillance, his brother having been hanged for an anarchist attempt on the Czar. Lenin was a great admirer of the revolutionaries of the preceding epoch, their courage, methods of organisations and sacrifices. But he was convinced of their petty bourgeois

nature and the futility of their struggle, and he exposed their reactionary Socialism which wanted to return to the pre-capitalist and feudal State in which Russia had been rotting so far. He began this with his articles "The heritage - we renounce" and "The friends of the people - who are they?"

The depression in industry brought on a strike wave. Lenin had not remained content with merely exposing the horrible conditions of work of the workers. His circle while secretly circulating leaflets on workers' demands and exposing abuses explained to them that the solution of the evil lay not only in economic struggle, but that the overthrow of autocracy and a social revolution alone could finally solve the problem.

Now there were in Russia Marxists-Communists, who believed as Lenin believed, but who did not act up to their belief in the correct manner. By the time that the workers had begun to revolt and the political activity of the petty bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie on constitutional lines was gathering strength the Communists in Russia found themselves involved in immense ideological and organisational controversies out of which arose Leninism. There were the Economists. They considered the economic struggle of the workers as the only and most important struggle. They wanted the movement to be limited to minor

demands and improvement of material conditions. Political struggle against autocracy and for democracy they liked to leave to the petty bourgeoisie. Thus this school though calling itself "Social Democratic or Communist" was like our pure Trade Unionist or social welfare workers of the type illustrated by the Servants of India Society or the Servants of the People Society, who send organisers amongst workers for economic struggle, sometimes even with the ideal of Socialist society before them, but who in politics follow the pro-Imperialist Liberal Federation or such other institutions. The Socialism of this group consists in vaguely conceiving a socialist society to which the working class along with the other classes will somehow gradually evolve. The Economists laid great emphasis on "spontaneity of the masses". They considered that out of Trade Unions, out of the daily economic struggle, the masses will spontaneously rise to a higher class consciousness and the needs of the struggle. Next to the Economists was one group of Social Democrats or Communists who went a step further than the Economists. By all means the working class must take part in the political struggle. They admitted the Marxian slogan that every class struggle is a political struggle. But then they conceived it as a "process". The working class must first carry on "mild politics", the politics arising from Trade Unionism. It

must learn by experience what politics is, slowly and step by step. The working class is incapable, according to them, of building up a revolutionary party at once or grasping the revolutionary content of the anti-Czarist democratic movement, without a long course of training. Therefore, a Communist they said, must not incessantly call upon the workers for revolutionary action. This school also took the colour of maintaining the most uncompromising "class outlook". They would not like the workers to take part in the demonstrations of the petty bourgeoisie. They would not like the workers to take part in any democratic movement conducted by the bourgeoisie. On the face of it this looked very Marxian and an unadulterated class outlook. But in fact it hopelessly misunderstood the tactic and strategy of Marxism. The Communist Manifesto had long ago said that a Communist must support every revolutionary movement even that conducted by the bourgeoisie and use it for his own revolutionary aim. The Leninist line had to fight against all these tendencies and groups. It should be remembered that all these groups were in one party, this Social Democratic Labour Party of Russia and agreed on one programme but they differed in its application, in the line of struggle and also in the interpretation of Marxism. All of them relied on Marx just as today in India even the anti-Communist quotes Lenin in his support.

(48) Lenin opposes them - "What is to be done?" -
organisation of professional revolutionaries.

The most exhaustive refutation of the various wrong tendencies in Communism and the first clear formulation of Leninism is to be found in Lenin's work "What is to be done" which he wrote between 1901 and 1902. The outline of thoughts in this booklet had already appeared in the controversial articles of Lenin in the "Iskra". The Social Democratic Party was split into two sections in the Second Congress in 1903, nominally on the question whether or not to have a centralised organisation but really on the question of different tendencies with regard to the revolutionary struggle which later on crystallised into Menshevism and Bolshevism. When the controversies broke out there were Social Democrats of the Economist school who said, "Leave controversies of theories, or quarrels between leaders, or exaggeration of the importance of ideology, to the people who are outside Russia, in exile. Here concentrate on the organisation of workers and Trade Unions. Lenin opposed this freedom" to every tendency taking the lead of the workers' organisation. Because such a freedom ultimately led to chaos and absence of united action. The advocates of "no theoretical quarrels before the workers" (because the workers do not know or care to know what is Moscow and what is Geneva, so say our Indian pseudo Socialists) quoted even Marx that ;

5/11/31 (Evening Part II).

"A single step of the real movement is worth a dozen programmes." Lenin pointed out that to repeat these words in the epoch of theoretical chaos is sheer mockery and if quarrels have to be set aside for the sake of tactical alliances, then you must remember Marx again, who wrote "if you must combine, then enter into agreements to satisfy the practical aims of the movement but do not haggle over principles, do not make 'concessions' in theory". The theoretical struggle is absolutely necessary.

Writing on the question of spontaneity of the masses Lenin says that the strikes and revolts of the workers ending in destruction of machinery began in Russia in the 1870, but they were merely signs of coming consciousness, they were simply trade union struggles. There was no Communist consciousness that is the workers were not and could not be conscious of the irreconcilable antagonism of their interest to the whole of the modern political and social system. This consciousness could only be brought to them from without. The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade union consciousness that is, it may itself realise the necessity for combining in unions, to fight against the employers and to strive to compel the Government to pass necessary labour legislation etc. The

working class organisations out of their own evolution can only find the way to trade union politics which confines itself to bourgeois parliamentary system. The slogan of giving the "economic struggle a political character" as a tactical slogan of using the trade union struggle to infuse Communist consciousness and convert that politics into the revolutionary politics of Communism looks most profound and alluring. But such a conversion is not possible by limiting the movement to the economic sphere only. It must spread over all forms of social life taking note of the struggle of all classes and their alignments. The workers can acquire class political consciousness only from without, that is only outside of the economic struggle, outside of the sphere of relations between the workers and employers. The sphere from which alone it is possible to obtain this knowledge is the sphere of relationship between all classes and the State and the Government - the sphere of the inter-relations between all classes. For that reason the reply to the question what must be done in order that the workers may acquire political knowledge can not be merely one which in the majority of cases, the practical workers especially those who are inclined towards usually content themselves with, that is "go amongst the workers". To bring political knowledge to the workers the Social Democrats (Communists) must go among all classes of the population, must despatch the units of their army in all

directions. The Communist ideal should not be a trade union secretary but a tribune of the people, able to react to every manifestation of tyranny and oppression, no matter where it takes place, no matter what stratum or class of people it affects.

But the widening of the field of struggle is likely to lead to another deviation in the field of organisation - one is likely to attempt to convert a whole trade union into a "party" and neglect the question of revolutionary organisation. In the zeal to widen the movement a criticism is made that unless the rank and file take part, the continuity can not be maintained; when a handful of leaders are arrested, the whole movement comes to an end. Lenin admitted the correctness of the description of the state of affairs. But the lesson that his critics drew that the masses must take the movement "out of the hands of revolutionary leaders - the workers must rely on workers, on the rank and file only and not on a set of ten wise men," was mischievous and demagogic. It was an attempt to set the worst instinct of the crowd against the "leaders". Lenin fought this. "A committee of students is no good, it is not stable", the Critics said. "Quite good", said Lenin, "but the conclusion to be drawn from this is that we must have a committee of professional revolutionists and it does not matter whether a student or a worker is capable of qualifying himself as a professional revolutionist.

The conclusion that you draw however, (like some of the Indian comrades who favour debarring intellectuals from holding trade union posts and restricting the posts to workers exclusively) is that the working class must not be pushed from outside. I would like to ask what is meant by the students "pushing on" the workers. All it means is that the students bring to the workers the fragments of political knowledge they possess, the crumbs of socialist ideas they have managed to acquire. Such pushing on from outside can never be too excessive; on the contrary so far there has been too little of it in our movement; we have been stewing in our own juice far too long. We have bowed far too slavishly before the spontaneous "economic struggle" of the workers against the employers and Government". Next to the theory, the question of organisation is most important. In this the wide organisation of workers like trade unions must not be confused with the organisation of revolutionists which is the party. On this, his view may be summarised thus: (1) that no movement can be durable without a stable organisation of leaders to maintain continuity; (2) that the more widely the masses are drawn into the struggle and form the basis of the movement, the more necessary is it to have such an organisation and the more stable must it be (for it is much easier then for damagouges to sidetrack the most backward masses). (3) That the organisation must consist

chiefly of persons engaged in revolution as a profession.

(4) That in a country with despotic Government the more we restrict the membership of this organisation to persons who are engaged in revolution as a profession and who have been so trained, the better will it be for the safety of the organisation. (5) The wider will be the circle of men and women of the working class or of other classes of society able to join the movement and perform active work in it. The centralisation of the secret functions of the organisation does not mean the centralisation of all functions of the movement, neither does it mean violation of democracy within the party. Applying the conclusion that he drew to himself and his comrades Lenin wrote "the most grievous sin that we have committed in regard to organisation is that by our primitiveness we have lowered the prestige of revolutionists in Russia. A man who is weak and vacillating on theoretical questions, who has a narrow outlook, who makes excuses for his own slackness on the ground that the masses are waking spontaneously, who resembles a trade union secretary more than a peoples' tribune, who is unable to conceive a broad and bold plan, who is incapable of inspiring even his enemies with respect for himself, and who is inexperienced and clumsy in his own professional art, such a man is not a revolutionist but a hopeless amateur. Let no active worker take offence at these frank remarks, for as far as insufficient training

is concerned I apply them first and foremost to myself. I used to work in a circle that set itself a great and all-embracing task and every member of that circle suffered to a point of torture from the realisation that we were proving ourselves to be amateurs at a moment in history when we might have been able to say - paraphrasing a well known epigram "give us an organisation of revolutionists and we shall overturn the whole of Russia." And the more I recall the burning sense of shame I then experienced, the more bitter are my feelings towards those pseudo Social Democrats whose teachings bring disgrace on the calling of a revolutionist who fail to understand that our task is not to degrade the revolutionist to the level of an amateur but to exalt the amateur to the level of a revolutionist."

The programme of spreading Communist consciousness to all, of taking the lead of every real revolutionary struggle had its dangers also, to which Lenin paid careful attention. The question of alliances with non-Communist parties for tactical purposes, to set the brandish strata of the masses in a revolutionary motion, brought forth the danger of the real Marxian principles getting adulterated at the hands of the petty bourgeois adherents. To overcome this and to guarantee the organisation of revolutionists from being swamped by opportunists, Lenin advocated alliances with non-Marxist parties and groups only in separate concrete instances for a limited purpose with the

proviso that the party was at complete liberty to criticise and expose the ideological differences between the party and its ally. Secondly the alliances took place not between individuals but between the party as a whole and the ally, that is the party did not merge into or become the organic member of the other body but retained its identity and separate command in all spheres. This method worked very well, so much so that in the several alliances that the Bolsheviks formed with other parties, though for a time they looked as if they were compromising or losing hold, they came out successful and stronger than before. The Bolsheviks split from the Mensheviks in the Second Congress and built up their revolutionary organisation. When in the rising wave after 1902, the Czarist autocracy attacked even the most moderate bourgeois liberals as were found in the Zemstvos, the "Iskra" goaded the Zemstvos to put up a fight; when the students were attacked or drafted into the army as a punishment, the workers were brought to demonstrate in support of them. The Bolshevik organisers were already in the industrial centres and had even reached the army and navy to a small extent.

(49) Social Democratic Party organisation - the Zubatov Unions - January 1905 - tactics of the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks - announcement of the Duma.

At this time the Police Chief Zubatov advised the

Government to start unions of workers through police help - thus keeping the workers under the influence of leaders who would be loyal to the Czar. The Zubetov Unions sprang up in many centres. But the result was that when the workers got organised and strikes arose, the workers amongst whom the Bolsheviks had spread their influence refused the loyalist lead and took a revolutionary turn. Lenin's line was: "Let Zubatov organise the unions since the Czar would not allow the Bolsheviks to organise one; the Bolsheviks must work amongst these unions on their own lines and when conflicts arise win over the workers to their side." The increasing depression in trade and the failure of the Czar in the Russo-Japanese War precipitated a crisis. When the revolutionary atmosphere was being smelt, the question of strategy arose. The Mensheviks said that the revolution would be led by the bourgeoisie against the Czarist feudalism, just as it did in the French and other revolutions of the previous century. The revolution would be bourgeois democratic, that is free the bourgeois productive forces from the feudal fetters. Therefore the workers should only "spur" the bourgeoisie on but without intimidation. ("Just mildly warn them against compromise" as many a petty bourgeois in India today does in the name of the working class organisations). They must not "repel" the bourgeoisie, which showed opposition to the Czar. As for the peasantry, it still had faith in the Czar and therefore

would not fight against monarchy. The Bolsheviks had quite a different line. The bourgeoisie according to them merely showed embecile opposition but it was incapable of revolutionary fight. A few concessions from the Czar and a few thrusts of the class struggle from the workers would throw it in the arms of Czarism. Therefore the only revolutionary force was the workers. As for the peasantry it could not take lead, but it was getting revolutionary as its conditions forced it to fight the landowners and hence Czarism. The revolution would be bourgeois democratic but it would be carried out by the working class and the peasantry - not by the bourgeoisie. The political power would be a Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Peasantry. The economic organisation would not be socialist and industry would not be nationalised; but remain private property; but under workers' control. It meant that the owners would have no secrecy of accounts and management, the factory committee would see how things were done; no more than 5.7 per cent net profit would be allowed; and out of this profit to guarantee expansion and further investments, 25 per cent would have to be reinvested in industry. The land would be redistributed amongst the peasantry and landlordism abolished. The Government would be a workers' and peasants' Government; without bureaucracy and the army, the whole people being armed against the counter revolution.

On 9th January 1905 the Czarist police fired on a

procession that was going to see the Czar with the petition for democratic rights and a constitution. It was the signal for intense resentment. A wave of strikes spread throughout Russia. Their demands were a Constituent Assembly, and an eight hours' day. Czarism was too strong to be defeated by mere strikes, which soon were exhausted. Under the pressure of the movement, the Czar appointed a Commission to inquire into the reasons of working class discontent (that should remind us of the Whitley Commission) and asked his Minister Bulygin on 18th February 1905 to prepare a draft for calling of a Duma with a right of discussion but not of legislation. A draft did come out in which the workers, nine-tenth of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie had no vote. These concessions were received with interest though not with satisfaction by the liberal bourgeoisie. But they were repudiated by the workers. The movement was now spreading into the agrarian districts. In the summer of 1905, 14 per cent of all country districts were drawn into the agrarian movement. The movement of the peasantry had not a purely political character just as it has for the workers who now use the weapon of strike for political ends. Political consciousness was to be found in those peasants who had been in the army and navy. The naval disaster in the Russo-Japanese War in May 1905 gave an impetus to the revolution. The revolt of the "Potemkin" shook the belief of the masses

into the absolute power of the Government. It created revolutionary traditions in the army and prepared the way for armed risings. Therefore Lenin wrote several articles on the Potemkin Rising. Just before this the Czar published information about the formation of the Duma. The franchise was to be given to the bourgeoisie and property holding peasants, merchants, big landlords and higher ranks of professors, but not to the workers, poor peasants, and poor intellectuals. But the textile strike of Lods, the barricade fighting, and the Potemkin Rising, the repression and massacres by Government continued and therefore the announcement had not much effect. Still at this time the question of the boycott of the Duma came to the front. The attitude of Lenin on this question has been a subject of reference from a very well renowned social revolutionary in India. During our work we ourselves had been confronted with this problem. Boycott of councils and Assembly has been a pet thing of Gandhism, irrespective of the situation in the country. The Leninist attitude on this is relative. It is not for or against the boycott of the Duma, councils or parliament per se. In the middle of 1905 he supported boycott of the Bulygin Duma but in 1907 he and the Party lifted the boycott of the Duma.

D/6.11.31

Evening 1st Part.

It was not done in order to wring some reforms from Csarism and to compromise with it or for "breaking Csarism from within" as our Indian Assembly heroes would like to put it.

(50) Lenin and the boycott of the Duma

When the character of the Duma was announced the Third Congress of the union of Unions decided on July 3 to launch a campaign of protest, a few days' strike and demonstrations. It advocated boycott of elections. The party of the Zemstvo constitutionalists, like our bourgeois Liberals of Sastri and Sapru type, decided to take part in the elections and formed a party of the Constitutional Democrats or Cadets. This was the Right Wing of the bourgeoisie already on the road to compromise with Csarism. In the Congress of the Zemstvos and urban municipalities (July 6-8), the majority was for boycott while the Organising Committee was for constitutional monarchy. This was the Left Wing of the bourgeoisie which was thus split into two sections. Amongst the Communists there was a divergence of opinion. The Mensheviks proposed that semi-legal workers' committees should be formed which in co-operation with the illegal party should make use of the electoral campaign and compel the enfranchised classes through their representatives in the Duma to press for a Constituent Assembly. Further these committees would hold

their own elections in which quite a network of representative organs of revolutionary Self-Government crowned by a nationally elected revolutionary Assembly would be created which will be dictating its wills to all other progressive groups. It was the deceptive tactic of raising "organs of parallel Government" without having first overthrown Czarism and its State. The petty bourgeoisie in India has been toying with such an idea for the last ten years with deceptive schemes of "parallel Government."

Lenin took stand against both these tactics. The Third Congress of the Party (both Mensheviks and Bolsheviks joining in it) held in London in 1905 had left the question open. So he wrote in the "The Proletari", August 3, 1905 an article headed "The boycott of the Bulygin Duma and insurrection". The Leninist or Marxist formulation of the question was not in the manner of sentimental or moral stupidity, as we find it in Gandhism. The boycott was not decided on the question whether it is moral or immoral to sit in the Duma of the "satanic" Czar. The decision depended on the concrete objective condition - was the insurrection developing or not? What was the Duma in the alignment of class forces? The Duma was "a deal between Czarism and the landlords and the bourgeoisie who for the sake of alleged constitutional doles, absolutely harmless to the autocracy, are gradually to dissociate themselves

from the revolution, i.e. from the militant people and effect a reconciliation with the autocracy. The political position of the bourgeoisie is between the Csar and the people. It desires to play the part of the honest broker and steal into power behind the backs of the fighting people. That is why one day the bourgeoisie appeals to the Csar and another day to the people. To the former it makes serious and business-like proposals for the political deal and to the latter it appeals with high-sounding phrases about liberty. The bourgeoisie in its fight against autocracy is compelled to rouse political consciousness of the people. We must take advantage of it and sow our theory among the working class. So when the Left Wing of the bourgeoisie itself is advancing the slogan of a direct fight with the Duma by means of the boycott, the Bolsheviki must support the boycott." "The question of boycott is in itself a question of International bourgeois democracy. The working class is not directly interested in it except in supporting that section of bourgeois democracy which is most revolutionary." For this purpose Lenin says, "It will be expedient to come to temporary agreements with various groups of the revolutionary bourgeois democracy. But in doing this the class distinction of the Party of the Proletariat must be maintained and the Party must not for a single moment cease Communist criticism of the bourgeois allies. It must advance the slogan of the democratic revolution."

On the proposals of the Mensheviks that workers should elect their own deputies outside the legal elections and form a revolutionary assembly, he says, "Such slogans are worthless. They represent a confusion of ideas from the point of view of political tasks and serve as grist to the mill of the Loyalists from the point of view of the immediate political situation. The organisation of revolutionary Self-Government, the election of deputies by the people is not a prologue but an epilogue of the rebellion. To attempt to establish these organisations now prior to the rebellion and without a rebellion means to strive after absurd aims and to carry confusion in the minds of the revolutionary Proletariat. To attempt to eclipse the slogan of rebellion by the slogan of organising revolutionary Self-Government or even to push the former into background is like advising us first to catch a fly and then to stick it on the fly paper."

(51) The October General Strike - December Rising - reaction - participation in the Duma - the liquidators.

The growing revolutionary situation threw the Duma into background. In September another strike wave began, with the economic strike of 6,000 Moscow printers. With them joined the printers of Petersburg. A bakers' strike fought with the soldiers on September 25. On September 20 a Conference of railway workers' delegates met in

Petersburg for their service grievances. A rumour of its arrest spread and the railway strike began on 7th October. It spread throughout Russia and became the carrier of the great Political General Strike of October. Not a single industrial centre or a large shop or factory was left which had not joined the strike. Economic demands went to the background and the demand of the eight-hour-day and Constituent Assembly became the chief demands of the strikers. There were street battles in Kharkov, Odessa and other places. The strike influenced even the liberal land owners, merchants, professors and officials. That though these people took part in the movement the leadership of the fight was taken by the workers. During the strike the Petrograd workers elected a Council of 26 deputies from 100 works. This Council took the name of "Soviet of Workers' Deputies". The name Soviet spread to other centres of the strike where such councils were being formed. The Soviet was the representative fighting organisation of the workers brought into being when the revolutionary struggle was intensified. Since then the Soviet has become a recognised form of the workers' State. On October 17, the Czar issued a Manifesto sanctioning the rights already seized by the people. But it did not break the strike because no one believed in the promises of the Czar. The workers had to call off the strike on 21st October as they were exhausted. The liberal bourgeoisie was won over by

the Czarist Manifesto. It refused to render help to the strikers. The revolutionary phrases disappeared from their speeches and conferences. Five days after the Petersburg workers had to come out in sympathy with the mutiny of the Kronstadt sailors. This time Czarism brought all its Military forces to crush the movement. In reply the Soviet decided on November 27 to prepare for an armed uprising. On December 3, the Petrograd Soviet was arrested. As a result the second Political General Strike began in Petersburg, and Moscow on 7th and 8th and developed into a seige and barricade fighting with the troops. The Moscow workers fought for ten days and were defeated on the 18th. Such fights took place in several centres. This was the first armed uprising of the masses.

Even before the echoes of firing had died away the Menshevik leader Plekhanov wrote that the workers had gone too far and they should not have taken to arms. Instead of finding out what was necessary to have made the revolution a success the Mensheviks sabotaged the spirit of the workers. Lenin's deductions were quite different. In answer to Plekhanov he wrote, "To keep from the masses the knowledge that a desperate war of extermination is necessary as a preliminary to our eventual programme that would be self-deception and false leadership of the people." One of the main causes of the failure of the rising in Moscow was the inadequate revolutionary work done in the Army and

that one of the chief errors lay in the uncertainty and hesitation of the leaders as to their military and strategic policy. He writes, "The December Rising has confirmed yet another profound saying of Karl Marx which has been forgotten by the opportunists". Marx says that insurrection is an art where the chief quality is a desperate daring and a resolute offensive. We must not preach passivity or wait inactively for the troops to come to our side. Now, we must advocate from the house-tops the need for a daring attack for an armed uprising, for the extermination of all masters and for a most active fight to win over the allegiance of the irresolute soldiery. We must apply all the new discoveries of science. Our workers' battalions must be trained for the mass production of bombs, they must be helped to provide themselves with explosives, fuses and automatics." That was Lenin's conception of the lessons of the Moscow insurrection.

When insurrectionist risings were taking place the Czar passed a new electoral law on December 11 making liberal changes in the August Law. By this in many places the middle and petty bourgeoisie gained ten times more votes. In addition to those of the landed proprietors, peasants and town dwellers an electoral college for workers was also established. The Cadet bourgeoisie was reinforced by these concessions and moved towards the Czar, who on the other hand carried on a ruthless suppression of Trade

Unions, radical papers, shot leaders of the workers and sent punitive expeditions into the villages. After the close of the strike wave the Duma was announced to meet on April 27, 1906. But before it could meet, the Czar announced that the Duma would be merely a consultative body. The bourgeoisie accepted it and started the electoral campaign.

The Communists were again confronted with the question of boycott. Both the Bolshevik and Menshevik sections of the Party argued that the halt in the revolutionary wave was temporary (February 1906), but the Duma was a pretence of popular representation and that it was necessary to combat it and prepare for a better insurrection. But the Mensheviks held that the Party should use the first stages of the electoral campaign to rally all the forces of opposition to Government. The Bolshevik section opposed this and wanted the direct continuation of the December line of action. No decision was taken though the majority of both Mensheviks and Bolsheviks were inclined towards boycott. Only in Georgia, where the Party was very strong, the Communists swept the elections and got 18 seats. The bourgeois and petty bourgeois sections captured the elections in all other places. The peasantry which had rallied to the insurrection was in a mood to see what the Duma could do for it since the insurrection had not been of much help. From the results

it was clear that there was no sign of insurrectionary wave that the opposition had not even been actively expressed in the form of the boycott. So the 4th Stockholm Congress of the S.D. Party which was a General Conference of both Bolshevik and Menshevik sections, called off the boycott and decided to form its block in the Duma and tried to push the bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties in the Duma into a definite opposition to the Government. All the Bolsheviks did not favour this but Lenin and a few others voted for the proposal. (April 1906). When the first Duma met on 10th May 1906 the Cadets disagreed with the Labour and peasant deputies (Trudoviki) who wanted the Government to carry out the agrarian reforms immediately.

I.H.K.

6/11/31 (Evening Part II).

The Social Democrats sided with the Trudoviki and urged for radical action. The Cadets after some hesitation joined in. 180 Deputies issued the Vyborg Manifesto asking the people not to pay taxes. The Social Democrats conjointly with three organisations of railwaymen, peasants and teachers issued a separate manifesto declaring the Government illegal and called upon the Peasants Committees to seize lands and the army and navy not to fire on the people. When the Government threatened action, the Cadets retracted their manifesto and the Duma was dissolved. Afterwards the representation of landowners was increased. The new Second Duma met on 20th February 1907. It had sixty Social Democrats in it. The Government soon arrested and exiled some of them on the charge of having made propaganda in the army. The Duma was again dissolved in June 1907. The same day the law was again changed, the workers, intellectuals and peasants were all disfranchised. It was a complete destruction of even small popular representation. This brought forth the boycott tendency again to the forefront, the initiative being taken by the Teachers' Organisations. Some of the Bolsheviks showed even now signs of favouring boycott. But Lenin unequivocally was against boycott and for participation. This conduct of his has been cited in India several times in order to show that in

a great revolutionary fight, even Lenin had compromised and allowed the Party to join the Czarist Duma. From this it was argued that the compromise in Indian politics need not be condemned because it is a compromise. It must be studied and valued in relation to the concrete objective situation. Exactly for these reasons as given by the critic, Lenin explained his reasons for participation in the Duma in an article headed "Against the Boycott". The situation at the time of the Bulyon Duma in August 1905 was quite different from that in 1907. The boycott of the Bulygin Duma was a complete success and was necessary because at that time the revolutionary wave was rising (something like our boycott of the Assembly in 1920). The old regime was trying to sidetrack the people from the path of direct action and revolution to the zig zag path of the Duma. To have told the people at that time to give up their rising strikes and insurrections for the promises of a constitution was to strengthen Czarism, deprive the people of the lessons of revolutionary activity, the exposure of the real nature of Czarism. Then even the bourgeoisie was showing opposition. After December, the situation had changed. The insurrection was defeated. The revolution had receded. The Czarist terror had suppressed all organisations, the bourgeoisie had joined hands with Czarism. When revolutionary activity was suppressed, there must be some links for the revolutionary party to keep touch with

the people. When the wide popular press was destroyed, the Duma was the best loud speaker. It had to be used. Participation after the failure of the insurrection was not to be used for purposes of forming alliances with the bourgeois parties, for bourgeois methods of parliamentary wirepulling, or for smashing autocracy from within. The participation was for unmasking Czarism, or broadcasting the ideology of revolution to the masses. In the Third Duma (November 1907 to June 1912) the Social Democrats had fifteen seats and they sat there throughout the period of reaction.

What was the policy followed by the Bolsheviks and other parties with regard to the organisational work, when it became clear that the risings had failed and the revolutionary wave receded? The workers had to bear the brunt of the Czarist attack of repression. The strike movement weakened every year. The percentage of the success for the employers increased year by year being 29.4 per cent in 1905, 68.8 in 1908 and 80 in 1909. The number of members of the Social Democratic Party fell. The largest number of resignations being from the intellectuals who could not stand the hardships of the period of reaction. Many of them lost themselves in mysticism and God. The literary intellectuals gave prominence to six problems in literature. The largest number of defections were in the Menshevik sections who amongst themselves had not evolved ideological

solidarity and discipline and had followed the policy of live and let live. The result was that a section of the Mensheviks called for a policy of "liquidation" of the illegal party. The law was ruthlessly suppressing all organisations which were not monarchist or loyally inclined. The liquidators advocated that illegal secret work was futile. That its gains were not worth the sacrifice. They considered the Duma to be sufficiently democratic to indicate a "change of heart" on the part of Czarism and a progress towards Democratic Parliamentarism of the bourgeoisie of Western Europe. They called upon the workers to give up secret revolutionary organisations and strictly limit themselves to legal unions, welfare clubs etc. Their party in the Duma gave up the demand of expropriation of landlordism in order to please and ally itself with the Cadet bourgeoisie. This move of cooperation with Czarism was so cowardly that some of the Mensheviks revolted against this new legal Marxism and Communism. Plekhanov wrote "Revolutionary conspiracy is now frequently attacked precisely by those who are unfit for any revolutionary action. They are tired they want rest; the heavy ceaseless martyrdom of the self-sacrificing rank-and-file workers is beyond their strength; they escape from their circles and try to make themselves and others believe that their flight is no treachery to the cause but merely passing over on to a wider basis."

The Bolsheviks emphasised that Czarism was still the reactionary machine of the feudal aristocracy; that only illegal revolutionary activity could provide the workers with true socialist ideology and it alone could direct the revolutionary labour organisations. The workers must be rallied by this organisation to the three fundamental slogans of 8 hr. day, expropriation of the big land-owners and Democratic Republic.

Amongst the Bolsheviks there was a section of "Left Liquidators". They wanted to concentrate solely on illegal work. They upheld the boycott of the Duma. This group was formed by Bogdanov, Lunacharski and Gorki. This tactic was opposed by Lenin who saw that unless the available legal connections were maintained the Party would become a sectarian organisation cut off from the workers. Under Lenin's leadership the Party stuck to the policy of revolutionary work they carefully done through Trade Union newspapers etc and also spread their programme through the Duma.

(52) Stolypin's Agrarian Reforms - revival of trade - strikes begin - parties during reaction - isolation of bourgeois parties - Bolshevik and Menshevik divisions - philosophical struggle - the problems of bourgeois revolution and the peculiarity of the Russian Revolution.

Czarism had not relied merely on violent suppression. It also created a class of supporters for itself. The new

policy was worked out by Minister Stolypin who is known for his bloody suppression as also the new agrarian policy. The agrarian policy was to break up the old Mir or the agrarian communes holding land in common. A law of November 1906 allowed the peasant to claim his share and withdraw from the Mir. This resulted in creating a class of middle peasantry with sufficient land and goods to be called even "rich" and become a market for capitalist goods and form a village bourgeoisie to support the Czar. Also in the plains cultivation had become difficult for the landowners due to the revolutionary risings. The Government followed the policy of asking the land-owners to sell lands directly or through the Agrarian Bank to individual peasants. Thus ten per cent of the land of the great proprietors was sold during four years of course at high prices. The lands concentrated in the hands of the rich peasants and the poor peasants became workers in the industries. After the revolution till the war 2½ million peasants thus became industrial workers.

On the "peace" restored by Black Hundred pogroms and seven thousand death sentences on workers, artisans and peasants, on the market created of the middle peasantry by the Stolypin Reforms and on the cheap labour of the impoverished peasantry pushed into the towns, Czarist reaction triumphed. Industrial production grew and the depression lessened after 1910. It is shown that in the

demands for articles required in the countryside there was special rise. The rise in the heavy industries like manufacture of steel and iron was an index of the growth. Metal manufacture rose by 51.3 per cent, pig iron by 65.5 per cent. This industrial boom revived the workers' movement, which began to be seen in the revival of strikes for higher wages. The bourgeoisie in order/^{not}to harm its production made a few concessions. But they were meagre and the political demands came forward again. In April 1912 the gold miners in Lena made economic demands on the company which was a British concern. The miners were situated far away in Siberia. The company was the sole ruler and exploitation was particularly brutal. The company's armed guards attacked the workers and about fifteen hundred strikers were shot dead. One can imagine the brutality of the company against the gold miners from what we see about their brother exploiters in India in the Oorgan Gold Mines in Mysore. The Lena Blood bath called forth protests throughout Russia by strikes and demonstrations. About a million workers had struck, in 1913 1½ millions struck. During first half of 1914 the figure had risen to 2½ millions.

What was the reaction of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks to this rising wave and what was the attitude of the workers to these parties? The Menshevik Liquidators wanted to limit the movement to the fight for association, trade

unionism and reformism. The Bolsheviks in contrast to this brought forth their programme of the three fundamental aims - 8 hour day, expropriation of land owners and a Democratic Republic. The workers to the surprise of the Mensheviks flocked under the lead of the Bolsheviks. It was surprising because during the period of reaction the legal organisations (Trade Unions etc) of the Mensheviks showed a large and substantial membership while the Bolsheviks were hunted out and looked like a corpse. When the revolutionary tide rose, the Bolsheviks suddenly seemed to have come to life and captured the masses, who refused to continue themselves within the bounds of the advice of "respectable leaders" or radical looking "Menshevik Communists". T. Dan, the historian and leader of the Menshevik Communists writes "As a result the liquidators who had up to now been of the opinion that their obvious task in the years of preparation would create a position of advantage for them when the workers' movement revived, noted much to their surprise that their monopolist position was shaken by that illegal Bolshevik Party which they had looked upon as a "living corpse".

During the period of reaction another development had taken place. That was the separation of the Bolshevik section of the Social Democratic Party from its Menshevik section. This occurred at the Prague Conference in 1912. As a result the Bolsheviks formed their own Central

Committees, their own newspapers, the "Pravada" and "Izvestia". The labour organisations were also split on the issue of leadership and programme. It may be noted here that the present Communist Party of Russia dates its foundation from 1898 when the Social Democratic Labour Party of Russia was founded. A change in the name of the Party was proposed by Lenin in the Party Conference in May 1917. But it was not changed as there was no time for discussions. The name Social Democrats now signifies with us the pseudo Socialists like Kautsky, Mac Donald and such others. It is also to be noted that the programme of the Party was the same since its foundation and was not changed till after the February Revolution of 1917. Both the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks attended the Congresses of the Party, (except when one or the other section could not or did not send their delegates. This happened with the Mensheviks many a time). Many "Unity Conferences" were held between the two sections of the same Party but nothing came out of them. Thus the Bolsheviks had a separate discipline, separate principles and policy though both the sections called themselves Social Democrats. Both preached adherence to Marxism and the necessity of overthrowing Czarism and bringing about a Democratic Republic. In spite of bitter controversies temporary alliances were formed, the most notable being in 1907-09, the alliance between Lenin and Plekhanov who had become politically a Menshevik, on the

question of the philosophical revision of Marxist materialism by prominent Bolsheviks like Bogdanov, Lunacharsky, Gorki, into the channel of subjective idealism, "God creating" tendencies making way for the priest, the church and ultimately the overthrow of Socialism. In this philosophic controversy a strange combination of the Bolshevik Lenin and the Menshevik Plekhanov was formed against a group which included many Bolsheviks for example Bogdanov who was still a joint editor with Lenin on the "Proletari". In the present conditions of Party development throughout the world amongst Communists such anomalous position may not be allowed and the Russian Party developments on these separate incidents may not be taken as precedents because at that time the demarcation of parties and the class struggle had not become so acute, a world Communist Party had not been born and the critical epoch of proletarian revolutions though in embryo had not yet set in in any active form.

The formation of the Russian Communist Party as separate from Menshevik and other groups constitutionally sanctioned by the Conference in 1918, was really accomplished in 1912, its elements and adherents were formed during the period of 1905 Revolution and the reaction and the nucleus of its Leninist leadership laid in the Party disputes of 1903 when a Bolshevik section was formed by Lenin. On the eve of the world war there was no country where such a

strong party development had taken place. The largest Party of Europe, the Social Democratic Party of Germany had a group led by Rosa Luxembourg who was nearest to Lenin, as much uncompromising and theoretically correct in all the major planks of Marxism. This group had not evolved a separate leadership, separate organisation, and separate disillusioned class conscious proletarian following. It had not gone through the splits and cleanings. Liebknecht and Luxembourg began that work when the war broke out, when in the fever of patriotism and military dictatorship it had become extremely difficult to plant a revolutionary nucleus amongst the workers and prevent them from marching under the leadership of the bourgeoisie. In Russia the Bolsheviks had a ready apparatus to lead the revolution when need arose. The first characterisation that the war is a robber war of Imperialists came from the Russian Party, from Lenin.

D/7.11.31

Evening 1st Part.

Another advantage was that the Russian proletariat and peasantry had the latest experience of 1905, a rehearsal of the coming revolution. In Western Europe after 1848 and 1871 the Imperialist development and colonial loot had prevented such a rehearsal. They had a whole period of 50 years of ascending capitalism. While in Russia neither the peasantry could be given land at the expense of the landlords nor could the workers' conditions be improved as Imperialist-capitalist development had already brought capitalism to the plane of decline. Thus after 1905 there could not be a long spell of inactivity or materially improved objective conditions for the bribery of the proletariat. And whatever was wanting was completed by the experiences of the war.

Another peculiarity of Russia at the beginning of the war was that there the power of the feudal land owning class had not been overthrown and the bourgeoisie had not yet been installed in the control of the State, i.e. the bourgeois revolution had not been carried out. Land-owning Czarism crushed all the classes except that of the feudal landlords and even bourgeois democratic freedom was not allowed. Therefore the petty bourgeois intellectuals were in opposition to Czarism. The problem of the bourgeois

revolution had been solved in the previous century by the revolutionary bourgeoisie in cooperation with the peasantry, both of whom attacked the feudal power. At that time there was no proletariat strong enough to lead the peasantry or threaten the bourgeoisie in such a manner as to make it counter-revolutionary and give up attacking feudalism. This condition had now been changed. In Russia the proletariat, as soon as it grew to a certain extent, imbibed the lessons of Marxism under the influence of the proletarian movements from the West. The autocracy having prevented even the growth of Trade Unionism helped the growth of revolutionary traditions in the workers from the beginning which was assisted by the fact that the revolutionary intellectuals finding no outlet in the channel of bourgeois democracy devoted their energies to the workers' and peasants' organizations. The bourgeoisie as it developed saw the revolutionary movement of the workers under the influence of Marxism, saw that if it helped the peasantry to the revolutionary overthrow of the land-owning class, the proletariat would follow the same example against itself also. Therefore the bourgeoisie in Russia could not lead the peasantry of Russia against feudalism as it had done in England and France. Naturally the question arose who would carry out the bourgeois revolution, overthrow feudalism and set the productive forces free for capitalist development, which is a higher stage than feudalism? That was the crux of the

Party quarrels since 1903 to 1917. The Bolsheviks said that the peasantry was a great revolutionary factor and would fight against landlordism under the leadership of the proletariat and establish a workers' and peasants' Republic as the proletariat alone would give land to the peasantry. The Cadets hoped to solve the problem by reforms through the Duma and giving land to peasants on payment of compensation. The Trotskites considered that a backward country like Russia could not hold out as a workers' and peasants' Republic unless the proletariat of the West accomplished their Socialist revolution. The Mensheviks though in agreement with the Bolshevik programme considered that the Cadets (the Liberal bourgeoisie, like that formed of our Malaviyas, Patels etc.) would be a good ally for the Proletarian parties against Czarism. But the Bolsheviks concentrated their attack on the Cadets more than on any other Party. Why? Because that determined the question under whose leadership the peasantry would march. Without the alliance of the peasantry there could be no revolution. Now the peasantry had illusions that the Cadets would give them land through the Duma. It had to be freed from these illusions; otherwise it would not take to revolutionary attack on feudalism. The proletariat had to be freed from any alliances with bourgeois parties, since these parties would lead it into illusive compromises. In a revolutionary struggle the compromisers are the greatest danger. Because under the illusion of

compromise the revolutionary class postpones or gives up the struggle, the autocracy which is tottering then consolidates itself and massacres the revolution. Therefore the Bolsheviks paid more attention to isolating the peasantry and workers from the Cadets and Mensheviks. Hence they were nicknamed "The Cadet eaters". Had they not done so, there would not have remained a single party ready to lead the revolution and to take power from the Provisional Government after March 1917. This is the most significant part of the Bolshevik tactic. The correctness of this tactic is demonstrated by the mess made of the Indian mass movement of emancipation by the Indian "Cadet" Congress. The achievement of the Bolsheviks in the period of 1903 to 1917 was the isolation of the bourgeoisie from the peasantry, the isolation of the Mensheviks from the proletariat, formation of a well disciplined and tested organisation of revolutionists drawn from the workers, peasants and intellectuals, guided by the theory of Marxism, rescued from the hands of "respectable Marxists" who tried to revise it.

(53) Russia joins war - the crisis - the February overthrow - Provisional Government and the Soviets - Lenin's return.

It is well-known to the students of history that during the 19th century Russia had acted as a great bogey to Britain in the East. In the Crimean War Britain and France had

united against Russia but the export of Capital from France and England to finance Czarist loans and Russian industry had liquidated the old Russo-British friction and Russia had to join the allies in the war because the Russian bourgeoisie was interlocked with Allied Capital which was invested in Russian heavy industry.

During the war Czarist militarism was helped by money and munitions from the allies. But a corrupt bureaucracy and a weak bourgeoisie which had not yet advanced to the stage of efficiency of Allied Imperialism was exhausted soon and could not manage the war. The production of munitions began to break down to such an extent that on some fronts the soldiers had not even cartridges for their rifles and were simply killed under fire from German artillery. Discontent grew at the front. Shortage of food led to severe crisis in the towns and shortage of manufactured goods and absence of cultivators on the land led to crises in the countryside. Above all this the peasantry had to maintain parasitic feudalism as before. The first protest came from the Petrograd workers who refused to send delegates to the War Industry Committee, which was an organisation to ensure class peace and bring the workers to cooperate with Czarism to fight the war. The Mensheviks joined the Committee. The Bolsheviks refused. By January 1917 the crisis had become acute and food riots began in Petrograd. These were followed by strikes of workers in the factories. The Petrograd

garrison was won over by the workers. . That settled the fate of Czarism. The soldiers and workers elected their deputies and formed their Soviets. The prison was stormed and political prisoners released. The workers however did not form a revolutionary Government. The Soviet was under the influence of the Mensheviks. In the Duma, the Bolshevik deputies had been exiled to Siberia for having opposed the war. The read cadre of Bolshevik leadership was either in prison or exile. Therefore the Duma and the Mensheviks in the Soviet succeeded in introducing compromising hesitation in the Soviet. The Duma formed a Provisional Committee of monarchists and Cadets to conduct the Government of the Czar, but the Soviet would have no Czar. By a resolution it decided to confiscate the financial resources of the old State, i.e. the State Bank, Currency Printing Press etc. but asked the Duma Finance Commission to carry out the decision. Thus it showed inclination towards the historical step that the Paris Commune had failed to take, but left its carrying out in the hands of the bourgeoisie. The President of the State Duma issued an appeal to preserve constitutional and social order and to allow no attacks on life and property. In the meanwhile the Czarist forces tried to restore the old regime. So the workers and soldiers fought on the barricades and streets of Petrograd and Moscow, secured victory and the abdication of the Czar. When the Provisional Government was formed by the bourgeoisie the Petrograd Soviet

discussed the question of participation in the Government. The Mensheviks were for participation. However the proposal was rejected. But in its policy the Soviet adopted the policy of support to the Government (March 1917). On the same day the Soviet of workers and the Soviet of soldiers amalgamated and issued the famous Army Order No. I. This order asked the soldiers to elect their own committees and send delegates to the Soviets. The troops were subordinated to the orders of the Soviet and their committees on all political matters. The soldiers were given complete citizen rights and right to participate in politics, were asked to observe military discipline when on duty, but the salute and standing at attention when off duty was abolished. Officers were forbidden to bully or abuse the soldiers. On 16th March the Provisional Government issued its manifesto which granted complete amnesty to political prisoners, liberty of speech, association, press, unions, strikes etc; promised immediate preparation for summing a Constituent Assembly elected by universal suffrage to determine the constitution and form of State, substitution of a State militia with elected officers in place of the former Police and abolition of the disabilities of the soldiers. This manifesto was endorsed by the Soviets. But in the manifesto the Government avoided the vital question of the termination of war, the confiscation of land, and an unequivocal declaration of Republic. Having left the whole matter to the

Constituent Assembly there was the danger of the Provisional Government sabotaging the revolution, starving Petrograd and its Soviet, continuing the war and ultimately restoring monarchy. The Bolsheviks saw this. But the Soviets at that time flushed with the overthrow of the age-old oppression of Czarism were carried away and supported the bourgeoisie in the Provisional Government. The game of the bourgeoisie was to put the Liberal Democrats, and if necessary even the Menshevik leaders of the Proletariat on the Government seats, then turn to the people and say that the attack of the Germans against Russia with such a 'revolutionary' Government was an attack on the revolution itself; therefore the people must go on with the war. In fact the allied powers had hailed the revolution and acknowledged the new Government and promised it to support because the bourgeoisie in power would conduct the war more enthusiastically and efficiently than the decrepit landlordism. The bourgeoisie wanted to hold power on the back of the peasantry and the working class. It could have done so if it could have solved the land problem. But the land-owning class, by its mortgages to the banks, was linked to the bourgeoisie, which, if it expropriated the landowners, would be expropriating itself. Thus when it could not close the war nor could give land to the peasantry it was bound to fall. But this conception about the new Government was not grasped by the Soviets, the Government was not yet discredited

before the workers and peasants. Therefore many of the Bolsheviks like Kamenev and Rykov supported the Government. Many believed in the Constituent Assembly the ideal of the last 20 years to cure the evils.

This mistake was exposed by Lenin when he returned to Petrograd from exile on April 16. As soon as he landed he chastised the Bolsheviks who had supported the Provisional Government. He at once gave the slogan, "No support at all to the Provisional Government" and formulated the famous April Theses which became the basis of the November Revolution.

I.H.K.

7/11/31 (Evening Part II).

(54) The First Soviet Congress - Coalition Government
- July Demonstration - Kornilov March - Masses
turn Left - Percentage of the Bolsheviks in the
Soviets - Lenin urges Soviets to take power by
peaceful revolution - then calls upon Bolsheviks
insurrection - Peasant Congress and compromise
with the Left Socialist Revolutionaries.

The First All-Russia Congress of Soviets, the real barometer of the opinion of the people that is the workers and peasants met in June 1917. This Congress under the influence of the petty bourgeois parties of the Socialist Revolutionaries which had the largest influence among the peasantry and the Mensheviks, who called themselves Communists and had a majority influence in the Town Soviets, supported the Imperialist war policy and the Coalition Government of Kerensky. The First Provisional Government when it issued the Note to the Allies stating that they would continue the war to the end had called forth the protest from the soldiers which led to a crisis in the Government. The Foreign Minister Miliukov was made to resign under pressure from the Soviets and the First Government dissolved. The masses had to be deceived by a better method. So a Coalition Government was formed with the support of the Soviet of Petrograd (May 1917). In the

Government the Socialist Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks had responsible ministries, thus giving the appearance to the Government of being formed of the real representatives of the masses. For example the Ministry of Agriculture was given to V. Cheronov, the most influential man amongst the peasants. (It was like giving Pandit Jawahar Lal the portfolio of Agriculture in U.P., while retaining the Imperialist army, the peasant debts and all capitalist relations in contact and yet calling it a Government of the Masses). Naturally the Congress of the Soviets supported the Government and its policy. The Bolsheviks who differed were hooted. Lenin considered the support of the Soviets so important that he attended the Congress as a rank and file delegate and addressed the Congress on the Bolshevik programme. With the support of the Soviet Congress Kerensky planned a big offensive on the front. But the soldiers were exhausted, technique had broken down and the Russian army was massacred. When the news of the tragedy reached Petrograd, the workers and soldiers came out on the streets. They took the slogan "Down with the Government, all power to the Soviet". The Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party was asked to direct the operations and seize power. The Central Committee flatly refused. The masses were veering to the Left but had not done so completely. The Government of the popular parties of Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks was not yet discredited completely in the

eyes of the majority of the people. Hence the Central Committee refused. The July Demonstration was turned into a peaceful demonstration and a premature rising was prevented, with the result that Kerensky arrested some of the leading Bolsheviks and suppressed their papers.

The petty bourgeois Government incapable of carrying out the proletarian programme or even the bourgeois programme, could not satisfy either a revolution or a counter revolution. The situation of 1848 was brought back. Therefore the bourgeoisie, the landowners and the Allied Imperialists planned a military coup to overthrow both the Soviets and the Government. General Kornilov marched on Petrograd with some monarchist troops. The Soviets came out to a man to give battle to the monarchist coup and Kornilov was beaten. This roused the workers and peasants to the danger of the counter revolution. The capitalists began to corner food stuffs and goods and planned a famine in the cities which were the strong holds of the revolution. The failure to introduce 8 hour day and workers' control even six months after the revolution, increased the Bolshevik adherents in the ranks of the workers. The petty bourgeois parties held a Democratic Conference, promised speedy summoning of the Constituent Assembly, but by September end the masses were completely disillusioned and were ready for seizure of power by the Soviets. The growth of Bolshevik majority was felt in the numerous non-party conferences of

the workers and peasants, in the Democratic Conferences, and in the Trade Unions and the Soviets. The growth of Bolshevik majority in the Soviets can be seen from their percentage of delegates to the Congress. The implicit support was of course much more than is illustrated in the figures.

All Russia Congress of Soviets	No. of Delegates	No. of Bolsheviks	% of Bolsheviks
1st. 16 June 1917	790	103	13
2nd. 10 November 1917	675	343	51
3rd. 23 January 1918	710	434	61
4th. 20 March 1918	1232	795	64
5th. 7 July 1918.	1164	773	66

These figures ought to shatter the statements of the bourgeois intellectuals and the "purely democratic" gentlemen Socialists of the Second International - that the Bolsheviks seized power as a minority clique of a few - only it was a determined and efficient minority. (Reference: Public Prosecutor's Address to the Court).

Though the Bolsheviks were in majority and had the backing of the working class and peasantry it did not mean that power was surrendered by the bourgeoisie of its own accord or in recognition of "the right of majority to rule the country". Neither did the Bolsheviks beseech Kerensky on "bended knees" to give power in the hands of the Soviets

because the people were behind them. When the crisis intensified in September, the peasants began to confiscate the big estates on their own initiative and formed local Soviets to supervise distribution and control. The so-called revolutionary Government sent troops to protect the land owners, but the troops in some cases soon fraternised with the peasantry and in others were driven by it. In September the Railway workers struck for higher wages, the land owners asked the Government to double the price of corn bought by the Government from them which was agreed to by Kerensky who would not, however, increase the wages of Railwaymen. Relying on these symptoms Lenin urged the preparations for insurrection and a forcible overthrow of the Government. Before he urged this measure, it is worthy to note that he tried much to form a Coalition Government with Left Socialist Elements and even the Mensheviks in the Soviets, urging them to supersede the Provisional Government and take power in their hands. From his retreat, in September, 26th-27th, Lenin wrote "the Russian Democracy, the Soviets, the Socialist Revolutionary and Menshevik Parties have before them now an opportunity which is rare in the history of revolution. They can assure the convocation of the Constituent Assembly on the date fixed without adjournment, they can preserve the country from military and economic disaster, they can safeguard the peaceful development of events There could be no longer any

question of resistance to the Soviets but for their hesitations. No class will dare to provoke insurrection against them, and enlightened by the Kornilov experience the big proprietors will peacefully surrender power before the Soviets' ultimatum. In order to overcome the capitalists' resistance to the Soviet programme it will suffice to institute a vigilant supervision by the peasants and workers over the exploiters and a short time imprisonment upon the recalcitrants. If the Soviets seized power they could still - and it is probably the last chance - assure the peaceful development of the revolution, the peaceful election by the people of their representatives, the peaceful competition of parties within the bosom of the Soviets, the experiments of different party programmes and the peaceful transference of power from one party to another." This peaceful development of the revolution, however, can not be confounded with the non-violent revolution of the Indian bourgeoisie. The political and economic content of the former was quite different from that of the latter. The transference of power from the bourgeoisie to the Soviets involved a complete destruction of feudal economy, depriving the bourg. of political power and if necessary the nationalisation of key industries accompanied by workers' control, in those that were not nationalised. It was a transference of economic and political power from one class to another. Lenin contemplated the possibility at that

particular moment of a "peaceful development" because, as he clearly states, "the whole mass of the working class and peasantry and the military forces were behind the Soviets and ready to support the seizure of power; since they had lost faith in the bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties of which the Provisional Government was formed by reason of the Kornilov rising and the economic sabotage of the bourgeoisie." (On August 1, 1917, before the Bolshevik Revolution, 568 concerns had been closed down by the owners on various pretexts). The Indian petty bourgeois parties when they talk of their peaceful revolution have none of these class forces in their minds or objectively before them either in the economic or political content.

But the conditions favourable for the proposal had vanished within four days by the rapid march of events. So by the beginning of October Lenin was urging the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks to seize power immediately either in Moscow or in Petrograd. There were a few members in the Central Committee who considered the movement still premature. But Lenin's viewpoint secured a majority. Complete preparations were made keeping in mind the profound instructions of Marx "insurrection is an art; defensive is the death of insurrection." Reliable battalions were converged on strategical points the battleship Aurora, whose sailors were the staunchest Bolsheviks, was brought to play its guns and exactly seven hours before this time,

today the 7th of November, fourteen years ago, Krylenko staggering with fatigue, climbed to the tribune of the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets with a telegram in his hand, just as today we climbed into the dock with a telegram - but differently worded - to the Soviet.

"Comrades, from the northern front, the army sends greetings to the Soviets announcing the formation of a Military Revolutionary Committee which has taken over the command of the northern front." (Ext. P.89). It is a sorry spectacle, yet full of revolutionary hopes that we on the Indian front can not send a like telegram to the First Workers' Republic announcing them the victory of the Indian revolution. We could simply express the revolutionary greetings, which we have done today, congratulating them on their victory which also is partially a victory for the Indian working class and peasantry.

D. D/12.11.31

Evening 1st Part.

The seizure of power by the Bolsheviks means the seizure by the workers and peasants. But the Bolshevik Party had its strongest organisations in the workers of the towns. In the vast peasant land of Russia, a purely workers' organisation could not be expected to run the Government without the support of the peasantry. The Bolsheviks had not a vast network of their leadership in the peasantry, which, though quite sympathetic to the Bolsheviks was organisationally bound in the organisation of the Socialist Revolutionaries. The All-Russian-Congress of peasants assembled in Petrograd, refused to recognise the Bolshevik Military Revolutionary Committee and the Government formed by it. But the great peasant party of the S.R.s was itself split in a Right and Left section, the Left being in the majority and sympathetic to the Bolsheviks. Lenin proposed a compromise to them, included three representatives of theirs in the Council of Peoples Commissars on certain ministerial posts and won over the support of the leading influences in the villages and small towns. But it must be noted that the compromise did not surrender the hegemony of the Bolshevik Party, i.e. of the factory workers.

(55) Land Decree - Brest Peace - Sabotage of the petty-bourgeoisie - Dispersal of the Constituent Assembly

The Government of the bourgeoisie and land owners was

overthrown and that of the workers and peasants enthroned. What were the consequences of this revolutionary change? The new Government was not like that of the Labour Party, administering the affairs of the bourgeoisie. It was to be the smashing of the feudal-bourgeois State and its replacement by the workers' State. But this workers' State was not immediately carrying out a Socialist revolution, i.e. overthrow of the bourgeoisie in social economy altogether. The first act in the economic transformation was the Land Decree by which the feudal ownership of land was abolished. Henceforth land ownership was vested in the State. Land ownership is nominally vested in the State in British India also. In Britain and France, feudal land ownership was destroyed a century earlier; so in this respect the Soviet Land Decree was merely carrying out the bourgeois revolution. But there was a complementary part to the Decree, to this bourgeois revolution which was absent in the former revolutions. The political power in the present case was held by the Workers' and Peasants' Soviet led by the Communist Party. What difference did this make? In the former case, the land got into the hands of the rich peasants and ultimately into the hands of Banks and agricultural financiers. The land workers and poor peasants were expropriated. In the Soviet State this was prevented. The seizure was now an organised seizure i.e. the local peasant committees and Soviets seized the land, and expelled the feudal landlords.

Then the disposal of the land was made according to needs and capacity. There was another danger lurking in this. The landless worker or poor peasant having no cattle and Capital was bound to be exploited by the richer peasant who possessed cattle and Capital. Thus gradually the land of the poor peasant was bound to be concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie and become the basis for the reintroduction of the bourgeoisie into political power, acting from the base of the villages and therefore more powerful and dangerous. The insurance against this was the formation of separate committees of the poor peasants and land workers, holding the livestock and farm tools of the big estates by the village Soviets and lending them to the poor peasants for use. This weightage, political and economic, is completely absent under the bourgeois State, though the land may be nominally nationalised and owned by the State.

Next to the land question came the question of peace. The Soviet Government at once asked all the belligerent powers to convene a delegate conference for cessation of war and making "a peace without annexations and indemnities". The Allies refused. German Imperialism hoped to defeat the disorganised Russian armies thoroughly, seize the grain and coal areas in South Russia and thus with renewed strength attack the Allies. The Bolsheviks refused the peace terms leaving to the Germans the conquered territories. During the negotiations Trotsky utilised the conference to broadcast

his appeals to the workers of the belligerent countries to revolt and stop the war. He appealed to the German Proletariat to rise and stop the German attack on workers' Russia. The German workers responded. There were strikes in Berlin and in the Navy. But there was not as yet a desire for general revolutionary upheaval. German Imperialism succeeded in crushing the workers at home. In Ukraine, they exploited the bourgeois nationalists, set up a Rada which refused to join hands with the Soviet negotiations for peace and concluded a separate peace with Germany in such a manner that Ukraine became a base of German Imperialism. There was a great crisis in Russia over the German peace terms. The Communists refused to yield an inch of ground. Would it not be betrayal of their declarations for peace without annexations? How could they surrender the border line workers and peasants to German rule? The Russian Party was rent with controversies. The Leftists wanted even to go to Siberia, if the Germans conquered Petrograd and Moscow and conduct the Soviet Government there. Lenin at this stage intervened and was the sole person responsible for defeating this Leftist heroism. The Proletarian Revolution rested on the workers and peasants of European Russia. A transfer of the peoples Commissariats with the whole band of the excellent brains of the revolution to the Siberian forests would not mean a transfer of the real basis of the revolution. It would be merely a romanticism of the

Robinhood type and not a Proletarian State. The conquest of the revolution required "a breathing space" which must be bought, if necessary at the expense of a peace dictated by a robber Imperialism, "with its knee on the chest" of the revolution. The peace terms would leave the Proletarian basis of power in all branches untouched and even the few territories now lost would be restored soon, if the German workers made a revolution in their country signs of which had already become visible. After a tremendous intra-Party struggle the Brest-Litovsk peace was signed on 18th March 1918, after the Allies had refused help against Germany.

More serious to combat was the internal danger of sabotage by the petty bourgeoisie. The petty bourgeois middle class employees of the railways organised in the Viksel, refused to transport the troops of the Soviet Government against the counter-revolutionary Kerensky, under the plea that it took no sides until the Constituent Assembly decided the question of power. Here again the class consciousness of workers came to the rescue. Though the middle class staff was not richly paid by the bourgeoisie and was as much exploited as the lower grade manual workers, like the signallers, pointsmen, coalers, enginemen etc. yet the petty bourgeoisie of the Station-masters and such others were ideologically and culturally allied with the bourgeoisie, while the other sections were not. The Proletarian rank and file as against the Trade Union petty

bourgeoisie bureaucracy ran the trains, helped the Soviet and the Viksel's sabotage was broken. Then there was the sabotage of the State Bank clerks and salaried officers and of the telephone bourgeois girls. Here too the Soviet appointed its own officers, who went to the Bank and learnt from the peons the allocation of duties. At the prospect of such a powerful sabotage many a Bolshevik weakened, but Lenin stood firm and asked the Party to learn from the peons and the lowest grade employees the work of the State. A lot of venomous propaganda was carried on against the Soviet that it wanted to destroy the intellectuals, the middle class petty bourgeoisie, "the salaried Proletariat", who under the Bolshevik terror were compelled to flee the country. The British Imperialist propaganda agents in India frighten the petty bourgeoisie by their imaginary fate under a Proletarian rule. But all this is mere misrepresentation. There is no doubt that the higher civilian bureaucracy whether Indian or British, will be removed from its posts altogether. It cannot be retained even on the low salaries proposed in the Commune State (even on the Rs.500/- as found in the Mahatma's proposal), because that bureaucracy is in most cases directly related in blood and money to the land owners and the bourgeoisie. The heads and most important sub-heads of the bureaucratic machine have to be removed altogether, otherwise the continuity of the previous bureaucratism cannot be broken. But such need

not be the case with the lower subordinates and the staff. Lenin wrote, "Besides the preponderatingly 'repressive part' of the apparatus, the standing army, police, officialdom, there is in the contemporary State machine another part closely interconnected with banks and syndicates fulfilling a great mass of work of account keeping and registration if one may so express it. This part of the apparatus cannot and must not be broken up. It must only be torn from subjection to capitalists with their wire-pulling influence. It must be subjected to the Proletarian Soviets." Thus when the State Bank was seized, only the former Governor was removed and replaced by the Bolshevik Finance expert, Piatakov. But wherever such steps were taken the petty bourgeoisie incited by the former masters sabotaged or struck work. When their resistance was met with firmness and the Soviet State could not be overthrown by them, the sabotage collapsed within four months. Only the higher bureaucracy migrated out of Russia, along with the land owners and capitalists; (and one of them has found his way into India to become the most imaginative Prosecution witness - Inspector Derojinsky, P.W. No. 182).

All the counter-revolutionary groups, the non-Bolshevik Parties and even honest petty bourgeois elements, who did not believe in the efficacy of the Soviet system, concentrated their energies on the Constituent Assembly.

The slogan of the Constituent Assembly had been adopted and made popular by all the revolutionary parties, including the Bolsheviks for the last 20 years. Every strike, every demonstration asked for a Constituent Assembly elected by universal suffrage to determine the constitution of Russia. Land to the peasants, ordinary rights of citizens in a bourgeois democracy as were found in the West were to come to the people only through the Constituent Assembly. Now when the Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies were the political power, what was to be done with the Constituent Assembly which the Provisional Government had failed to call and which failure was one of the reasons of popular opinion veering towards the Bolsheviks who asked for the immediate convening of the Assembly? Here was a problem of first-rate importance before the Communist Party. Was the Constituent Assembly elected by universal suffrage to be allowed to determine the constitution of the new State and act as the sanction for the new State or was the Soviet Congress to predominate? A large number of Bolsheviks were under the infatuation of the last 20 years' propaganda. They thought that if the Constituent Assembly supported them and the Government then alone would they enjoy the support of all the people, i.e. all the workers and peasants.

12/11/31 (Evening Part II).

But Lenin struck quite a different note. The Soviet form of democracy was a higher form than parliamentary democracy as represented by the Constituent Assembly. To allow the C.A. to act as a sanction for the Soviet State was to go back a stage. The C.A. was now the rallying centre of the bourgeoisie and the counter revolution, while the workers and peasants solidly stood behind the Soviets as is shown in the table quoted in para 54. The C.A. therefore should be allowed to meet but it must be dispersed after it had shown its bankruptcy in meeting the demands of the workers and peasants. Lenin arrived at this formulation and was confident that the C.A. would not meet the demands of the masses because out of the 36 million votes that were polled the S.Rs. had polled 20 million, the Bolsheviks 9 million and other parties 6 million, which presented quite a different contrast to the percentage of seats held by the Bolsheviks in the Soviet Congress. Of the elected members again 535 were anti-Bolsheviks and 168 Bolsheviks. When the date of the Convocation came near, the S.Rs. tried to mobilise battalions to protect the C.A. from dispersing. When the preliminary conferences of the delegates took place, the Bolshevik group proposed to them that they ratify the land decree of the Soviet. The conferences with the majority of petty bourgeois elements under the leadership

of the bourgeois groups refused. That much was sufficient to expose the "bourgeois parliament" in the eyes of the masses. The Bolsheviks, when the C.A. met, sent an order for the deputies to disperse. Thus the long-dreamt of bourgeois parliament that was to give democratic freedom was superseded by the Soviets and the leadership of the C.P. The "constitutional screen" of the landowners and the bourgeoisie to hide their class dictatorship and delude the workers and peasants was torn away.

(56) What is International in the Russian Revolution
- tendency to partial acceptance of Leninism -
Lenin shows four specific conditions of the
Russian Revolution - Leninism is not mere applica-
tion of Marxism - the eleven points that enriched
Marxism - Indian tendency to reject certain points
- accept whole or reject whole - no non party
attitude.

The facts and significance of the Russian Revolution were at first perverted by the intellectual agents of the world bourgeoisie. But when the Soviet grew stronger and withstood all attacks, there was a rush of visitors and delegations to study the new phenomenon of the working class building up Socialist Society. (For example delegations from the Labour Party). When the workers of the world under the leadership of the Communist Parties began to hold

the ideal of the Soviet before themselves the petty bourgeois intelligentsia and the labour aristocracy acting as the agents of Capitalism within the Labour Movement adopted a new tactic. In the European countries, they had adulterated Marxism, tried to "revise" and "correct" it, on the ground that after the experiences of the new stage of Capitalism - Imperialism - which was not prevalent when Marx formulated his doctrines, Marxism requires "correction" or "revision". They have produced a breed which says "we are Marxists - but not Leninists. We are Communists but not of the Third International type." (As is hinted in the cross examination of Mr. Brailsford). Some have gone further and say we are Leninists, but not according as the Comintern understands it today." Now what is the result of such an attitude? We are familiar with this sort of political acrobatics even in the camp of the Indian national bourgeoisie. When a certain slogan or political principle becomes popular with the masses, the politically worn out reactionary groups change their outer skin in order to ingratiate themselves with the new trend of mass psychology. If the masses accept them, they become the settled centres of reaction within the growing movement and betray at the time of crisis. For example the big Indian bourgeoisie with its landowning affiliations refused to accept the word "Swaraj" at the 1906 Congress and broke the Session. Next they fought the introduction of the

Home Rule ideal of the radical petty bourgeoisie in 1917. When Home Rule became popular and the masses began to march under its flag, they adopted the Home Rule ideal. When the petty bourgeois Congress chucked out the word Dominion Status from its constitution in 1920 they held away for a time but re-entered it and from within sidetracked the mass forces on to the line of reaction. Today even the most counter revolutionary bourgeois talks of complete Independence, but "honestly" differs on the nature of that Independence as conceived by the revolutionary parties. Similarly when Marxism became the accepted creed of the working class the petty bourgeoisie accepted it but wanted to "revise" it. The attempts at revision were strongly fought by the Bolsheviks. The erstwhile Marxists like Plekhanov and Kautsky denounced the Russian Revolution and its methods lest the working-class of every country be enamoured into following them. But when the workers of the industrial countries and the oppressed toilers of the subject countries gravitated towards the Soviet Idea, the opportunists in the revolutionary proletarian movement adopted a new tactic. They said that the Soviet is really workers' State. Lenin was really the greatest Leader of the proletariat. But then you can not accept his principles and methods in other countries. Russia had her own "peculiarities". We can not learn lessons of the Russian Revolution, because our country's development is "peculiar"

(as Jawahar Lal and Subash Bose would like to put it). We admire Leninism but only when it is restricted to Russia. Moreover even if Leninism is to be applied to the conditions in our country the application as suggested by the Comintern is wrong. Thus argue a certain section of the radical intellectuals in India who finding that the Labour Parties of Europe and even the Liberal and Labour Imperialists have succeeded in their career making before the workers on the slogan of Socialism and Marxism (adulterated, perverted and revised) writ large on their flag to deceive the working-class and are giving up their wholesale opposition to Marxism and Socialism. Socialism and Marxism are becoming a fashion with some of the Indian warlords and even a man like Sir Faisal Hussain confessed with great pride before the Session of the Federation of the Indian Chamber of Commerce in 1931 that he, too, was "something of a Socialist." A man like Subash Bose when faced with the strength and solidarity of the workers' demonstration at the Calcutta Congress in 1928 was hesitating whether to choose between the workers or his petty bourgeois volunteers. But when he became conscious of the new forces he began to wear the borrowed Trade Union and Socialist feathers to strut as a genuine eagle among the revolutionary working-class but at the same time would like to keep some mental reservations on the question of what attitude the working class should adopt towards the problem

of Geneva. We meet with the spectacle of a Congress President declaring his "Socialist" solidarity with the working-class and peasantry and in his actual politics paying homage to the "discipline" imposed by a counter revolutionary compromise or a Fact. All of them praise Marx and Lenin, because the revolutionary working-class in India is by the instinct of an oppressed class moving towards the Soviet idea, towards Leninism though even advanced members of that class may not be able to express it scientifically in so many words. Lenin himself had anticipated these trickeries and when he was alive he pointed out that the Russian Revolution has its own peculiarities no doubt but there are "some fundamental features of our revolution to be of such international significance The advanced workers in every land have long understood - although in many cases they did not so much understand it as feel it through the instinct of their revolutionary class." (Reference Ext. P 975). But neither Lenin nor the Comintern insist that every feature of the Russian Revolution or the Russian Party will be copied in other countries, including the bald head of Lenin or the beard of Marx. Such slavish unscientific imitations are left to the degenerate petty bourgeoisie or the religious fanatics who would follow their prophets to the length of wearing a langoti or having their heads shaved in three places. Lenin said, "Of course it would be the greatest

mistake to exaggerate this truth (of international application of the Russian experience) and apply more than the fundamental features of our revolution. It would be likewise erroneous not to keep in mind that after the Proletarian Revolution in one of the advanced countries, things will in all probability take a sharp turn; Russia will cease to be the model and will become again the backward (in Soviet or Socialist sense) country." Because a highly industrialised country like England, Germany or U.S.A. can build Socialism faster and more easily than in agrarian country like Russia. What were the peculiar conditions, according to Lenin, helping the Russian Revolution whose repetition in another country is not very probable? These specific conditions were (1) The possibility of connecting the Soviet Revolution with the conclusion, thanks to it, of the Imperialist war which had exhausted the workers and peasants to an incredible extent. (2) The possibility of making use for a certain time of the deadly struggle of two world powerful groups of Imperialist plunderers, who were unable to unite against their Soviet enemy. (3) The possibility of withstanding a comparatively lengthy civil war partly because of the gigantic dimensions of the country and the bad means of communications. (4) The existence of such profound bourgeois revolutionary movement amongst the peasantry that the Proletarian Party included in its programme the

revolutionary demands of the Peasant Party (the S.Rs. a Party which was sharply hostile to Bolshevism) and at once realised these demands through the proletarian conquest of power.

But Leninism is not merely the application of Marxism to these specific conditions of the Russian struggle. Leninism is a further development of Marxism in the epoch of Imperialism and Proletarian revolutions. You can not be a Marxist without being a Leninist, nor can you be a Leninist without learning the lessons of the Russian Revolution, because Leninism developed in relation to certain class forces and their conflict, in relation to a bourgeois revolution as well as a proletarian revolution, the general features of which apart from its Russian peculiarities are bound to be reproduced in every country in so far as the general features of feudalism or capitalism are reproduced in the same way in every country. We have seen the general deductions of Marxism from the class struggle of Marx's time. Leninism enriched that experience by the solution of the following questions:- (1) The theory of Imperialism and of the Proletarian Revolution. (2) The conditions and the forms of realising the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. (3) The mutual relations between the proletariat and the peasantry. (4) The significance of the national question generally. (5) Particularly the significance for the World Proletarian Revolution of national movements in colonial

and semi-colonial countries. (6) The role of the Party. (7) The tactics of the Proletariat in the epoch of Imperialist wars. (8) The role of the Proletarian State in the transition period. (9) The Soviet State as a concrete type of the Proletarian State in that period. (10) The problem of social sub-divisions in the Proletariat itself as a source of the division of the Labour Movement into an opportunist and revolutionary tendency. (11) Overcoming both the Right Social Democratic tendencies and Left deviations in the Communist Movement.

D/13.11.31

Evening 1st Part

Those who accept "Marxism", (as they would call it) but say that they are not Leninists or Communists, accept mostly the Marxian critique of capitalism but reject its revolutionary part, especially on the question of the overthrow of the capitalist political power with its corrupt bourgeois Parliamentarism and its replacement by the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The opportunist Socialists of the Imperialist countries reject Leninism because they do not want to strive for the separation and independence of those countries that are subject to their Imperialisms. The "Marxists" of the Second International in England, France, U.S.A. would desire the independence of India, China etc. but would not aid the revolutionary movements of those countries for independence. They would rather persuade the subject countries not to press for independence though they would recognise the abstract right to independence of these countries (e.g. Mr. Brailsford's view, as is seen in his evidence before this Court). In India also we find the petty bourgeois Socialist parties of the Punjab and C.P., adopting the fashion of Socialism but preaching against Leninism and the Comintern. We find the President of the Trade Union Congress - Ruikar - asking for immediate establishment of Socialism and in the same breath urging for more representation at the Round Table Conference which

is the summum bonum of class-collaboration on the part of petty bourgeois nationalists, Labour Imperialists feudal land owners, princes and the industrial bourgeois all trying to reconcile their irreconcilable contradictions.

We have to reject all such deviations. We stand for complete application of Leninism to the Indian conditions, unequivocal adherence to Marxism-Leninism by every one who is a Communist and further complete adherence to the Comintern. There are some who would like to accept Leninism but would hesitate to adhere to the C.I. Such an attitude is a contradiction because it rejects the Leninist line on point no: 6 in the eleven points noted above. If you accept Marxism thoroughly you have to logically accept Leninism, the Party and the Comintern. If you deny the Comintern, you then naturally deny the Party, and "only that much part of Leninism and Marxism" as some people express it. Then you create a dual Party or no Party. In the former case, if a more or less good party exists already, it is bound to lead to a conflict and sabotage of the proletarian struggle which then becomes divided under dual leadership. In the latter case no party means no correct leadership which leads to aimless piecemeal disorderly struggle. Thus in both cases you arrive ultimately at the negation of Leninism and the proletarian revolution. The whole chain is quite indivisible. I will deal with the Indian aspect of this question as found in the exhibits a

is the summum bonum of class-collaboration on the part of petty bourgeois nationalists, Labour Imperialists feudal land owners, princes and the industrial bourgeois all trying to reconcile their irreconcilable contradictions.

We have to reject all such deviations. We stand for complete application of Leninism to the Indian conditions, unequivocal adherence to Marxism-Leninism by every one who is a Communist and further complete adherence to the Comintern. There are some who would like to accept Leninism but would hesitate to adhere to the C.I. Such an attitude is a contradiction because it rejects the Leninist line on point no: 6 in the eleven points noted above. If you accept Marxism thoroughly you have to logically accept Leninism, the Party and the Comintern. If you deny the Comintern, you then naturally deny the Party, and "only that much part of Leninism and Marxism" as some people express it. Then you create a dual Party or no Party. In the former case, if a more or less good party exists already, it is bound to lead to a conflict and sabotage of the proletarian struggle which then becomes divided under dual leadership. In the latter case no party means no correct leadership which leads to aimless piecemeal disorderly struggle. Thus in both cases you arrive ultimately at the negation of Leninism and the proletarian revolution. The whole chain is quite indivisible. I will deal with the Indian aspect of this question as found in the exhibits a

little later on. Suffice it to say that the attempt of the Prosecution and some pseudo Socialists to separate Marxism from Leninism and contrapose them is an attempt to introduce opportunism in the Indian Communist Movement. For us there can be no such thing as an "independent attitude" of taking "the good points" of both Moscow and Geneva and rejecting the bad. For us Moscow is all truth and Geneva all lie.

(57) Bolsheviks and Red Terror - how it arose - causes of Allied hatred of the November Revolution - the wild stories against the Soviets - Anarchism of the Bakuninist Anarchists - casualties in Petrograd fighting - no restrictions on political parties except the bourgeois - intervention in Civil War - the S.R. rising and attempt on Lenin's life - Red Terror instituted - Kautsky's books and Lenin's answer to him - formal democracy and dictatorship.

Did the Bolsheviks on their installation in power start a reign of terror? (The late Mr. Langford James in his address to the court drew a very vivid picture of this supposed Red Terror). Capitalist propaganda between February and November 1917 was overflowing with the praise of the bloodless Russian Revolution, because that revolution had put into power the bourgeoisie, which was pledged to war. After November the intense venom of the bourgeois

press was released against the Bolsheviks, because in the first place they repudiated Imperialist war and signed peace with Germany. But this they did after calling upon all the Allies to stop the war and join a peace conference which they refused. There were 18 such attempts and appeals from the Soviet between November 1917 to December 1919. The second reason was that the Soviet repudiated the Czarist debts on the strength of which the Czar had maintained his autocracy. The third was that the new State was not a bourgeois Parliamentary State but the proletarian class State. If it were allowed to exist it would be an inspiration to the world proletariat and peasantry. The world propaganda against the Soviet was thus the concentrated hatred of the world bourgeoisie against the world proletariat and peasantry. The innumerable lies that were spread about the Bolsheviks have now died down, exposed and smashed by the most progressive and healthy development of Soviet Russia and the necessity forced upon decaying Imperialism to come to terms with her. The hideous form of the propaganda of early days has now been replaced by a subtle method which trades in India on the ignorance of the people helped by the rigorous censorship maintained by the Government. Mr. Langford James in his address to the Court repeated almost all the old stories about Soviet Russia and the attempt was so disgusting that even the "Daily Herald" of London, which has no love for

the Soviet, was ashamed of it and denounced it. It is not necessary here to recount all those lies. You can find them systematically put down and exposed by an American author, E. A. Ross, who has gone into the question in his book "The Russian Soviet Republic". Immediately after the November Revolution there was no Red Terror. Neither was there a general confiscation of the belongings of the bourgeoisie. The Soviet had not even declared the factories nationalised. The seizure of power in Petrograd resulted only in 1408 casualties and the so-called bombardment had not gone beyond the smashing of window panes of the Palace. Immediately after the conquest, the Anarchists had issued an appeal according to their principles of abolishing the State immediately (of whatever class) urging upon the people to seize everything they liked and calling upon every section of them, including thieves and robbers to abolish society. In order to abolish the State they encouraged the weakening of centralisation of power. They said, "Village, ignore the orders of the city, disobey the Centre. Organise the Commune. Ye Gulls of Religion destroy the churches. Blow up the universities." (Full text of this interesting Manifesto can be found in Ross' book). Such attempts of the Bakuninist Anarchists were bound to result in a certain disorder and they were attributed to the Bolsheviks who in the first days allowed full freedom to all the revolutionary political parties and

did not take any steps against the propaganda of the parties like those of the S.R.s and Anarchists. There was no terror either against the bourgeoisie or the petty bourgeoisie. But the overthrown bourgeoisie fights for its counter-revolution with tenfold vigour. Even before November, Petrograd and the big cities were threatened with famine. The Bolsheviks began to take energetic steps against this. The bourgeoisie supported the Czarist Generals in their revolt. The French, British, American and all the other bourgeois powers united to smash the Soviet and aided the Czarist Generals in starting the Civil War. In March 1918 when the Germans were silenced by the Brest Treaty, the British landed marines on the Murmansk Coast on the plea that they wanted only to protect their base in the Baltic against the Germans and would vacate it very soon. But after landing they massacred the whole of the Kem Soviet in July 1918. The Czecho Slovaks who were on Russian soil and wanted to go back to fight on the side of France were allowed to proceed to Vladivostok to board their ships. On the way at the instigation of France, which paid them 11 million roubles and England which paid 3½ millions, they seized the Siberian Railway and fought the Soviets in May 1918. The Japanese, the British and the Americans landed troops in Siberia on 6th April and July 17th, 1918. The Czech treachery starved Moscow as they held up the food transport in Samara and Simbrisk.

From the North the British advanced from Archangel. The plan was to join hands with the Czechs and Kolchak who was advancing from the Urals. From the South the Cossacks helped by the British and French guns advanced North. Thus when the foreign Imperialist powers were out to overthrow the Soviet by armed intervention, in Moscow and Petrograd they carried on conspiracies with the S.R.s and the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. The head of this was Lockhart of the British Mission. The conspiracy was hatched in the extra territorial grounds of the Consulate. British Lieutenant Riley got into touch with the Commander of the Lettish Guard of the Smolny, by name Bersin, and promised him several hundred thousand roubles. Forged documents purporting to be secret Russo-German treaties were to be planted in the peoples' Commissariats. The question was seriously debated whether Lenin or Trotsky should be merely kidnapped or should be killed on the spot. Some one pointed out that these two had such uncanny powers that if kidnapped they would win over their kidnapers on the way by propaganda and get free. So they must be killed. But Bersin was a Bolshevik Commander. He joined the conspiracy but took instructions from the Bolshevik Cheka. When everything was ready, the Mission was raided and the whole conspiracy exposed in August 1918. Just then the Socialist revolutionaries becoming reactionary arose in revolt. They murdered the German ambassador, Count

Mirbach, to show that they did not like the Brest peace with Germany. It was an attempt to involve Soviet Russia in war with Germany, a suicidal policy at that moment. The S.R.s were suppressed and expelled from the Government. The coalition of 18th November 1917 was ended and henceforth the peoples' Commissariat was wholly a Proletarian Government under the guidance of the Communists. The S.R.s however did not stay their hands. Their Party headquarters had now become the rendezvous for bourgeois conspirators. On 5th September an attempt was made on Lenin's life in Moscow. Uritsky of the Cheka was killed in Petrograd and Volodarsky in Moscow. This was the last blow to the freedom of the political parties and the more or less absence of any rigorous restrictions on the bourgeoisie. The working class of Russia was profoundly moved by this attack on their greatest leader. The effect was exactly contrary to the expectations of the bourgeoisie. The workers and peasants gathered round the banner of Bolshevism more solidly than before. A complete extermination of the counter-revolutionaries was demanded and hence the Red Terror came into existence. The difference between the Red Terror and White Terror is that the former is exercised by the overwhelming majority of the people through their State power which is frankly a class State against the minority - the exploiters. The White Terror is exercised by minority against the whole people to protect

its parasitic and decaying existence against social progress. Every new revolutionary class, when it rises to power, has to exercise its revolutionary terror against the class which is overthrown. Every new class power is threatened by armed intervention and the violation of its integrity by the surrounding exploiters. The bourgeois French Revolution of 1793, whose principles are now taught even in school text-books of the bourgeoisie had to institute its terror against feudalism and its Allies. The French bourgeoisie was attacked by the British bourgeoisie allied with the European feudal States, consistently for 22 years (1793-1815). To combat the attack, the hives of the enemy, inside the bosom of the revolution, had to be cleaned out. The Bolshevik terror was nothing compared to the French terror. The Red Terror did not use its proletarian revolutionary arm against more than 10,000 counter-revolutionaries. The French, the British and other bourgeois States that had risen to power by exterminating feudalism on the shoulders of the peasantry were now sending their armed forces to kill the revolution of the workers and peasants of Russia, because it had dared to rise to power against the bourgeoisie.

We hear a lot about the Communist International "interfering in the internal affairs" of the British Empire, trying to overthrow the Empire and fomenting revolution. But Mr. Churchill and the renegades of the Labour Party

try to hide from the workers that they spent millions of pounds in supplying arms and officers to the counter-revolutionary Denikins, Kolchaks and Wrangels in Russia, that they interfered most violently in the internal affairs of Russia. Mr. Churchill fearing that the British soldiers might refuse to fight against Russia cheated them into landing at Archangel on the pretence that British missions and troops had been stranded and required rescue. For two years the bourgeois bandits of England, France, U.S.A. and Japan killed thousands of peasants and workers of Russia until the Red Army drove them out.

13/11/31 (Evening Part II).

And now they complain of the Comintern sending into their countries not armed battallions but revolutionary leaflets. Can these assassins of Lenin and thousands of Soviet workers show a single instance of the Comintern or its members having ever attempted to kill any one of these Imperialist bandits? The Social Democratic and petty bourgeois lackeys of Imperialism forgot this. Kautsky wrote a book entitled "Communism and Terrorism" perverting the historical experience and lessons of the Paris Commune and the teachings of Marx. He cried for democracy and freedom for the bourgeoisie saying that the Soviet State was not a democracy like the Paris Commune, which had allowed even the bourgeoisie to take part in its Commune Elections. He also wrote another book which tried to show from the point of view of "Marxism" that the Soviet State, the dictatorship of the proletariat was not the real proper form of the proletarian State because it had rejected formal democracy. The answer to the former work was written by Trotsky in the midst of his military expeditions against the counter revolution. The latter was answered by Lenin in his book "The Proletarian Revolution and the renegade Kautsky" (Ext. P 898). The Soviet State is the real democratic dictatorship of the proletariat because it is a dictatorship of the majority of the people (who are the

workers and peasants) against the bourgeoisie. It is democracy for the proletarians and the dis-possessed. Does the bourgeoisie in its State allow democracy to the workers and poor peasants? Not even the shadow of it.

(58) The difference between the economic and political content of bourgeois and proletarian revolutions - did Bolshevism introduce Socialism after October 1917 - October was not a Socialist revolution.

From what has been stated so far it must have been made clear that the immediate and ultimate ideals of the Communists arise directly from the development of productive forces and the consequent changes in the condition of society calling for a constant struggle towards a change in the production or property relations of classes. In order to bring about the necessary change in the economy of society the class struggle is fought on the question of political power since all regulation of class monopoly of wealth or of property relations is done in the final instance by the class State which pours its class content in its law of property. But having conquered the political power, the changes in social economy follow two different roads for two different kinds of class power. When a change from feudalism to capitalism takes place, the bourgeois productive forces have already ripened within the womb of the old society, bourgeois economy has already

developed to such an extent that it only now requires to take political power from feudalism in order to enable its further development and progress. But it is quite a different case with socialist economy. The basis of socialist economy ripen within the womb of Capitalism but the actual transfer of production and distribution on to socialist methods follows the conquest of power by the proletariat. For example the bourgeois property relations in which the worker sells his labour power for a wage develop within feudalism, wherein the serf is not free to sell his labour power on the market. It is also possible to find feudal and bourgeois economy prevailing side by side and its reflex in the State power being shared by a bourgeois-feudal bloc as was found in Germany before the 1918 Revolution. You can find feudal and bourgeois economy living side by side with both the classes sharing political power in the State. Similarly you can find socialist economy living side by side with a survival of capitalist economy. But there is this vital difference that the State in the latter case can not be jointly controlled by the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. It must be exclusively a proletarian State. What is the specific and vital demarcation between socialist and capitalist economy? This question is answered by the question who appropriates the surplus produce of Labour? Under Capitalism the wage earner sells his labour power and the surplus value produced

by him is appropriated as private property of the capitalist class. Now private appropriation of surplus values by a class is common both to feudalism and capitalism. That is why both can share economic and political power. But private accumulation of surplus value by a class is definitely the thing that is absent in socialist economy. Socialist economy is a far more serious contradiction of capitalist economy than the latter is of feudal economy. The function of the proletarian State is to bring within the sphere of socialist economy all the productive forces of the given society, that is it must move constantly towards destruction of capitalist relations. Therefore the two can not be reconciled within one State, one political power. Now though they can not co-exist in one State, they can for a time co-exist in one society in the economic field. And this happens for a long time in a petty bourgeois country like Russia (or China or India in the future) because in these countries agriculturalis still petty bourgeois and the predominating productive force. Even if the State is proletarian and supported by the peasantry, even if it has nationalised all the big industries, the society or the whole economy of it has not yet become socialist. In the socialised sector of economy the worker produces values and his surplus comes to him through his State that is it does not become private appropriation for further exploitation. But then there is the vast number of

private farms where labour is hired and sold and the surplus value produced accumulate for further exploitation. There is there capitalist economy. Unless they are collectivised, mechanised and socialised a proper distribution of all goods produced in the whole of the society can not be brought about. The sale and purchase of labour power of one by another can not be eliminated. This process can be swiftly carried out in industrialised countries like England, U.S.A. and Germany because there large scale mechanised production already exists in agriculture, along with a highly centralised industrial production. There is however one thing to be noticed. Under the capitalist State (especially in a highly industrialised country) though socialised economy can not be introduced yet forms of its introduction have already got ready. Highly centralised large scale production with its planned methods on a sufficiently big scale is built up within Capitalism. What socialist economy requires is to destroy the private appropriation of the surplus which compels the vast technique to function only on condition that it can produce profits for the owning class and not for use. Thus we get the following formulations :- (1) Feudal and bourgeois economy can exist side by side in one society. Any one of them can be predominant without very acute conflicts. The State can be wielded by any one of them exclusively or jointly. (2) Capitalist economy does not tolerate socialist

private farms where labour is hired and sold and the surplus value produced accumulate for further exploitation. There is there capitalist economy. Unless they are collectivised, mechanised and socialised a proper distribution of all goods produced in the whole of the society can not be brought about. The sale and purchase of labour power of one by another can not be eliminated. This process can be swiftly carried out in industrialised countries like England, U.S.A. and Germany because there large scale mechanised production already exists in agriculture, along with a highly centralised industrial production. There is however one thing to be noticed. Under the capitalist State (especially in a highly industrialised country) though socialised economy can not be introduced yet forms of its introduction have already got ready. Highly centralised large scale production with its planned methods on a sufficiently big scale is built up within Capitalism. What socialist economy requires is to destroy the private appropriation of the surplus which compels the vast technique to function only on condition that it can produce profits for the owning class and not for use. Thus we get the following formulations :- (1) Feudal and bourgeois economy can exist side by side in one society. Any one of them can be predominant without very acute conflicts. The State can be wielded by any one of them exclusively or jointly. (2) Capitalist economy does not tolerate socialist

economy within itself. The State is wholly a bourgeois State, even if a few representatives of the Trade Unions or workers' parties are to be found in the Government. (3) Socialist economy can tolerate survival of capitalist economy within itself. But the State must be exclusively under proletarian control, even if the petty bourgeois peasantry is found in the Government. At the same time, the movement of growth must be in favour of socialist economy and against capitalist or petty bourgeois economy, or else the latter will engulf the former. (4) In the first two it is economy that predominantly determines the nature of political power. In the third it is predominantly the political power that governs and shapes economy.

Having seen this we shall now clear a few perversions made by the bourgeois propagandists about Soviet Russia, the perversions which are believed in many quarters in India. These perversions are built by postulating wrong premises, calling them Marxist premises and then trying to show that Soviet Russia does not specify them. Questions such as these are raised often. The Communists captured political power. Now when there is Communism in Russia, why is there inequality of wages? Why do they want Capital? Have they not destroyed Capital? How much Communism is there now? They introduced Communism and then had to scrap it out and introduce the New Economic Policy and bring back Capitalism. So have they not failed? When

there is Communism why is there the system of wages at all? Why not any body go and take any thing he likes? If the whole authority belongs to workers and peasants is it not natural that intellectuals should be exiled and killed? so on and so on. Now there is nothing wrong if such questions are framed by workers who may not have read Marxism. But we find hundreds of bourgeois professors and lawyers and socialists in the Second International raising these questions triumphantly pointing out that in spite of a workers' State there is some economic trouble and no communism in Russia.

In the first place such questions are unscientifically worded. No Communist ever can say that on the morrow of the revolution or even within a decade of it there will be Communism. Communism is the final stage of society which comes after Socialism, the two are not the same. Under Communism there is no State, because there are no classes left. The productive forces and relations are so organised that there is bound to be plenty of everything and no restriction then need be exercised on the question of hours of work or distribution of things produced. So in all the above questions the use of the word Communism is un-Marxian. Again if you formulate all the questions with the word Socialism in place of Communism what does Soviet Russia show in answer? The Revolution of November 1917 did not destroy classes. It destroyed only the class

State of the bourgeoisie. But it could not destroy the economic and cultural stratification of classes. The Revolution of November 1917 was not a Socialist Revolution, in the sense that it did not introduce Socialism in Russia. It only produced political conditions that prepared the pre-requisites of starting the real socialist revolution that is large scale socialist, planned production both in industry and agriculture. The Revolution destroyed landlordism. But that does not mean that it was a socialist measure. Because this was done by bourgeois revolutions also in the 18th century and it helps capitalist economy to grow. The revolution nationalised some industries. Is not nationalisation of industries a socialist measure? Not in all conditions. During the war, in many countries, the industries were taken over from private owners and controlled by the State. But the State was a bourgeois State, paid tribute to the bourgeoisie for this temporary nationalisation, which again was in no way controlled by the proletariat in its interests. The Government of India has nationalised railways, roads, post, telegraphs, salt mines, opium etc. Does it mean that it has introduced Socialism? Not at all. But the condition of nationalisation in Russia was different. The State belonged to the proletariat. If it nationalised the factories was it introducing a Socialism? Was it not a Socialist Revolution? No. Because the ownership of some industries may go into

the hands of the proletarian State but it may lease out these industries to capitalists as concessions. It then only becomes State Capitalism, with the proletariat in control of the State. It is not Socialism. Next even if a few industries are managed by the workers' State itself through its soviets and other organs that is even if the surplus produce of the workers in these industries goes to the working class State and therefore to itself those industries constitute fractions of socialist elements only and not socialist revolution so long as it does not become a predominant form of production in the total productive forces and production of the given society. The Socialist Revolution in Russia thus did not take place in November 1917 but started in 1928.

(59) Economic developments and nationalisation - decline from March to November 1917 - arrested by the October Revolution - decline during the civil war.

People have got very fantastic notions about nationalisation in Russia and judge the programme of the Indian Communist Party from those wrong notions. Therefore we shall see what is the progress of nationalisation of industries in Soviet Russia and incidentally the economic measures of the revolution - because we must not forget that the essential motive of the conquest of political

power is fundamentally "the economic emancipation of the working class to which every political movement must be subordinated."

The economic breakdown of Russia which bourgeois propagandists tell us was the result of the revolution really began even before the February Revolution. "By the end of the third winter of the war (1916) the economic disorganisation in Russia had reached its breaking point", writes Maurice Dobb ("Russian economic developments since the revolution") and he quotes Baerlein as follows: "As early as 1916 the railway system was in a grievous condition. Cartloads of fresh roses came from the Riviera for the Petrograd aristocracy, but in the Vitka Government of North Russia there was no means of transporting wheat." While sums amounting to seven to eight thousand million roubles had been borrowed from abroad and while gold reserves had been shifted to France and England to the amount of 460 million roubles in payment of war equipment, the deficit in the State Budget in 1916 amounted to 76 per cent of the whole expenditure and inflation and swollen the currency issue by nearly four times to nine milliard roubles at the end of 1916.

14/11/31 (Morning Part II).

Did the February Revolution and the Provisional Government of the middle classes supported by the bourgeoisie and landlords improve matters in any way. No. The position got worse still. One of the first acts of the Provisional Government was to declare a State monopoly of the Corn Trade, in an attempt to tackle the food problem and to prevent the rise in prices of corn illegal speculation in food stuffs in evasion of the grain monopoly grew apace. A worsening of the transport chaos took place. By October 1917 the number of locomotives awaiting repair had increased to 5500 or nearly 30 per cent of the whole - an increase of some 2200 as compared with the previous autumn. " Between March and November 1917 the currency in circulation nearly doubled, while prices rose as much as 224 per cent. The Provisional Government could not arrest the decline as it could only be done by handing over the lands to the peasantry, who then would release food for the towns and would themselves act as a watch on the corn speculations and by the introduction of workers' control in industry. But these measures meant expropriation of land owners and severe curbing of the capitalists of which the petty bourgeois Government was incapable.

What did the November Proletarian Revolution accomplish in this respect? Is it not a fact that the economic

decline went deeper during the next two years, followed by a severe famine? Yet it did. But the Proletarian Government did not cause it or aggravate the decline. On the contrary it reduced the terrible and inevitable misery. The Bolshevik Government after taking over the State Bank found that the private banks financed the strikes and sabotage of the petty bourgeoisie against the Workers' State and acted as mediaries for the flight of Capital. Only then was a decree nationalising banks issued on December 30, 1917. Thus this nationalisation was forced by the political exigencies and not as a measure "to introduce Socialism". The merchant fleet and corn depots were nationalised in February 1918. But it was not till June 1918 that a general decree of nationalisation of firms with a capital of over one million roubles was passed. Thus not a single branch of industry was nationalised before May and June 1918, as an act of general socialist policy of nationalisation. Even this general decree and other confiscations prior to it were due to purely political reasons. One was that the capitalists in order to overthrow the Workers' State conspired with the German Government by which Germany was to declare a large number of concerns as having been bought by her and as such putting them beyond the pail of nationalisation. The second reason was that the civil war had begun and in order to cope with it several factories and concerns had to be nationalised

in order to break the resistance of the bourgeoisie. Prior to June 1918 in 50 per cent of the cases of nationalisation the reason was the sabotage of the owner, unwillingness to continue production or flight of the owners. But the greatest resistance that the owners offered was to workers' control. The workers' factory committees were claiming the right to inspect the accounts and books of the management and to see that no material left the factory without reason. As early as June 1917 that is before the Bolshevik November Revolution, Kerensky had to tolerate this because the bourgeois sabotage and sale to foreigners had begun even then in order to coerce the Government into surrender and complete the restoration of the capitalist dictatorship. In order to prevent this the decree on workers' control was issued on November 14, 1917. Workers' control did not mean nationalisation or confiscation. By Articles 1 & 6 the Workers' Committee was given the right to be consulted on matters of sale and purchase, of fixing the output programme and even of determining the selling price. If the Committee's opinion was contrary to the wish of the owner the former prevailed, subject to an appeal to a superior economic organisation. The Committee had the right of inspection of account books without regard to commercial secrecy, which is nothing but a method of secret appropriation of profits. The Committee at the same time was charged with the maintenance of workers' discipline

and Article 7 reserved to the proprietor the sole executive right of giving orders as to the running of the concern and forbade the Factory Committee to countermand them. The effects of this decree were both good and bad. The good result was that the capitalist counter revolutionary activities were severely watched and crippled on the industrial field. The bad result was that in many cases the workers went further than mere control and seized the factories. Before July 1918 only hundred businesses were nationalised by decrees of the Centre and 400 by local organisations on their own initiative. In some production was disorganised. Separatist, syndicalist and centripetal tendencies grew in many cases. But Socialism is not decentralisation and anarchic production by each productive unit as it likes. It requires strict control and planning, a well-regulated equilibrium between all branches of social production, which is not possible by syndicalist methods. Within the Bolshevik Party there had grown a Left Wing Communist section, which favoured immediate nationalisation of all small and big enterprises directly by the workers. This section was also the one most vehement in denouncing the Brest peace with Germany. This group issued a separate paper of its own and was led by Bukharin, Rykov and others. Lenin called for a cautious policy in nationalisation in as much as there was no cadre of trained workers or Communist technicians in sufficient number to organise

production and distribution. Lenin vigorously slashed the Left Wingers as "slaves of phrases". He called for central control on production and the occupation by the Germans of the Ukraine called for a speedy reorganisation. The Factory Committees were brought under the control of Trade Unions and these in matters of industrial management were subordinated to State control, at the Third Congress of the Trade Unions in April 1918. This was opposed severely on the ground that it would destroy the independence of Trade Unions and all those arguments used against the capitalist State encroaching on the rights of workers. But these objectors forgot the fundamental point that more work or sacrifices of other kinds, State control etc were not now exercised by the enemy class for its interests but by the Workers' State that is by the workers over themselves voluntarily.

Another important measure of the most serious character was the repudiation of the Czarist debts by a decree in January 1918. The decree was issued when the Allied Powers refused to enter into peace without annexations and indemnities, and to stop helping the counter revolution. Foreign capital invested in State, municipal and guaranteed loans in Russia was 5400 million gold roubles. The foreign bandits had helped the Czar against a revolution with several loans. The revolutionary proletariat already impoverished could hope to reconstruct its life only by repudiating this

this huge liability, the simple interest charges on which would have absorbed a large percentage of the output of their productive capacity.

The cancellation of debts, nationalisation of businesses sabotaged by the bourgeoisie and abolition of landlordism could not produce their results immediately. On the contrary the revolutionary disturbance of the normal productive process was bound to cause a decline for which the previous period was responsible to a greater degree than the Bolsheviks. Still during the first year of the Revolution the deficit in the budget was 66.6 per cent of the total expenditure while it was 81.7 per cent in 1917 and 74 per cent in 1915. "In the first 8 months of the revolution the rate of increase of paper money was slower than it had been in the period of the Provisional Government." (Dobb). Had the Imperialist interventionists not financed the counter revolution and devastated the whole country even up to the gates of Moscow, this process of recovery would have gone on more speedily with only "the key positions", of industry in the hands of the State and perhaps those too would have been given for a time to private industry as concessions for some period. But the bourgeoisie hoped to restore its dictatorship over the masses by force and civil war.

(60) Decline and war Communism - breakdown of economy - cessation of civil war - currency - agricultural production and wages.

Most of the economic measures that were introduced during the civil war are considered by the intellectuals to be the normal ideals and methods of the Communists. Hence when they were abandoned, they pointed to the introduction of other economic measures as failure of "Communism" and the necessity of restoring capitalism. As has already been shown, the majority of the Bolshevik Party did not want to nationalise any and every business. First it was limited to industries that were strategically to maintain the new political power and break down the sabotage. But when the civil war began this policy had to be abandoned and a system of war Communism came to be introduced. Under it every concern employing over five persons was nationalised. The decree of general nationalisation was issued in June 1918 that is when civil war had already begun. The number of enterprises administered by the State rapidly rose to 1000 at the beginning of 1919 and passed 3000 by January 1920. At the end of 1920 to the State normally belonged 37000 enterprises of which 18000 had no mechanical power while over 5000 businesses were with only one employee. Was this the normal economic need of socialising industry and building up large scale planned production? No. It was an outcome of civil war when the petty bourgeoisie hoped to join the counter revolution, sabotage economic life and production and bring about the overthrow of the Workers' State. Nationalisation of enterprises with one employee

or even a hundred for that matter was a war measure and not the method to bring about socialist society. That is why in our programme you can never find a mention except of "key positions".

In management, the civil war introduced "militarisation". The anarchic control of individual factory groups was abolished and all were rigidly submitted to the control of the Vesenha. (the Supreme Economic Council). Due to the necessities of civil war even the Trade Unions were deprived of their powers and made subject to the State. Without strict order and discipline the workers would not win against the powerful land owners and the bourgeoisie. These measures naturally gave birth to a huge bureaucratic apparatus distorting the nature of a socialist State. Bureaucracy is the direct anti-thesis of Socialism. Neither could the economic life be pushed forward with such bureaucracy. They did not know what warehouses and goods they had nor could they manage them. Business got stuck up in these "bottle necks" of bureaucracy. The demands of the civil war on the resources of the State in money and reliable fighting workers for the front dislocated production. The largest centres of fuel and corn supply were in the hands of the enemy. The result was starvation of workers in cities, fall in wages and the State living on piles of paper money. In the winter of 1919 when Yudenich's guns could be heard on the Nevsky, men fell dead

of exhaustion and hunger on the streets. The real wages of the workers in 1918 were 40 per cent of pre-war, in 1919 they were 30.8 per cent. Their productivity was reduced to one-third while the total output of industry on an average was 14.5 per cent. The currency circulation which stood at 30 milliard until March 1918 went up to 60.8 in January 1919. Inflation multiplied three times in 1919 and four times in 1920. The real value of all the circulating media fell from 2200 million roubles in November 1917 to 152.9 millions in July 1918-1919 and to 29.1 in 1921. While the note issue rose by leaps and bounds, the real value of Government revenue from such issue fell from 163 million roubles to 20 million in 1920.

Taking advantage of this state of affairs, the Kulaks in the peasantry began to speculate on food stuffs and the masses of peasantry refused to bring food stuffs on the exchange market as the high prices of manufactured goods and paper roubles devaluating every moment gave him nothing real in exchange for his goods. But grain was an absolute necessity and unless the bulk of the peasantry sided with the revolution, the civil war could not be won. Therefore a ruthless grain monopoly and a compulsory grain levy had to be instituted in order to save the towns and the revolution. But who was to carry that out? Merely an armed force in the name of the revolution or a bureaucracy could not have succeeded. It was a question of class forces. The

revolutionary class force in the countryside was the poor peasants and the land workers. The February and November Revolutions had helped the whole peasantry to seize lands and drive away the big land owners. But in that process the richer strata of the peasantry began to appropriate the whole land as against the poor peasants, who had no capital or implements to work with. Now in the middle of 1918, the class war spread to the peasantry, the land workers and poor peasants coming out against the richer and middle peasantry. Land workers and poor peasant committees (decree, June 1918) and Soviets were formed, who helped the revolution to carry out the corn levy and the fight against the civil war. The richer peasants therefore helped the Czarist Generals for a time, until they found that the generals stood for the restoration of land owners. The middle peasantry did not take any active side and simply waited to see the result. The poor peasants siding militantly with the town workers helped, and beat the counter revolution. However when civil war had come to an end, the method of corn levy had exhausted its possibilities. The sowings had gone down heavily, as the middle peasantry refused to grow things only to be exchanged for paper or a whole crop for a pair of boots. The rate of exchange between town and village lost all basis of incentive to production. In pre-war days a pood of rye was exchanged for about 8 archins of cheap cotton

goods. This rate of exchange in the civil war had fallen very heavily as is shown below :-

	Grain collected (Mil.poods)	Textile goods supplied (Mil.archins)	Ratio of one pood grain to archins of textiles
1919	108	325	1 : 3
1920	212	180	1 : 0.85

How was this policy a normal socialist policy? No. It was the result of the civil war, it was the result of the millions of pounds spent by the foreign Imperialists to kill the Proletarian Revolution. Both the workers and peasants suffered by the war, underproduction, famine and bureaucracy. But this was not the result of socialist policy, not the result of "an experiment in communism" as bourgeois scholars term it. But an abnormality produced by the Imperialist attack. That is why when the civil war was won, War Communism, grain levy, militarisation of labour were at once scrapped out by the introduction of the new economic policy (NEP) in August 1921.

D/14.11.31

Evening 1st Part.(61) Introduction of NEP - alliance with the middle peasantry - educative functions of the dictatorship.

Within the Communist Party there were two wings who opposed the NEP. One was the Left constituted of Trotsky and others, who wanted militarisation of Labour to continue, who viewed the peasantry as a backward mass, with whom a Class war is inevitable and therefore who are to be forced into Socialism. The Right Opposition wanted complete decentralisation of the State apparatus of industry, on the syndicalist lines. This group was led by Madam Kollantai and sympathised with by Bukharin. Lenin who led the majority attacked both these groups and especially the latter as it was a disintegrating factor in the centralisation policy of the proletarian State. The discussions on the question of NEP show very clearly how according to Lenin Socialism was going to be built up. It was not going to be an overnight process. He characterised war Communism as a "jump" and a "mistake" "in complete contradiction to all we wrote concerning the transition from capitalism to Socialism." For the capture of power he had advocated "Two Tactics" for two stages. (Exh: P 1207(2)). In the first the feudal autocracy was to be overthrown by the workers and peasants as a whole and the bourgeoisie

neutralised. In the second the workers allied with the poor peasants were to overthrow the bourgeoisie and neutralise the petty bourgeoisie of the middle peasants. After the proletarian revolution had been carried and the Civil War won the third tactic was "alliance of the proletariat and the poor peasants with the middle peasants." This alliance with the middle peasants who now formed the bulk of the peasant population was to be effected by the NEP; the NEP would reintroduce free trade, the free market. It also meant a policy of concessions to capitalists for developing industry. To that extent it meant a certain growth of capitalism. In the absence of large scale industry, socialised by the State, small scale production has to be reinvigorated. It will give birth to capitalism. "But have we any occasion to fear this capitalism provided we keep the factories, the big enterprises, the means of transport and foreign commerce in our hands", asked Lenin and replied, "No". To those impatient Leftists he answered, "during the Dictatorship of the Proletariat it will be necessary to re-educate millions of peasants and petty proprietors, hundreds of thousands of employees, officials and bourgeois intellectuals; to subject them all to the proletarian State and to proletarian guidance, to rid them of bourgeois habits and traditions In like manner it will be necessary, in the course of a long struggle and under the aegis of the Dictatorship to re-educate the

proletarians themselves - for even the proletarians do not shake off their petty bourgeois prejudices in the twinkling of an eye, as if by miracle through the grace of virgin Mary, thanks to watchwords, resolutions or decrees; but only as the outcome of a tedious and difficult mass struggle against massed petty bourgeois influences." "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat is a hard fought fight against the forces and traditions of the old society; a fight that is both bloody and unbloody, both violent and passive, both military and economic, both educational and administrative." The NEP was now a class struggle, a Dictatorship of the Proletariat functioning under new forms, not the spectacular victories of glorious battles but slow constructive work. Thus those who think that Leninism is opportunism and a weathercock policy of compromises are great ignoramuses. The NEP was not a deviation - it was the natural outcome of the revolution in a backward agricultural country of small scale production, and every country of this type will more or less have to go through the NEP development. Those who say that we first massacre the peasants and then when in danger compromise with them are simply slandering us. (The address of the late Mr. Langford James). The Communists are the only Party that stands for the vast mass of the poor and middle peasantry, for this development of small scale industry to supplement the large scale socialist industry till the latter can

supply the needs of the whole population, and till small scale agriculture by the voluntary will of the peasantry becomes mechanised and collectivised.

(62) Restoration of economy without foreign loans - scissors' crisis - solution by lowering cost etc - results as at the 14th Congress, May 1925 and 15th Congress, December 1927 of the C.P.S.U. regarding industry and agriculture.

The period of 1921 to 1925 was a period of restoration and rehabilitation. After the introduction of the NEP, Soviet Russia tried to secure Capital from the industrial countries. But they insisted on the recognition of the Czarist debts and restoration of nationalist property, abolition of the State monopoly of export and import trade. The Bolsheviks who were in need of Capital were prepared to yield on the question of debts in return for guarantees of long termed credits, but they were adamant on the question of nationalised large scale industries and monopoly of the export-import trade, through which the superior technique of the Imperialist countries batters down national economies of the backward countries. After the defeat of the Allied Imperialisms in their attempt to forcibly overthrow the Soviet, a new orientation towards Russia took place and she was eagerly asked to come into the whirlpool of international imperialist conspiracies at Geneva and of the League of Nations. But many States

refused recognition to the Soviet Government hoping that it would be overthrown soon. The first recognition came from Great Britain in 1924. Then other countries followed. When the results of the industrial revival were seen in 1922 and 1923, the attitude of Soviet Russia towards the need for foreign Capital changed. A larger confidence in the creative power of the workers was generated and a policy of complete self-reliance and less dependence on foreign Capital was followed.

We have already seen the depths to which production had sunk during the three years after the revolution. When the Soviet was freed from foreign attacks, the huge military forces were demobilised. The grain levy was abolished and the single agricultural tax took its place. Four thousand enterprises were released by the State and leased out. They were all small scale businesses employing not more than 18 workers each. The State industries were reorganised under industrial Trusts, their coordinated control for general policy lying in the hands of the Supreme Economic Council, but for all other purposes acting as separate commercial concerns. A new gold rouble was issued as currency. The Budget was cut down and made dependent on real revenue. The result was that gross industrial production which was 18 per cent of pre-war level in 1920 rose to 27 per cent in 1921 and 35 per cent in 1922. In 1923, the Soviet was faced with a serious "scissors" crisis,

the industrial prices rising far above the agricultural prices. In September 1923, on a pre-war ratio of 100 the industrial prices had risen to 190 and agricultural prices had fallen to 60. Soviet Russia was again faced with as much peasant discontent as in the days of compulsory grain requisition. This time the State had an organised control over the major part of industry. Party discussions on the causes and remedies of the crisis were opened, the problem thrashed out and drastic remedies applied. The most drastic remedy was in the field of State industry. A liberal supply of currency and credit to the State industry had made the Trusts careless of commercial values, they had instituted monopoly prices, and neglected to secure a rapid turn over of capital through sales. The indiscriminate supply of credit was cut down. The divergence between whole scale and retail prices, the difference being pocketed by the NEP man, was fought through the cooperatives. Costs of production were cut down by retrenchment drive against bureaucracy. Such and other measures closed the scissors within six months. The political report of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. to the 14th Congress in May 1925 shows the rate of growth of restoration thus :- Agriculture - In the economic years of 1924-25 the gross production of 9 milliard roubles amounted to 71 per cent of pre-war production of 1913, of 12 milliard roubles. Next year it was expected to rise up to 88 per cent. Industry - gross

production in 1924-25 of all industry i.e. State, concessions and private was 5 milliards, i.e. 71 per cent of the pre-war 7 milliards. In this productive activity, was capitalist development gaining the upper hand or the socialised sector? This was the most crucial question since on the answer to this depended the answer to the question - will capitalism return or will the Soviet march towards Socialism? The share of State and cooperative industries in production in 1923-24 was 76 per cent of the total industrial production; in 1924-25 it was 79.3 per cent. The property concentrated in the hands of the workers' State was 11.7 milliards in Capital funds and 7.5 milliards in private enterprise, chiefly in the form of peasant enterprises. The central administered State industry and the Metal Trust made a profit of 142 million chervonets roubles in 1923-24. In 1925, it rose to 350 millions of which 173 millions were handed over to the State treasury. Similarly in the matter of the internal trade. The supply of raw materials and grains, the share of the State organs dominated the share of private capitalist enterprise. Thus when in Western capitalist countries they were restoring industry, enriching capitalism and accumulating social wealth in the hands of a parasitic class, in Soviet Russia the gains were being concentrated in the hands of the workers' State to form the foundations of further socialist expansion. When the workers in the

West were being attacked in the matter of wages and hours of work, in Russia they were slowly rising to above the pre-War level. The average monthly wage of the workers in Chervonets roubles was 35 per head in April 1924 i.e. 62 per cent of the pre-war; in September 1925 it was 50 roubles or 95 per cent. The total sum paid in wages was rising. In 1923-24 it was 808 millions; in 1924-25 1200 millions; in 1925-26 1700 millions. The assistance to the poor peasants amounted to 100 millions.

This state of affairs changed even more hopefully by the time of the 15th Congress of the C.P.S.U. in December 1927. The gross output of the whole of agriculture (1926-27) had risen to 12370 millions of pre-war roubles, i.e. 160.6 per cent of the pre-war level. In industry it was 8641 million roubles, i.e. 102.5 per cent.

We have already seen (in para 31) that the capitalist countries involved in war also regained their pre-war production and even surpassed it. But at the same time the workers' and peasants' share in the increased national income was not increasing. The capitalist recovery was being accomplished there by means of the growth of unemployment, rationalisation, increase in hours of work, strikes and risings, wholesale wage-cuts and increased taxation. In Soviet Russia the growth was accompanied by a well regulated distribution of the national income in .

favour of the workers and poor peasants. The capitalist class was slowly losing its share even in the small scale trade and industry. In the rural areas the rich peasants living on the rents of land workers and poor peasants had strengthened a bit, but the vast strata of middle peasantry was consolidating its position in a far greater degree without which there could not have been the increase in the production figures seen above.

I.H.K.

14/11/31 (Evening Part II).

(63) Construction problems - whence to bring Capital
- pre-revolutionary Russia built on foreign
Capital - socialist rationalisation - Party
Congress discussions to increase industrialisation
- collectivisation of agriculture - premature
scheme of the opposition - two deviations and
the real equilibrium between town and country.

But a restoration was easier because it only meant putting into order what was already there. The Soviet was now confronted with the problem of reconstruction, new investments and further production. Where was Capital for this to come from? Pre-revolutionary capitalist Russia had been built by foreign Capitalism. The total foreign Capital invested in Russian industry (excluding State loans etc.) before the war was 2200 million gold roubles of which 32 per cent was French and 22 per cent British. 90 per cent of the capital in metallurgy and 87 per cent in oil was foreign. A considerable proportion of the cotton mills were staffed by English managers and foremen as we find in India. In the engineering and other works English and German technicians predominated. When the revolution confiscated all this capital on the profits of which foreign imperialism fattened, the foreign Powers refused to give capital to the U.S.S.R. for reconstruction. The

foreign intellectuals, technicians and managers, hating to see the workers beneath them in political power working with a new spirit of freedom, sabotaged and conspired to destroy industry. Under such conditions it was natural that various groups should arise in the Communist Party advocating different methods of reconstruction. Uptil now the main basis was to allow unrestricted growth to middle and poor peasants and some incidental growth of the Kulaks. A section got alarmed at the growth of Kulaks and advocated a campaign of extermination. They hoped to build the basis of industrial capital on the expropriations of the Kulak class and push forth heavy industrialisation. If this policy had been followed in 1925 it would have meant kindling an immediate class war in villages on a large scale and a campaign of collectivisation. But for this there must be a basis of supplying goods and machinery to the villages, which was not there. It would have meant a drop in food supplies, crisis in the towns and retarding industrialisation. So this policy was rejected. The Fourteenth Congress decided on industrialisation by a campaign of socialist rationalisation, drastic economy without lowering working-class standards. Grain reserves were built up for the expanding industry. Having followed this policy for two years, a policy which on the political field meant a fight against Trotskyism, the Fifteenth Party Congress in 1927 December chalked the programme of

making a drive for collectivisation of agriculture. This meant bringing the middle peasants to form collectives of their farms, introduce mechanised production, increase production and consequently their surplus return. On the industrial field the famous Five Year Plan was adopted, the problem of Capital being solved not by making concessions to foreign capital but by socialised accumulation of the State industry by the voluntary raising of productivity by the working-class, by continuous working weeks, by shock battalions of work etc. When the Five Year Plan had sufficiently built up the technical basis for supplying the villages with tractors and tools and when grain problem was well in hand, the Sixteenth Party Congress decided on the general socialist offensive along the whole line, for the final suppression of Kulak economy, for converting petty agricultural economy into a predominantly socialist and collectivised economy. The real socialist revolution was thus begun. Any body who knows a bit of economics can easily understand why the alternate offensives have to be well timed, once pushing on industrialisation and once pushing on the agricultural front. Soviet economy is not anarchic economy but planned in so far as its conscious direction is not vitiated by private small scale production scattered in the 22 million small farms. It can not leave the economic forces to their own working. If it were to push up industrialisation and neglect agriculture, the

result would be that the peasants capacity to produce not having risen, there would be an industrial crisis as under capitalism. But to increase the peasants capacity to buy means to increase productivity by mechanisation. Mechanisation can not take place on isolated small farms. They must therefore be collectivised and then mechanised. Under Capitalism, this process takes the form of ruination of the small and middle peasantry, concentration of farms in large capitalist estates and then their mechanisation. But as capitalism in decline can not absorb the pauperised peasant in industry, he is thrown on the unemployed market. Thus under Capitalism the growth either way leads to crisis and ultimately to decline. Under the Socialist State, the conscious direction of economic forces eliminates this conflict. But there is one type of conflict that remains in the Soviet. That is the class struggle. Collectivisation is met with resistance by the Kulaks, who are capitalist elements. They incite the deep-rooted property instinct of the middle peasants. But it does not work long. The middle peasants finding the gains of productivity obtained in collectivisation soon join in by millions. Their higher productivity helps the market for industrial goods in the rural districts and for their own in the towns. Thus the two forces create an equilibrium.

Why was it said that the real Socialist Revolution began in 1928? Because it was then that the plan was laid

in Soviet economy to make the ratio of socialist production to small scale petty commodity production larger. The Five Year Plan put on the agenda to transform agricultural Russia into an industrial country. Secondly, agriculture itself was going to be brought into collectivisation and socialist construction. Once the output of socialist production becomes or has begun to be dominant both in industry and agriculture the real Socialist Revolution has begun: such a beginning was made in 1928.

When the bourgeois world heard of the Five Year Plan, it first laughed at the idea, at the immense rates of development planned therein. When under the drive of collectivisation the Kulak elements began to resist the measure, the Capitalist world predicted the downfall of the Soviet. The usual Riga stories of revolts were broadcasted. After two years of the Plan this attitude changed and capitalism in every country has accepted the fact that the Five Year Plan is going to succeed and if it succeeds, it will be a menace to world capitalism.

(64) Indices of growth - rates of development high
but not so the level of development - comparisons
- areas under Soviet & collective farms - Distri-
bution of National Income - wages - hours -
no. of workers.

The relationship between industry and agriculture from the point of view of the relative importance of

industry in the gross output of the whole of national income began to change thus :-

	Share of Industry	Of Agriculture
Pre-war	42.1 %	57.9 %
1927-28	45.2 %	54.8 %
1928-29	48.7 "	51.3 "
1929-30	53 "	47 "

What is however of greater importance is the relative shares of the socialised sector and private capitalist sector.

Capital investments in industry.	Socialised.	Capitalist
1926-27	1270 Ml.Rbs.	63
1927-28	1640 "	64
1928-29	2046 "	56
1929-30	4275 "	51

Capitalism was completely beaten especially in large scale industry. Its share in 1929-30 being 0.7 per cent and that of the socialist sector being 99.3 per cent. The rate of development of State industry planned by the Supreme Economic Council grew in 1929-30 to 209.8 per cent on 1926-27. The rate of development however must not be confused with the level of development. Such a rate of growth is not shown by any capitalist country in the world. But Soviet Russia has not yet caught up with the highly industrialised countries. For example her electrical power

output in 1929 was 64.65 million kilowatt hours while in U.S.A. it was 126000 million, in Canada 17628 million, in Germany 33000 million. Similarly in pig iron the output was 5.5 million tons while in U.S.A. it was 42.3 million, Germany 13.4 and Britain 7.7.

The most remarkable growth was in the increase of area under Soviet and collective farms. In this the Five Year Plan is being completed in two years. A general comparative statement of the Sixteenth Party Congress showed this. The Soviet farms organized under the Grain Trust "will have by the end of the Five Year Plan as much area under grain as the whole of the Argentine today." (1930); secondly all the Soviet farms taken together will have one million hectares more under grain than the whole of Canada as today. The results in collective farming showed that in three years the area sown in the collective farms increased forty times. Secondly their area sown today is as large as France and Italy put together.

D/16.11.31

Evening 1st Part.

Such a growth in the capitalist system leads to concentration of wealth in the hands of a parasitic class. In the U.S.S.R. it leads to improvement in the workers' standards. What sections of the population have how much share in the national income in the workers' State? The share of the workers and toiling peasantry who do not exploit the Labour of others represented in 1927-28, 75.2 per cent of the total national income, in 1928-29- 76.5 per cent, in 1929-30 77.1 per cent. The share of the State sector which is generally the income of working class and peasantry constituted 8.4 per cent in 1927-28, 10 per cent in 1928-29 and 15.2 per cent in 1929-30. The share of the rich peasants and town capitalists decreased to 1.8 per cent in 1929-30. This shows that while in the most prosperous capitalist countries the share of the exploiting classes is over 50 per cent, in the Soviet Union it is no more than 2 per cent. That is why in the Soviet Union increased production does not lead to a crisis of over production as it is doing in other parts of the world to-day.

As regards hours of work, in the capitalist countries, they are increasing while in the Soviet Union they are decreasing. In 1929-30, 960,000 workers or 40 per cent of the total industrial wage-earners were on seven-hour-day.

Today the working day is shorter by 2.18 hours than the pre-revolutionary working day and will be 3.21 hours shorter by the end of the Five-Year-Plan. The working week in Russia compares thus with other countries :-

U.S.S.R.	40.2	Hours
England	47.1	"
U.S.A.	49.6	"
Germany	47 to 52	"
India	60 to 70	"

Side by side with this the real wages increased to 167 per cent of the pre-war level. In the most-prosperous country of capitalism - the U.S.A., the number of employed workers has declined absolutely while production has increased. In England, the number of workers has been stationary since 1890. In Soviet Russia it rose from 10.99 millions in 1926-27 to 13.12 millions in 1929-30.

(65) Preparing for war - anti-Soviet Propaganda -
Indian bourgeoisie joins in - Paris International
Chamber of Commerce on the causes of the world
crisis - the Indian professors repeat them - Is
Soviet dumping one of them - Litvinoff's reply.

This tremendous orderly Socialist growth in Soviet Russia acts like a thorn in the sides of the declining world capitalism. Having failed once in overthrowing the workers' State by armed intervention ten years ago, Imperialism is again rallying its forces of war against

the Soviet Union. Soviet ambassadors and officials have been murdered in the capitalist countries; their shipments of gold were seized (by France); their merchant fleet which was carried away in the Civil War by the bandit Wrangel with the help of the British and French has not been returned; the Chinese counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie seized the Soviet's section of the Far Eastern railway; Soviet embassies are raided on the pretext of hunting for "lost State documents" by the Imperialists. All this with the hope of preparing the world for war against the Soviet Union. But how are we in India concerned with this? Why should we, workers and peasants of India, celebrate the anniversaries of the Russian Revolution and Lenin Days? Why should we congratulate the U.S.S.R. on the success of the Five-Year-Plan? In the first place because success of the Soviet Union means success of the world's working-class movement. Secondly because, the success of the Plan shows the inevitable success of Socialism, of the revolutionary initiative and creative powers of the workers and the failure of the capitalist system. Thirdly because, it shows how the tremendous increase of productive forces under Socialism alone are now capable of increasing the prosperity of the working class and peasants and fourthly because it shows that all this can only be done by a successful proletarian revolution. In India the Five-Year-Plan is being actively used by the British bourgeoisie to

enlist the Indian bourgeoisie in a fight against the Soviet Union. So long, since the Russian Revolution, only an ideological anti-Bolshevik campaign was being waged. When strikes occurred anywhere the Communists and the Comintern were sought out for abuse and attack. But actually, the Indian bourgeoisie had not joined hands in an economic fight against the Soviet Union and the Five-Year-Plan. When the world slump in industry and agriculture hit all the capitalist nations but could not hit the Soviet Union, the shrieks of capitalist hatred against Socialist economy became more universal and desperate. In this the Indian bourgeoisie joined though in fact it had nothing to fear from the Five-Year-Plan and its success. The world bourgeoisie opened its new attack against the Soviet Union, in order to divert the attention of their workers and peasants from seeking the cause of the world slump in capitalism and attributing it to Soviet competition. The International proletariat was definitely pro-Soviet. Such a psychology is harmful to the war aims of capitalism. Hence in 1930, the world bourgeois press was flooded with stories about slave conditions of Labour in Russia, of political prisoners rotting in lumber camps, of priests being persecuted and intellectuals being shot. The International Chamber of Commerce meeting in Paris considered the world crisis and found 12 causes of the crisis amongst which No.10 was "the forcing on the world markets

of large quantities of grain, raw materials and semi-finished products by Soviet Russia at prices less than the normal cost of production." In this meeting the Indian bourgeoisie had its representative in Mr. David Erulkar. When the whole International bourgeoisie was against the Soviet, the Indian representative did not care to see whether his class in India had any reason to subscribe to the above proposition of the Chamber. But the Indian bourgeoisie has never been known to have shown an ounce of understanding even of its own bourgeois Economics and the world forces. In the most advanced bourgeois countries the bourgeois intelligentsia, the professors and experts, help their bourgeoisie in understanding its class interests more intelligently by means of painstaking scientific productions. But in India, the bourgeois intelligentsia has failed even to explain to its class its real class interests, because its master, the Indian bourgeoisie, is incapable of independent class action against Imperialism. The result is that we find a professor of the department of Economics and Sociology of the Lucknow University, Mr. R. B. Gupta, M.A.P.H.D., repeating parrot-like that Soviet dumping is one of the causes of the world and Indian crisis. Not only that but he betrays the interests of his class by saying that "the boycott of foreign goods has intensified the depression in trade", while in fact the boycott is the defence of the weak national bourgeoisie in

India against the cheap commodity production of the European and American bourgeoisie. We find another Professor, Mr. G. D. Karwal in an article in the Leader in December 1930, repeating the same tune and approvingly quoting one writer that "the unloading of Russian products is taking place in many countries and with the Russian Government controlling production and wage scales it is possible for the Communistic regime to underbid the workmen of other countries." In this the writer cleverly misrepresents the fact or does not understand that if there is to be underbidding it is with the bourgeoisie of the other countries and not the workmen. We next find a representative of the land-owners in the Council of State, Rai Bahadur Lala Ramsaran Dass putting the following question:- "Will Government state whether its attention has been drawn to the contents of the book, 'The Five-Year-Plan of the Soviet Union,' by G. T. Grinko, published by Messrs. Martin Lawrence and Company Ltd. London and what steps, if any, Government contemplates to safeguard the interests of those engaged in agriculture in India against the effects of the impending heavy dumping of wheat, oilseeds, cotton and other produce by Russia on the Indian market?" (The "Capital", May 7, 1931). The Hon'ble Member engaged in "agriculturing" millions of profits from his tenants was naturally frightened by the tremendous increase in the productivity of Soviet agriculture and began to gasp for

fear that all that produce would come here to kill his trade. He still retained some sobriety in that, he did not, like our learned professor, talk of actual dumping but of impending dumping. However, the Rai Bahadur forgot to read at the same time that all the increase in productivity under the Soviets is not skimmed off the producer but is left to him in increasing proportion. The Government's reply given by the Hon'ble Mr. J.A. Woodhead said, "Government have not yet seen the publication referred to but have taken steps to obtain a copy. (It seems they did it free of cost by at once confiscating a few copies under the Sea Customs Act - an excellent practice in days of deficit Budgets). They have as yet no evidence of dumping on the part of Russia." If the learned professors had consulted this land-owner in the Council of State who had the copy of the Five-Year-Plan or spent a few shillings over the Soviet Union Year Book published by George Allen and Unwin, they would have found that they were purely humbugging the Indian bourgeoisie, the workers and peasants by saying that Russian exports of either raw materials or industrial goods were the cause of trade crisis. These professors quote the high production figures of world productive forces. But they did not care to see what share of the export trade Russia had. Russia was an exporter of goods in 1913 also. In 1928 she did not export even 60 per cent of her pre-war exports. Her export trade

in 1913 was 1,520 million roubles. In 1928-29, it was 877.6 millions. She has left to the rapacious capitalists 40 per cent of her former field, at a time when the total volume of world's export trade has not fallen but risen. Moreover if these Indian intellectuals had dived deeper they would have found that their country, their bourgeoisie, had gained rather than lost from Soviet Russia. India's exports to Soviet Russia in 1928-29 were 24,362,000 roubles while imports from the U.S.S.R. were only 5,775,000 roubles. What were these imports? Only oil which India or any section of the Indian bourgeoisie does not produce (page 304 of the Soviet Union Year Book, 1930 Edition). Though latest figures on this point were not available and though it is a fact that the howling about Soviet dumping gathered strength in this and the last year particularly, the proceedings of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce sufficiently show that the bogey of dumping has not a serious foundation. "The Capital" of 7th May 1931 quotes the proceedings of the Committee of the Chamber in which we find it stated, "The attention of the Committee was drawn recently to the heavy increases in the imports of goods of Russian origin into India particularly in the case of sugar, timber, (aspen logs), soda-ash and other chemicals. The Chamber wrote to Government on the matter saying, 'While the Committee did not suggest that existing situation was such as to cause an alarm it appeared to require

watching.' It should first be noted that in the above nowhere does the Chamber mention, wheat, cotton etc: which the Rai Bahadur mentioned in his question. The Chamber mentions sugar, aspen logs used for matches and chemicals. The Chamber is not interested in minimising but rather exaggerating the problem of Russian imports as its constituents are the largest importers from Britain and other countries. Now as regards sugar and chemicals we are completely at the mercy of the International sugar combines, who, by international cartel agreements, fix monopoly prices for export. Last year there were several conferences to fix the export quota of each country at agreed prices. But the contradictions of capitalism break such attempts and the charge of dumping is now levelled not at Russia but at the Java Trust, a British concern. The Trade Correspondent of the 'Times of India', an intensely anti-Soviet paper writes, "The Java Trust action in dumping the old crop sugar at low rates is being criticised in some quarters as the Trust was expected to maintain the rate at F.I. 8-25. It is feared that this may create an uneasy feeling among the other participants of the Chadbourne Plan. Germany and other Central European countries with Bank rates of 12 to 15 per cent are already finding it very difficult to carry the segregated stocks." (29th August, 1931.).

16/11/31 (Evening Part II).

During the week the correspondent wrote this the Java Trust sold all their old crop of whites of about 270,000 tons and of browns about 150,000 tons to Export Houses. "The latter in their turn were offering these purchases on the Indian markets." Does all this sound like Russian dumping? These Levithan Trusts in sugar have such a hold that while prices of all other commodities crashed by nearly 50 per cent, sugar prices were higher than in 1930.

	<u>August 24th, 1931 at Karachi</u>		
	1931 Rs. as. p.	1930 Rs. as. p.	1929 (Sept.) Rs. as. p.
Wheat white ready	17- 0- 0	26- 8- 0	40- 4- 0
Sugar Java ready	12- 9- 0	11-15- 6	12-10- 0
Cotton New York (October)	6.87 C	11.20 C	18.56 C

From this it can be seen how strong the Sugar Trusts are and how little there is of Soviet dumping. In chemicals, the German cartels and the British combine of the Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd. of Lord Melchett, with a capitalisation of 62 million pounds, monopolise the whole supply for India. The charge of Russian dumping when thus reduced to figures becomes a myth, a bogey to frighten the gullible! The counter revolutionary Indian bourgeoisie is not daring to take strong capitalist class action against Australia and wants to steal into a tariff barrier under the excuse

of combatting Russian wheat imports. But it dares not offend or abuse the big sections of the Imperialist bourgeoisie. The following comparisons of exportable surplus of wheat show how Russia which had been the granary of Europe is now very low in wheat exports.

Estimated exportable surplus during the season, 1st August 1930 to 31st July 1931:

<u>Country</u>	<u>Million Bushels</u>
U. S. A.	240
Canada	352
Argentina	200
Australia	152
Russia	120
Balkans & Hungary	48
India	24

If we look at the actual imports by India, the Indian Trade Journal, a Government publication, for August 13, states that during the three months April to June 1931, the imports of wheat in India were 80,562 tons out of which 79,150 tons that is almost the entire quantity came from Australia. Now if you shout to the peasant the other way round and say to him that his wheat is not sold on the foreign markets because Russia competes with him in the foreign markets, the peasant can easily see that exports of Indian wheat were greater in 1931 than in the previous two years.

Wheat Exports from India

<u>Year</u>	<u>Tons</u>
1928-29	114,700
1929-30	13,000
1930-31	196,500

Thus even here the Russia of workers and peasants is in no way a direct or indirect cause of the worsening of Indian exports or imports. India is an exporter of agricultural goods to the world market. What is the Russian character of competition in this with India? None. Not only from her total volume over the pre-war level she has left 40 per cent of her "claims", but her ratio of agricultural goods has come down from 70 per cent in 1913 to 38.9 per cent in 1928-29. In view of this the Indian representative, while consenting to Clause 10 of the International Chamber was betraying his bourgeoisie and doing the work of the Imperialisms of France, U.S.A. and Britain, who chafed at the success of the Five Year Plan because the efforts of the Russian working-class and peasantry which are now becoming the socialist accumulation of their own industry, would have been available as the profits of the Imperialist bourgeoisie, if Russia had been the same bourgeois country as theirs. The die of bourgeois propaganda was exposed by M. Litvinoff, the Soviet delegate at the Commission of Inquiry for the European Union at Geneva. He asked whether it was not a

Wheat Exports from India

<u>Year</u>	<u>Tons</u>
1928-29	114,700
1929-30	13,000
1930-31	196,500

Thus even here the Russia of workers and peasants is in no way a direct or indirect cause of the worsening of Indian exports or imports. India is an exporter of agricultural goods to the world market. What is the Russian character of competition in this with India? None. Not only from her total volume over the pre-war level she has left 40 per cent of her "claims", but her ratio of agricultural goods has come down from 70 per cent in 1913 to 38.9 per cent in 1928-29. In view of this the Indian representative, while consenting to Clause 10 of the International Chamber was betraying his bourgeoisie and doing the work of the Imperialisms of France, U.S.A. and Britain, who chafed at the success of the Five Year Plan because the efforts of the Russian working-class and peasantry which are now becoming the socialist accumulation of their own industry, would have been available as the profits of the Imperialist bourgeoisie, if Russia had been the same bourgeois country as theirs. The die of bourgeois propaganda was exposed by M. Litvinoff, the Soviet delegate at the Commission of Inquiry for the European Union at Geneva. He asked whether it was not a

fact that Soviet exports rather mitigated the world's crisis? Did the fact that the Soviet Union was absorbing from 50 to 75 per cent in the total export of certain branches of machine industry in Germany, Austria, England and Poland intensify or mitigate the crisis? In 1930, 53.5 per cent of the total tractor exports of the U.S.A. went to the Soviet Union and in the same year the Soviet Union received 12 per cent of the textile machinery export of Great Britain and from Germany 25 per cent of the total export of agricultural machinery. It was unnecessary to point out that once the importance of Soviet imports was admitted, it was impossible to object to Soviet exports, which must be made to balance the imports. There was a loud cry against Soviet wheat, whose export was negligible. On the other hand the exports of Canadian wheat increased from 2,350,000 tons in 1913 to 10,900,000 tons in 1928 and there had been an increase of 810 per cent in the Argentine butter exports. Why had these increases evoked no protest? The Soviet was not 'dumping' her products though in some cases her prices are certainly lower than world capitalist prices. The reason was that export trade is a monopoly of the Proletarian State. The "normal cost of production" under capitalism includes a heavy toll of rent and interest in agriculture, of profits of the bourgeoisie, of exchange speculation, and the middle men. The elimination of these under the socialist

form of production and exchange was bound to lower the prices. But it can not said to be "dumping" which is the policy of high prices on home markets and cut prices for exports made possible by high protectionist duties and this was done by the capitalist countries. For example in Csecho Slovakia the price of Sugar on the home market was 555 Kroners for 100 Kilogrammes and the export price was 80. In Germany the price was 48 marks at home and 11 marks for exports. The cost of production, so far as wage charges, whether in reduced hours and other amenities or in actual wages, are concerned, is higher in Russia than in India. The Indian bourgeoisie has most shamelessly allowed the Burma Shell group to rule the Indian market by a monopoly price above world parity, which fact was exposed by the Tariff Board on oil at the time of the oil rate war in 1928. It was the Soviet oil at that time that saved the Indian workers, peasants and other poor consumers, crores of rupees, until the two Imperialist groups of Britain and America came to the compromise and reimposed their monopoly prices on their Indian consumers.

(66) India's trade with the Soviet - adverse balance of Britain - favourable balance of U.S.A. - India's gain of three crores suppressed in official statistics - Government Report and the Soviet Union Year Book - Indian bourgeoisie does not see its own interest - the petty bourgeois

attitude - want of technicians in the U.S.S.R. -
migration from U.S.A. - the fate of inventors
under Capitalism and under the Soviet - wages of
technicians - beauty under Socialism and
Rama Nand Babu

When Indian exports are not competed with by the Soviet, when her exports to Russia are greater than her imports, when economically and politically even the Indian bourgeoisie, let alone the workers and peasants, can benefit from a pro-Soviet policy why do the Indian bourgeoisie and its intellectual agents pick up the anti-Soviet cries? In the first place because the Indian bourgeoisie is more afraid of the Indian workers' and peasants' pro-Soviet inclinations than of the British Imperialist suppression of its industry. And secondly because it is not strong enough and willing enough to go against the British capitalist dictation. The British policy of anti-Soviet propaganda is greatly in contradiction to her political relations with Soviet Russia. Britain recognised Soviet Russia earlier than any other country. America has not done so upto now. Yet in trade what do we find? British imports of Russia for the period of 1920-29 were 165,108,000 pounds while exports were 113,017,000. Adding to this invisible exports in the form of freight, insurance etc of 27 millions, the Soviet Union had a favourable balance of 25 million pounds. In contrast to

attitude - want of technicians in the U.S.S.R. -
migration from U.S.A. - the fate of inventors
under Capitalism and under the Soviet - wages of
technicians - beauty under Socialism and
Rama Nand Babu

When Indian exports are not competed with by the Soviet, when her exports to Russia are greater than her imports, when economically and politically even the Indian bourgeoisie, let alone the workers and peasants, can benefit from a pro-Soviet policy why do the Indian bourgeoisie and its intellectual agents pick up the anti-Soviet cries? In the first place because the Indian bourgeoisie is more afraid of the Indian workers' and peasants' pro-Soviet inclinations than of the British Imperialist suppression of its industry. And secondly because it is not strong enough and willing enough to go against the British capitalist dictation. The British policy of anti-Soviet propaganda is greatly in contradiction to her political relations with Soviet Russia. Britain recognised Soviet Russia earlier than any other country. America has not done so upto now. Yet in trade what do we find? British imports of Russia for the period of 1920-29 were 165,108,000 pounds while exports were 113,017,000. Adding to this invisible exports in the form of freight, insurance etc of 27 millions, the Soviet Union had a favourable balance of 25 million pounds. In contrast to

this the trade with U.S.A. with whom there are no political relations or any treaty as with England, the American imports from Russia for the six years, 1923-29 were 120 million dollars while her exports to Russia were 450 million dollars. Herein lies the reason why Soviet propoganda about dumping is led by Britain. The British bourgeoisie wants to develop trade with Russia but can not. Her inability she disguises as a moral unwillingness to trade with the Soviet. The British bourgeoisie is unable to finance long term credits like the U.S.A. and sell as cheap as Germany and U.S.A. the machinery, tools etc required by the Soviet. In order to spite herself she can do nothing but shriek against the Soviet, and the Indian bourgeoisie is foolish enough to be cheated in this. Has the Indian bourgeoisie demanded direct trade relations with Soviet Russia, during the last nine years, that Great Britain has been trading with the "abominable" Bolsheviks? The Statistical Abstract of British India, published by the Government of India, shows that the Indian exports (1928 edition page 487) to Russia to have been 49,51,000 rupees in 1927 and imports (page 475) of 48,52,000 rupees. In the first place we find in this a balance of only 99,000 rupees in favour of India. But the figures given by the Soviet Union Year Book show a balance of 3,02,73,015 Rs. (This is worked out as follows :- Exports of Russia in 1927 roubles 25,633,000 and imports from Russia roubles

4,177,000. Balance in favour of India roubles 21,456,000, converted into pounds at the exchange rate of 9.45 roubles and then in rupees at 18 pence to the rupee). Where has the huge difference of over three crores disappeared? Why is that trade figure suppressed? obviously to cheat the Indian bourgeoisie and the people, in order to make them believe that a direct trade with Russia for the negligible sum of 50 lakhs giving the poor favourable balance of one lakh is not worth the trouble. The Indian bourgeoisie and its intellectual agents have proved dull enough to shut their eyes and not push the question ahead even in their own interest. The Indian bourgeoisie has failed to see that British capitalists re-export to Russia tons of commodities bought in the cheap Indian market and needed by Russia. Russia makes huge purchases of cotton, hides and tea all over the world and from Great Britain. Every one knows that Great Britain does not produce any of these three. How does it then sell them to Soviet Russia? Obviously by buying them from the Indian and Chinese markets. 60 per cent of British sales to Russia are of goods not produced in Great Britain and of this 60 percent, half comes from the colonies and dominions. As regards dominions like Canada and Australia the Soviet makes purchases directly from them. Even Egypt sells her cotton directly to them. Then who remains of importance except India? A large volume of tea, cotton, jute and hides is

re-exported by Britain to Russia at high prices after purchasing from India at low prices and the gain is skimmed off the Indian producers to make up for the adverse balance of British trade with Russia. In 1925 the British bourgeoisie purchased at preferential rates 5 million pounds of hides and skins from India and sold 2,892,000 pounds worth to the Soviet. Has the Indian bourgeoisie ever claimed trade facilities with Russia? The smallest striping of a nation keeps an independent consulate in India. Italian textiles compete directly here in Indian markets with Indian textiles. The Indian bourgeoisie with its reactionary outlook kindles communal feelings on a Tripoli issue to incite a boycott of Italian textile goods. The Indian Nationalist papers however eagerly broadcasted the communiques of the Italian Consul denying the Tripoli massacres. But they suppressed Litvinoff's exposure of the Imperialist lies about dumping; they tolerate false statistics, sell their produce to British agents and do not ask for direct relations with Russia. Why? Because the Indian bourgeoisie is counter revolutionary and weak.

What does the petty bourgeoisie, the middle class that every day sentimentally weeps for India's progress, for employment and prospects think of the Five Year Plan? Its attitude is of a type that has no class line of its own because it is not a class at all. The petty bourgeoisie has ambitions, and dreams of becoming a bourgeois some day,

of becoming "independent" as he flauntingly likes to put it. But in reality he never rises above the poverty line and is constantly tumbled into the proletarian class economically. Naturally he hates the working-class and is ideologically the slave of the bourgeoisie. You can go in any hive of these men and even when they are starving, unemployed or hawking two annas patriot-pictures on the streets, they will ask you "how can the workers create art and literature? How can they do the work of intellectuals? Is not art killed in Russia? Have they not driven away the technicians, professors and intellectuals? What incentive is there for creating art, for inventions etc If you can not make money and be rich?" These questions have been repeated in every age by every class whose class rule has been threatened by the oppressed class. The capitalist press has frightened the intelligentsia of every country by the concocted massacres of professors and technicians and their flight from Russia. There is no doubt that any counter revolutionary attempts are punished. The bourgeois states having been smashed, its highly paid bureaucracy has been broken up. So the bourgeois intellectuals can not expect any longer to get fabulous salaries that are allowed even by the cheapest bourgeois Government in the world. There can be no question of the State supporting writers, scribes and poets who write mere nonsense about the pale moon and the pale damsels. The proletariat has no place

of becoming "independent" as he flauntingly likes to put it. But in reality he never rises above the poverty line and is constantly tumbled into the proletarian class economically. Naturally he hates the working-class and is ideologically the slave of the bourgeoisie. You can go in any hive of these men and even when they are starving, unemployed or hawking two annas patriot-pictures on the streets, they will ask you "how can the workers create art and literature? How can they do the work of intellectuals? Is not art killed in Russia? Have they not driven away the technicians, professors and intellectuals? What incentive is there for creating art, for inventions etc If you can not make money and be rich?" These questions have been repeated in every age by every class whose class rule has been threatened by the oppressed class. The capitalist press has frightened the intelligentsia of every country by the concocted massacres of professors and technicians and their flight from Russia. There is no doubt that any counter revolutionary attempts are punished. The bourgeois states having been smashed, its highly paid bureaucracy has been broken up. So the bourgeois intellectuals can not expect any longer to get fabulous salaries that are allowed even by the cheapest bourgeois Government in the world. There can be no question of the State supporting writers, scribes and poets who write mere nonsense about the pale moon and the pale damsels. The proletariat has no place

for pale idling damsels and therefore no need for such poets. But there are poets, writers and novelists rising from the proletariat, creating proletarian culture and they have not to spend their lives sleeping under hedges, catching tuberculosis and seeing bourgeois society awakening to the existence of the great artist just when the great artist is sinking into the grave, starved and broken.

Dange D/17.11.31

Morning 1st Part.

Let the bourgeois intelligentsia look up the life sketches of the artists of every country and they will find the edifice of bourgeois art built on the bones and tears of starved genius. Shakespeare died in a poor man's tavern. Chatterton was starved to death. Rembrandt, whose works now sell for thousands of guineas at Christie's in London, had to be declared a bankrupt. Kepler's life was a continual struggle with poverty and debt. Success in the life time of the artist is a rarity. Yet bourgeois art has not ceased being created. So it is with inventions, the authors of which have died in poverty while the financiers have made millions from them. The modern scientists and inventors are the contracted servants of mighty syndicates who have bought their production in advance. There are hundreds of processes, the inventors of which are kept in obscurity but which yield millions to the Trusts. To give one or two examples. Charles Tellier who invented a boat in which ammonia was used as a motive power, was sent to a debtors' prison and his inventions stolen. On his release, he invented the system of freezing food and thus preserving it. This invention was revolutionary one. Food products could be transported over vast distances and the shortage of one kind of food of one place could be repaired by imports from another. What happened to the inventor?

While the cold storage syndicates made millions, the law courts refused to acknowledge Tellier's rights over the patent and he died of starvation in 1913. Demsy, a chemical genius, invented dyeing formulas while working in a factory. His employers came to know of this. They dismissed him suddenly one day, raided his rooms on some pretext and seized the note-books in which the formulas were noted. The law courts decided in favour of the rich company and against the poor genius. The invention of agricultural machinery was stolen by the house of Mackormicks who have become millionaires on it and also the benefactors of many a nationalist newspaper in India through their contributions of large advertisements (e.g. the Mackormick ploughs). The inventor of the ginning machine which created a revolution in cotton industry was robbed of his patent rights; the financiers denied that he had any rights at all. He, Eli Whitney, died in poverty. The linotype machines, which have revolutionised the newspaper plants have the same history. While their inventor, Mergenthaler, was dying in poverty, a set of millionaires fattened on it. One of them, by name Whitelaw Reid, while an ambassador at London, spent some of his millions on keeping such a luxurious garden at his palace, that Queen Victoria became its frequent visitor. Dive at the root of every great creation in bourgeois society and you will find its wealth built on the poverty of its real worker.

Still inventions have not ceased to be created. Soviet Russia, Socialist society, has no need to suppress the genius because it has no millionaires ready to rob the inventor for their private gains. Soviet Russia feeds, maintains and honours its artists and inventors, and gives them whatever facilities they want. They are not required to pass through a school of tuberculosis, the streets and the insults of an arrogant publisher or an employer. The proletarian State welcomes them on the slightest request.

Even taking the question of the ordinary technicians and experts, they are given preferential treatment and emoluments. Socialist society does not equalise wages at once. This point was made clear by Lenin long before the Bolsheviks captured the State. Inequality of wages between the skilled and unskilled and of other types of workers has prevailed all along and therefore the statements of the bourgeoisie that inequality of wages is now introduced by Stalin are false. Since 1921 September there have been 17 categories of wages. Before 1921 the difference between the lowest and highest was 1 to 3. It was widened in 1921 to 1 to 5. Categories 1 to 9 covered workers and 10 to 17 covered technical and administrative personnel. The ratio 1 to 3 existed between 1st and 9th categories and 3 to 5 between 9 to 17. What has been done from time to time was still further widened by these ratios in order to attract experts and technicians as the Five-Year Plan requires a

large number of these. It must not, however, be understood that inequality will never be abolished. It is only a temporary measure of the transition stage. The "changed outlook" towards technicians, as it is called, was outlined by Lenin as early as 1921. "To conceal from the masses that the enlistment of bourgeois specialists who are given an exceptionally high compensation is a deviation from the principles of the Commune, would be to stoop to the level of the bourgeois politicians. To openly explain how and why we made a step backward and then to discuss publicly what means are available in order to recover the loss is to make the masses learn from actual experience in working with the enlisted specialists how to build Socialism. It is necessary to enlist a thousand men, first class specialists in their respective branches, who are devoted to their work, who love large scale production because they know that in large scale production a high level of technical efficiency is reached. And when it is said that it is possible to build Socialism without an apprenticeship to the bourgeoisie, I know that such words come from the psychology of the inhabitants of Central Africa. We cannot imagine a Socialism not based on all the lessons derived from the large scale capitalist culture. Only those are worthy of the name Communists who understand that it is impossible to create or introduce Socialism without taking lessons from the organisers of what has been created by

large number of these. It must not, however, be understood that inequality will never be abolished. It is only a temporary measure of the transition stage. The "changed outlook" towards technicians, as it is called, was outlined by Lenin as early as 1921. "To conceal from the masses that the enlistment of bourgeois specialists who are given an exceptionally high compensation is a deviation from the principles of the Commune, would be to stoop to the level of the bourgeois politicians. To openly explain how and why we made a step backward and then to discuss publicly what means are available in order to recover the loss is to make the masses learn from actual experience in working with the enlisted specialists how to build Socialism. It is necessary to enlist a thousand men, first class specialists in their respective branches, who are devoted to their work, who love large scale production because they know that in large scale production a high level of technical efficiency is reached. And when it is said that it is possible to build Socialism without an apprenticeship to the bourgeoisie, I know that such words come from the psychology of the inhabitants of Central Africa. We cannot imagine a Socialism not based on all the lessons derived from the large scale capitalist culture. Only those are worthy of the name Communists who understand that it is impossible to create or introduce Socialism without taking lessons from the organisers of what has been created by

the Trusts. For Socialism is not idle invention but an appropriation by the proletarian vanguard who conquered the power. It is an appropriation and an application. We, the Party of the proletariat, and the proletariat, can secure the ability to organise the largest enterprises of the Trust type only from the first class specialists of capitalism." Speaking at the 9th Congress of the C.P.R. in 1920 Lenin said, "The task of the Communists in the State Commission for electrification is to refrain from commanding or rather not to command at all but to approach these scientific and technical specialists (who in most cases are inevitably steeped in capitalist predilections and attitudes) with every care and tactfulness, learning from them and helping them to widen their horizon, starting out from the data and the achievements of the respective sciences. It is necessary to remember that if the engineer is ever to come to Communism he will do so not in the same way as the underground worker, the agitator and the writer, but through the portals of his science; equally the agronomist will come to Communism in his own way; and this holds good for every technician and scientist in his own field." How does this compare with the statement of the late Mr. James that our method to deal with the intellectuals, Peasants and everybody else with whom we might differ is simply to kill him?

The very fact that the Soviet has taken 40,000 American

technicians in her employ while the most prosperous Imperialism with half the world's gold in her chest cannot find employment for them, ought to be a sufficient answer to the carping petty bourgeois in India about the success of the Soviet and the life under it.

In spite of this we find a man like Mr. Ramanand Chatterji, a rational bourgeois journalist, but Philistine all the same, saying in a meeting in Bombay in June 1931 that the equality which Soviet Russia was trying to introduce would destroy all beauty. Now it is a hard task to find the real meaning of beauty as conceived by an elusive Brahma metaphysist and a journalist at that. But on second thought I think Ramanand Baboo and those critics of Socialism who agree with him are quite right. Soviet Russia does destroy the beauty of a Philistine Brahma in a snug palace glooming over how our feudal ancestors invaded Japa and carried there the "Pan-India culture", the researches into which give employment now to so many bourgeois professors. Soviet India will not tolerate these hives of Pan-Hindu, Pan-Islam or any Pans and their 'beauties', when within ten miles of them three hundred thousand jute workers starve on Rs. 15/- a month and live in filth of the bastees and yet do not rise in revolt when they find that their neighbour Ramanandji and his ilk pay a year's wages of a jute worker for the beautiful photograph in ten colours of an idler vagabond poet. Ramanandji is

again right for on the filth of the proletariat thrives bourgeois beauty. If the one fails, so does the other. I will only quote Lady Astor who returned from Russia in August 1931 in company with Bernard Shaw and Lord Lothian at present the Under-Secretary of State for India. Lady Astor describing Soviet conditions in a lecture at the Liberal Summer School in Cambridge said "the only drawback about the treatment of babies was that they were so anxious to get the babies clean that they would not allow them to get dirty." Lord Lothian describing peasant conditions said, "While the ordinary peasant lived in a small house full of flies and vermins occupied also by domestic animals, the ideal collective farm consisted of one thousand families with a communal kitchen, very clean, with competent cooks, five hundred cows in milk, tractors, builders, reapers, a large number of horses, a timber mill, a forge, a doctor, a clinic, an office with typewriters and calculating machines and a creche for babies." But our learned Brahmo shouts, "I want that hut of flies and vermins. For on them are reared the beautiful palaces of the Bengal Zamindars and merchants. From them pour the advertisements of my Review and on the Review thrives my sublime beauty." What is the cure for such petty bourgeois reactionary breed that will not see and yet blaspheme the revolutionary workers' ideals and Socialism? Lord Lothian says, "There is a proletarian amusement park, shooting galleries, swings

and circuses. The shooting galleries are adorned with pictures of Sir Austin Chamberlain and M. Poincare, dark objects at which the proletariat learns to shoot." Will it not be necessary to add some pictures from the bourgeoisie of this country also?

Lenin while commencing to write his book, "Left Wing Communism", quotes Kautsky who, in 1902, wrote in the *Iskra*, when the Russian revolutionary tide was just rising, "But, however, the peasant struggle in Russia may end, the blood of the martyrs who have sprung from it, unfortunately in too great numbers, will not have been shed in vain. It will nourish the shootings of the social revolution throughout the civilised world and make them flourish more quickly. In 1848 the Slavs were the crackling of frost which killed the flowers of spring of the awakening peoples. Perhaps now they are destined to be that storm which breaks through the ice of reaction and will irresistably bring with it the new happy spring of the peoples." The November Revolution broke through the ice of reaction in Western Europe as well as in Asia but it has not yet brought with it the new spring. Why?

I.H.K.

Section 4

17/11/31 (Morning Part II).

(67) Experience of Russia exceptional or general -
will it be the same in parliamentary countries.

The lessons of the class struggle, formulated by Marx in the most scientific manner, later on enriched by the experience of their thorough and correct application under the leadership of Leninism, left very little to be added on the question of the bourgeois democratic and proletarian revolution, of the new form of the proletarian State, of the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the role of the party, trade unions, parliament etc. The newest experience came only from colonial countries. The Russian revolutionary developments however were for a long time considered either exceptional or to be applied immediately in all their fullness by the Communists of western Europe. Post war revolutionary developments of Europe therefore indicated Bolshevism, showed it to be a model tract for all to follow. The question had been already raised by the Mensheviks in all countries that under a full fledged parliamentary democracy, the transition to socialism will not require a dictatorship of the proletariat, established on the strength of the successful armed revolution, but that power would peacefully pass into the hands of the workers through the successful

wielding of the ballot box. (Vide the evidence of Mr. Brailsford). They argue that there is no parliament, no adult suffrage, no trade unionism and collective agreements in the power of millions of organised workers in trade unions as in England, Germany and elsewhere. Where these exist a violent revolution is unnecessary. The Magistrate in this case also told us that the law of His Majesty allows you to overthrow His Majesty's sovereignty through the institutions created under that law, under the constitution. You can strive to do anything through it, but not outside it. It is a difficult logic to understand and believe that (to take a simile) a robber who carries a club to keep his head from being broken by those whom he daily robs can allow that very club to be used for breaking his head, simply because one day he finds all his victims voting for such a procedure. Common sense will tell that the club simply requires to be seized and broken. In Marx's time this truth did not require explanation. But later on adult suffrage, parliamentary acts, collective agreements and ameliorations received under them, had clothed the club with so many cotton paddings, silken covers and embroidery that the workers had ceased to see that behind all these there lay the club, the violence of the bourgeois State, which throws away the paddings and embroidery when its real power is threatened. Imperialism in India tells us, we give you a constitution, even almost

to the extent that our home country has got. Therefore these revolutionary theories are all useless. Gandhism believes in these promises, agreements and settlements. But does history justify that? Has the bourgeoisie of the freest parliamentary country consented to the workers' desire to transform capitalism into socialism? Have those middle class parties and the so-called Communist but not Leninist parties ever stood by the proletarian class interest and revolution?

(68) The German rising - murder of Liebknecht and Luxemburg - Republic with a Social Democratic Government - the conclusion from it.

The Imperialist war, after four years of the massacre of workers and peasants and enrichment of the bourgeoisie of all countries was broken by the workers in Russia. The next step was taken by the German workers. In November 1918 in the first week almost every industrial town had a rising and the bourgeoisie seeing that the soldiers and sailors sided with the workers gave in and started the game played by the Russian bourgeoisie a year earlier. (For the various risings see Diary in P 2491). They procured the abdication of the Kaiser and the power was handed over into the hands of the Social Democratic leaders, Ebert and Scheidemann. In Russia when the Czar abdicated, the power was not "handed over" to the Social Democrats

(the Leninists). That is sufficient to show that the Social Democrats in Germany were not the Social Democrats or Communists of Russia. They swore in the name of Marx. But Marxism was at that time voicing itself through Liebknecht and Luxemburg who were released from prison by the revolution. Just as the revolution began with the setting up of Soviets in Russia, the German workers also set up Soviets. It showed that the Soviet is not a peculiarly Russian phenomenon, but an internationally expressed form of the proletarian State. The workers in industrial centres took action to capture power, the peasants in agrarian districts and land workers on big estates seized land. But the revolutionary action of the masses is not alone sufficient for a successful revolution. There must be a strong Communist leadership. In 1905 in Russia there was a mass revolutionary action but no C.P. leadership. In 1917 February there was C.P. leadership but not the right situation. In November 1917 both were present. Germany had had no 905. It was having it. The Spartacist group under Liebknecht and Luxemburg called for a dictatorship of the proletariat. But the Social Democrats as before betrayed. They argued about the collapse of the industry, about the enemy at the door, and the difficulty of a revolution at that moment, as if revolution comes without it at any time. The majority of the working class had not yet been disillusioned about the Social Democrats

as the Russian workers were about the Mensheviks. Moreover, the only revolutionary group, the Spartacists, were suffering from four Luxemburist errors which have appeared from time to time among many Communist Parties. It paid no attention to the technical preparation for the revolution. It believed too much in the spontaneity of the masses. It considered peasantry in all stages of the revolution as a petty bourgeois force against the proletariat. It identified membership of the Party with the membership of Trade Unions unlike the Bolsheviks. The national question was underestimated as being no concern of Communism and impossible of solution under world Imperialism. In spite of these errors, the Spartacists were real revolutionaries. The result was that the patriotic bourgeoisie got Luxemburg and Liebknecht murdered by monarchist assassins. Both of them were hammered to death and thrown into the river in January 1919. The financiers of the country helped by the Social Democrats in smashing the Soviets, organised the officers' corps against the revolutionary workers. The Soviets were liquidated and a Republican Constitution was evolved. The Constitution made the National Labour Council, elected by Factory Committees, a part of the Constitution. But the Factory Committees without a workers' State remained only watchful guards and later became ineffective. Though a Republic was founded and the Social Democrats, the Party

commanding the largest following amongst the workers, formed the Government of Scheidemann and Noske, what did the masses of workers and peasants gain? The monarchist found in Prussia seeing that the industrial north was getting Communist, migrated to Bavaria and in alliance with Poland and France conspired to overthrow the Republic. But the French, thinking it might restore militarism and hence resistance to its own loot, backed out. In Bavaria they raised the "Orgesch", those counter revolutionary petty bourgeois guards, whose business was to smash revolutionary trade unions and organisations. In 1871, counter revolutionary Thiers had taken the help of Bismark against the Paris Commune. In 1919 the German bourgeoisie and counter revolution took the help of France to behead the German workers' revolution. In a class war the bourgeoisie recognises no nationalism and boundaries. When the Allies by the Versailles Treaty demanded reparations France wanted deliveries of Ruhr coal for her iron foundries seized from Lorraine, the industrialists of Germany transferred their capital to foreign banks and in the name of the fatherland asked the workers to accept ten hours' day and two hours' extra levy for reparations. When the French seized Ruhr the workers resisted the deliveries of coal to France. The German and French militarism after coming to an understanding about the share of each from the exploitation of the iron and steel industry crushed the workers' resistance.

The big Finance Kings of the AEG, Crupps & Stinnes in Germany were quarrelling not about the freedom of German nationalism but about the percentage of shares that they would be allotted in the new Franco-German mixed concerns to be floated to exploit the coal mines and steel industry under the domination of the French banks & The Comite Des Forges. When they could not agree on the shares, they quarrelled. The British incited the German bourgeoisie to quarrel because the delivery and smooth production of German coal was a setback to their coal. The occupation of the Ruhr, the seizure of plants and furnaces destroyed the German credit and the German Mark. The latter began to collapse just as the Russian rouble had collapsed during the civil war. By October 1923 the par value of Mark to sterling had come down from 20.40 to 80,000 millions. It became impossible to pay wages or continue production, when the money basis of the whole economy had lost its significance. By October 1923 the crisis had developed into a revolutionary situation. The Allies expected a Bolshevik revolution. They sent warships in the Baltic to be in readiness for intervention, just as in Russia. The Polish and French prepared for intervention from the east and south, if the workers succeeded in their revolution. All the forces of revolutionary outburst were ready but there was no leadership. For 40 years the working-class in Germany had been organised in the Social Democratic

Party. That Party had never seen the struggles like the Russian. The war gave birth to a Left Wing in it - the Independent Socialists within whom were included the Spartacists. The Spartacists stood for revolutionary action and later became the Communist Party of Germany in 1919. But they committed Left Wing mistakes. They underestimated the role of the Parliament and thought that the masses - the workers and peasants - were disillusioned with the Reich, while in fact large sections of the masses expected very much from the Republican Constitution. Thus instead of exposing bourgeois parliamentarism they boycotted it. A large number of workers were followers of the Independent Socialists from amongst whom the Left Wing section was amalgamated with the C.P.G. But as yet the exposure of the Left Wing revolutionary phrase-mongering was not carried out. Thus a strong, centralised and well distributed Communist leadership with its roots in the masses had not been born. In the October crisis the Social Democrats refused to support a General Strike demand. The Communist Party issued a manifesto in which it took the correct line of not advising immediate insurrection. But if partial actions took place they did not particularly cinown them. They also called for a thorough iselation of the Left Wing Social Democrats and for the formation of a united front from below. But the German revolution was not given time to collect its forces. The workers' Government

set up in Saxony was overthrown, the rich peasantry supporting the reaction, and the small peasantry not siding with the revolution as it had done in Russia.

(Dange)

D/18.11.31

Morning 1st Part.

The insurrection in Hamburg was drowned in blood. It was premature for the fact that several thousands of workers were found actively fighting against the insurrection on behalf of the S.D.s. The German revolutions confirmed the lessons of the Russian Revolution. The bourgeois constitution, bourgeois Parliamentarism is not a cure for capitalism. The masses must be taught by experience to throw away the Parliamentary machine. Only the leaders being convinced of its futility is no use. For a revolutionary situation there must be an experienced Communist Party. That Party must have ideologically and organisationally demarcated itself from all other compromise parties, and especially the Left Wing parties and Reformist Labour leadership. There must be a thorough technical organisation for the revolution.

After the abortive revolution of 1923, Allied Imperialism saw the foolishness and danger of fleecing Germany by the old primitive method of direct loot. They adopted the course of "reconstructing" Germany as a highly industrialised colony of Allied Imperialism. The German working class, massacred and maimed in the war, starved and forced to work on 30 per cent of pre-war wages ridden with famine and disease, sank into exhaustion. From 1923 to 1931 Germany has been reconstructing its capitalist economy,

on the workers' back with the glorious result that in 1931 it has applied for insolvency again, with 7 million unemployed starving on the streets. An intensely patriotic republic, an intensely efficient capitalism, the most efficient technique and Labour at the end of 8 years find themselves unable to reconstruct capitalism on a stable basis.

(69) The period of proletarian revolutions - revolutions in the smaller countries, France, the classical land of class struggle comes out as the hangman of revolutions - results of these revolutions.

That the epoch of proletarian revolutions had begun, that capitalism was unable to reconstruct itself can be seen from the most important revolutions and insurrections following upon the Russian Revolution. A few of them may be quoted.

- (1) March 1917 - The bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia.
- (2) November 1917 - the proletarian revolution in Russia.
- (3) March 1918 - workers' revolution in Finland.
- (4) November 1918 - The bourgeois revolution in Germany and Austria carried out by workers and peasants.
- (5) March 1919 - The bourgeois revolution in Hungary carried out by workers and peasants.
- (6) January 1920 - The bourgeois revolution in Turkey

carried out by the petty bourgeoisie and peasantry.

(7) September 1920 - The revolutionary seizure of factories by the workers in Italy.

(8) March 1921 - the March rising in Germany.

(References till 1921, P 2396).

(9) September 1923 - revolution in Bulgaria.

(10) Autumn 1923 - Semi-revolution of the German proletariat.

(11) December 1924 - rising in Esthonia.

(12) May 1926 - General Strike in Great Britain.

(13) 1927 rising in Vienna.

(14) The revolution in China begun in 1919.

(15) The rising in India in 1921.

(16) The rising in Morocco in April 1925.

(17) The rising in Syria in August 1925.

(18) Agrarian revolt in Java 1923-24.

(References articles by Bukharin, Exh P 1220).

In all these revolutions the two Imperialisms that poured their millions and used their vast military machine to massacre the revolutions were those of England and France. British Imperialism sent its forces against the Chinese, Indian and Turkish revolutions. The French massacred the Riffs in Morocco and the Syrian rising. In Syria, they bombarded the Velvet City of Damascus for three days and razed it to the ground and yet this very French bourgeoisie was telling the world that the Germans were Vandals as they had bombarded the cathedral of Rheims and

the Bolsheviks had aimed guns at the treasures of the Winter Palace. In Bulgaria the peasant party came to power under Stambulisky but the peasantry without the leadership of the workers cannot hold long against the bourgeoisie. A coup d'etat of the bourgeoisie killed Stambulisky and a Civil War was begun. The Communists committed there the grave blunder of not calling out the proletarians to aid the peasants. The result was the restoration of bourgeois dictatorship. In Poland, Rumania and Czecho-Slovakia, the French bourgeoisie lent 8 million Francs credit in 1923. They were not in cash but in the form of purchases of war materials from France by these countries to arm the counter-revolution in Central Europe. In Italy the mistake was that the opportunist wings of the Socialist Party were not denounced in time; Serratti, the Communist leader sabotaged the carrying out of the leadership of the Comintern and failed therefore to advance for the seizure of political power when the workers began to seize factories. The Government was powerless and was saved only by the treachery of the trade union leaders and the Right Socialists, who agreed to hand over the factories back to the capitalists, on the ground that the workers were not in a position to work them as the raw materials were held up by the bourgeoisie which had control in other centres. But that exactly is the reason why the base of the struggle should have been extended and not curtailed. The result was that the petty

bourgeois middle class and the disbanded soldiery which first inclined towards the proletariat went over to the counter-revolution and the Fascist Dictatorship was established. Fascism started as a party of the middle class, professing to be both against high finance and against its anti-thesis, the revolutionary proletariat. But Fascism has no economic programme, because the middle class aided by the aristocratic upper sections of the bourgeoisie and the rich peasantry ultimately is based upon private property in instruments of production, i.e. upon capitalism. As such it is bound to carry out the policy of capitalism. It started with the tall talk of petty bourgeois economy, something quite new in social working. What was the result? When the Lira fell in value and currency collapsed as in Germany, the American financiers were called in for help. The Italian bourgeoisie supported by the Americans became the ruler behind Fascism. Its only hope now remained in making petty bourgeois stunts and feeding the people on dreams of prosperity- on what basis? on the basis of militarist expansion and seizure of colonies for exploitation. Thus Fascism becomes full-fledged Imperialism; and yet there are in India petty bourgeois leaders who call themselves Socialists and at the same time proudly declare the ideal of Fascism for Indian youths. That means that they recommend to the Indian petty bourgeois to attack the Indian workers and poor peasants, to enthrone armed

capitalism in Indian economy. Everyone who recommends Fascist ideals in India must therefore be thrown out of the workers' platform by the Indian workers and poor peasants. Every admirer of Fascism is a potential hangman of the worker. They must remember that Mussolini too had begun as a Socialist. In India we have to be careful from the very beginning and cannot coquet with such elements on any conditions.

(70) The lesson of the British experience - struggles on the railways, coal mines etc: - the results of Commissions - Triple Alliance - fall in wages - unemployment.

The Indian workers and peasants are told today to believe in the "satisfactory assurances" of the Indian Viceroys and British statesmen. The whole of the Indian National Congress leadership has been spending millions of the workers' and peasants' contributions to make the people put faith in the "gentleman's agreement". The Government tells the workers also to follow the "gentleman's way" of Geneva and get what they want by negotiations. Has the British bourgeoisie which preaches the above lesson observed any agreements with its own workers? I am purposely limiting myself to the relations and agreements between the British workers and the British bourgeoisie because it may be said that as conquerors of India the British bourgeoisie might lie and deceive to retain its rule but so far as its

own workers are concerned it must be behaving like brothers with them. But all such "household" theories do not hold good so far as class relations of the exploited and exploiters are concerned. We have seen how the British workers received a share of capitalist prosperity and colonial loot from their bourgeoisie and therefore abandoned the revolutionary struggle. We have also seen in para 43 how during the Imperialist war British Labour Parties, one and all joined hands with their Imperialism, with the slogan of protecting the rights of smaller nations of culture and civilisation, of self-determination etc. We have also seen in para 28 how the British bourgeoisie has never been able to secure its pre-war leadership of world finance and the workers have been losing heavily in their wages. I shall now mention the biggest attempts of the British workers to improve their conditions through the bourgeois Parliamentary machine and through direct action and how these constitute the premises on which the Communist platform of the Comintern, the C.P.G.B. and C.P.I. is raised.

In para 43 we have seen that according to Webb almost a revolutionary outburst was developing in Great Britain when the War broke out. The workers were forced by the Second International leadership to stop this class struggle. When the Armistice was signed the same struggle was renewed and the workers in every industry brought forth their

demands. The peace brought back the soldiers who had to be found a place in the industry on demobilisation while the industries themselves were under the necessity to curtail their capacity as the war industries would have to be closed down. The bourgeoisie clearly saw the revolutionary implications of the situation and like the most class-conscious very shrewd bourgeoisie, with vast reserves that it is, it set to work. A system of "out-of-work donation" to ex-soldiers and civilians was instituted in November 1918. The war-time restriction on wages was abolished and a Minimum Wage Act was passed, first for six months and then renewed in May 1919. On November 14th the National Conference of the Labour Party asked the Labour members to withdraw from the Coalition Government. The General Election fought by the wily Lloyd George on the slogans of "Making Germany pay for the war" and "Trial of the Kaiser" was won by the coalition. The trade unions began their offensive first on the question of hours of work. The railwaymen secured eight hour day in February 1919. The engineering and ship-building workers got 47 hour week instead of 54. Similarly cotton, iron and other workers in organised industries got the eight hour day but not the other sections of the working class in most of the unorganised industries.

In January 1919 the miners formulated their programme of demands. Along with the demand for shorter hours of

work and increased wages, it asked for public ownership and democratic control of the mines. The miners issued strike notices and secured the support of the railwaymen and transport workers forming the famous Triple Alliance. A strike at this juncture of such a powerful combination would have developed into a serious situation. The military forces were impatient for demobilisation and may not have stood by the Government though Government tried to placate them by the donation fund. The British bourgeoisie has been famous for leaving aside all scrupulous and entering into negotiations promising anything to tide over the crisis and then smash the opponent. And this they did. They negotiated with the miners, appointed a Royal Commission to enquire into their demands with the result that the strike notices were suspended though not withdrawn. They also called a National Industry Conference of employers and Labour for the usual programme of class peace. The Government at the same time gave an advance promise that they would scrupulously carry out the recommendation of the Commission both in letter and in spirit. But the Triple Alliance refused to join. Still the Conference and the Royal Commission were successful in lessening the crisis. The Commission even issued an interim report (20th March 1919) and recommended a wage advance of 2 shillings a shift, a reduction of hours of underground workers from 8 to 7 and gave the opinion that even on the small evidence given so far, some system of public ownership or joint control was desirable.

18/11/31 (Morning Part II).

Such a radical recommendation cheated the workers and the immediate crisis was averted. But the railwaymen came out in September on the question of hours and wages. The Government denounced the strike as an "anarchist conspiracy". In spite of military force the Government had to yield to some of the demands of the railwaymen.

With these struggles the organisation of the workers expanded and the trade union membership rose from 4,189,000 in 1913 to over 8 millions in 1919. The expanding needs of the struggle required coordination and unification. So the General Council of the Trade Union Congress was formed for the first time in 1921. But the British workers had not as yet a revolutionary leadership, a strong Communist Party. The young C.P.G.B. was formed only in August 1920. The result was that when the Coal Commission recommended the nationalisation of the mines, the Government refused to carry it out. On the contrary the bourgeoisie decided to launch an offensive and suppress the movement. A slump in prices and trade had begun. The German revolution had been smashed, the reparations paid in kind by Germany were hitting British trade and in the colonies the Indian struggle was showing its head.

Until now, since the war, the mines and railways had been under Government control. It was suddenly decided to

hand them back to the owners, five months in advance of the time originally fixed and announced. The miners opposed the Decontrol as it would have destroyed the all-national wages system and introduced competitive district arrangements. The Decontrol was carried out, the owners issued a notice of wage reductions and lockouts, which began on March 31, 1921. The miners called in the aid of the Triple Alliance which decided to strike on 12th April. The Government called out the military forces and a civil war was looming on the horizon. But again the spirit of 1848 dominated. The leadership afraid of the revolutionary consequences collapsed and the Triple Alliance betrayed the miners on "Black Friday" (15th April 1921). That set back the whole movement for a time. Nationalisation, wages, hours etc. were promised to be brought about through the next fight in the general election. The bourgeois attack on workers' standards commenced. But the resistance had broken down. In 1921, the working days lost in dispute were 86 millions, in 1922 they fell to 20 millions and in 1923 to 10 millions. During these two years the workers lost 10 million pounds per week in wages. Why this failure? Because the leadership had all along advised the workers to rely on negotiations and class collaboration, to keep faith in the bourgeois Government, the Royal Commission, etc. The leadership of the Second International Socialists sabotaged the struggle at this

point; hence the failure. Hence the Government appointed Commissions and Committees to tide over the crisis and afterwards when the crisis was over it attacked the workers. The extent of this attack can be seen from the single fact that the total weekly wage change between 1914 and 1920 was an advance of 13,332,300 pounds and the decrease since 1920 to 1923 was 10½ million pounds. Whereas the cost of living from 1914 to 1920 had risen from 100 to 269, the wages had risen to 226.6. At the end of 1923 the cost of living had fallen to 177 and the wages to about 130 to 140. (L.R.D. Monthly Circular for January 1926 page 8). Yet, British capitalism had failed to restore its economy or give work to all. By the fall in wages, goods become cheap, work increases and workers get work so argues the bourgeoisie. But the unemployed army has become a permanent one in England as in every other country. Since 1920 it has never gone below one million.

(71) British workers tried two weapons - Labour Government and the General Strike - the achievements of the Labour Government - its fall.

The working class had not yet definitely experienced the result of two weapons, which, they had been taught, would be the most effective, in giving them political power and bring about Socialist society. One was a Labour Government in Parliament and secondly such a mighty all-national general strike that the whole bourgeois socialist

order would come at stand-still. The British workers had the opportunity to taste the fruits of both these weapons in 1924, 1926 & 1929. Do those lessons tell us to give up Marxism as the only weapon to change production relations in society and free its productive forces for further development?

The Labour Party had 191 members in the Parliament in 1924. In January of that year, the Conservatives resigned the Government and the Liberals having agreed to support the Labour Party, the first Labour Government of England came into being. While in opposition the Labour Party had denounced the capitalist robbery of Germany by the seizure of Ruhr and heavy reparations. It had denounced the refusal of the bourgeoisie to recognise Russia, the only Workers' Government in the world. The whole British Empire, the European Continent, in fact the whole world looked with interest at the Labour Party forming the Government. The Communists only did not expect the Labour Party to do anything that would break the capitalist system inside the country or the capitalist foreign relations of Great Britain. The Labour Party in the T.U.C. had already allowed the workers to be duped by Coal Commissions and Industrial Peace Conferences. The Party could not be expected to change the capitalist foundations and relations of British economy. Still the Communists supported the Labour Government, and asked for its formation because

unless it had become a fact and the workers confronted with the living fact of it, unless it had had its run to expose its futility, the idea of realising socialism through a Parliamentary vote could not be got out of their minds. Hence Lenin had said that the Communists would support the Labour Government just as the rope supports the man who has hanged himself. (Ext. P 975).

India knows very well what the Labour Government of 1924 did to its bourgeois nationalist movement as also the workers' movement. The first Labour Government attacked the Communist movement and the Communist International by instituting the Cawnpore Conspiracy Case. They imprisoned the revolutionary youths of Bengal. The Labour Government left the Bombay textile workers' strike "into the hands of the Government of India and saw no reason to interfere with it", as they said in an official statement. The Labour Government in the approved Imperialist style warned China against taking action against British capitalists in China and sent its gunboats to massacre the Chinese Revolution. It threatened Mexico and showed to Egypt the warships in Alexandria.

(The Prosecution Counsel the late Mr. Langford James, as if in pity for the fate of Mr. MacDonald, had read out in his address to the Court several extracts from the Inprecorr, in order to show what an abominable set the Bolsheviks were in the Comintern who wrote about MacDonald

and prophesied his renegacy to the cause of the working-class.) The first Labour Government had elected Mr. MacDonald as its first Premier and Foreign Secretary. In the hands of the most expert and reactionary bureaucrats of the Foreign Office he behaved worse than Lord Curzon towards India, Russia and Germany. On assuming office the question of treaty with Russia was forgotten until Neil Maclean opened the question publicly. The London Labour Party was about to threaten a protest meeting and MacDonald had to yield and give recognition to the Soviet. But he was a puppet in the hands of the Foreign Office. They flattered his egomania, they praised him and got very important work done exactly in the traditions of Imperialism. "For this egoist was to prove at bottom as weak and unstable a man as that one of whom Mrs. Elphinstone said, 'he has a leg!' He had a leg will serve for MacDonald's epitaph. His inevitable Abbey statue will, one trusts, show him in Court dress". This was written not by the Inprecorr or any rabid Bolshevik but by one who signed himself as "U.D.C." and who was probably his colleague in the Cabinet in the first Labour Government. Though recognition was given to Russia he never sent an ambassador and pushed energetically with the Exports Credit Scheme. In the traditions of the Foreign Office he even forgot that he was once a Socialist. He wrote pompous letters to Tchicherin and Rakovsky. In a public speech he called the

President of the U.S.S.R., "a Mr. Rykov", as a man not of "real political authority". In one letter he wrote that a settlement with Russia would be reached "satisfactory to the people of Russia and to us and our subjects." It is a matter for wonder writes U.D.C. that he never began a note, "We, James Ramsay, by the grace of God". Think of the workers' Socialist leader writing himself "us and our subjects". He had already become in his ideology an Imperialist oppressor. In his relation with the arch Imperialist Poincare, he was fawning and currying favours. He promised full cooperation in the French occupation of the Ruhr, enforcing the Dawes Plan on Germany and he, a Socialist, declared that Germany must be forced to pay heavy reparations, else she might compete with "our industry". Such a Premier the Indian bourgeoisie applauded in the hope that they would be granted a capitalist Swaraj without safeguards for British Imperialism.

As regards the workers themselves, the Government had failed to do anything to better their conditions. The unemployment figure remained over a million as before. There was a textile workers' strike which was only patched up. Only a direct attack of Government on the trade unions was stayed which allowed them a few opportunities of consolidation. The fall of the Government was cleverly engineered by the bourgeoisie through its Foreign Office, who arranged for clever forgery of the Zinovieff Letter

and Mac Donald's bungling about it. The Government might have changed but the bureaucracy of capitalism was still there running its capitalist system. The experiences of the Labour Government thoroughly justified the Marxist doctrine that for any change in the capitalist system the old State with its bureaucracy has first to go.

(72) The Coal Crisis - the Samuel Commission - Government preparations and T.U.C. bungling - secret conversations - Soviet help refused - British experience confirms Russian experience - the vote can not stop attack on wages - that the general strike without a revolutionary party has no use - Leninism derived from history.

With the fall of the Labour Government the British workers, under the reconstruction drive of capitalism turned towards the Left and headed for the general strike of 1926. Capitalism in Central Europe had succeeded in beheading all the revolutionary forces and had started on the road of partial reconstruction. It was necessary now for British capitalism to smash the radical working-class forces. The revolutionary forces of the British workers have always been the miners, and every offensive of capitalism has begun with the miners. On June 30, 1925 the mine-owners gave one month's notice of abolition of the national minimum of wages, reducing wages by 13 to 49 per cent and

increasing the hours of work to eight. The Miners' Executive refused to accept the proposal. The Communist Party had been warning the British workers of the impending attack for months and months previously, pointing out that the attack on miners was the beginning of an attack on the wages of all workers. The miners were now supported by the Trade Union Congress, the railwaymen, transport workers and engineers. A strong quadruple alliance was formed and a big battle seemed to be approaching.

Dange. D/19.11.31

Morning 1st Part.

The Communist Party however pointed out that unless workers defence corps were set up, unless a strong leadership was built in every local the great action would collapse. The immediate lock-out, however, was averted by the Government, guaranteeing 20 million pounds subsidy to the mine-owners, who would then continue the present scale of wages and hours. The compromising leadership of the workers as represented by the T.U.C. and MacDonald was elated with the action of the Government. They spoke of "bloodless victory" and agreed to help the Commission which Government appointed to enquire into the miners' conditions. But, as the Communist Party alone pointed out, the subsidy and the Truce were only a screen behind which the Government prepared its forces. Police forces and the military were organised to meet the strike situation on a large scale. The Fascist organisation for maintenance of supplies was set up. During all this time the Labour Party and the T.U.C. remained inactive and abused the Communists for raising baseless bogeys of capitalist attack, while the shrewd Mr. Wheatley declared, "that we were rapidly moving towards a revolutionary crisis, when the fate of the working class would depend upon whether their working-class brothers in the army and navy would shoot them or line up with them." The Government showed itself alive to this situation and

attacked the Communist Party and sentenced 11 of its leaders for inciting the army to overthrow the Government and join the revolutionary workers.

The Samuel Commission reported in March 1926. It turned down the demands of nationalisation and it gave some very scientific reasons which ought to have taught even the Socialists some sense. It agreed with the statement of the miners' Federation that mining concerns are now complex heavy industry units, which comprise electricity, gas, oil, chemical products, blast furnaces and other activities. When the huge capitalist concerns are so interlocks, what meaning does a proposal of nationalising only one of them carry. The Commission said, "By removing these mines into State ownership the very sections of the industry which already approached the standards that are likely to prevail in the future would be the most injured. Existing combinations would be disintegrated and a serious obstacle would be raised against further integration." In plain language the Commission told the Socialists that modern monopoly capitalism is so interlocked that you cannot nationalise only one part of it; and if you argue that the part which is highly developed only should be nationalised, then the capitalists would not develop the other. The MacDonald Socialists surrendered before such an argument, because the only answer to this is that the capitalist economy itself has to be overthrown, ruling out

the policy of "serious obstacles" and sabotage to further development under Socialist nationalisation. On the publication of the report all the pseudo-Socialists refused definitely to state at once that they rejected it and that a serious fight would have to be given. Only the C.P.G.B. called for a definite organised united front against the attack. On April 30th 1926 the mine-owners tabled their demands of eight hour day and 13 per cent wage-cut. The Trade Union Congress took the stand that the miners would not accept reduction before the reorganisation of the industry, implying that they would do so (or at least the leaders would do) at a later stage. But the Conservative Government intent upon smashing the Unions refused to allow the leaders to save their faces. The General Strike was in fact begun by the workers themselves over the heads of their hesitating leadership. The printers of the Daily Mail refused to print an article containing a violent attack on the workers and went on strike. The Government considered it as an act of hostility and broke off negotiations. The General Strike began on 3rd May 1926.

The General Strike, the great ideal of every Trade Unionist which was to bring everything to stand-still and thus force Government to yield to the demands of the workers had at last come. It was being conceived for the last 75 years since the Chartist Movement. At that time it was to

be brought about for a definite political issue, for gaining political rights for the working class. The attainment of franchise had removed that issue. Now it was purely for the wages and hours of the miners. The strike, threatened since the war terminated, had at last come and revealed the vast incapacity of the leadership, the absence of any really sincere organisation on a nation wide scale closely and solidly interlinked to function in a crisis. The General Strike revealed that each group of workers, each organisation, though appearing to be of vast dimensions was like the vans of a railway train, scattered over several railways and incapable of forming a single train except after immense loss of time and unavailable when required. The leadership at the top simply thought of "somehow" ending the dispute. The local groups did not know what the top was doing or thinking and what exactly was required to be done. On the call they simply struck work and asked everyone else to strike which everyone did. Each day the strike spread and every service and industry stopped. The Trade Union leaders called out the printing workers and in loyalty to bourgeois fairness to show how "good boys" they were, they closed their own paper and press also. When the workers clamoured, they tried to issue the 'British Worker' as a small sheet but the Government raided the press and allowed the paper to appear only after censoring. The Government took over the "Morning Post" plant and issued

their own paper "The British Gazette". The Trade Union leaders again bungled and offered the Government the co-operative food supply services. The Government refused and under military protection made its own arrangements. The leaders prohibited picketing, but the workers refused to obey and prevented blacklegging. The Government called out the students of the universities, clerks, and petty bourgeois girls to become volunteers and run the trains, buses etc. The T.U. leaders had not even a Defence Corps to protect their pickets. We have had in this Court a witness (Mr. Fordham, P.W. 16) who is now a Magistrate in U.P., who was at that time a student in Cambridge and took part in breaking the strike and is proud of it. (Vide his evidence.) Blacklegs, who fought against the workers in Britain, are bound to get their rewards in the colonial loot. The British Government in England behaved towards its workers just as ruthlessly and armed the petty bourgeois Fascists to shoot the workers as ruthlessly as they do today in India, the latest example of which is the White Terror they are practising in Dacca against both workers and radical sections of the middle class.

When the strike lasted four days and even showed signs of intensifying, the Government called it "illegal", and "an attack on the constitution of the Kingdom". The T.U. leaders trembled and protested their loyalty to the bourgeois Government and to the bourgeois Parliament. On

8th May, Sir Herbert Samuel, the Chairman of the Commission, whose report was the immediate cause of the strike, returned to England and saw some of the T.U. leaders. Secret conversations took place. The workers never knew what they were. On 11th May, the workers were trying to extend the strike to engineering and ship-building trades also, while the leaders were talking with Sir Herbert. On 12th May suddenly the announcement was made that the strike was called off. The workers for a time were puzzled. Then they thought the Government might have yielded, so magnificent and powerful had been the response of the workers. They held meetings to celebrate the "victory". The capitalist press called it an "abject surrender" and the T.U.C. General Council called it an "honourable settlement". We in India now know what an honourable settlement means! The General Council had negotiated with Sir Herbert in his "private capacity" only, as he himself put it. He had no instructions from Government to negotiate. The T.U. leaders accepted a scheme of wage reduction and all that was connoted by the Coal Commission. Not only that. They had not even stipulated that the existing Trade Union agreements would continue. So that when the workers went to resume work the employers exacted new agreements. The miners after the termination of the General Strike continued their struggle but were beaten in the single-handed fight against the strength of the whole bourgeois State machine. (Some of the references - P 901).

The workers of every country (including India, Ext. P. 1381) had rallied to the help of the General Strike, the greatest help having been rendered by the Russian workers. But the T.U.C. General Council, afraid of capitalist ill-will refused to receive the money sent by the Russian workers. It is therefore quite natural, that when the Indian workers accept the fraternal help of the workers of every country including Russia, the General Council of the British T.U.C. should denounce us. The slave of Baldwin assuming the airs of the boss cannot but denounce the disciples of Leninism.

The British General Strike shows that the widest strike of all industries cannot automatically overthrow the capitalist system. That in the strictly economic strike the capitalist State comes to the aid of the bourgeoisie. Every big strike becomes a political strike. Without a revolutionary organisation and seizure of power a General Strike alone can never succeed in overthrowing capitalism. The conclusions are that the Russian experience holds good even in the freest bourgeois country in the world; that the ballot-box does not help you even to defend your wages from the attacks of the bourgeoisie. That even the most powerful General Strike without a revolutionary party and revolutionary action does not succeed even in its economic aims, let alone the political, that before the workers can become revolutionary they must be rescued from

the leadership of the Menshevik, the petty bourgeois Trade Unionist and Labour aristocrats. The freest Parliament is a speculators' den (as Mr. Bernard Shaw calls it) and can never lead to Socialist society. It may elect pseudo Labour Government but it cannot change the fundamental class relations and destroy capitalist organ.

Part II

Section I

(73) Role of the individual in the Indian conquest negligible - conquest of superior social groups by the inferior - British not inferior - our standards applied to them are subjective and therefore wrong - no return to pre-British era.

We have seen so far the activities of the human social groups in other parts of the world, their struggle with nature, resulting in inventions and increase of immense productive powers, the private appropriation of the increased wealth of society by a class, at one time the feudal class and at another the bourgeoisie, the socio-political class struggles arising out of such appropriation, the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, its new socio-political outlook and method of reconstruction of society on Socialist basis in Russia. We shall now see how much of this is applicable to the Indian conditions in which we have worked.

When all this mighty drive of social development and

revolutionary class struggles for a happier world had been going on, the independent feudal economy of India was seized and crushed in the steel wheels of British Imperialism. Feudal India of 18th century was stagnant while bourgeois Europe was constructing the giant wheels of capitalist production to storm the vast closed lands of Asia. We have seen in para 21 the frivolous analysis of the history of Indian conquest by bourgeois writers, who see our fall either in superstition of the priests or the treachery of unpatriotic Sardars, Nawabs and Peshwas.

I.H.K.

19/11/31 (Morning Part II).

While separate battles can be explained by such reasons, the whole epoch of the conquest or subjugation not only of India, but of China, Africa, Egypt, Turkey, Persia, to the bourgeoisie of Europe and America can not be explained except by the development of the superior technology alias civilisation of their bourgeois society. The historical materialist method of Marx (which the late Mr. James in his address to the Court said is not of any use to the Bolsheviks) alone shows us the right way, a method now being adopted though with some adulteration by the bourgeois writers also. We were conquered by force, by violence. But this violence was superior to ours, was the bourgeois violence of Britain against the feudal violence of India. It was neither just nor unjust because it was a force that was submerging the world like a flood from the excess of productive forces, that must find markets, if it is to progress and sustain itself. Hastings may have been a scoundrel and a murderer when he despoiled the Begums of Oudh and hanged Nand Kumar. But he did not succeed in India because he was so and we were excellent religious angels. His successor Cornwallis when matched with the young and virile bourgeoisie of America had failed. The young and unadulterated bourgeoisie of U.S.A. had stood against the partially feudal bourgeoisie of England. But

Cornwallis succeeded against the old and stagnant feudalism of India. A scoundrel in both the places - yet when contending against two types of technology, he produced two different results. Marxism does not neglect to count the human intellectual quantity as a definite quantity in the shaping of history and its separate events. But it assigns it a negligible role in relation to a whole epoch, an appreciable role in relation to its component separate events, but never the predominant role of the "sole cause" in the complex of social history. That place is assigned to the totality of productive forces and production relations. I do not mean that every conquest is a result of superior technology attacking an inferior one. There are instances of the conquest of a culturally advanced social group by a barbarous one. But almost every such conquest has resulted in the conquerer having ended by being merged in the conquered group. Our historians cite hundreds of instances wherein the invaders had been successful but ultimately merged into the social order they had conquered. Our historians at the same time say that the Britisher has conquered us and though culturally of an "inferior civilisation", has not yet been submerged in Indian society but has succeeded in keeping aloof and destroying our "old civilisation", culture, religion etc. Now when these historians called the "British" civilisation (it is not British as such but capitalist) inferior, their standards of measurement

are the subjective, moral or ethical notions and as such quite unreliable. The Hindus do not kill a cow and the British do. But such standards are useless as can be seen from the fact that Hindu society itself at an early stage in its development ate cows and bullocks. Ethical codes are basically the prejudices of the dominant class, which imposes them on society as their own safeguards against the revolt of the exploited. As the process of ideological development is intensely complex and subtle, it does not serve as an objective material standard of measuring superior or inferior civilisation. The Indian historian calls the British civilisation inferior from the stand point of his feudal Imperialism which spread its culture to China, Java and other countries. The remanent of that psychological arrogance coupled with an impotent, inferior economy that has saved the social group from complete extermination like the Red Indians because of its vast population, accumulated reserves of wealth and an old agrarian feudal economy entrenched on fertile land, makes us dream of "giving messages to the west" and spiritual leadership. The Imperialists cheer us, when we indulge in this gaseous imaginery superior leadership, so long as it does not attempt to take the concrete material socio-political shape. Let us once for all admit that we have been conquered by a superior economy, by superior productive forces which have called violence, subterfuge, massacre, murder and diplomacy

to their aid just as Indians also have done in relation to other countries in their past history. Let us once for all admit that its productive forces in the end lead to a higher stage of social development that there is not going to be a "return" but a march forward by assimilating all the achievements of the bourgeois technology that has conquered us.

(74) Has Britain civilised us? - introduction of industries - feudalism not destroyed - degeneration of revolutionary slogans - 1857, fight of a revolutionary class under reactionary leadership - what we would have done in 1857?

Does this mean that British Imperialism has "civilised" us? In Europe when the economically powerful bourgeoisie overthrew its feudal order & destroyed the feudal relations, it liberated the forces of production in its own country. In some colonial possessions till the war the Imperialist export of capital resulted in development of industries, a growth of the colonial and dominion bourgeoisie which soon became politically powerful enough to refuse to be expropriated in the interests of the mother country. British Imperialism in India did not carry out this task of developing the productive forces of the country. It deprived the feudal order of its political power but retained its socio-economic character making it serve the needs of the

Imperialist country. To serve the needs of British industry means to serve as its suppliers of raw materials and markets. If it were to develop as a bourgeois capitalist country it would be an industrial power competing with the Imperialist countries. Imperialism so far as it can prevent will not carry out such a suicidal function, though in the very act of transforming a huge feudal economy into a raw material base of modern industry, a certain amount of industrialisation does take place. (Reference P 90).

We consider the British conquest as an aggravated evil for two reasons. If as a capitalist civilisation it had properly destroyed the feudal order, it would not have been such an evil; because in that case it would have generated the proletariat, a revolutionary force that would have in time overthrown it. British conquest started by destroying the political power of the Indian feudal emperors, purely as a proposition of merchantile loot in the first instance. It was nothing but simple violent primitive robbery. However when it embarked on the campaign of destroying the power of the princes and lords, the work was left half done due to a series of historical impediments. One was the threat of Napoleon, necessitating in some cases an alliance with the princes; secondly the opposition of feudal lords in England to a thorough destruction of their class allies in India; thirdly the numerical strength of the princes and lords and the rising of 1857.

These three prevented the thorough disappearance of the princes and their allies and this abortion has now choked the new India in a peculiarly horrible manner, a small representation of which can be seen in the proceedings of the Round Table Conference.

The late Mr. Langford James did us a service, when in his opening address he brought to the forefront the slogans we shout every day. Revolutionary slogans by the prisoners of Imperialism in India owe their birth to the indomitable spirits of the great Bhagat Singh and Dutt. But I am sorry to say that those who profess to follow the great revolutionary have failed to understand his later development and have degraded the revolutionary slogans many a time into a shout of reaction. Slogans of the prisoners are not jokes nor lung exercises. They are not veils to shut out in a loud noise your innermost pain of suffering. You do not should slogans to tell the world how cheerful or romantic you are in sufferings. Slogans in a way are a revolutionary duty. The revolutionary duty in such a case is to keep up the correct self-training from degeneration and the correct leadership. In a simple concentrated manner they represent your revolutionary class outlook in relation to a whole movement or its separate events. "Down with Imperialism" and "Long live revolution" summarise the aims of the national movement for Independence. But they have been so vulgarised now that even the reactionary

supporters of the Round Table Conference shouted them at the Ballard Pier in Bombay and some introduce even a communal riot with them. Therefore they have to be amplified. We amplify by adding, "Up with the rule of the proletariat and peasantry," "Long live the Communist International". Now it will be very difficult to confuse us and our aims when one hears these slogans with any other school of revolutionaries. The followers of Bhagat Singh have forgotten that he had blossomed into a socialist and was on his way to becoming a Leninist (1930) though he was confused in his ideology for want of proper literature. But none could have expected from him in 1931 the slogan "Long live Bahadur Shah" or the observance of the "1857 Day" as some of his followers have been doing. Such slogans and such Days betray the class outlook, the romanticist in his hatred of the present rule trying to idealise rank reactionary and becoming a utopian. Why so? Because the movement of 1857 is not scientifically understood. We are simply deceived into idealising it by its anti-British character. The war of 1857 was a war of reaction of feudal lords to restore their formal role of uncontrolled exploiters of the peasantry. The peasantry and artisans in so far as they supported them were strengthening their weapons of feudal slavery. They fought under their former oppressors' banner because the new British rule had introduced money rents and was ruining

handicrafts without substituting industry in their place. Thus the class which ordinarily would have played a revolutionary role was supporting a reactionary war. What has been the outcome of 1857? The present native states, the present taluqdars and jagirdars, the strongholds of feudal oppression, allied with British Imperialist exploitation, are the legacy left by 1857. I would have considered it a great historical service if Dalhousie had succeeded in wiping out all these yellow patches from our map. In that case we would have been saved the trouble of carrying out one more task in the revolutionary programme - that of destroying these reactionary strongholds of princes and we would have better concentrated on Imperialism alone. That is why we do not shed tears over the fall of Bahadur Shah, though we may over his poems, if you like, or over the last of the Peshwas. I should also dispose of one fantastic question that is likely to be raised. If a Communist had been alive in India in say 1800 or 1850 would he then have helped the British into consolidating their rule over India because they represented a bourgeois economy which according to Marxism is superior to feudalism. Now it is not possible to project the historical forces of one-epoch into another and begin arguing about the resultant complex. History is not a chemist's tube. What we can do is only to analyse the process with the given forces and later developments. Still this much can be said in answer. The

existence of a communist presupposes a certain development of the proletariat. If it had been there it would have fought both against the British and the Indian feudal forces. There would have been no question of choice. Such hypothetical questions can best find their answer in the "1848 of Europe".

(75) Do we deplore British conquest? - effect of it - first Company loot - reasons for Crown control in 1858 - British Imperialism expands from the Indian base - commercial and legal forms of loot - why British writers expose British doings in India - sum total of the results of British rule.

Does this mean we do not deplore the conquest of India by Britain? No, it does not mean that. Because in the course of ordinary development, in the absence of British conquest, the bourgeois forces would have been generated within the womb of Indian feudalism, the class struggle would have been fought out as in Europe. If not that, we would have gone through a Chinese experience which would also have been far better than ours. As it is we have a single efficient Imperialist militarism in power, superimposing Capitalist relations of the market on a peasantry that carries on production under feudal conditions. The result is the absence of the development of the productive forces, a double exploitation of the masses and complete

disarming of the people. We deplore British conquest as much as we deplore the desire of some revolutionaries to go back to the pre-British days.

The first period of the conquest of India by the East India Company, was a period of indiscriminate and unlimited loot of wealth. It was not the indirect loot carried on under the cover of commercial relations between a conquered agrarian country and an industrial country. But it was a direct one in such an open manner that the proprietors of the East India Company when they saw their servants coming loaded with wealth, they demanded an increase of their dividends and the House of Commons rushed in to lay claim to all the territorial possessions of the Company and the gains accruing therefrom in 1773. By 1858 it was clear that the possibilities of such a loot had decreased. The capitalist crisis had begun to make its appearance in regular manner in Europe the first to experience them being England, calling for more systematic export of goods to foreign markets and their exploitation than had hitherto been done. We have seen elsewhere how the production of iron and steel jumped in England from 18 million tons in 1840- to 32.5 million in 1850-60. It may well be remembered that the system of guaranteeing fixed returns on railway capital invested by British companies & the construction of railways begun during this period, were in a measure the reason of this development of British steel production.

(Dange)

D/20.11.31

Morning 1st Part.

The revolutions of 1848 were the outcome of the crises of 1840, but England was saved from the intensity of the storm, as India was already serving her as a safety valve. As the bourgeoisie developed and obtained control over the Parliamentary machine and ousted the land owners from the State power, the bourgeois power began to grow more systematic and organised. The vast wealth taken from India had given a stable basis of liquid Capital to British industries, but disturbed state of affairs in India and unregulated rapacious Company control, wherein the traders were directly both administrators of the political rule and commercial development, was not in accordance with the idea of a bourgeois State, which in outward form appears to be above classes and therefore functions better in the business of deception. Time was ripe economically and politically to constitute India into a State subordinate to the British Imperialist State. The 1857 War only served as a very suitable pretext.

The second use to which India was put was to serve as the eastern base for the British militarism. As yet the British State had not developed fully into a militarist State with a regular standing army and vast armaments. This development took place in Britain later than in the other continental countries. (Reference ExH; P 898). One of

the reasons, I think, is that much of its work of combating the advance of its rivals was done through the armies raised in India. The Imperialist expansion of England unlike that of other countries, proceeded from its richest colony India, after it had struck its roots there on a sufficiently large scale. The penetration in South Africa, China, Egypt, Persia etc. was done from the Indian base, on a large scale. The expenditure on such wars till 1857 was 35 crores besides the regular normal military expenditure of 15 crores a year. Mr. Buchanan, a member of the Welby Commission, in his report says, "The military strength of India is the main factor in the strength of our Empire in the East." As an example of the aid that these forces render, he says, "Nearly 6,000 British troops on complete war footing were rapidly despatched at a critical moment from India to Nepal; others have followed, and Indian regiments now garrison Mauritius, Ceylon, Singapore and other places." (He is referring here to the time of the Boer War). It is perhaps this factor which hid from the European world that England had a standing army on the Indian soil which led Marx to believe that Britain as such had not developed into a militarism, though Britain had become the biggest colonial power before 1880 while the other continental powers only began after 1880.

When the military dictatorship of the British traders was divorced in outward form from their economic functions,

the dictatorship assumed the form of Government established by law in India. The openly violent expropriation of Indian wealth was clothed in the peaceful forms of commercial relations and bourgeois property laws. As the British bourgeoisie did not intend to completely destroy the feudal system, since it was the only class with which it could enter into an alliance of exploitation of the peasantry, the basic property laws whether of Hindu or Mohamadan feudal systems, were left as they were. But the new ideology of the bourgeois property relations and status appeared through the new procedure, the Law of Torts, Civil Procedure and even new values of 'truth' - the bourgeois truth appearing through the Evidence Act. Bourgeois "law" was raised above society, "all were equal before law" was the new principle substituted for the old feudal principle of rank and status holding their own in all spheres. This subtle form of bourgeois dictatorship, which in the last instance is the arbiter and sanction of the law, serves to partially obliterate the class character of the State. But in India the Imperialist nature of the State could not be hidden successfully, due to the national factor, which keeps alive the differences.

The exploitation of India by the British bourgeoisie has been exposed in great detail with voluminous facts and figures by the Indian bourgeoisie and also by many liberal

bourgeois intellectuals in England. Especially before the last quarter of the 19th century when capitalism had not yet become Imperialism, when peaceful trade and commercial exploitation of markets was predominantly the policy of capitalism, when heavy industry and export of capital had not become dominant in England, you could see many champions of India in the House of Commons, indignant at the policy of conquest, of the forward policy of the Afghan frontier, men who could spend years in impeaching Hastings and shouting hoarse over the robbery of the begums. At that time, very interesting works exposing the violence and loot as practised by the British could and did appear. But later on when capitalism had become Imperialism living on the incomes derived from export of Capital to the colonies the spring source of liberalism dried up. India became an All-Party or non-Party question - even for the Labour Party. Because every section of the bourgeoisie including the upper strata of Labour became a partner in the profits from the colonies. That is why the best exposures of British writers have appeared mostly before 1900 and some till 1914, but rarely after that. The Indian bourgeoisie awakened after the war. Hence its activity in this matter belongs to the post-war period.

The sum total of results of British rule according to us (as expressed in the Colonial Thesis of the C. I. Ext. P 90) are: the handicrafts and manufactures were

destroyed first by extra economic force and violent destruction and a vast number of artisans were thrown on the land. The character of agriculture was thoroughly changed. The growing of crops was subjected to the needs of the exchange market and the peasant economy was brought within the orbit of capitalist market. The peasant still remained burdened with feudal slavery while his productive activity became economically subject to the capitalist market. This double burden impoverished him completely. Absence of industry gave him no outlet. Land values and rents rose excessively. Indebtedness of the peasantry increased and the number of parasites feeding on him grew (some of these things are also set down in the Resolution on Peasants, in the General Political Resolution of the W.P.P. vide Exh P 135 and also in some of the articles in the Masses Exh P). The low level of productive forces, the poor national income, was burdened with an expensive bureaucracy and disproportionate militarism, the resulting discrepancy being filled up by high taxation and public debt. Famines, poverty, illiteracy, disease & high death rate, all leading to pacifism and mysticism from the petty bourgeois to the peasantry are the heritage of British rule in India.

I.H.K.

20/11/31 (Morning Part II).

(76) Our reasons and policy of national struggle - gains of the British bourgeoisie from India - what loss our independence will cause to them - the basis of some of our resolutions.

Every body in India and outside agrees with the fact that we are poor and undeveloped and every body agrees that we must develop and not remain poor. Even the Government says (vide its Annual Reports to Parliament) that India is poor, that Indians should ultimately get complete political power and that the British shall have ultimately to relinquish control over this poor ward entrusted to their charge by Providence working through the pious souls of the East India Company and its artillery fire. We communists also say that it is high time that this excellent guardian policeman should give up our necks to ourselves. So every one seems to be agreed - and yet it does not happen! Because in the first place it is a thing that does not "happen" but is "brought about". Secondly because the chorus of agreement is false. It is false because the problem as stated looks as a problem to be solved upon an all-class agreement. While in fact it is a problem of class struggle and national struggle. It is a problem of contradictions embracing the very basis of the structure.

The contradictions of the class struggle is not created as is alleged in the Crown complaint.

The first contradiction is between the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie and those of British Imperialism. The natural ambition of the Indian bourgeoisie is to develop the productive forces of India that is build up industries. The desire of the British bourgeoisie is to employ the Indian masses as markets for its goods, prevent industrialisation and the growth of the industrial bourgeoisie. Thus the two ambitions conflict and they certainly are not the creation of communists. This conflict affects the other classes also. Without industrialisation, the growing petty bourgeois intellectuals can not find their living. Without industrialisation the pauperised peasant can not find place to sell his labour power. Without the destruction of Imperialism the peasantry can not be saved from the burden of maintaining a costly foreign bureaucracy. Without industrialisation the working class can not grow. All this gives birth to the necessity of a united front against Imperialism to an intensified national struggle.

British Imperialism has invested in India about 1000 million pounds, in industries, railways, shipping, mines, banks, Government and Municipal Loans. Total British investments outside the United Kingdom are computed to be 4000 million pounds, India therefore holds one-fourth of

the total exported capital of Great Britain. More British capital is invested in India than in any other single country. The gain from India to Britain accruing in the form of profits over imports and exports, over investments, currency manipulations, payments of services etc are said to be roughly 150 million pounds per year. This is only 4 per cent of the total national income of Great Britain. If it is such a small part, then why is it that British Imperialism holds so tenaciously to India? The importance of this 150 million pounds drained from India can not be realised by comparing it to the national income. The question is who realises this money and how it is employed? It is the income of the uppermost bourgeoisie in England. The incomes of this class being large, their consumption percentage is low. I should take it to be one-third. The question would arise - are all these investments, the sources of its parasitic income necessarily held by the big bourgeoisie. Any one who knows how high is the modern concentration of capital will not doubt that it is so held. It is essentially so in England. There you do not get that kind of joint stock company development as in America or Germany, in which the stock is split into millions of small units. So very little stock is held by the small well-to-do petty bourgeoisie. Secondly England with its small area, the incomplete liquidation of the big land-holders and a very old capitalism has a very high percentage of the

proletarian population and no rich farmer class of any considerable size. It is the farmer class which forms the big strata of petty bourgeois small holders of foreign stock in other countries. It is not there in England. Whatever small share may have been so long held by the aristocracy of labour and the middle class of the "offices" has been now thrown off by them or expropriated from them in the last ten years of severe fluctuations and crisis. Hence almost all the holdings are concentrated in the hands of the big bourgeoisie. To consider that two-thirds of their incomes become savings, that is, reinvested to draw more surplus values is not an exaggeration. Even if the whole sum of national savings of 500 million pounds is distributed over the whole national income (4000 mil.) which means that even the two million unemployed are supposed to have savings, the percentage comes on the average to 12.5. To consider that a bourgeois drawing over 2000 pounds a year saves two-thirds would not be much wide of the mark. With those who draw hundreds of thousands, the percentage would run still higher. The Liberal Industrial Inquiry says, "That something like three-fourths of the new capital invested in industry is set aside out of profits". So out of the 150 millions from India, the British bourgeoisie can be said to re-invest as its national savings 100 millions. The annual national savings made available for reinvestment are 500 mil. (Ibid page 108). Thus the Indian

drain contributes 20 per cent to the annual basic capital of the British bourgeoisie. I think this is what Lord Rothermere had in his mind when he said that England would lose 20 per cent of her national income by the loss of India. With the usual method of capitalism, he described the loss of the bourgeoisie as the loss of the whole nation. India is the brightest jewel in the British Crown because no other single country contributes such a large bright block of capital to the British bourgeoisie. The loss of India does not mean only the loss of these 150 million pounds. India is the basis of Britain's eastern militarism and trade. India maintains an efficient military machine for the British bourgeoisie. (That it is so can be seen from the latest speech of Sir Samuel Hoare). Such extra expenditure, after deducting what may be considered the normal for Indian purposes, would amount to 25 crores of rupees per year. But more than this is the question of the threat of trouble in England itself, that would be given by the loss of India. The loss means a beginning of the disintegration of the Empire, and the fall of the Empire means the almost complete collapse of world capitalism. Apart from this ultimate release of vast revolutionary momentum there will be serious complications immediately in the British internal situation. The Indian imports provide work for about a million workers in England. I arrive at this figure in the following manner. The total

number of workers in England is 16 million. Commodity production in England is mainly for exports. We find that 70 per cent of textile production is exported; of coal 33 p.c., of iron and steel 50 per cent. These three are the staple and exporting industries (vide the Report of the Liberal Industrial Commission 1926 pages 334 and 343). In the minor industries also not less than 25 per cent product is exported. (L.R.D. Monthly Circular 1926). I therefore consider 50 per cent of the whole productive capacity being engaged in production for exports that is 8 million workers. The Indian share of British exports for 1925 was 86.1 million pounds. This would absorb 900,000 workers for Indian exports. This number does not include the British workers engaged in the sea-borne export trade from India, nor the intellectual proletariat engaged in the Clearing House operations of Indian financial transactions with the whole world, all of which pass through London. I would therefore put generally one million British workers as being provided for by the monopoly of Indian trade which would be wiped out almost entirely by the loss of India. It means the revolutionary pressure of one-sixteenth population on the British bourgeoisie. Revolutionary India nationalising all the capital invested here means the expropriation of 1/17th part of the total effective capital of the British bourgeoisie.

(77) All classes here tend to gain from independence -
question of revolution raised by whom? - the
state of British Imperialism - is it democracy or
dictatorship - the apparatus of force - its costs
- force matched against whom?

Though all classes in India apparently stand to gain by carrying out the struggle for independence from Imperialism, there is another set of contradictions within India itself, which prevents an all-class front against Imperialism. Indian society like any other society (quite contrary to the statements of the Prosecution) is divided into classes. We have the bourgeoisie living on profits produced by the workers. We have the land-owners living on the rents from the peasantry. The function of these classes is to exploit the working-class and peasantry. The bourgeoisie is opposed to Imperialism so far as it is deprived of the 150 crores of rupees drained off by England annually and prevented from increasing the productive forces in the country and enrich itself more. The big land-owning class grumbles but is not opposed to Imperialism like the bourgeoisie. Because it is itself a creation of the British Raj. The former land-owning class being wiped out in the wars, the present land-owning class, which was at first merely the tax-gatherers' class, was confirmed in its allotments as land-owners in order to form a solid class

supporter of British Imperialism. (Vide Reference Ex. P 759). The interests of both these classes conflict with those of the working-class and the peasantry. We have a class struggle as in every other country. The working class and peasantry have thus to fight out a class struggle and a national struggle. For the workers and peasantry the struggle against Imperialism is as much necessary as the struggle against their immediate oppressors, the land-owners and capitalists. They have to carry out both at one and the same time. The communists stand for revolutionary struggle against Imperialism and Indian capitalism and feudalism. We do not believe that the Indian bourgeoisie though it stands to gain by independence is going to fight for it. Therefore the workers aided by the peasantry and the revolutionary elements of the petty bourgeoisie have to carry out the task, because the fear of the social revolution ultimately throws the national bourgeoisie into the arms of Imperialism.

When we present the question of the national struggle as being a part of the revolutionary class struggle, to be carried out by the working-class and peasantry under the leadership of the working-class as organised in the Communist Party, we are said to be talking prescribed Moscow recipes, having no relation in fact to the needs of the Indian situation. We are said to be importing a class

war in a country where there is none and where there is love between all classes. We are said to be unnecessarily importing the question of revolution when everything seems to be attainable by "the conference method". We maintain that the question of revolution is not unnecessarily and artificially raised by us. It is there in actual life in India. The class struggle exists, it is not created. We have seen from other countries how all the tenets of Marxism and Leninism are derived from and applied to the existing conditions of the social struggle. India is no exception.

No one in India, not even the most moderate nationalist, requires to be convinced of the fact that the state in India is a class state of the British bourgeoisie maintained by force. (Even Mahatma Gandhi the advocate of the conference method now-a-days admits that the army in India is an army of occupation). The main function of Government as is always stated by the bourgeoisie is maintenance of law and order. The maintenance is done by force; it is of law that is existing property relations, the Imperialist - capitalist system; of order that is the peaceful conditions guaranteeing a continuity of present relations to facilitate the process of exploitation. What is the cost borne by the masses of this apparatus of force? The whole State being an organ of the dictatorship of one class against another, all the revenues raised by it can be said to be its maintenance cost.

Dange D/21.11.31

Morning 1st Part.

The revenue raised by the Central organ of the Imperialist dictatorship was Rs. 127,22,77,920 and by the subordinate Provincial organs Rs. 93,29,54,406. The dictatorship of the modern bourgeoisie undertakes directly some of the economic functions of the bourgeoisie, which have become so wide and so necessary for all classes and at the same time so vitally necessary for the maintenance of the dictatorship that it becomes dangerous to leave them into the hands of the bourgeoisie with its internal competition and contradictions. Such departments are the posts and telegraph, the railways, customs, land revenue, income-tax etc. For example, if the assessment and realisation of income-tax were left to a limited company it may collapse due to the contradictions amongst the bourgeoisie itself. Therefore the bourgeoisie voluntarily surrenders the functions to its own organ, which is not so fluctuating as a limited company but for all purposes subject to their control like their own company. It is not that the bourgeoisie cannot manage these departments. The railway systems of America and England are privately owned. But in times of war, the State in order to protect the bourgeoisie from itself is forced to take over their control. The wireless telegraphic system of the British Empire is managed privately by the big combine, the Imperial and

International Communications Ltd. formed of 12 separate companies with a capital of 30 million pounds. In spite of this the State has to take control in times when ordinary profit-making competitive management becomes dangerous. The British dictatorship in India being every day threatened with the revolutionary movement and international complications is increasing its hold on several vital services and undertakes many economic functions which in a normal bourgeois State are left to the bourgeoisie itself. The latest example is its refusal to give to a private company, the firm of the Tatas, the institution of the air-service for internal purposes in India. So from the revenue budgets, if we omit the ordinary capitalist functions discharged by the State and those that are undertaken in order to realise money for the apparatus of force, the State is reduced in its essence to a dictatorship, based on force composed of the Military, Police and Bureaucracy. (The judiciary is included in the bureaucracy.) The Central and Provincial expenditure on its essential apparatus of force in 1927-28 was distributed thus:

1927-----1928

Money spent on the machinery of force behind the Dictator- ship.	Central Budget	Provincial Budget
Central administrative Bureau- cracy	1,72,17,998	11,17,70,093
Pensioned Bureaucracy	2,79,14,206	3,80,54,880
Military	56,33,94,893	-----
Police	68,99,654	11,55,00,135
Prisons	34,96,100	2,32,57,545
Bourgeois Justice	13,90,211	5,68,06,953
Political (interstate relations)	1,57,74,479	-----
Frontier bribery & Force	2,49,68,001	-----
Total	66,10,55,542	34,53,88,706
Total revenues (Central & Provincial)	220,52,32,326
Spent on exercise of undiluted violence (Central & Provincial)	100,64,44,248

These figures are for a year which was quite normal. In times of popular upheavals the expense on State violence increases. It would seem that one hundred crores for a population of 24 crores and seventy lakhs (in British India) is not much. But such a comparison is misleading. The comparison can properly be made only in relation to the effective mass of the population that comes out on the streets for active participation in the political movement, such as demonstrations, raids, breaking of laws, political strikes, etc. In British India the population of both the

sexes between the ages of 15 and 50, the period of possible effective action is about 124 millions a little over half the total. But the whole of this never takes part even in the most intense period of agitation. A large part remains sympathetic and benevolently neutral. The big bourgeoisie and land-owners go on the side of Government. The richer sections of the petty bourgeoisie in the towns and villages do not come out on the streets. In 1930, Bombay and Calcutta were the hottest places of Civil Disobedience, raids and street demonstrations. I do not think that at the most intense moment more than one lakh of persons took part even in a demonstration pure and simple or active sympathetic raiding party. That means 1/6th of the active population, taking 6 lakhs of the age between 15-50 and nearly 1/12th of the total of the city of Bombay. By this we may say that in the whole of India the machinery of violence of the British dictatorship had to contend against the unarmed activity, even taking it to be fraught with the threat of mild violence as in the agrarian areas of about 20 million persons. The violence of the British dictatorship is maintained at the cost of 100 crores of rupees per year armed with the deadliest mechanism of destruction against the potential unarmed violence of 20 million workers, peasants and youths.

(78) Share of the cost of the machinery of force in the total State expenditure - Dictatorship begins to assume constitutional forms - consolidation of the bourgeoisie - association of the feudal class in its work.

Is the British dictatorship maintained and financed by a contribution of "equal sacrifices for all"? The yearly Government of India publications give very graphically how each rupee of the total Central and Provincial revenue is made up. It shows that 74 per cent of the revenue is made up of :

Customs	.22
Railways	.17
Land Revenue	.15
Excise	.09
Salt	.04
Irrigation	.04
Forest	.03
	<hr/>
	.74

Half of the Customs revenue is from taxation of imports of commodities consumed by the masses. Thus the bureaucracy and machinery of violence is fed by the working class and peasantry. Out of the total revenues of 220.52 crores we have to omit the revenue amounting to 45.63 crores derived by purely capitalist commercial activities of the

State in the matter of railways and irrigation for which separate capital accounts are maintained. There remain then 174.89 crores for the maintenance of the functions of the dictatorship. From this a part is allotted to clothe the dictatorship and its fundamental basis of unrestricted violence in divers deceitful forms, such as the "democratic" institutions, departments of education, religion etc. The remaining 101 crores, i.e. 57.5 per cent is spent on its organs of force and bureaucracy.

The dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in its most subtle form becomes a Parliamentary democracy, which serves to create an illusion that the masses are being governed not by a class but by themselves according to their own will as expressed through the ballot-box. In India the British dictatorship had no reason to undertake such a deception because immediately after the violent conquest, the military occupation and forcible imposition of new capitalist relations the whole country was plunged in a social chaos. It took some time for the new forces to spring up and gather strength. The Civil War in America, 1860-65, produced a cotton famine in England, which made the textile owners look up for cultivating surer fields in their own Empire for cotton. The cotton boom affected India and gave impetus to the cultivation of commercial crops. Under the moving forces of the Imperialist capital exported to India, the means of communications linking the internal markets to the

seas, the demand for raw materials for factories, created a new bourgeoisie with an International sense of the stock exchange market. The factories gave birth to a new working class, concentrated in large numbers, selling its Labour power to capital, having nothing to lose, but chains disciplined by the machine and soldered into a strong class by the interdependence of its cooperative actions in the productive process. The factory owner and the factory worker were the inevitable creation of Imperialism. The Indian bourgeoisie arose slowly from 1860 to 1914, and the world war gave it a consciousness of strength. The result of the birth of the Indian bourgeoisie was the birth of the demand to convert the undiluted violent dictatorship into one functioning under the cover of Parliamentary democracy, with less rigour and with the consent of the Indian exploiters. The first demand was one of the right of criticism of the severity of the dictatorship. The second was for "the association of Indians in the work of administration of the country" i.e. the association of the Indian bourgeoisie in the work carried on by the dictatorship.

The British bureaucracy in India was not that solid disciplined frame which it is today. At first it suffered from individual deviations, a conflict between members of the Viceroy's Executive councillors or a conflict of Provincial Government members disobeying the Central. Then there was the second group of internal conflicts that

between the bureaucracy in England and the bureaucracy in India, which took the form of the question of Parliament's control over the Indian affairs. Both these conflicts were settled by 1894. When Lord Mayo's Government grumbled about the introduction of the bourgeois legal system without knowing from the Councils of 1861 their opinion, he was told, "The Government established in India is from the nature of the case subordinate to the Imperial Government at home and no Government can be subordinate unless it is within the power of the superior Government to order what is to be done or left undone." (Montague-Chelmsford Report). The dictatorship of the Imperialist bourgeoisie functions through the Parliament, whose Executive organ is the British Cabinet. A mitigation of the complete control of the Parliament means a mitigation of the dictatorship. "If the control they (the British Government) possess were to be in any respect less than complete, the power of Parliament over Indian questions would be necessarily annulled", wrote Disraeli's Government. The last occasion when the Indian bureaucracy tried to direct affairs according to its own sense of the need of the situation was in 1894, when the cotton duties were imposed against the growth of the Indian textile bourgeoisie (which later on was one of the causes of the 1925 Textile Strike in Bombay and partially that of 1928 about which evidence has been led and to which I shall come later on). When some prominent members of the

bureaucracy differed, they were told by Sir Henry Fowler "to place their resignations in the hands of the Viceroy. The supremacy of Parliament over the Government of India and that of the Central Government over Local Governments was thus finally established.

These conflicts and objections about some separate measures being dictated from England were not due to any pious desire to annul the dictatorship. It was due to the fear that a very severe administration of the dictatorship might lead to a revolt like that of 1857. Even after 1857 though there was no bourgeoisie yet born and the landlords were completely bought over, the peasantry wherever it was being pauperised had continued to revolt as in the Deccan Riots of 1870. Hence the Indian bureaucracy wanted to institute a new policy. The second reason is that every bureaucracy is bound to overreach its limitations forgetting especially when it is in a formative stage that it rests on the support of the class which has raised it to power, to work out and administer in accordance with the interest of that class and not according to its "dictates of conscience".

In spite of this the rise of the bourgeoisie in India, the rush of the European bourgeoisie towards the colonies and partition of the world, the American Civil War, the emancipation of the serfs in Russia, compelled from the

hands of Czarist dictatorship, were too great events, not to force the British bourgeoisie to think of finding a class in Indian society itself on which to rely for the continuance of its dictatorship. "Above all the terrible events of the mutiny brought home to men's minds the danger arising from the entire exclusion of Indians from association with the legislation of the country," so says the Montague Chelmsford Report. Thus it was the revolutionary action of the peasantry (though under the leadership of the reactionary feudal lords) that helped the feudal landlords, its own oppressors, in the growing bourgeoisie to become associates in the work of the dictatorship. The Indian Councils Act of 1861 and further that of 1892 gave the Indian bourgeoisie a right to tell British Imperialism how badly the dictatorship stood in the way of its development. The Indian bourgeoisie not having any means to tell this more plainly, had started the Indian National Congress in 1884. When the working class in Europe had already produced Marx and the First International, had gone through the experiences of the Commune and was now going to found the Second International, we had no proletariat at all. A group of educated petty bourgeoisie were asking for increasing association of Indians in the administration of the dictatorship of Imperialism when the Paris Commune had already given the call to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

(79) Development of the radical bourgeois and petty bourgeoisie - the influence of 1905 - attitude of the Dictatorship - evolving into a constitutional autocracy - difference between our "Democratic Dictatorship" and their "constitutional Dictatorship".

The developments after 1892 were far more serious. There were severe famines leading to the expropriation of the peasantry. The petty bourgeois youths unable to find much outlet in the very slow growth of the minor industries took to terrorism. The Continent of Europe was threatened with a severe crisis. The British bourgeoisie itself was in a crisis. The result was the Cursonian regime, the swing of the Indian bourgeoisie to the Left under pressure from the petty bourgeoisie. The Indian National Congress adopted the resolution for Swaraj. The Boycott movement arose as a protest against the suppression of the growth of the Indian bourgeoisie. The Montague Report while referring to this period says that the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5 was a contributory factor in the movement. The Russo-Japanese War in 1905 led to the 1905 of the Russian Revolution.

I.H.K.

21/11/31 (Morning Part II).

But Mr. Montague does not say that it had any influence and he is right. There was no proletariat in India sufficiently class conscious, yet to pick up the ideological radiation of the 1905 Revolution of Russia, only the petty bourgeoisie had arisen to national consciousness and it naturally picked up the influence of its own class, that is the admiration for the rise of the Japanese bourgeoisie.

What was the attitude of the Imperialist Dictatorship to the rising consciousness of the Indian bourgeois and petty bourgeois ranks. It tried to suppress the revolutionary pressure of the petty bourgeoisie by repression and to buy over the feudal landlords and the upper bourgeoisie to the support of the dictatorship. When we communists use the language of the class struggle of the workers and the class alliance of the bourgeoisie with Imperialism we are said to be talking a language not accepted by responsible sane constitutionalists. But the evidence of late Mr. Montague, the Secretary of State for India would show differently. Writing about the idea behind the Morley-Minto Reforms, he says "The problem which Lord Minto's Government set themselves to solve was how to fuse in one single Government the two elements which they observed in the origin of British power in India. They hoped to blend the principle of autocracy derived from

the Moghul emperors and Hindu kings with the principle of constitutionalism derived from the British Crown and Parliament, to create a constitutional autocracy." The Prosecution in this case have several times ridiculed our slogan of "Democratic Dictatorship" (vide the Crown Counsel's Address page 7). Will they now laugh at this excellent representative of British Imperialism when he is speaking of creating constitutional dictatorship? Perhaps they may, seeing that the writer is dead and no longer a Secretary of State for India. But Mr. Montague was quite right and frank in using the phrase "constitutional autocracy" and so are we. What is the difference between our Democratic Dictatorship and Mr. Montague's Constitutional Autocracy or Dictatorship? As he says the British Government in India was composed of two principles. The principle of autocracy which means the rule of force unrestricted by law, which under a feudal monarchy is open and unmitigated by any other element and therefore "derived from Moghul emperors and Hindu kings". The second was the principle of constitutionalism". It means the "rule of force" appearing as a "rule of law or a constitution", which is generally a form of the bourgeois dictatorship, and therefore "derived from the British Crown and Parliament". Under the bourgeois rule the task of administering this deception of the rule of constitution is generally handed over to the petty bourgeoisie and even sometimes to a

section of workers as in England and there the blending is easy. But it is difficult in a colonial country. There the interests of the Imperialist bourgeoisie are contradictory to those of the national bourgeoisie. The latter is not interested in administering the "unrestricted rule of force by Imperialism" in the guise of a constitution, unless it is surrendered a share which the Imperialist bourgeoisie is unwilling to do. Hence the Morley-Minto problem was to find "a special blending" that is to keep the rule of the Imperialist bourgeoisie unrestricted and yet get it administered by a class which will not conflict with bourgeois Imperialist interests and succeed in creating the illusion of a Constitution. Autocracy was to be a reality, and the Constitution a mere "principle". The autocracy of the Indian feudal kings was taken over by the Crown of the British bourgeoisie; now was the time for the "principle" of constitutionalism, the illusion to flow out from that Crown. To whom? To those "derived" from the Moghul and the Hindu kings that is to the feudal Nawabs, talluqdars and land-holders. "Constitutional autocracy" was a dictatorship of the British bourgeoisie administering as a Constitution of the Indian feudal class. It was time for the British king to appear in an Indian prince's dress to allay the revolt. He did it by the Morley-Minto Reforms. Mr. Montague says "They anticipated that the aristocratic element in the society and the

moderate men, for whom there was no place in Indian politics, would range themselves on the side of the Government and oppose any further shifting of the balance of power and any attempt to democratise Indian institutions". (Mr. Montague's soul may now look with satisfaction on the Round Table Conference).

This shows the difference between our Democratic Dictatorship and the Constitutional Dictatorship of the Morley-Minto Reforms. Ours is a democracy for the proletarians and a dictatorship against "the aristocratic element in society and the moderate men." Theirs is a Constitution for the feudal and now for the bourgeois class and the Dictatorship against the masses. You can not laugh at our terminology for thereby you laugh out your own bourgeois dictatorship. Now at least the Prosecution will not argue about a "Government established by law". They are of course at liberty to argue about their "Constitutional Dictatorship". But they can not say it is democratic as Mr. Montague says "It is to prevent any attempt to democratise".

(80) The formula of August 1917 - the hoodwinking inquiry - 1919 Reforms - wide basis of class alliance.

While trying to veil the rule of force with a constitution giving the reactionary feudal landlords the opportunity

to associate with the work of British Imperialism, the furies of the Dictatorship were let loose against the radical wing of the petty bourgeoisie, the cases of Sawarkar and Tilak being the most famous of them. The violence of the Imperialist Dictatorship against the Press, Demonstrations and Assemblies was sanctified as the administration of law by the Press Act (1910). The Seditious Meetings Act (1907 and 1911), The Criminal Law Amendment Act (1913) etc. The radical Press was suppressed and the heavy hand of repression stifled the bourgeois national movement till the war. The constitutional garment of the Dictatorship however had given no shelter to the bourgeoisie which was developing. The war boom gave the bourgeoisie a new strength and even inside the Constitutional Dictatorship of the Imperialists and the semindars, they penetrated with a desire to expose it, not to the benefit of the working-class and peasantry but for their own class. Amongst the non-official element in the Councils, the land-holders had nearly 70 per cent of the seats between 1909 and 1916; the rest going to the legal profession and others that is the Indian bourgeoisie. By 1919 the land-holders lost much ground "to the commercial interest" and the Indian bourgeois and petty bourgeois interests began a mighty clamour not for a revolution but for a reformed constitution. The Imperialist Dictatorship was engaged in a death struggle with another Imperialism. At first it totally denied the

right to ask for a "Democratic Constitution", for Home Rule. Next when it found that times had advanced beyond such a Czarist outlook, and that a mass revolution was maturing, the Imperialist Dictatorship offered to the bourgeoisie association in its work. In 1917 when the rumblings of agrarian revolt were being heard, in the words of Mr. Montague "A ruling prince (feudalism), a Lieutenant Governor (bureaucracy of the Dictatorship) and an Indian ex-Member of the Council (Indian bourgeoisie) attended the Imperial Conference and shared "in the innermost deliberations of the Government of the Empire", share in the innermost conspiracies of the Imperialist Dictatorship. But when the footmen's stool, given to the Indian bourgeoisie at this Conference, did not satisfy it, (about which there was a lot of row in the papers), the King Emperor was called to aid. The pronouncement of 20th August 1917 was made containing that long winded formula (the increasing association of Indians, in every branch of administration, and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible Government." The formula served its purpose of silencing the Left Wing growth of the petty bourgeois and bourgeois sections. The leader of the Left, Mr. Tilak, congratulated His Majesty on the pronouncement by the Gangapur telegram and promised "responsive cooperation" with the Imperialist Dictatorship. The formula like the winding staircase set

the petty bourgeois Leftists on the "upward" path rising to the tops, where the golden seats of the bureaucracy appeared to lie, but giving them no opportunity to occupy the wide expanse of the wealthy plains around. The formula raised their hopes but did not widen their share in the exploited wealth of the country.

The pronouncement and the Reforms Inquiry was a "war measure" in order to keep something before the people in India till the crisis of war had been tided over. Mr. Montague puts it quite frankly in his diary in which he says "I have set the politicians thinking of nothing else but my inquiry". Only he told the truth after his death when it was of no use to us.

The Reforms of 1919 widened the basis from which the Imperialist Dictatorship hoped to draw its supporters so long the land-holders predominated. Now the predominance was given to the bourgeoisie, wherever it had grown during the war period. The upper strata of the intelligentsia income tax payers, a section of the richer peasant petty bourgeoisie were enfranchised and given the majority in the Provincial Councils (70 per cent of the total seats). This class formed 2.8 per cent (6,375,000) of the total population of the eight provinces (excluding Burma), in 1921, (227,238,000). Vide Simon Commission Report page 191. In the Central Legislative Assembly the electoral roll is of $1 \frac{1}{8}$ million, half a per cent in a population of 240

millions. The Simon Commission says "The adoption of the property gratification as a basis for franchise gave a predominance and sometimes a monopoly in the vote to certain classes of the population". In clear terms, it means, only the bourgeoisie, the land-owning class with a small section of the richer sectors of the petty bourgeois were enfranchised.

(81) Enfranchisement does not give power to the bourgeoisie over the machinery of force - voted and non-voted budgets - certification by the Viceroy - 73 years of progress - Dictatorship the same.

Enfranchisement is not really the indicator of how far the Imperialist Dictatorship is prepared to allow room for the colonial bourgeoisie to develop industrially and to subject the State to its class control, by which alone it can hope to develop. The interests of the Imperialist bourgeoisie and those of the colonial bourgeoisie are inherently contradictory. Therefore the Imperialist Dictatorship can not allow its final authority, its organs of force, of army, bureaucracy and finance to be delivered into the hands of the Indian bourgeoisie. So under the new and enlarged constitutional form of the Dictatorship, the essence of Dictatorship having remained the same, conflicts broke out between the Indian bourgeoisie and the British

Dictatorship within the Constitution itself. In the first place the Indian bourgeoisie was not allowed a vote on some of the financial items in the Central and Provincial Budgets. The financial requirement of the supreme organs of force, the army, was beyond its vote. The pay and pensions, the appointments and control of the upper sections of the bureaucracy, the real bureaucracy that administers the Imperialist Dictatorship, were non-votable. The third big item that it could not touch was the income of the British bourgeoisie, (the debt charges,) from its investments in Government Loans. The smaller organs of force like the Provincial police, jails and justice were made subject to the financial vote of the bourgeoisie. But even her control is nil. If we take the expenditure of the organs of the Dictatorship for the year 1927-28 (see para 77) we find that 31 per cent it is voted and 69 per cent non-voted. In the second place, even in cases where the vote is allowed, the Provincial or Central Head of the Dictatorship can set aside the vote and certify the requirements of the State. In the first Assembly (1920-23) wherein the largest section of the bourgeois and petty bourgeois class did not take part, the Viceregal dictation of Lord Reading certified the enhancement of the Salt Duty, and the Princes' Protection Act (1922). Even the most loyal land-owning and upper bourgeoisie which had its interests completely identified with those of Imperialism had to refuse to pass the Finance

Bill of 1923 on the Income Tax question. Its opinion was contemptuously thrown aside and the Bill was certified. In the second Assembly (1923-26) in which the bourgeoisie after liquidating the mass revolutionary movement outside, entered "to wreck the legislature from within", the Government demand for finances was rejected as a protest against the refusal to give responsible Government to the Indian bourgeoisie. The Finance Bill was certified again. In 1925, the bourgeoisie refused to pass the Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Bill, directed against the middle class revolutionaries of Bengal. The Bill was certified. In the life of the fourth Assembly the whole country was put under the direct open rule of force, of Martial Law & Ordinances and all the canons of the rule of law and Constitution was thrown aside. In the matter of giving the Indian bourgeoisie a share in the 5250 key positions in the All-Indian Central bureaucracy that runs the Dictatorship. The Lee Commission held before the bourgeoisie a hope that its sons would have one half the posts in the Civil Service by 1939 and half in the police by 1949. After nine years of the working of the Constitution and "the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to a progressive realisation of responsible Government", of which the Legislative Assembly was supposed to be the highest expression, the point to which the "self-governing" and "progressive realisation" of the honour and responsibility of the most honourable members of that august body had reached is reflected in a scene which shows the Imperialist Dictatorship in its most vivid colours.

Dange

D/23.11.31

Morning 1st Part.

On 11th April 1929, the President of the Assembly, Mr. V. J. Patel, a fine specimen of the most class conscious and clever bourgeois, after ruling out the Public Safety Bill (which later on became an Ordinance; vide Exh: P 2579) said, "I have received the following communication from His Excellency, the Viceroy and Governor-General. (The message was received standing by the Assembly, except the members of the Congress Party who continued to sit in their places). Will the Hon'ble members kindly stand in their places?" Pandit Motilal Nehru said, "Is it your decision, sir, that we should stand? Mr. President: Courtesy requires that we should stand. (The Assembly then received the message standing). What was the message and how was it written? "in pursuance of section I, Edward Fredrick Lindley Baron Irwin, hereby require the attendance of the Legislative Assembly in the Assembly Chamber at 11 o'clock on Friday, the 12th April 1929." (Assembly proceedings, page 2992 dated 11.4.1929). There are supercilious Rai Bahadurs and Knights who return letters addressed to them, if their titles are not properly superscribed on the envelope; Hon'ble members frown if they are not called honourable; but their relation to the Dictatorship of Imperialism is that of liveried servants. The dictatorship of the Barons of British industry refuses to recognise their

honour, insists on the homage of standing even to the scrap of paper that is to be read, the scrap, which "hereby requires" - not requests - their attendance. The Indian bourgeoisie attended at 11 o'clock on 12th April 1929, on Baron Irwin, who tells them, "you have refused to consent voluntarily to the Public Safety Bill, to the deportation and suppression of revolutionaries. But the organs of force, the Army and Finance are in my hands and not yours. Therefore, I promulgate the Public Safety Ordinance. I require your attendance to hear this. You can now go and protest if you please." The violent open dictatorship, clothed in the Councils Act of 1861, coloured with the attribute of elections conferred on the Indian landowners and big bourgeoisie in 1892 and 1909 and promising to become gradually a responsible Government of the Indian bourgeoisie, remains in essence the same dictatorship after 73 years of "constitutional progress", a rule of force unrestricted by law, of force imposed by the barons of British industry on the Indian working class and peasantry, on the Indian bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie alike. The Parliament of the British bourgeoisie has issued four constitutions for India and in all the four the essence and organs of the dictatorship are left intact.

(82) Attitude of the bourgeoisie - early Home Rule demand - loyalty to the Empire in the war boycott of the first Assembly - Swaraj Party and the second Assembly - difference between their entry

in the Assembly and that of the Bolsheviks in
the Duma - wrecking the Dictatorship by the
constitutional vote.

What is the attitude of the Indian bourgeoisie and land-owning classes to this rule of force established by conquest? Its attitude has varied from time to time, partly influenced by the attitude of Imperialism towards its economic ambitions and partly by the revolutionary pressure from the masses and the petty bourgeoisie. The Indian bourgeoisie as a force did not exist before the war. Whatever of it there was, was the small hive of merchants engaged in export and import trade closely bound up with the foreign exchange banks and houses. Under the shelter of the war it developed on an appreciable scale possessed of a considerable amount of mobile capital and reserves expropriated from the peasantry and workers by high prices and low wages. Even then it did not develop any revolutionary bias. Its highest demand was Home Rule, and not independence. It spoke of the Irish struggle and threatened to copy it. But at the same time in the next breath it promised five million soldiers to defend the Empire and Imperialism, if a promise of Home Rule came forth. The Irish resisted conscription and organised the insurrection and yet our petty bourgeois heroes had the impudence to give a threat of the Irish example while promising millions of

peasants to fight the battle of British Imperialism. You can see this attitude in the most radical leader of the petty bourgeoisie of the war days, Lokamanya Tilak, in his speech at the Provincial Conference in Belgaum in April 1916, on the "Loyalty Resolution". He says, "In order to strengthen and consolidate the British rule, we have shown our willingness to sacrifice to the utmost our blood and our purse." (page 405 Writings and Speeches, published by Ganesh & Co., 1919 Edition). "We never entertained the idea of severing the British connection." (Ibid page 409). In the weak stage of the bourgeoisie of the time and when the masses had not been drawn into revolutionary movement this was the only policy that could suit the objective forces. The eminence of Tilak does not lie in his ideals, which especially in the latter stages were not at all revolutionary, when it may be remembered that just at the time he was supporting the loyalty resolution, James Connolly was organising the working class for insurrection against British Imperialism and Lenin was calling upon the working class to turn the Imperialist war into a civil war. The eminence of this leader of the bourgeois and petty bourgeois class, apart from his personal qualities lay in organising and directing the petty bourgeois movement in the capacity of sacrifice and preventing the compromising upper bourgeoisie from sudden collapse before Imperialist diplomacy. There lies the difference between his leadership

of the bourgeoisie and that of Gandhi. Under the pressure of the mass movement and the shock of the competition revived by the close of the war, the ruined petty bourgeois turned more to the left. The war profits began to decline and the bourgeoisie sympathised with the Non-Cooperation Movement under the leadership of Gandhi. When the constitutional reforms of 1919 were instituted and the Legislative Assembly set up, the mass revolutionary forces were on the rise and the working of the constitutional dictatorship was boycotted by a large section of the petty bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie was as always split into sections, the big financiers and those whose interests were completely linked with those of Imperialism, entering the Assembly and the more class-conscious and radical section desiring an independent growth, remaining out though not participating in the mass movement. The first Assembly was elected by less than 25 per cent of the voters. Though the official figures showed 25 per cent, ten per cent would be nearer the truth as the Government exercised a considerable amount of force and compulsion in the rural areas on the voters. When the mass revolutionary pressure collapsed on the surrender of Gandhi under the pressure of the bourgeoisie and the land-owners, the bourgeoisie which was so long coquetting with the Left abandoned the revolution and entered the Assembly and the Local Councils under the leadership of the Swaraj Party. A section of the petty

bourgeoisie representing the interests of those who had not the high property qualifications of the franchise kept on the boycott slogan and organised as the "No-Changers". What did the bourgeois and petty bourgeois sections that entered the Assembly do? Was their entry the same as that of the Bolsheviks in the Czarist Duma after the failure of 1905 revolution? We have seen the reasons which urged the Bolsheviks to enter the Duma. The revolutionary situation was no longer present. Therefore it was necessary to use the Czarist Duma for reorganising the forces under the cover of legality and for keeping the antagonism of masses to Czarism alive by revolutionary propaganda through the Parliament. The Bolsheviks were carrying out revolutionary Parliamentarism and they themselves were a party of the working class. The Swarajists were not a revolutionary party of the working class. Therefore their fundamental notions of social progress which were based on the development of capitalism were not intrinsically opposed to those of the Imperialist Dictatorship, which in other words means that in relation to the working class and peasantry both stood for the continuance of the present property or social relations. Their mutual opposition lay in bourgeois competition which had a revolutionary content only in so far as it desired the displacement of the foreign bourgeoisie from the field of the exploitation of the tailors in India. But it was not the opposition as between two mutually exclusive

classes like the working classes and bourgeoisie. The necessary outcome of such a position is that at a certain stage, the Indian bourgeois and British Imperialist interests can combine and compromise without each deserting its own class interests. The Swarajists entered the Assembly with the idea of constitutional opposition and not revolutionary Parliamentarism. Their earliest programme when the Swarajists had not yet cooperated with the British Dictatorship stated that they wanted to enter the legislatures with the policy "of uniform, continuous and constant obstruction to make Government through the Assembly and Councils impossible," if the Government rejected the National Demand. The conditional clause, "if the Government rejected the National Demand" itself is sufficient to show the non-revolutionary and compromising attitude of the Swaraj bourgeoisie to the Assembly. The Government had rejected the National Demand when made by millions of the revolutionary masses. The Dictatorship of Imperialism was not going to concede to the Assembly heroes what they had rejected to the mass pressure. Secondly the policy shows that it has failed or purposely refuses to grasp the essential forms of the dictatorship. The above clause implicitly concedes that Government is carried on through the Assembly and Councils. The Government or the Imperialist Dictatorship is carried on through its machinery of force, the Army, Police, Bureaucracy, Justice, Prisons etc. None

of these were governed in any sense by the Assembly or the Councils. And in the final instance even if they are a Parliamentary vote does not displace the dictatorship of a class. The Swarajist policy was not revolutionary Parliamentarism once more because it did not aim at rallying the disorganised forces in the country by propaganda through the Assembly. As a party of the bourgeoisie it adopted all the forms of bourgeois respectability and set on the road to participating in the work of the Assembly, i.e. participating in the deception carried on by the Imperialist Dictatorship.

I.H.K.

23/11/31 (Morning Part II).

(83) No-changers and Left liquidators not comparable and not correct - opposition gives way to co-operation and acceptance of office - by 1926 Indian bourgeoisie participates in the rule of Imperialism completely.

Does this mean that the No-changers were right in sticking to the boycott, saying that they would not participate in the councils of the satanic Government? We do not believe so. - Czarism was as much satanic if not more. Yet the Bolsheviks used the Duma not for getting concessions but for organisation. The No-changers in no sense can be compared to the Left Liquidators who stood for continuous boycott of the Duma, because the latter did not advocate the abandonment of revolutionary activity. Their leftist mistake lay in insisting on the liquidation of all legal work. The attitude of the No-changers while retaining the pseudo revolutionary attitude to the Assembly was one of ignominious capitulation liquidating all forms of political activity.

Even this mild attitude of playing with radical ideas of obstruction and wrecking was soon given up. The National Demand was rejected and while speaking on it Pandit Moti Lal Nehru said, "We Swarajists have come here to offer our

cooperation. If the Government will receive this cooperation, they will find that we are their men." (Vide reference Ext. P 908 page 56). When the Budget of 1924-25 came before the Assembly, Pandit Nehru in moving its rejection said "My present motion has nothing to do with the wrecking or destroying policy of the Non-cooperators; and is in fact a perfectly constitutional and legitimate means of drawing attention to the grievances of the country." So he had already agreed to abide by the Constitution that is the deceptive form adopted by the Dictatorship. In 1925, Mr. C. R. Dass carried on negotiations with Lord Lytton, the Governor of Bengal, for the formation of a Ministry, thus trying to lend direct support to the administration of Imperialist force against the masses. Acceptance of office under the Constitution has no other meaning. Any Constitution formulated by the British Parliament can only be a Constitution which at its most liberal interpretation is a violent Dictatorship, hidden in constitutional illusions of the interests of the Imperialist bourgeoisie predominantly and of the Indian bourgeoisie as its minor partner. These negotiations were cut off by the death of Mr. Dass. In July 1925 Pandit Nehru accepted membership of the Skeen Committee. Soon after Mr. V. J. Patel accepted the Presidentship of the Assembly and declared, "from this moment I cease to be a party man. I belong to all parties. If the Viceroy wants I will attend him ten times a day and

my assistance will always be at the disposal of the Government officials." Unfortunately for all his attendance he got his "Speaker's Peerage" in the Delhi Prison in 1930 (as he himself said it). In 1926 in the Provinces, sections of the Swarajists broke away and formed the Responsivist Party who stood for accepting office. The first acceptance of office was begun in the Central Provinces by Mr. Tambe who joined the Governor's Executive Council and later on (in 1930) became an Acting Governor for a few months. Thus by 1926 representatives of all sections of the Indian bourgeoisie and the upper strata of the petty bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeois intellectuals and rich peasants were found accepting offices and actively aiding, advising and administering, wherever they were allowed to do so, the violent rule of Imperialism against the Indian working-class and poor peasantry until it was again forced into opposition by the refusal of the Dictatorship to accommodate the Indian bourgeois interests within its economic framework.

(84) Simon Commission - repression and turn to the Left - revival of boycott fails - the talk of "action" of the Working Committee and the A.I.C.C.

The announcement of the Simon Commission and the refusal to give the Indian bourgeoisie any place on it coupled with the adverse Currency Legislation and a coolness

in the policy of protective tariffs for the Indian bourgeoisie on the part of the British bourgeoisie forced on the bourgeois parties to once again talk of fight and challenges. The Congress again called upon the bourgeoisie to boycott the legislatures. But the rewards of participation in the work of the Dictatorship were too tempting and valliant bourgeois out for Independence, poured in hundreds of telegrams asking the Congress, which again was getting under the influence of the radical petty bourgeoisie, to excuse him as the "business was important". The boycott according to the General Secretary of the Congress proved a thorough failure. (Annual Report to the Calcutta A.I.C.C. 1928 December, page 54). When the Government continued its attack on the growing revolutionary trend of the movement, the bourgeoisie was forced to arrange a stage play of sacrifice, fight and challenge by the imbecile method of boycott. The Working Committee met on 5th July 1929 and found that it was not powerful enough to fight those vested interests, who profited by the participation in the work of the Imperialist Dictatorship and who would be hit by the boycott. "In view of the importance of the question" it shelved the question to the to the A.I.C.C." (Bulletin No. 11 of 1929 page 122). The A.I.C.C. met and "in view of the importance of the question" left it to the Lahore Session of the full Congress to decide. The source of these hesitations lay in the secret negotiations carried on by the

bourgeois leaders with the Government on the question of giving a few crumbs. Membership of the Assembly and Councils provided the best screen for such secret treaties and stage shows. The Congress deliberately and knowingly upheld such secret negotiations while it openly bluffed the people with revolutionary phrases. The surreality of the leadership of the Congress to the Constitution of the Imperialist Dictatorship, which we have criticised all along and against which the Prosecution had taken cudgels on behalf of the Congress at the beginning of this case can be shown in the scene of the A.I.C.C. Meeting in Bombay. Secret negotiations had taken place between Pandit Moti Lalji and the Viceroy who had announced the extension of the life of the Assembly. The nature of these negotiations was not known to all. Therefore the President of the Congress Pandit Moti Lalji who sat in the Assembly at the mandate of the Congress made a statement in the A.I.C.C. He said "the announcement made by the Governor General is very important and calls for a definite action on the part of the A.I.C.C. There are however certain facts which it is necessary for the A.I.C.C. to know before it can decide upon the action to be taken." After such a grave and brave call for action backed by certain facts, the President told the "revolutionary" flock before him "I feel I must not disclose those facts without making a reference to the Governor General." A very grim call for "definite

action", and also "certain facts which it is necessary to know in order to decide upon the action". But the facts can not be disclosed." To whom? To the Congress that put the honourable gentleman in a position of power to know those certain facts. The facts are known to the Imperialist Dictatorship, who has perhaps already decided what action he should take against the Congress. The Congress is out for complete Independence and "definite action" but it must first have the gracious kind consent from the Dictatorship giving it permission to become brave. What was the resolution of the A.I.C.C. on this? "This Committee having heard the important pronouncement from the President" - (the important pronouncement that the Viceroy had made an important pronouncement, certain facts about which could not be disclosed) - "realises the gravity of the situation" and having realised it the A.I.C. took the important and "definite action" of authorising the Working Committee "to take such action as may be necessary". As regards what? "As regards the action to be taken by the members of the Congress Party in the Assembly and Provincial Councils". The A.I.C.C. takes definite action to authorise the Working Committee to take such action as may be necessary regarding the action to be taken by the members. Tremendous revolutionary action! And all based on facts that can not be disclosed, without reference to the Viceroy. What men of action and profoundly complete independence?

This is the herd that is going to free the country. The uncompromising policy of Imperialism put an end to all this farce and under the revolutionary pressure of the masses, for which the working class and peasantry did not make any "reference to the Governor General", the constitutional Dictatorship had to shed its deceptive colours and come out with its full force of violence against the toilers. Thus ended the fourth constitutional bribery of the Indian bourgeoisie. The foundations of the fifth on the bones and blood of the heroic struggle of 1930 are now being laid to meet with what fate?

(85) Indian bourgeoisie and British Imperialism ask us to follow the constitutional example- what classes sit there? - legislation according to their interests - legislative gains of ten years - temporary policy of protection - Royal Commissions and Committees.

The political career of the nationalist bourgeoisie in the Legislative Assembly shows that it had not at all carried out a consistent line of what we call "revolutionary parliamentarism. Its first boycott was forced on it by the mass pressure. As soon as it was withdrawn, it donned all the liveries, wigs and robes of the lackeys of Imperialism in the Assembly with great pride, showing to the world that is to the world bourgeoisie, how soon an adapt it can become

in the art of parliamentary deception. It not only did not carry out revolutionary parliamentarism as it had boasted it would do, but it actually deserted to the Imperialists, accepted offices and became administrator of the Dictatorship.

The Imperialist Dictatorship points to this acceptance, by the nationalist bourgeoisie, of all the good points in the Constitution, its responsive cooperation in the working of it and asks the working-class and peasantry to follow the same road, to agitate for constitutional rights in a constitutional manner, just as the nationalist bourgeoisie did in the period 1923-29. The nationalist bourgeoisie when charged with having deserted to the camp of the enemy, turns round and says, "well, we cooperated when necessary with the Dictatorship. But it resulted in some good to the whole of India. We have fought for the workers and peasants on the floor of the Councils." The question is can we with advantage follow the road of the bourgeoisie in the Councils? Does it lead to all-class-good, all-class-welfare or only to the aggrandisement of the class of the exploiters? Does this road profit us, the workers and peasants in any way? We have already seen that the real power of the Dictatorship does not lie in the constitution conferred by it but outside it. The Constitution has conferred no rights on any class that can really invest it with political and economic power. So the

recommendation of Imperialism to us to follow the way of the Indian bourgeoisie has no meaning. But what about the claims of bourgeois nationalism? It is known that even though the bourgeoisie has no power to control and to enforce the carrying out of its opinion as expressed in its resolutions in the Councils or the Assembly yet it has a complete majority in the Provincial Councils and the Assembly when allied with the land-holders. The Constitution divides the electorate on two bases - one the communal and caste basis - Hindu, Mohammedan and Sikh etc. - another the social or class basis - land-holders, Commerce Chambers etc. Though these bases appear to be different yet essentially they are one and the same; because the whole of the electorate is fundamentally based on high property qualifications that it is composed of the land-holders, rich farmers, the bourgeoisie and the upper bourgeoisie. Naturally the social class of the representative whether elected as a non-Mohammedan or Mohammedan, as a landholder or from the Chamber of Commerce is exactly one and the same - the exploiters' class of land-holders and the bourgeoisie. The attempt to show that the representative elected on communal basis has different economic class allegiance from the one elected on definitely economic or social class basis is pure cheating of the workers and peasants who are duped into believing that a Hindu or a Muslim landlord when elected on the communal basis will fight for the economic rights of his co-religionist peasants

without looking to his own class interests as such. Therefore for all material concrete everyday life purposes, we have to divide the representatives in the Councils on their economic class basis, as landlords, businessmen, manufacturers or their agents in the intelligentsia and study them as such. The big landlords have never boycotted the Constitution at any period even at the time of intense revolutionary wave, when even the big nationalist bourgeoisie left the Assembly. They have ever been willing to aid the Imperialist Dictatorship whether in 1921 or 1930. As for the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie, a larger part of it boycotted the Constitution in 1930 than in 1921 and consolidated its class ranks for its class interests within the Constitution since 1923. In the bourgeoisie also there are different interests. The export import traders have different interests from the manufacturers. The importers of steel will oppose protection to Tatas, others may not. The attitude of different sections of the landlords and the bourgeoisie towards the resolutions and bills coming up before the legislatures differs according to their economic class interests and not according to their communal or caste origin, except in cases which are purely communal which happens rarely. The Swarajist bourgeoisie which assumes very much of non-class airs and talks of sympathy to the workers and peasants is no exception to this. The competitive struggle of the exploiters amongst

themselves, their internal class contradictions, lead to the formation of different parties amongst themselves such as the Swarajists, Independents, Nationalists, Responsivists Non-Brahmins etc. Their votings and combinations whether in relation to bills and proposals of Government or their own groups are guided purely by the question of class gain.

Dange

D/26.11.31

Morning 1st Part

Their doings of the last ten years show four things justifying the viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism.

- (1) That the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie in relation to Imperialism are fundamentally contradictory and therefore its problems insoluble constitutionally.
- (2) That the Indian bourgeoisie, like any other, suffers from internal class contradictions and is incapable of fighting even for its own class demand.
- (3) That the Indian bourgeoisie, like any other, is opposed to the working class and even the peasantry.
- (4) That the landlords are completely allied with Imperialism and are opposed not only to the workers and peasants but even to the industrial bourgeoisie on vital points.

During ten years of working with constitutional dictatorship the bourgeoisie all along tried to secure gains for its own class. In the life of the first Assembly the revolutionary outburst overshadowed everything. But as soon as it was betrayed and finished the bourgeoisie which had remained outside the Councils went in and there began a period of small but important concessions to it from Imperialism. The greatest ambition of the Indian bourgeoisie is to build up a high tariff wall and grow behind it.

Imperialism is naturally bound to oppose. But it looked as if the Imperialist Dictatorship had given up this policy & its own class interests and had adopted an attitude of allowing the Indian bourgeoisie to grow. It looked as if Imperialism was about to "decolonise" India and make big concessions to its bourgeoisie. This matter has been subject of great controversy but it has now been definitely shown by historical experience that Imperialism has no such desire. (For the controversy vide Exh: P 2491). The temporary manifestation of concessions were due to several factors a few of which were :-

- (1) The fright caused by the serious mass revolutionary upheaval of 1921 and the necessity of attempting to buy off sections of the bourgeoisie by promises and not very vital concessions.
- (2) Capture of Indian markets by Continental and Japanese goods and the inability of British Imperialism to stop it by ordinary economic competition.
- (3) The necessity of keeping the Indian bourgeoisie quiet when British capital would be engaged in attacking British Labour, which culminated in 1926 and 1927.
- (4) The alarming deficit in Budgets necessitating the attempts to fill them up by increasing customs revenue etc. But all this policy of concessions was to be carried out in a very dilatory manner, the most usual method employed being

that of commissions and committees. During the last ten years of the constitutional dictatorship we have had six Royal Commissions costing Rs. 54,04,537/- (for complete list with the expenses incurred, see page 508, Legislative Assembly Report dated 6th February 1929). There was also a big crop of committees, the most important being the Inchcape Committee on retrenchment, External Capital Committee, Taxation Inquiry Committee, Huddiman Reforms Committee, Skeen Committee and the latest the Banking Enquiry Committee. The Lee Commission promised the petty bourgeoisie half the posts in the bureaucracy after 20 years of candidature, the Currency Commission refused to give gold currency to the Indian bourgeoisie and put on its head the weight of 18 pence ratio; the Simon Commission declared it unfit for Dominion Status and the Agricultural and Labour commissions revealed problems that neither Imperialism nor the Indian bourgeoisie can solve. The only concession that produced anything fruitful was the Fiscal Commission out of which arose the Tariff Board (whose recommendations have played such a havoc in the 1928 Textile Strike of Bombay: vide evidence). All other commissions and committees have served to collect some statistical material which can be used with benefit not by the bourgeoisie but by the class-conscious vanguard of the working class. To Imperialism the long rows of these reports are stretchers on which they aspire to carry declining British

Imperialism to a revival. To the Indian bourgeoisie they are so many tombs of the frozen eggs of their future. To the Communists they are chalk lines on which to lay the rail roads of revolutionary strategy, after flashing on them the red searchlight of Marxism.

(86) The Tariff Board and war policy - steel, chemicals etc - other big branches of production not in the hands of the Indian bourgeoisie - still their attitude to labour and peasant legislation hostile - success in furthering their class gain through the legislatures very poor - hence transference of the struggle outside the constitution and amongst the people.

The only substantial gain to Indian capitalism during a decade of inquiries has been the protective Tariffs granted to the cotton industry, wherein the Indian bourgeoisie is the strongest. Only in this field can there be said to be some concession from Imperialism to Indian capitalism. But in all other vital matters there has been none. The solid edifice of capitalism is built on the development of the machine industry, the production of the means of production. The index of this development is the production and consumption of iron and steel. In the whole of India there is only one plant of this industry - that of the Tatas. But though it is an iron and steel plant it is

not one that produces machinery. Its largest capacity is engaged on the production of steel rails, wagons, building materials etc. 2/3rd of its production is dependent on Government orders. It also exports a part of its big iron output to Japan. On the recommendation of the Tariff Board, the Indian Steel Protection Act was passed in the interests of this one single company and the initiative came from the Government side in 1924. The Indian bourgeoisie tells us that this concern is a national industry. Is Imperialism then changing its policy and helping national industry i.e. helping its rival, the Indian bourgeoisie, to grow? No. The protection to iron and steel was given because the Tata Iron and Steel Company is necessary for the military purposes of Imperialism. Both the Government and the nationalist bourgeoisie accept this proposition. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya is very proud that his bourgeoisie is able to manufacture rails on which the victorious British Imperialism can be carried to shoot the workers and peasants in Mesopotamia. "Without the rails which the Tata Steel Works supplied the success of the British arms in Mesopotamia would not have been so certain as it was", said the patriotic and the holy Pandit, while supporting the Government Bill on protection. (Legislative Assembly proceedings, page 2320 dated 27th May 1924). Only two years before that he was vociferously supporting the Khilafat agitation against the dismemberment

of Turkey. Two years after he was boasting that it was the "national concern" of the Tatas that supplied rails to Imperialism in order to defeat Turkey and then asks, with the holy water of the Ganges in his hands, the masses of India to perform the shradha of the masses of Turkey by paying 1½ crores per year to the Tatas, the Indian bourgeoisie and the Pandit for helping to send the peasants of Turkey to Heaven with the aid of the British bullets. When a member pointed out, at the time of voting the reward to the Tatas, that there were many 'kept' members in the Assembly who had shares in the Tatas, the Pandit asked the members to trust to the sense of honour of those members not to vote protection to their pockets. So the protection to the steel industry was not given to build up the foundations of Indian capitalism, but to maintain a war plant. The protection approved lately to the chemical industry by the Government of India, on 4th September 1931, is also a part of the war policy. The Tatas are in a position to supply railway material to carry troops and even to turn out guns. But up till now there has been no basis for the supply of chemicals for war. England is a far off base and likely to be cut off by submarines. The Tariff Board in their report observed, "The case for protection of the chemical industry rests primarily on its supreme national importance. It is a key industry whose products are used in most other countries; it is indispensable for purposes of national

defence". The Government accepted the recommendation and imposed a duty of 7 annas per hundredweight on magnesium chloride, who can say that the protection policy is not a part of war preparations on the Asiatic frontier? The third industry which is protected is cotton. The protection granted to textiles is extorted by political and economic struggle in which the workers have played the largest part. Protection is a part of the bribe to the strongest section of the Indian bourgeoisie in order to wean it away from financial support to the political anti-Imperialist movement. It is also partially a deal between the Indian and British bourgeoisie to keep a third party, the Japanese, out. The success of the bribe can be seen from the fact that the Bombay Textile bourgeoisie which is most in need of protection has been the least supporter of the political movement and their representative at the R.T.C. was quite willing to barter away on the question of "safeguards".

The Tariffs approved in the matter of sugar, electrical wires, cables etc. play at present a negligible part in the productive forces exploited by the Indian bourgeoisie and therefore in no way hit the Imperialist economy in any way. Thus by a policy of mere protests, commissions and inquiry committees the Indian bourgeoisie has been able to secure protection worth the name for the textile industry

only that may be said to affect the British bourgeoisie to a certain extent. The other tariffs are either for war equipments or for minor branches. Yet for so small a part from the exploited wealth of the workers and peasants, the Indian bourgeoisie abandons the political struggle outside the present constitution.

As against this the largest fields of exploitation are more or less exclusively controlled or dominated by British capital, and the Indian bourgeoisie has been straining every nerve to get a share in them not by economic competition for which it is not powerful enough but by using the extra economic force - legislation or political power. But the political power, the State being the Imperialist State it has been defeated in the attempt and even got the worse of it. In shipping, coal, banking, exchange and jute, the Indian bourgeoisie is still a weak minor. A few members of its class have secured entrance as far as the outer gates of these huge British monopolies. In order to force that entrance further they tried to reserve the coastal shipping by the Haji Bill. But they failed. On the contrary they have lost heavily on the exchange ratio and in this they were betrayed by their own allies, the landholders' representatives. The Steel Protection Bill in 1924 was passed by the Assembly without a division, so solidly they were united on it. But on the Currency Bill, in

March 1927 the industrial bourgeoisie was divided and the voting was 63 against 51. The internal class contradictions of exporters and importers, of currency speculators etc. left the industrial bourgeoisie in the lurch.

While they were thus pouring millions into their pockets by protection, wherever they could what attitude did they take towards the working class and peasantry in legislation affecting them? They put a vehement opposition to the Trade Union Act of 1926 which Government had passed because the working class had advanced far beyond the stage of tolerating illegalisation of its Trade Union activity. But when Imperialism three years later introduced the Trades Disputes Act in order to keep down the militant direct action of the workers, the Indian bourgeoisie first "agreed to the principle" of the bill and ultimately passed it.

I.H.K.

26/11/31 (Morning Part II).

Not one of the members of the Assembly ever brought any private bill to improve the workers' lot. In the local Councils, when Bombay carried the Maternity Benefits Act it was done by the help of the rural land-holding members who had a grudge against the highly proud Bombay bourgeoisie. In the U.P. the Oudh Rent Act was opposed tooth and nail. In Madras they fought the Malabar Tenancy Bill. Because both gave occupancy rights, though meagre, to the peasants. In Bengal the Swarajists fought the Bengal Tenancy Bill for the same reason. In the Punjab they would not allow the Moneylenders' Bill to go through. It was passed due to the competition between two groups of exploiters, not due to any love for the peasantry. The whole history of legislation would show that all that benefits the workers and peasants was opposed and if passed it was due to the pressure of the movement outside or by the opposition of the landholders to the industrial bourgeoisie and their mutual rivalries.

The conclusion from the ten years' experience of the Constitutional Dictatorship and the use made of it by the Indian bourgeoisie is this. The British bourgeoisie is not at all willing to allow its Indian competitor to use the political machine, the State, for its class aggrandisement, except in small matters. The Indian bourgeoisie has

tried with some success to directly increase its profits of industry and commerce by the aid of the Imperialist State. But the same bourgeoisie refused to allow the workers and peasants the right of political movement in order to further their own economic interests. They are told not to mix politics with economy. The workers' and peasants' earnings are subject to "economic laws" with which politics should not be mixed up. But when the bourgeoisie and land-owners are hit by the same economic laws they want to use the State to protect their class interest. Both the Imperialist and the Indian bourgeoisie unite in protecting their economic interests by politics and prove the Marxian proposition that "politics is a concentrated expression of economy." The success of Indian Capitalism, however, was very poor. When the temporary policy of encouragement was abandoned by the British bourgeoisie in 1927, the Indian bourgeoisie transferred its economic struggle from the Assembly floor to the world outside. It wanted to use the revolutionary forces of the workers, peasants and petty bourgeoisie against the growing pressure of Imperialism and to wrench some concessions for itself. The organisational expression of the bourgeoisie in the struggle is the Indian National Congress.

(87) The economic struggle even of the bourgeoisie necessarily becomes political - examples of the control of the Imperial Bank & Chartered Bank -

deposits policy - refusal of further liberali-
sation of the Dictatorship forces the bourgeoisie
into opposition.

The defenders of Imperialism tell the intellectual defenders of Indian Capitalism to learn to stand on their own legs and not to rely so much on Government help. Why should not the Indian capitalists mobilise the resources of India and build industries of their own and compete with the foreign bourgeoisie? Why should they ask for protection from the Dictatorship, when they know that they are not going to get it? Why should they not build their own ships, their own banks on the moneys of their own countrymen and oust the foreign competitors? These are the typical questions put to the middle class patriots who fight for "Indian" industrial development. In the first place it is a general proposition proved by history that in no country has capitalist economy developed with full force without the bourgeoisie possessing the political power. The State is an indispensable instrument for that class which wants to build its economy, and India is no exception to this rule. Whatever capitalist development has taken place has come about in spite of and against the desire of Imperialism. But a further development is impossible without the "constitutional dictatorship" of Imperialism being converted into a constitutional dictatorship of Indian Capitalism. For

example, we can take the field of banking. Industrial development in the present period means long term credits at cheap rates of interest supposing for a moment that other favourable factors are existing. Long term credits for Indian industries means a high development of centralised banking facilities under the control of the Indian bourgeoisie. It is also necessary for financing of the trade in such a manner that it operates to the benefit of the Indian industry. Can the Indian bourgeoisie do without political power in this field? Take the Imperial Bank of India. It is constituted by an Act of the Legislative Assembly and is an accredited receiver of Government revenues which it holds as deposits. Thus the State here acts directly as the customer of the bank - a customer, whose operations total more than the operations of all other customers. The deposits of the Imperial Bank are one-third of the total deposits of all the joint stock and exchange banks in India. Its total deposits in 1928 were Rs. 79.25 crores. The deposits in the biggest bank of the Indian bourgeoisie, the Central Bank of India, are only Rs. 18.55 crores. Whence did the Imperial Bank get such a large amount? Its public deposits were only Rs. 7.64 crores while as a treasury holder of the Government it carried Rs. 71.30 crores so that when there was a run on the Central Bank it had to take assistance from the Imperial Bank. Who controls the Imperial Bank? The British

Imperialist Dictatorship. How does the control affect the Indian bourgeoisie? It is reflected in the following table:-
(The Central Banking Inquiry Committee Report page 575.)

<u>Deposits</u>		<u>Lacs</u>
Non-Indian current accounts		564
Non-Indian Fixed deposits		<u>264</u>
	Total	828
Indian current account		1732
Indian Fixed account		<u>2149</u>
	Total	3881
<u>Advances</u>		
Non-Indians		1170
Indians		3038

The table shows that while the British bourgeoisie deposits Rs. 828 lacs, with the bank, it gets advances of Rs. 1170 lacs. - 41.4 per cent more than what it deposits. In the case of the Indian bourgeoisie, when it deposits Rs. 3881 lacs, it is advanced Rs. 3038 lacs - 14 per cent less than what it deposits. If we calculate this difference on the fixed deposits, the advances to the British bourgeoisie are 436 per cent of its fixed deposits while those of the Indian bourgeoisie are only 141 per cent. In the evidence given before the Banking Inquiry Committee, it was shown that the bank insures its properties and mortgages with British and other foreign banks, it opens branches in

competition with the Indian banks and captures customers by giving loans on lower rates to kill the competing banks and raises them when the competitor is wiped out. Though it has got Indian directors on the Management Board, yet its bureaucratic machinery being controlled by Europeans, the day to day custom of the bank operates in favour of British business. The majority of the shares of the bank are held by the British bourgeoisie - 284 lacs - as against the Indian capitalists' shares - 278 lacs. (Report C.B.I. Committee page 574). No bank of the Indian bourgeoisie can beat the credit of the Imperial Bank with its huge Government balances of over 70 crores. Naturally the only way in which the Indian bourgeoisie can get hold of its power is to get a complete possession of the State. Hence the struggle for the Imperial Bank becomes a political struggle. One more example. The whole of the export import trade is in the hands of the exchange banks, nearly all of which are foreign. The most powerful of them, the five Anglo-Indian banks, are led by the Chartered Bank of India, Australia and China. The bank is not like the other banks. It operates by a Royal Charter, the latest of which was renewed in 1927 for thirty years. "In China the bank has direct representation at the leading Treaty ports, including Shanghai, Tientsin, Hankow, Canton while in Hongkong its status is such that it is permitted to issue notes up to 30 million dollars." ("The Statist" - 9th November 1929 -

International Banking Section - page 716). This bank has also controlling interest in the P. & O. Banking Corporation which again has the controlling share in the Allahabad Bank. Can a bank which has political voice directly in the Chinese ports and controls the currency of one of them be overthrown in its trade supremacy, without seizing political power, by its competitors - the Indian bourgeoisie? So the economic struggle against the exchange banks becomes a political struggle which is not localised to the Indian soil alone. The political struggle of the Indian bourgeoisie against them has to be linked up with and becomes a part of the Chinese struggle also. The struggle of the Indian bourgeoisie against Imperialism is now-a-days carried on so very plainly and openly in terms of banks, trade and currency, that it is needless to show further examples illustrating our principle that its political struggle is essentially an economic struggle and that the latter to be successful can not be limited to economic competition but has to be waged against the political dictatorship as such.

It has already been shown that the Indian bourgeoisie has failed to gain anything notable by agreeing to work the constitutional machinery of the Dictatorship. We have also seen that even when the Dictatorship was not giving the Indian bourgeoisie "equal partnership" in the profits of exploitation, the most radical section of it, the Swarajists, never tried to work the same constitution of

the Dictatorship in favour of the workers and peasants but rather against them. In all tenancy legislations the feudal landlords and the Swarajist bourgeoisie have opposed liberal existence to the peasantry.

When the Dictatorship refused to liberalise its constitution further in favour of the Indian bourgeoisie in such a manner that it can have "the right to discriminate" against the giant of British finance and give thorough protection to the dwarfish Indian bourgeois finance, the bourgeoisie went to the masses and threatened a revolution against Imperialism.

(88) Does it then lead to the revolution? - the idea of bourgeois independence - Canada and Britain as examples - is separatism a mere sentiment or a material objective necessity?

In order to give a successful and powerful threat, the bourgeoisie is forced to rouse the working-class and peasantry and to organise them for the threat. It calls upon the peasantry to fight for independence from British Imperialism so that the Indian masses may be freed from poverty and slavery. Is this not a sufficient reason for us to cooperate with the Indian bourgeoisie in an anti-Imperialist struggle? If the interests of Indian bourgeoisie are fundamentally opposed as shown above to those of Imperialism and if it has failed to achieve its interests

through a constitutional agreement and if as a result of it, it is going to the country for support in a political struggle, is it not sufficient to show that it is the leader of the revolutionary struggle and that the bourgeois struggle is ultimately in the interest of the whole country irrespective of classes? Because after all a development of the Indian bourgeoisie means the development of the productive forces of the whole country. The communists also desire the development of productive forces. There is also the complaint that British Imperialism does not develop the productive forces of the country. It is not then clear that the communists should lead the workers and peasants in the revolutionary struggle, not in opposition to the bourgeoisie but in cooperation with it. Why then should they shout in season and out of season against the Indian bourgeoisie? You may shout simply, "Down with Imperialism" but why with "Down with Capitalism"? The Prosecution in this case and some of our anti-communist co-accused also have picked up this argument and have held us before the people as rabid anti-nationalists because we oppose the Congress and its bourgeois leaders.

Is it absolutely necessary that anti-Imperialist struggle has to be a struggle for independence - independence in the sense of complete separation from the Empire? The realist spokesmen of the bourgeoisie do not admit that it must be so. The question of independence has to be viewed

by the bourgeoisie and by us also from the point of view of the concrete material development of the country. The sentimental factor has very little place in the final outcome of the struggle. It serves only as an ideological incentive to rouse the forces. What after all is the difference between the status of Great Britain, France and Germany on the one hand and that of Canada, Australia on the other? The former are independent sovereign States and the latter are dominions. What is the difference in their status? Canada is within the Empire but raises a tariff wall against British goods, maintains a Consulate in U.S.A., signs separately all the agreements of the League of Nations, has a navy and an army. When England was in need of men and money in the Greeco-Turkish War, Canada refused to be a party to the war against Turkey when requested by Lloyd George to send men and money to help Greece. As regards capital investments the American share in Canada is greater than that of England. So though not separated, yet is she not independent of the Empire?

D/27.11.31

Morning 1st Part.

Take Germany. She is an independent sovereign State, but is mortgaged to the capitalism of the Allied countries and all her economic life is at the mercy of America. Then take even England, "the most independent State." Though a victorious Imperialism, having the largest colonial possessions, yet as a result of the economic crisis she has become a colony of America, not theoretically but in practical politics. In order to stabilise her currency and economy, England had to change its Labour Party Government and instal the National Government at the bidding of the U.S.A. financiers. An ex-minister of this "most sovereign State" after the fall of the Government declared, "We were told that the country would not have Russian Dictatorship, German Dictatorship or for that matter even the Dictatorship of the British Trade Union Council; but the so called National Government is apparently prepared to accept the dictatorship of the American Banks at the cost of the British working class." The Daily Herald, the organ of Labour Imperialists wrote, "Where is the patriotism, we may ask, in allowing the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to dictate as a condition for a further credit to the Bank of England, the policy to be pursued in relation to the unemployment benefit? This is not patriotism but acceptance of the dictatorship not even of the British Bank but of

foreign finance. It is a blow to British prestige equalled only in recent history by the terms of the Versailles Treaty ----- . Sterling may recover, the Banks of America and France may rally to the aid of Lombard Street, but more is at stake than the credit of the Banks." (September 1931). More is at stake and that is the sovereignty of British Imperialism. Neither is this sovereign independent State in a position to levy its own tariffs without being challenged by another capitalism just as the Indian bourgeoisie cannot raise a tariff without opposition from the British bourgeoisie. When the British industrialists proposed to levy tariffs, the French Government threatened intervention, although in a very polite language, because had it not a control in British affairs because of the help of French Banks in the crisis? The Imperialist robbers guard each other's thin coating of sovereignty, even when exploiting each other, in order that the revolutionary masses should not be severed from their ideological mooring to the Imperialist class State and its all powerful sovereignty. Therefore, as the news says, M. Rollin, the French Minister of Commerce, approached a representative of the Board of Trade and expressed the view of the French Government an imposition of customs duties for the purpose of remedying the adverse balance of trade would constitute an infringement of the elementary rights of the countries engaged in normal economic relations." (Times of India

foreign finance. It is a blow to British prestige equalled only in recent history by the terms of the Versailles Treaty ----- . Sterling may recover, the Banks of America and France may rally to the aid of Lombard Street, but more is at stake than the credit of the Banks." (September 1931). More is at stake and that is the sovereignty of British Imperialism. Neither is this sovereign independent State in a position to levy its own tariffs without being challenged by another capitalism just as the Indian bourgeoisie cannot raise a tariff without opposition from the British bourgeoisie. When the British industrialists proposed to levy tariffs, the French Government threatened intervention, although in a very polite language, because had it not a control in British affairs because of the help of French Banks in the crisis? The Imperialist robbers guard each other's thin coating of sovereignty, even when exploiting each other, in order that the revolutionary masses should not be severed from their ideological mooring to the Imperialist class State and its all powerful sovereignty. Therefore, as the news says, M. Rollin, the French Minister of Commerce, approached a representative of the Board of Trade and expressed the view of the French Government an imposition of customs duties for the purpose of remedying the adverse balance of trade would constitute an infringement of the elementary rights of the countries engaged in normal economic relations." (Times of India

19.9.31). Thus the independence of Germany is dependent on France and England and the independence of England and France is dependent on U.S.A. economically and politically though theoretically all of them are quite separate from each other. The theoretical existence of Canada within the Empire harmonises completely with its political and economic independence from the Empire and a concrete existence within the American Empire. The theoretical independence of Germany, England, Belgium etc. harmonises completely with their concrete and practical subjection to the Dictatorship of American finance. When such is the case the continued insistence on the right to separate or the actual separation from the Empire is reduced to a mere sentiment when read in terms of the Indian bourgeoisie or the Congress. Because you may separate from the Empire and yet be subject to the British Bank credits, or you may remain within the Empire and yet have the right of tariffs, your own army and navy, your own banks etc, by mutual compromise and adjustment. Therefore, the Indian bourgeoisie reduces its anti-Imperialist struggle into one for Dominion Status and the Congress reduces its anti-Imperialist struggle for independence to one for "substance of independence". Independence and Dominion Status in terms of the bourgeoisie are equivalent terms, provided the economic substance with its concomitant political superstructure is given into its hands.

The bourgeoisie is thoroughly right in this view. The world wide development of modern capitalist Imperialism is internationally so interdependent that "absolute separation" and absolute independence of one bourgeoisie from another is not at all possible. Every bourgeois sovereignty in external relations is a limited sovereignty and in the modern epoch of Imperialism, even internal bourgeois sovereignty has become limited. In all practical working, the modern independent bourgeois States are one world's State, with an extremely sensitive interdependence. In the pre-Imperialist epoch the independent bourgeois State had the independence to develop the productive forces of its own country, to appropriate in a sovereign manner all the exploited surplus values produced by workers and peasants, and the power to resist by force the encroachment of another bourgeoisie. In the Imperialist epoch with the system of international investment of capital irrespective of political boundaries of independent States the former economic content of absolute independence is lost. So what remains now is the possession of the machinery of force by a bourgeoisie which if independent can use it in order to smash the productive forces of another, if they are getting stronger or to resist the others' attack, if its own development, its own appropriation of the producers' wealth is becoming a danger to another. Thus the bourgeois struggle for independence becomes a struggle, in the modern

The bourgeoisie is thoroughly right in this view. The world wide development of modern capitalist Imperialism is internationally so interdependent that "absolute separation" and absolute independence of one bourgeoisie from another is not at all possible. Every bourgeois sovereignty in external relations is a limited sovereignty and in the modern epoch of Imperialism, even internal bourgeois sovereignty has become limited. In all practical working, the modern independent bourgeois States are one world's State, with an extremely sensitive interdependence. In the pre-Imperialist epoch the independent bourgeois State had the independence to develop the productive forces of its own country, to appropriate in a sovereign manner all the exploited surplus values produced by workers and peasants, and the power to resist by force the encroachment of another bourgeoisie. In the Imperialist epoch with the system of international investment of capital irrespective of political boundaries of independent States the former economic content of absolute independence is lost. So what remains now is the possession of the machinery of force by a bourgeoisie which if independent can use it in order to smash the productive forces of another, if they are getting stronger or to resist the others' attack, if its own development, its own appropriation of the producers' wealth is becoming a danger to another. Thus the bourgeois struggle for independence becomes a struggle, in the modern

Imperialist epoch, to obtain freedom to develop a strong machinery of force on the basis of which to create or preserve its International share of the wealth expropriated from the workers and peasants. Absolute and complete economic financial independence is an impossibility for any bourgeois State because in all essence its whole fabric is a part of world finance. Hence the demand of the bourgeoisie and the Congress for "equal partnership", "for substance," meaning thereby a satisfactory share in the exploitation. It is not insisting on complete independence, it does not just now feel the necessity for independence to build its machinery of force because it has nothing to preserve or increase as its share of the international loot. It is quite prepared to leave the external relations and the army to the Imperialist partner, and for the present take the limited economic substance. Thus the bourgeois demand for independence is bound to become one for Dominion Status when it comes to actualities.

(89) The nature of workers' and peasants independence as found in our programmes - can we not postpone the class struggle for a time till we have overthrown Imperialism - there is no rule for bourgeois development like that of England or Japan for our bourgeoisie - hence the class struggle is forced to the front.

But such is not the case with the demand of the

revolutionary parties of the working class and peasantry. (Exh: P 135). They have no interest in the financial partnership with the international bourgeoisie, because the one is exploited by the other. There cannot be a partnership between the exploited and the exploiters. The revolutionary struggle of the working class and peasantry necessarily means stopping the loot of the Imperialist bourgeoisie from India, expulsion of its bureaucracy and overthrow of its militarism. The working class has no profits to share by participation in world finance, hence its separation is real and revolutionary. Our demand for independence amounts to negation of all exploitation and therefore does not degenerate into one for Dominion Status. Our struggle therefore necessarily includes a struggle for Soviet Democracy. Soviet Democracy is incompatible with bourgeois democracy. Hence separation is the natural resultant.

The attainment of Dominion Status by the bourgeoisie in the present epoch of the decline of capitalism is an impossibility. Dominion Status means giving to the colonial bourgeoisie a share in the profits and freedom to develop. Can a losing concern allow its trade to go into the hands of a subordinate for the simple demand of it? Dominion Status to the Indian bourgeoisie will lose British Imperialism 1/5th of its national savings and will give birth to a possible competitor, adding to its already existing

difficulties. British Imperialism is not in that rich position now when it could allow Canada, Australia, U.S.A. to develop independently and kick at the mother country.

This uncompromising attitude of Britain forces the Indian bourgeoisie to assume revolutionary airs, to threaten mass action and talk of independence in order to increase "its bargaining power". It does not take to revolutionary action even for its class gains like that of U.S.A. in the 18th century for two reasons. It is economically weak and is itself closely interlinked with British concerns. Secondly, even to attain Dominion Status, if it is compelled to organise the revolutionary forces it is afraid to do it, because in the present epoch of proletarian revolutions, whenever the bourgeoisie for its class gains puts the workers and peasants on to revolutionary action, it is turned into a class struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and Imperialism together. It happened like that in China, in Java etc. So the Indian bourgeoisie is afraid to go to the masses and enlist their revolutionary support as did the American bourgeoisie against England.

We have already seen that the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie are contradictory to those of Imperialism, that the uncompromising attitude of Imperialism forces the bourgeoisie into opposition but for fear of the workers' and peasants' Revolutionary class struggle and its own economic

weakness, it cannot support revolutionary action. Even if the bourgeoisie is not really fighting for independence but is only showing some opposition still, for the sake of united front, why should we not restrain the workers and peasants from pursuing an immediate class struggle? (Exh: P 1373(19)). Let us first do away with Imperialism, then in our own home we may fight our own internal feuds if there are to be any. Even strategically for the Communists it is better to have one enemy at a time. Grow first like Japan, the great Asiatic power. Then if capitalism does fail, if our special Indian culture does not succeed in evolving a better society, we may think of becoming like Soviet Russia. Why not postpone the class struggle for the time being? Let the Congress and Communists, Mahatmites and Marxists unite against the satanic Government, is the advice of the nationalist petty bourgeoisie to us. And the Public Prosecutor in this case made it something of a grievance that we did not accept this advance.

This call of the bourgeoisie for all class unity makes a powerful appeal to the masses and some sections of the petty bourgeoisie. The working class and peasantry being still under petty bourgeois illusions, listen to this all-class-unity appeal very seriously. When the revolutionary Communists have exposed the hollowness of the plea they have been shouted down by the petty bourgeois intellectuals. The bourgeois argument is very simple and therefore

more dangerous requiring an exposure showing how the world conditions of capitalist economy leave no room for the development of capitalism, for that type of revolutionary growth of the bourgeoisie, which built England, Germany, U.S.A. and Japan. The present conditions of world economy inevitably force the class struggle to be conducted jointly with the anti-Imperialist national struggle. The present conditions of world proletarian movement govern the forms of our two-fold struggle. The programme of the Communists in India is evolved out of the compelling forces of world economy and the place of the Indian inside it. The programme of the C.P.I. is the only programme that can lead the Indian masses out of the present blind alley of capitalism. The programme of the Indian bourgeoisie has to surrender to ours because it cannot solve the Indian problem at all.

Section 3 - Paras 90 - 100

(90) The bourgeois programme regarding removal of the poverty of the masses - the main points of the problem - the drain of wealth - high land revenue - debts - absence of rural banking - adverse currency. (Some of our viewpoint on this: in P 135).

The capitalist economy of India is a part of world economy and is influenced by it. The programme of the Communists receives its shape mainly from the conditions of

Indian capitalist economy and is influenced by world conditions to the extent that the operations of capitalism and hence of the class struggle are International (which would further explain the question of International relations of the Proletarian parties). There would have been no reason for us to congratulate the Chinese Revolution (Exh: P 1381) or condemn the Sacco-Vanzetti Case (Exh: P 2311) had it not been that the capitalism of both the countries affects our struggle.

I.H.K.

27/11/31 (Morning Part II).

We can not think of India as an isolated chamber. The Indian National Congress and the bourgeoisie are not absolutely blind to this fact. But they are incapable of assessing its full import and hence even from the point of view of the bourgeois struggle commit mistakes. We shall therefore see how our programme supercedes that of the Indian bourgeoisie (which will explain incidentally our resolutions before the A.I.C.C. which have been put into exhibit) and is vindicated by the actual needs of the situation and its development.

The Indian bourgeoisie posing as the leader of the peasantry moans over the appalling problem of their poverty and proposes to fight for them and remove their poverty. The Communist Party also fights for the peasantry in order to free it from poverty. There is not a single writer of the bourgeoisie in India who does not say that that is the most urgent problem of the Indian situation. The agents and intellectual representatives of the British Imperialist Dictatorship also admit it even though they try to underestimate it a great deal. The Montague-Chelmsford Report in 1918 said, "it is evident that the curb of wealth descends very steeply and that enormous masses of the population have little to spare for more than the necessities of life" (page 87). Twelve years later the Simon Report

said the same thing "The ordinary cultivator on his tiny plot is still a man of few resources, with small means for meeting his limited needs" (page 19). So all are very anxious to remove the poverty of the teeming millions. The Dictatorship has no specific programme for them. But the Indian bourgeoisie has one on which it bases all its propaganda, to capture the peasant masses for its own class gain. The premises for the programme of the Indian bourgeoisie which is always put before the peasantry (and against which we put our own) are: (1) the foreigners drain 195 crores of rupees from India making "us all" poor to that extent; (2) the foreign Government takes a very high land revenue and ruins the peasantry; (3) the land revenue and other burdens of taxation throw the peasantry into debts; (4) Government does not assist rural banking and therefore the peasant can not get capital to increase the productivity of his land; (5) Government reduces peasant's return of his price of crop by adverse dislocations of currency. This affects not only the peasantry but the whole country. These points you can find in the bourgeois nationalist literature in India. The peculiarity of these points is that they nowhere mention what is the relation of the bourgeoisie and the landlords to the peasants economy. The whole issue of peasant poverty is shifted on to the shoulders of the British Dictatorship and the question of classes inside the country is hushed up. However, we

take the bourgeoisie at its own words and give the intellectual petty bourgeoisie the credit of revolutionary honesty and suppose for a moment that it does succeed with the aid of the peasantry in the anti-Imperialist struggle. To what extent is the problem of peasant poverty solved thereby? The bourgeoisie is everywhere the same in its class role. All the capitalist countries have got "their own rule" that is of their bourgeoisie. Does that their own rule solve the problem of peasantry there? It does not. The same indebtedness, the same starvation is found there also.

The drain of 195 crores of rupees is composed of several items and goes out of India in several ways. Will the expulsion of Imperialism alone return these 195 crores to the peasantry, the workers or even the petty bourgeois middle class? The British bourgeoisie draws this wealth by means of trade, interest on loans, pensions of its bureaucracy sent to India, currency manipulations etc. The installation of the Indian bourgeoisie in power will only mean a diversion of trade into the hands of the Indian bourgeoisie. Trade as such, export or import, does not stop. The sale of British goods to the peasantry will be substituted by the sale of goods of the Indian bourgeoisie. Thus the bulk of the 195 crores will be still accumulated and drained. Only the pool will be held by the Indian bourgeoisie instead of the British. Cotton will be bought from the peasants in the same way as it is today. Only the

profits of discounting its bills on the foreign export market will be taken by the Indian exchange banks instead of the foreign. The Indian bourgeoisie describes this process as "retention of the wealth inside the country." It may be retained inside the country. There is much food locked inside the earth also. The main question is does it reside inside the vast masses of the peasantry? It does not by any means. The stoppage of the drain reduces the "poverty" of the Indian bourgeoisie only and not of the masses.

The nationalist bourgeoisie bids for the support of the peasantry on the slogan of the reduction of land revenue. The total land revenue demand of the British Dictatorship to finance its machinery of force and its other activities is about 35 crores for the last ten years. (35.68 crores in 1927-28). This is 16 per cent of the total taxation. The sum appears to be staggering but not so as the percentage. In fact the total percentage of land revenue to total taxation has been falling for some years, when in those very years the nationalist bourgeoisie was clamouring against excessive land revenue rates. In the recent years the struggle of the Bardoli peasants is the ideal epic of the peasantry, by singing which the bourgeoisie wants to hold the leadership of the masses. But the problem of land revenue is not a problem of its ratio to the total taxation, of the country. Mahatma Gandhi may demand reduction of the

land revenue by half as a sign of Swaraj. But such a reduction not only by half but even by three-fourth is not going to benefit much the vast masses of the peasantry nor is it going to reduce its debt problem. Its excessive rigour is not its absolute amount but its relation to other factors. Land revenue can not be considered apart from the question of the whole peasant problem. It is indispensably related to (a) the capitalist exchange market and money rent; (b) the fragmentation and low size of holdings; (c) the rental demand and tenures; (d) indebtedness; (e) the general crisis of capitalism. It is for these reasons that in our programme we do not solely insist on the reduction of land revenue. (Vide the W.P.P. Manifesto on Bardoli Ex. P). Our demand in relation to the peasantry has to be taken up as a whole. Our programme has been brought several times before the Indian National Congress but it has been all along rejected by it. That our programme is now attacked by the Prosecution in this case and is held before the country as one that will ruin the peasantry rather than improve its condition.

(91) The state of the Punjab peasantry as an example -
what does increased productivity lead to ?
economic holdings will only displace two million
peasants in the Punjab - where to find place for
them ?

As an illustration of our programme we may take the

state of the Punjab peasantry (our efforts at the Lyallpur Conference). The reason for taking the Punjab as a first illustration is that it is adored as an ideal land of peasant proprietors. It grows high price crops. It enjoys a good climate and a fertile soil. The land revenue is paid direct to the Government unlike the U.P. where it is paid to the semindars. The whole land is watered by rivers and canals. It grows good wheat and cotton and it is praised by both Imperialism and the national bourgeoisie because its people are daring and migrate to other lands, join the army and relieve the pressure of population on land. In such conditions, we ought to have found the peasantry free from debts, owning tolerably good holdings, without fragmentation and people covered with gold. But actually we find that (1) 83 per cent of the proprietors are in debt, the debt of the tenants is heavier, (2) the total agricultural debt of the province is 135 crores or 33 times the annual land revenue. (Page 56, Report of the Central Banking Inquiry Committee). (3) Annual interest charges amount to over 34 crores or nearly 8 times the total land revenue of the province. When the intellectual representatives of the bourgeoisie discuss the causes and the remedies of indebtedness, they agree almost on all points with the British bourgeoisie and the Government. Both the Indian and British bourgeoisie blame the peasantry for extravagance in marriage and death ceremonies. Both

blame them for litigation. Both curse them for not seeing the advantages of cooperatives. Both want to whip them into increased effort and productivity. The peasant's pseudo liberators tell the world that he sits idle for six months. All pray to heaven that he may be liberated from debt and while praying they carry in their pockets the peasant's mortgage deeds, and almost every street paper contains unstinted abuse of the moneylenders. We view the result of these remedies as follows. You want increased production. Supposing it is obtained where you will sell it? Our bourgeoisie is sorry for the low productivity per acre in India and wants scientific cultivation to be increased. The yield of wheat per acre in India as compared with the wheat producing countries in the other parts of the world shows the following results :-

Maunds per acre

India	
U.P. Irrigated	12.2
U.P. Unirrigated	8.2
U.S.A.	10.7
France	13.0
Canada	13.2
Germany	17.5
Great Britain	22.5

(Figures as given in the paper read by the Director of Agriculture in U.P., Mr. George Clarke, at the Indian Science Congress held at Allahabad in January 1930). The figure

of 8.2 is the yield per acre of unirrigated land in the U.P. The irrigated yield is 12.2. In 1927-28, the area under irrigation was 12 per cent of the total cropped area (vide "India" 1928 page 111). If we take the above two figures as normal yields over the whole country, the average production comes to 8.68 maunds per acre. Supposing our bourgeois and landlords succeed in raising the production - which of course they can not - to the British point, to 22.5 maunds per acre and also the other countries were to join in the race, we shall get the total world production of 292.2 million tons, while the present approximate world production is 130 million tons (1930). We have seen for the last two years that under the present property relations of capitalist society even these 130 million tons could not find buyers. Millions of bushels are lying in the fields in Canada because the price does not cover even the cost of moving the crops from the field. In Ottawa they burn wheat in the locomotives instead of coal. If capitalist relations are to remain the same how can production be increased to 292 million tons? The whole bourgeois world is issuing mandates to curtail production and not to increase it. The bourgeoisie argues that if increased production can not be disposed of do not do it; but that each peasant should increase the productivity per head. In other words it means rationalisation of agriculture by reducing the number of cultivators per acre. What does it

mean in the case of the Punjab? There are 29 million acres under cultivation with 4,031,000 cultivators. The average holding is thus 7.2 acres. It requires 15 acres to keep one plough and a pair of bullocks engaged without waste of energy either of the peasant or his instruments. So in order to give minimum living to the four million cultivators either two millions will have to be expelled from the Punjab or the cultivated area will have to be doubled. Under the present capitalist relations neither is possible, because there is not industrialisation to absorb the two millions nor is there another 29 million acres that can be cultivated. If intense cultivation on the present acreage is to be practised in order to raise productivity - granting that by competition and tariff walls our bourgeoisie will find the markets - the new capital requirements in the form of manure, improved seed and tools will be so huge that no bank in India can undertake the task. For example the present plough of Rs. 7-8-0 to be converted into a better one, say the Meston plough, will cost Rs. 15/- that is a new total capital of Rs. 16.87 crores for the Punjab alone will be required. In Chhach where they have intense cultivation it requires from Rs. 100 to 270/- per acre for manure. Leaving aside such high specialisation, if Rs.10/- per acre are allowed ordinarily we shall require 29 crores for manure capital. How can a peasantry with a debt of 135 crores raise 46 crores more, when the whole world

bourgeoisie is not releasing its monopoly of wealth and the people have nothing to buy with?

(92) Moneylenders - rural banking is moneylending - our fundamental problem - who swallows the surplus ?

The propaganda of the Indian bourgeoisie against moneylenders is inspired from motives of profits rather than of sympathy for the peasantry. Its cure for the moneylenders is rural banking. What is rural banking if not moneylending? You may say the moneylender charges high interest, as much as 150 per cent per year, while the banks charge 12½ per cent. That the moneylender is a ruthless oppressor. Is the banking bourgeoisie less ruthless? The moneylender is his own bailiff while the polished bourgeois bank uses the bailiff of law. There is very little difference between the bank and the moneylender, so far as the peasant is concerned.

D/28.11.31

Morning 1st part.

The demand of rural banking is the demand of the city bourgeoisie to oust the moneylender and instal itself as the receivers of rent. The demand of rural banking is the demand of the Indian bourgeoisie to control the export of commodities at their source, to establish a monopoly of buying. It is a demand to reduce the price it has to pay for its raw material by operating upon the crops through its loan banks. It is a competition between the rural moneylending bourgeois who pockets a large part of the peasant's surplus and the city bourgeois who wants a share of it. It is only an attempt to transfer the indebtedness of the peasant from one section of the bourgeoisie to another. In their competition, the peasant for a time may gain a small reduction of interest, but when the deal between the two bourgeois sections is complete, the peasant will be thrown into the clutches of capitalist farming and the monopoly buyer even worse than today. Rural banking is the forerunner of the Wheat Pools on the Canadian model, that control the fate of the workers' price of bread and when the markets fall, squeeze the farmers out and^{tell} them to stop cultivation at the point of Martial Law if necessary. (The Central Banking Inquiry Committee has actually suggested the Canadian model for adoption in India, in paragraph 281). Moneylending or banking in agriculture is

only a form of investment of capital in agriculture and the expropriation of the peasant's surplus value production by the bourgeoisie does not cease, whether it is carried on by a limited Company of moneylenders, who never see the peasant or by a single moneylender who always hangs around him. The difference in the tortures inflicted by both is the difference between the death by the butcher's knife whose hand is visibly near and the death by the bullet whose shotsman hides in the polished chambers of a stone-building.

The conversion of the indebtedness of the peasantry standing at present at high rates of interest into one held by banks at low rates does not solve the fundamental problem of rural poverty (and therefore does not find mention in our programme). The fundamental problem is who steals the surplus of the peasant labour and how it is done. Only on the solution of this depends the solution of the agrarian problem. The expropriation of the peasant surplus is a problem of class struggle. In the vast rural masses of India a terrific class struggle is raging, the same class struggle which the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution and all agrarian revolutions of the world have expressed in direct form. We, Communists, do not create the class struggle in the peasantry. It is not imported from Moscow in a suit case nor conjured out of the works of Lenin. The class struggle is there embedded in

the capitalist system under which the peasantry in India is starving. The Punjab is said to be the most prosperous land, "the ideal land of peasant proprietors" and our agrarian programme (which was going to be put forth through the Lyallpur Conference, of which I was first elected the President) is one that arises directly from the demands of the peasantry even of this ideal land and is the only solution of the agrarian problem.

(93) Stratification of the peasantry - concentration of land in the hands of the rich owners - where is the lost purchasing power locked? - an example under Batai cultivation in Lyallpur.

In the Punjab we have come to a stage of very well marked stratification of the peasant proprietors. The concentration of land in the hands of big proprietors is proceeding fast and the rate of exploitation of the poor sections is so high that the stable class of middle peasantry is being gradually ruined. The percentage of small owners with barely a strip to cultivate can be compared with those who possess more of the land though they are few in number. It will reveal the growth of the parasitic class of land-owners developing in a province where land can be purchased and sold more freely than in the neighbouring province.

No. of owners	Percentage	Acre holding	% of the total land.
625400	17.9	Less than 1 acre	1
1428000	40.4	1 to 5	11
919000	26.2	5 to 15	26.6
434000	15.5	Above 15	61.3

The most intense class struggle is visible in these figures. Every peasant proprietor must have at least 15 acres of land to keep him alive the year round in times of normal prices. But 3/5th of them have not got more than 5 acres each while a tiny section - 15.5 per cent has more than enough and owns 61.3 per cent of the land. Do not those 28 lakhs of small proprietors desire to possess that huge tract of 18 million acres held by a few rich proprietors? They do. They hunger for land, free of burden, to cultivate and to live on. Those upper rich are also ready to give land to the hungry peasants but for a price - a price which "allows" starvation to the toiler in order to create riches for the rentier. Even then not all the parasites will give land. From the group of 168,000 owners owning between 25 and 50 acres, they refuse to give 609,000 acres for cultivation. From the group of 121,000 owners of over 50 acres who hold over 74 lakhs of acres they refuse the tenant 52 lakhs for cultivation. Is not then this parasitic class the cause of over population on fragments of holdings forcing ten lakhs of cultivators to starve with less than 1 acre per head? The nationalist bourgeois reformer praises the hard-working peasant on the small strip of land. "Eating barley that they may sell their wheat, grinding the seeds of their melons to mix with their flour and giving the rind to the cattle that nothing may be wasted, the Mehtons of Hoshiarpur and Jullundur are a remarkable example of what

can be achieved even upon the smallest holdings by industry and thrift," writes Mr. Darling and the Imperialists and the bourgeoisie applaud him. In Alipur 3 per cent of the owners own half the Tehsil leaving about 2 acres each for the remaining 97 per cent. The class struggle thus rages in all fury compelling the 97 per cent to seize the land of the 3 per cent. It does not require a Communist to tell them much about it.

It is one of the planks in the nationalist creed to idealise the poverty of the poor peasants and hold them back from the "satanic lures of the city". But as usual nationalism here also becomes a bundle of contradictions. If the peasant has a piece of land which cannot feed him well or keep him engaged, nationalism tells him to have supplementary cotton industry or a second string to his bow. This propaganda only serves to keep a large reserve of landless labour in the rural areas, to cheapen the wage rates for the benefit of the richer landlords. Then comes a second school which wants him to migrate, to be enterprising in order that he may earn wages outside and send his money to the village so that the land revenue may be paid, the moneylender satisfied and the danger of class struggle reduced. But capitalism refuses to absorb the increasing numbers of the pauperised peasantry. Imperialism, landlords and the rich rural bourgeois refuse to let him have better wages in the city and thus jammed between two,

the poor peasant oscillates between the town and country ever starving and waiting for a happier day. That day is when he overthrows the rich landlordism, tears off his mortgage deeds and papers and frees himself from the dictatorship. To this end he is driven by Imperialism and capitalism.

They say everything will be well with everyone, only if the purchasing power of the masses were to return to them or to increase. The bourgeois moans over columns of newspapers about the vanished purchasing power, as if he does not know where it has vanished. But Marxism locates the thief that steals it. It is the feudal capitalist and Imperialist system of property relations, that exist in India and in the world, that puts the purchasing power in the pockets of the robbers, This robbery is done skilfully under capitalism because it takes place under the cover of the money form of exchange. But in agriculture under the semi-capitalist feudal conditions it is vividly clear where the peasant purchasing power goes. The visible proof of it is found in the batai system of land tenure. A study of this system shows that even if he has a very economic holding, the tenant cultivator starves and is worse off than the labourer on the capitalist farm. (In our programme we ask for the abolition of this system). The Economic Board of Inquiry, Punjab, under the patronage of the Government maintains certain farm accounts of various systems of

tenure. Most of the farms are situated in the fertile Lyallpur colony area where splitting up of holdings into small pieces is prohibited. It is a district which has the highest average of cultivators holding above 25 acres. From the accounts published by the Board for 1926-27 we may take four estates (three from Lyallpur and one from Montgomery district) of acres 28, 228, 796 and 50 on which the crops did not fail and were more or less normal. All these were rented out on the batai system. The distribution to tenants was as follows :-

Estate No.

- | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1) of 28 acres | given to 1 tenant | giving him 28 acres for cultivation. |
| 2) of 228 " | " " 18 " | " each 12.66 " " " |
| 3) of 796 " | " " 40 " | " " 20 " " " |
| 4) of 50 " | " " 5 " | " " 10 " " " |

Thus every tenant had an economic holding to work upon. There is one peculiarity about no.3. It is that 500 acres of it were laid for tractor cultivation and preliminary ploughing was done with a tractor. The minute details about these farms can be found in the publication. The Board refuses to draw any conclusions as it is afraid of landing itself into the class struggle and perhaps becoming an "accused organisation" in the Meerut Case. The results worked out from the accounts show that the actual application of peasant labour produced per acre: Rs.50/-, 40/-, 59/-

and 38/- respectively. How was this produce shared under the batai system?

	Estates.							
	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%
Net income per acre	Rs.50	100	40	100	59	100	38	100
of which the Landlords took "	33	66	25	62.5	39	66	26	66
Tenants share "	17	34	14	37.5	20	34	12	34

In every case the landlord has taken nearly double the share of the tenant. But the real import of this can be grasped still further by the total incomes. The total net production was Rs.59,527. Out of this 4 landlords seized Rs.39,430 and 64 tenants were left with Rs. 20,097 for the whole year's work. The landlord took Rs. 9,857 per head and the peasant Rs. 314. When 64 peasants were producing values per day they were producing for each of the parasites Rs. 27/6/- per day and for themselves only 14 annas a head. Still more you have to consider the fact that the tenant had to find money for expenses of seed, revenue, water charges, etc for which he may have had to pay interest to the moneylender. The major part of the expenses are shared by the tenant and the percentages of earnings of both on expenses alone, apart from the fact that the tenant has contributed his productive labour, will show why money so feverishly rushes for investment in land.

Expenses per acre by the		Percentage return on expenses of the	
Landlord	Tenant	Landlord	Tenant
9- 1-0	24-11- 8	364	68
10- 2- 2	20-13-11	250	71
8- 4- 1	28- 0-10	487	71
6-12- 5	17- 8-10	371	87

This shows why every petty bourgeois with a few farthings tries to invest in land and not in industries or banks. The demand for land by the poor peasantry finding no outlet in industries and the high rate of exploitation of the labour of the tenant raises the price of the land continually. The intense exploitation shown above attracts the moneylender to invest his money and the city bourgeoisie yearns for rural banking in order to have a share in the loot.

I.H.K.

28/11/31 (Morning Part II).

The bourgeoisie sheds tears over the vanished purchasing power and says that the masses are poor and the reason it gives is that we are ground down by Imperialism. But that is only one cause according to us. A simple overthrow of Imperialism will not add to the 14 As. of the cultivator in the above example. Along with it the parasite landlord capitalist must vanish. A change in the social structure in the above example would mean raising of the 14 As. of the toilers purchasing power to Rs.2-10-0. The purchasing power will thus return.

(94) How landowners were imported in the colony to form a bulwark for Imperialism - their increasing numbers - cause of peasants' indebtedness - capitalist rule and break up of village communes into individual holdings - money rent.

The fallacy of the statement that prohibiting fragmentation of holdings (about which an attempt was made in Bombay by a Govt. Bill; vide W.P.P. activities) and keeping these new colony areas in big blocks of land will produce a happy class of peasant proprietors is proved by the fate of the Lyallpur Colony. The Imperialist Dictatorship in India sometimes appears as the champion of the peasantry and claims credit for the irrigation and colonisation of

the waste lands in the Punjab. But unfortunately the Dictatorship produces men who reveal its secrets. The nationalist bourgeoisie of the Congress also thanks the Dictatorship for irrigation or colonisation projects and is prepared to acknowledge the irrigation loans of the Dictatorship as a debt that can be justifiably borne by the working-class and peasantry in India. For were they not raised to benefit agriculture? But a member of the Dictatorship himself says the following about the opening of the canal colonies :- "It was thought that a moderate infusion of the capitalist element would strengthen the colony not only by providing natural leaders for the new society but also bringing in men of superior intelligence and wider outlook than the ordinary peasants." What happened to these natural leaders of superior intelligence? "They bring their lands much more slowly under cultivation, they quarrel with their sub-tenants. They dispute endlessly amongst themselves In the Lyallpur Colony of today few of the larger grantees reside on and never even visit their estates". (Darling's "Punjab Peasant"). The real purpose of the Dictatorship was not to bring land into better cultivation. It was to create a class, which, after bribery, would support it against the rising class struggle and the ambitions of the city bourgeoisie to get rid of the Dictatorship. "Where, too, in the Punjab, society is still semi-feudal in character there were obvious advantages in

propitiating the landed gentry with valuable grants of land; and the hope was cherished that it would do something to restore the influence of a class which has been seriously impaired by the rise to power of a prosperous and educated middle class in the towns." (Ibid page 137). Thus the irrigation schemes and vast debts to foster colonisation were actuated by a desire to stabilise a feudal landlord class as a support of the Dictatorship of Imperialism against the attempts at democratisation by the rising bourgeoisie. So here again as in the sphere of "constitutionalisation" of the Dictatorship by Mr. Montagu, Imperialism was raising a class to fight another class - a class war of reaction against progressive development. If the colony areas now we see a class war, it is a correction of the former retrograde process. However the hope of Imperialism is not yet completely smashed. In the struggle of 1930 when the city petty bourgeoisie and the workers and peasants threatened Imperialism, the Punjab landed gentry, "propitiated with valuable grants of land," resolved to stand by the Dictatorship and against the Congress and the Civil Disobedience Movement. The Imperialist Dictatorship threatened with a serious situation by the rapid expropriation of the peasantry pretended to save the peasants by the Punjab Land Alienation and other acts. But capitalist economy is superior to such aberrations of its own legal structure. The law only changed the label

of the peasant's exploiter - from non-agriculturist to agriculturist money-lender. The terrific rate of exploitation is creating rapidly a class of rentiers, who called themselves peasants. The area under tenancy is increasing. The ideal small proprietor is now the ideal toiling slave of one million parasites according to the 1921 census, who, 10 years ago, in 1911, were 626000.

Our attitude to this question including that of the moneylenders (as expressed in our platform and literature) differs radically from the bourgeois - Congress view, or even the view point of the so-called Punjab Socialist Party. It has been thoroughly demonstrated that the incidents of mortgage debts and peasant indebtedness began after 1860. Mortgages which in the early seventies had averaged only 15,000 a year, 20 years later (1888-93) averaged 20,000 and in 10 years the annual increase in the area under the mortgage rose from 165,000 acres (1875-78) to 385,000 (1884-88). Sir James Lyall, the then Lieutenant Governor wrote, "Under the influence of indebtedness and our present law and Civil Court Code Procedure, transfers of land were proceeding in all districts in an increasing ratio and in many with dangerous rapidity." The number of bankers and moneylenders, including their dependents, increased from 52,263 in 1868 to 193,890 in 1911. These facts are known to every bourgeois economist in India but being bourgeois they can not understand its significance. The official

spokesmen of Imperialism who have humanitarian feelings consider that the peasant was a stupid fellow who either was extravagant or indolent and therefore got into the hands of the moneylenders. Some of them say that the peace and security of British rule have enhanced his credit and prosperity. Those who are prosperous borrow because they have credit. The poor borrow because they are poor. The profound conclusion of such writers is that the reason why the two men became blind was because they lost their eyes! One lost it because he had an eye to lose and the other because he had already lost it. Our petty bourgeoisie content themselves by simply pointing out to the British rule.

The real cause is to be sought in the advent of the Dictatorship no doubt. But the real nature of it lies not in the fact that it is foreign, British or white but because it is a capitalist Dictatorship. Secondly, even if the British Dictatorship had not come, the Indian bourgeoisie would have been forced to do exactly what the British bourgeoisie did.

We have seen what the Czarist Minister Stolypin did after the Revolution of 1905 in Russia. He permitted the peasants in agricultural communes to separate themselves with their share of land, with the right to sell or purchase. The result was the growth of a rural bourgeoisie that became the supporter of Czarism and a pauperised peasantry that

went as workers to the towns. Was there any question of foreign rule there? None. Every capitalist economy has done it in every country. The British Dictatorship did it here also. Mr. Thornburn, who has studied the Punjab peasant economy well, noticed this feature but failed to understand its proper significance and after mentioning it degenerated into a sermoniser, over extravagance, credit etc. "In 1849-50 we converted collective into individual ownership of land plus the right to alienate it at pleasure. By so doing we made an unconditional gift of a valuable estate to every peasant proprietor in the Punjab and raised his credit from the former limit of the surplus of an occasional good crop to the market value of the proprietary right conferred. In one day the old order passed away and gave place to a new one, which imposed upon the yet unsophisticated Punjabi a responsibility to which he was unequal. To his delight and surprise he found that his former petty borrowing powers were now practically unlimited, his bania being ready to accommodate him to any extent." Divested of the sophisticated nonsense about responsibility, surprise, etc. what does the above proposition mean? It means that at first the collective agriculture was broken into one of individual private property holders. A process of class differentiation was started. But it is impossible to accentuate it without money economy, money rents. The fixity and security of British taxation

is often compared in glowing terms to the ruthless complete expropriation by the former Sikh rulers. But this fixity brings the peasants into the clutches of the capitalist market because the revenue and rental charge has been made a fixed charge in money on the peasants' production. Without the money rent, the right of alienation would not have led to rapid expropriation of the peasantry. Indebtedness, increasing mortgages and pauperisation of the poor peasants were born out of the introduction of capitalist economy into agriculture, which happened under the British rule but there is nothing "British" about it. The British Dictatorship did in the Punjab in 1849-50, what the Czar did in 1861 partially and in 1905 more thoroughly. The Prosecution, who charge us with copying Russian methods for the solution of the peasant problem would do well to note that they have been allies of the Russian hangman Stolypin long before we thought of becoming their executors to save the peasantry.

(95) Effect of money economy as we read it - crops brought under the rule of the capitalist exchange market - the demand for reduction of land revenue and its meaning.

What did the introduction of capitalist economy mean? It meant the break up of the stagnant economy of the feudal days; it had a progressive element inside it. Germs for such an introduction had ripened within the economy of the

commune villages. A growth of a rich peasantry as against the poorer one had been slowly developing though by periodical redistributions, the peaks used to be lopped off. The British rule simply broke up the shell of what had already ripened. The rich peasant was allowed to separate from the commune and its obligations, which many a time meant the payment of the share of taxes of the poorer one by the rich member. The opportunity to separate was "a delight and surprise" to the richer strata and not to the poorer. The separation and allotment of land-holdings took place according as they existed at the particular period, and even the poorer sections liked to hold land separately and break off hoping to see better days. With the break up of the communal agriculture, the men with little reserve borrowed to invest capital in instruments, cattle etc and the competitive struggle began. This by itself would have not meant much but for the introduction of money rent. The obligation to procure ready money to pay rent to the Government is a compulsion to bring crops on the exchange market. Submission of crops to the exchange market means enticement of village economy into the fluctuations and expropriations of the capitalist market and the consequent expropriation of the poor peasants who are "unsophisticated" so far in the knowledge of capitalist finance. The result is that in order to provide for cash money, the banker, moneylender, is sought after, who between him and the market wipes off

the whole of the peasant's surplus, compell him to sell out and become a worker in the towns or a field worker. Concentration of land and a growth of landed proprietors began.

This is an inevitable process under Capitalism and not a specific feature of the British Dictatorship. Every Capitalism has to find market for its goods in the peasantry. Ten richer peasants are better buyers than 50 pauper peasants in a commune (though one big landlord is not a better buyer on the whole than ten richer peasants).

D/30.11.31

Morning 1st Part.

Hence class differentiation has to be accelerated. Secondly the growth of the richer peasantry means sending out the poorer to the factories. Thirdly it means a better growth of commercial crops for the industries. All this is inevitably necessary for capitalism. It is necessary in order to develop the productive forces in capitalist society up to a stage.

The specific evil of the British Dictatorship is that it broke the old shell but did not provide the new one. On the contrary it reimposed a bit of the old broken piece on the new forces. It did not allow the Indian industries to develop, to absorb the ruined peasant or the artisan. While breaking the Commune and introducing money economy, it imposed the feudal landlords who held up capitalist competition in agriculture and thereby prevented the growth of the bourgeoisie. The specific destructive feature of British Imperialism lies in this. It generated all the human ranks for the growth of industry and capitalism, but suppressed the material forces for it.

The petty bourgeois parties in India not understanding the economy of capitalism adopt a reactionary Utopian outlook towards this question. Their analysis of causes being wrong, their remedies are wrong. They think the

peasant goes into debts over his marriages and pleasures. So they organise social reform circles and harangue about thrift, self-control and all the ancient fable about it. Not knowing the compulsion of capitalist economy they preach fantastic schemes of self-sufficing village units. In normal times they preach increased productivity. When confronted with a glutted market, they tumble into schemes of curtailment of production. They are sorry for the loss of purchasing power of the peasant and when shown vividly how it is pocketed by the parasitic landlord and rich peasant moneylender, they remember the rights of private property in land and the "due returns" of capitalism. For even a slightly more purchasing power, the poor peasant must be allowed to retain a portion of his produce on which alone he can become a customer for goods. To allow him to retain it means extinction of rent, i.e. landlordism, extinction of his debts and interest thereon. It leads to a revolutionary class struggle which may ultimately engulf the bourgeoisie also. So they abandon the class struggle against landlordism and moneylenders and ultimately end in vapoury schemes of village reconstruction and demand for reduction of land revenue only. How do we view the struggle for the reduction of land revenue? Reduction of land revenue by half is said to be one of the ingredients of Purna Swaraj. Landlords, rich peasants, poor peasants, big industrialists and small bourgeoisie all demand it.

The Communists also demand it. In each case the demand has a different class significance. In each period of agricultural development it carries a different economic significance. What does our demand mean in relation to that of others?

(96) The land revenue in India - The two systems - what does our support to the demand for reduction of land revenue mean?

The land revenue in India is a part of the surplus values produced by the peasant toiler and seized by the Imperialist Dictatorship for its maintenance. The operations undertaken to carry out the seizure assume many varied forms, whose sum total comprises all the systems of land tenure and land revenue codes. The dictatorship in some historical stage of the needs of its consolidation and development required allies. So it allowed a class of powerful brigands, who were for the time in possession of land and were pocketing the whole of the surplus values of the peasant, to retain a certain percentage for themselves in return for their uninterrupted support to the dictatorship against all attempts to overthrow or nullify it. Such agreements were principally of two types: One in which the dictatorship in a period when it had not yet the highly developed machine of bureaucracy or the complete bourgeois class sense, scenting the undeveloped productive forces agreed only to take a fixed sum for all time to come and

left the possessing brigands to do with the peasantry as they liked. That became the Permanently Settled Zamindari. Another type was that in which the dictatorship and the possessing brigands agreed upon a certain proportion to be shared by each from the receipts of the seizure of values produced by the peasant. The dictatorship reserved to itself the right of varying the amount of such total seizure but the shares of allocation of it between itself and its supporting class remained more or less fixed. That became Temporary Zamindari system. Under the first type falls 18 per cent of the total area and under the second 30 per cent. There is a third type of seizure and it is called the Ryotwari. In this the principle at the beginning was that the dictatorship would seize directly from the cultivator a part of his produce through its paid servants and would admit of no intermediary. These classifications are conventional and in the present stage of the development of the productive forces, of the class struggle and the national struggle they have lost their original content and form, as regards the relationship between the Imperialist State and the cultivator. Our bourgeois professors stick to these classifications because in the first place they are continued into the text-books of the educational system; secondly because it provides a good attractive ideological form for the class struggle between bourgeois economy and feudal relations which hinder its development. At the time

that these classifications came into existence, these forms of seizure had real meaning. The British Dictatorship did not employ its bureaucracy to regulate the amount or forms of seizure of the peasant produce by those whom it recognised as Zamindars. It was only concerned with what it received. In the permanently settled tenures it had no reason to inquire at all what happened to the actual toiler. In the temporarily settled, it only exercised a little supervision to see that it received a proper share. In the rayatwari it had a deal with separate, small or comparatively big holding peasants who were directly brought into contact with the bureaucracy of the dictatorship, in matters of the seizure of their produce. But as time passed by this had to change. The Zamindars, backed by the dictatorship and its machinery of force, seized all they could from the cultivators leaving them very little for their own feeding. The result was revolts, fall in production, and consequently an adverse effect on the British bourgeois profits. The dictatorship had to intervene and guarantee the cultivator a greater part of the produce for his needs so that he may produce more. In many cases the Zamindars squandered everything and the dictatorship undertook to manage their possessions by courts of wards. In the case of temporarily settled Zamindari as it prevails in Agra and Oudh where the dictatorship takes 45 per cent and the Zamindar 55 per cent of the total seizure of peasant

produce, it was impossible to ascertain the 45 per cent without knowing the full hundred per cent. Thus today under all the three systems of land revenue the dictatorship directly assists the seizure of the peasant produce. For example under the Zamindari, if the Zamindar's men fail to secure rents from the cultivator, the dictatorship at once appears on the scene with its courts issuing decrees, attachments, warrants etc. and its Police force executing them. Under rayatwari if the sub-tenant holding the land from the actual tenant (or khatedar) who has rented it from Government fails and refuses, the same process is carried out. It is also not true to say that under rayatwari there is no intermediary between the dictatorship and the cultivator. Where and as happens in most cases, the cultivator rents land from the original khatedars, he liable to the man from whom he rents the land. The only difference is that under Zamindari of the type in U.P. and Bengal the cultivator in every case has to deal with the Zamindar and the Government. While in rayatwari there is still a percentage of cultivators who are not yet ruined and made sub-tenants. They can deal directly with the Government. In Zamindari, in every case, the dictatorship has to share the loot with its ally, while in ryotwari it is not universal. But since in rayatwari also the extremely small holdings and the pauperisation of peasantry leads the peasants to become sub-tenants and to concentration of land

in the hands of rich farmers, moneylenders or bankers, we get everywhere in India a system which is more or less a Zamindari system. The three systems may be said to have resolved into two - permanently settled or temporarily settled Zamindaris. The classification made by Government from the point of view of sharers in the expropriation of the cultivator thus becomes faulty. The Punjab is put under temporary Zamindari. But there are small cultivators as are found in the rayatwari directly paying rent to the State. While in rayatwari there are millions of acres sublet by the owners, thus making the system what is generally understood as Zamindari. In fact if we take the loose sense of the term Zamindari - that is a system of cultivation in which the cultivator carries on cultivation with his own instruments and is compelled to pay rent to one or more super tenants or owners, who share it with the State - then probably 80 per cent of the cultivators live under Zamindari, under the direct subjection of landlords, khatedars, khots etc. Thus we can say that 8 out of every 10 cultivators are directly expropriated by a social parasitic class, apart from the fact that the State and the whole capitalist system rest over their head.

Viewed in this manner the struggle for reduction of land revenue is purely a reformist struggle, which ultimately promises no emancipation for the peasantry. When anyone whether under rayatwari or zamindari asks for a remission

of revenue or rent what does he ask for? That the dictatorship should reduce its share of the seizure of the peasant's produce. Since most of the cultivators' rental goes through intermediary, the benefit of the reduction of the revenue does not reach him for a long time while enhancement affects him at once. Secondly the expropriation of his surplus through rent does not vanish at all. The enhancement of land revenue becomes a serious danger only in cases where by a deliberate policy the small cultivators' minimum subsistence also is cut into by settlement officers proposing fanciful rates by looking to the high prices of certain products, as it happened in Bardoli. The struggle against enhanced land revenue when carried on by a small peasant is a struggle for guarding his minimum subsistence. The same struggle carried on by wealthy estate owners becomes a struggle for maintenance of their profits from rent. When we support such a general struggle, we in fact support the former, not the latter. Moreover we never support the struggle against land revenue as such. But it is always allied with other fundamental demands (vide the W.P.P. Manifesto on Bardoli in 1928). To take a concrete example from the Bardoli struggle which we supported wholeheartedly and about which evidence has been led in this case. There the Bombay Government increased the land revenue demand by 22 per cent on the previous settlement and the people refused to pay it. This refusal had different

meaning for different classes. For example take three cases out of the several mentioned by the Government Inquiry Committee, (page 19) whose report was accepted and approved by the Congress. A piece of land (1) 9 acres & 21 gunthas assessed at Rs.45.7 was rented to the cultivator at Rs.217-8-0 (2) 10 acres and 38 gunthas assessed at Rs.33-14 was rented to the cultivator at Rs. 248. The enhancement of 22 per cent means increase in the assessment by Rs.10/-. But now the peasant would not have to surrender only Rs.10/- more of his produce. The rentier landholder will not give up the ratio of his rent to that of the assessment; so he will insist on taking Rs. 266-8, an enhancement of Rs. 49. In the second case while the share of the dictatorship will increase by Rs. 7-8 that of the monopolist holder of the land will claim Rs. 54-8 more. So who will fight in the struggle against revenue enhancement more determinedly - the monopolist who lets out the land or the tenant cultivator? Of course the latter. When the big land-holders were compromising in the Councils over the question, it was the cultivators and tenants who starved themselves, suffered losses, disease and death at the hands of Police violence. All the landholders encouraged them from a distance and sent them a few pies for relief because the success in the struggle meant a successful continuance of the expropriation of Rs. 217 and 248 by the rentier landlord in the above instances. The one struggles for "existence",

for the protection of his starvation wages, the other applauds him for his own "parasitic existence". When we advocate a platform of peasant struggle, we not only fight against the expropriation by the dictatorship but also by the monopolist rentier.

I.H.K.

30/11/31 (Morning Part II).

(97) The class struggle inside the anti-Imperialist struggle in Bardoli - the Dublas and Dharalas - what it means in U.P. & Bengal? - rents and the feudal class - Indian bourgeois interest opposed to feudalism.

In that mighty struggle of Bardoli, there was also another chapter which was hidden from the eyes of the masses. There are thousands of landless workers who are literally slaves of the peasant families not only rich but sometimes of the ordinary type also. They are called Dublas. The Dubla is a slave who can be sold from one master to another. He has no separate independent existence, he is not a human being. He is entered into cost of production along with manure and bullocks. In the accounts of the farmer, depreciation is charged on him as they charge it on the plough or a tool. The Congress advocates before the Government Inquiry Committee vehemently pressed for determining the cost and depreciation of a Dubla. The Committee tried it and said, "It is a difficult matter to reduce that uncertain quantity, the Dubla to rupees and annas". In the evidence laid before the Committee by the Congress, rich farmers would come one after another and declare that their agriculture was in loss because "the Dubla had disappeared".

The Dubla, like the bullock, when under oppression, desires for freedom and simply runs away. When he does this, he is hunted out from village to village and all the farmers join in the chase and even the Imperialist machine aids in it. In order to take away from this hunt, the obliquy that is attached to the idea of "slave hunting" in the modern bourgeois times and in order to fool the world, every master puts a certain cash debt on the Dubla's head, labels him as an indebted person flying from his creditors and thus satisfies bourgeois conscience and culture, which gets eloquently indignant over slavery (have they not been taught to hate slavery in the textbook "Uncle Tom's cabin?"),, but aids in a hunt for the Dubla because his slavery is clothed in bourgeois terms of cash obligations. What interest has the Dubla to fight against the enhancement of land revenue? Nothing at all. With reduced profits, his fodder is reduced, but out of increased profits he will not get a single blade more. Yet in the whole campaign of the Bardoli struggle no one except us spoke for the liberation of the Dubla slaves. Yet the Indian bourgeoisie is not ashamed to clap its delegates when they thunder against slavery in the League of Nations. It is quite possible that individual farmers may be very kind to their Dublas, may even treat them as members of their own family. But such kindness can not take the place of emancipation. Thus within the anti-Imperialist struggle for reduction of

land revenue, there is a class struggle for the liberation of the Dublas. There is also a class struggle of the Kaliparaj villages against their landlords. When we support the Bardoli struggle we not only support the one against the enhanced land revenue but also the class struggle. The poor peasant of Bardoli who has a small holding and in some places also owns a Dubla toils as much heavily as his Dubla on his field. He is incited against us by the bourgeois rich farmer who tells him that we do not support his struggle against high land revenue but want to incite a fight between him and his Dubla. This is a piece of misrepresentation. We certainly do not tolerate the expropriation of the peasant's produce not only by the Dictatorship but by others also. At the same time we point out that the robbery of the small peasant by his rich lessee from whom he rents land is just as much to be overthrown as the exploitation of the labour of the Dubla by the peasant owners, small or big. Unless the toiling peasant recognises that this is so, he will not succeed against the Dictatorship. Unless the claims of the landless workers and even of the so-called criminal tribes like the Dharlas are not recognised, so long as they do not get the promise of land and freedom, they will not aid the small and middle peasants in their struggle against their expropriation by Imperialism.

The struggle against land revenue, i.e. the share of the Dictatorship in the peasants surplus becomes a genuinely anti-Imperialist struggle, in the case of the actual tenant or owner cultivators. But that same struggle when carried on under the feudal samindaris like those of U.P. and other places, becomes by the very nature of the system under which the Imperialist Dictatorship and its allied class expropriate, the peasants, assumes a double role. It seeks to overthrow both landlordism and Imperialism, because there the one is inseparable from the other. The estates of Agra and Oudh are vast plantations cultivated by peasants in small plots, working under semi-slavery conditions. Slavery is thousand times better than the life of the U.P. peasant, because a slave has at least to be fed by his master till he has not sold him. But here you are free peasants and nothing is yours. The whole province of Oudh is a vast colony of "free slaves" who are killed, beaten, dishonoured by the handful owners of the 260 estates. The Imperialist Dictatorship supports this class of brigands now called "Barons of Oudh" because as the Simon Commission observes, "The most powerful of the talluqdars own hundreds of villages and enjoy very large incomes. Their wealth, their social status and the control they exercise over their tenants give these 'Barons of Oudh', a position of very great influence in their areas." (Page 64). Their wealth arises from the robbery of the

peasants, their social status from the class rule of capitalism and feudalism and their control from the bayonets of the Dictatorship. A purely reformist struggle against land revenue in this area at once develops into a class struggle. Because here the Dictatorship is directly the force that guarantees the feudal rights of the samindars and is a cosharer with them. It guarantees to the feudal landlords, the strength of its machinery of force with whose aid, the barons expropriate the peasantry of all its produce. This brings us to one characteristic of the Zamindari System as it prevails in the U.P. and Bengal, and the other general type which we have already defined. The tenant in the Ryotwari areas of Bombay or the petty samindari areas of the Punjab leases land from a bigger landholder who receives a certain amount of rent, a fixed part of which he delivers to the State as land revenue. Here the tenant enters into a more or less bourgeois type of transaction unencumbered by any other personal obligation of custom or usage. But in the samindari areas under feudal conditions a tenant is burdened with feudal obligations which, though nominally declared illegal, continue to exist. (Vide Sir Malcolm Haily's speech in the U.P. Council). The cultivator is directly ruled by the samindar, to whose servants and agents he has to pay, for easy terms of tenure, big nasranas, birthday gifts and free service whenever required. Until 1921 the peasantry was being

wholly expropriated by the feudal barons. After the rising of 1921 the Dictatorship, awakened to the danger of revolutionary extermination of the samindars by the ruined peasants, curbed the feudal brigands and granted some fixity of tenure to the peasants. But it proved absolutely futile in the real working as the Governor of U.P. himself admits. The feudal landlords being in a position to buy off the whole bureaucracy were in a position to nullify the Oudh Rent Act and such other enactments. Neither was the Dictatorship in a position to displease this powerful class, which is a great counter revolutionary bulwark against the masses. So in this part the Dictatorship of the modern bourgeoisie which historically overthrew feudalism in its own country is the direct supporter of it. The result is that the peasant in this area has to meet the demand of rent as much as in the other areas, but in addition, is forced to put his labour power and implements at the disposal of the samindar for which he gets no return. His expropriation is therefore more distressing. Not being given the help of even that semblance of law, which the Dictatorship is forced to lay down for its own unlawful existence, the peasant under these feudal samindars is deprived of his produce, his clothes, his cottage, his wife, his children, is robbed, beaten and killed at the sweet will of the samindar. In the permanently settled tracts the expropriation of the peasantry by land revenue

demand is negligible. When we compare the shares of the Imperialist State under the three prominent parts, we find the incidence of land revenue realisation per cultivated acre to be :-

Under Rayatwari	Rs. 2-10-4	(on 63.9 million acres)
" Zamindari Temporary "	1-15-4	" 64.9 " "
" " Permanent "	0-15-4	" 48.6 " "

(The total million acres compared form 64 % of the cultivated area.)

(Worked out from "Statistical Abstract of Government of India", 1930 edition Page 358-59).

On the face of it this looks, as if in the system, where the Dictatorship expropriates the peasant directly, the peasant is heavily oppressed, while under the Zamindari expropriation per acre is so small. But the fact is quite the reverse. If the highest rate of average exploitation by the Government is taken to be at Rs. 2-10-4 per acre, the difference between Rs. 1-15-4 and 2-10-4 and that between 0-15-4 and 2-10-4 per acre of cultivated area is the bribe which the Dictatorship pays to the feudal landlords, the big samindars, for their support to its adulterated maintenance against all revolutionary attempts and against "further attempts at democratisation". The extent of the bribe to this parasitic class can be gauged from the fact that while in Bengal the Dictatorship receives Rs. 3 crores from the peasants' produce, the samindars are

left with 10 crores. In U.P. the British Dictatorship receives Rs. 694 lacs from a total known expropriation of Rs. 2135 lacs, leaving 1441 lacs to the parasitic class. This is on the acknowledged realisation. But in addition to this the wealth producing labour power of the peasants exploited by feudal usage is not calculated. "The actual fixture of rentals as between landlord and the tenant has been a matter of bargaining in which the Government has taken no direct part", said Sir Malcolm Haily to the Legislative Council on 20th July 1931. The Dictatorship need not take a direct part but every rupee enhanced by it in the land revenue adds Rs. 2/- to the feudal land-holder's pocket. Thus the Dictatorship bribes and carries with it a big feudal train to assist its work. It may not directly assist in the fixture of rentals but lends its bayonets when the peasantry wants to reduce them. The expropriation of the peasantry by a class that has no function to discharge in social production creates a quadrangular struggle in Indian political and economic field. We may take the annual expropriation of the peasantry by 12½ million rent receivers at about 180 crores. It represents an accumulation in the hands of the feudal class, of 67 per cent of the total paid up capital of all the joint stock companies in India which was about 267 crores in 1927-28 according to Government statistics. It means that

a few million landowners receive in 18 months more than the total joint stock capital of British India. The Indian bourgeoisie discharges a social function in production and distribution and is economically and politically an active class as yet, except in cases, where it has become absolutely monopolistic and divorced from the social function as is the case in Bombay textiles, Tata Iron, etc. The Indian bourgeoisie finds it difficult to assemble the liquid resources for investment in the face of the fierce Imperialist opposition and competition; while a sum which would represent 67 per cent returned on their capital is annually swallowed by a feudal class and is not made available as a fund for the averaging of capitalist profits. The second loss to the Indian bourgeoisie is that a peasantry whose whole production is expropriated by feudal rights, carrying no progressive economic function, is a poor buyer of industrial goods. Thus the Indian bourgeoisie and for that matter, even the British bourgeoisie find their economic class interest in conflict with feudal landlordism. The class conscious economists of the national bourgeoisie put the issue quite plainly though ultimately they do not fail to point out alternatives in order to avoid a class struggle. Speaking about agriculturist incomes which are not taxes, Professors Shah and Khambattan say "It is presumed that the land revenue these people pay is the counter part in the direct taxation of the income taxes

that the industrial and commercial classes have to pay. It may be so in the temporarily settled Rayatwari provinces, where in fact the individual incomes are so exceedingly small that no human or civilised system of taxation can possibly tax them. But in the case of the samindari land holders and especially those whose land revenue has been settled once for all several generations since, the situation is wholly different. The income in this case is almost wholly unearned; it is utterly independent of the personal interest or exertions of the owner and finally it is steadily growing independently of any activity of the owner. Thanks to the Permanent Settlement, the owners are themselves exempted from any corresponding increase in the demand from them for the purposes of the State; and though there is in most provinces enjoying such settlement some sort of landlord and tenant legislation framed with a view to safeguard the rights of the tenants under these landlords, the latter have one thousand and one means of defrauding the peasants of their rights and privileges." (Wealth and Taxable Capacity of India; page 300). The main point of the bourgeois complaint is not so much against receiving rent as against its not being taxed like their incomes. The Indian bourgeoisie which still takes some personal part in industrial activity, unlike the monopolist coupon-cutters of the Imperialist countries, grumbles against the landlords "coupon-cutting" without any activity. Like

a brilliant modern child it points out to Imperialism, that its most ancient brother is going tax free while it is being taxed simply because it is brilliant enough to increase the producing forces and thereby its own incomes, in a concentrated, intensive and palpable form. It does not advocate the abolition of landlordism but asks for taxation and the Imperialist Dictatorship, faced with deficits, is inclined to agree with it !

The Imperialist Dictatorship representing the interests of the British bourgeoisie sees that this feudal class is unnecessary and parasitic, that it does not discharge any necessary social function. Therefore it allows a certain criticism of feudalism by the intelligentsia of the bourgeoisie. Even the Anglo-Indian papers take part in it and a most responsible member of the Dictatorship, Sir Basil Blackett, observed in a lecture before the Royal Society of Arts in London: "True economic progress in India will not be fully realisable till India sloughs of its "mediaeval abstractions". Sir Basil wants to hide his true class outlook behind a very clumsy phrase "mediaeval abstractions". What does he mean? The characteristic of the mediaeval age is feudal economy and its "abstraction" is the ideological and social super-structure that arises from that economy.

D/1.12.31

Morning 1st Part.

Bourgeois economy having grown within the feudal structure, "the abstraction", the feudal rights of nazrana, self labour, the existence of big landholders and their influence in politics become a hindrance. They require to be overthrown. The conflict begins in the ideological field. But that conflict generates revolutionary forces and as Sir Basil Blackett himself observes, "More than once since the Montagu Chelmsford Reforms, (which it may remembered gave a share of the partnership to the bourgeoisie as shown before) as for example during the controversy over the Reserve Bank Bill, the Central and Provincial legislatures have borne witness to the possibilities of severe friction between urban and rural interests; and the inevitable predominance of the urban intellectual among the politically minded Indian gives constant preoccupation to the Government and especially to the district officer." ("Leader", February 2, 1930). The 'mediaeval setting' is the political bulwark of Imperialism and is not economically a direct competitor to the British bourgeois interest as the Indian bourgeoisie is. The Indian bourgeoisie cannot progress without the overthrow of feudal aristocracy. British goods can find no market without releasing from the feudal blood sucker a few drops at least for the peasant, of course in the

end to be yielded to the Imperialist bourgeoisie. Hence, the Simon Commission suggest reconsideration of the permanent settlement and imposing a tax on the Zamindari incomes. The bourgeois interests support Tenancy Bills but all of them refuse to pursue the opposition to the end, because the end means rousing the peasantry against landlordism, against the moneylenders. Once the revolutionary tide is on who can say, in the present epoch, where it will stop? It boils and grows over into a revolution against the whole bourgeois order.

The feudal class recognises this class cleavage. It is not we alone that speak it out. Economic social reality is a thing that makes the most rabid anti-Communist provide the base for the argument of the Communists. Marxism is born out of class reality and that reality, in a time of sharpening class struggle, begins to recognise our premises but refuses our solution. The consciousness of parasitism, of the fact that it has ceased to be in any way a socially necessary class, even to the smallest extent, in the present stage of the world productive forces, has dawned upon a section of the intellectual representatives of decayed feudalism, in the brains of a feudal lord, who is trying ideologically to grow into a modern bourgeois. And nothing can give more pleasure than to quote in support from the speech of Rai Rajeshwar Bali at the Zamindar Conference held in Rae Bareli (19-7-31).

He said, "we must all remember that no class or community can survive for long which ceases to be of value to the society. This is particularly true at the present moment when the world forces are acting against the retention of institutions connected with capitalism of any kind. Therefore we must actively and incessantly demonstrate our value." (The Leader, July 25, 1931). Rai Rajeshwar confounded his feudal class with the modern bourgeoisie. Still he is to be congratulated on his decision "to demonstrate the value" of feudalism to Indian society. He proceeded to outline the basis of this demonstration and most actively insisted on three very profound proposals. The landlords instead of becoming dancing monuments in the Butler Palace after the notorious leadership of Sir Harcourt Butler and the late Raja of Mahmudabad, in the realm of demonstrating their "unlimited values" in the "mediaeval romantic setting" of society life should follow "Mahatmaji's cult of simple life and Swadeshi". Absentee landlordism should be converted into presentee landlordism and the rural areas should be reconstructed. What is the net result of this demonstration of value of landlordism? If all the landholders spend a hundred thousand rupees on Khadi instead of ten lakhs on silks the 14½ crores of rent they take from the peasantry cannot be reduced by a single pie. Their savings of nine lakhs are not returned to their tenants. An absentee tyrant does not become less

demoniac by his presence, rather he adds to it. Reconstructing rural area has only one meaning - to strike at the root of the expropriation of the peasantry by rents. This is impossible for landlordism because it means the abolition of landlordism and construction not of the rural area but of its own coffin. The ultimate result of all this advice is a reconstruction of the fallen tombs of dead pirs and temples of nondescript Mehants, while the bones of the peasants sink into the grounds of his mud hut under the blows of the Attachment Officer. Landlordism has no value in the development of the productive forces. It only hinders them by exacting a tribute by reason of its old production relations. Its only value lies in its abolition from social life and survival in the museum of Indian revolution.

(98) Pandit Jawahar Lal's opinion - his welcome to landowners - even if feudalism is substituted by capitalism - expropriation of the peasantry through the capitalist market remains.

We have seen so far the fundamental basis of the production relations of the peasant toiler, that prevail over 3/4th of the cultivated area of India. It is that the peasant in order to exert his energies in extracting useful and necessary things from nature must first agree, has to agree, to surrendering half the fruits of his toil

as rent to a class which holds the monopoly of the soil. The moneylenders' oppression is in a great measure due to this feudal expropriation. The dearth of capital for the bourgeoisie arises from this sterilisation of its supply at its very source. Commodity movements are crippled due to this feudal loot; and bourgeois industry groans under the heavy burden placed on its shoulders by the tribute to the landlord, which its raw material carries on its head. Imperialism threatened with a competitive native bourgeoisie and a revolutionary proletariat and peasantry refuses to displace its feudal allies and the Indian bourgeoisie unable to fight releases a few intellectuals to shout for nationalisation of land. Now it is a well known fact that Communists advocate nationalisation of land and the distribution of it to the landless and small peasants. (Vide programme Exh: P). This is interpreted by some as "the extension of the Rayatwari System" to the whole of India. For example, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, who is supposed to be a Socialist, is against the feudal land tenure. Speaking at the Lahore Congress (December 1929) he said (in his Presidential Address) "We have among us many big landowners and we welcome them. But they must realise that the ownership of large estates by individuals which is the outcome of a State resembling the old feudalism of Europe, is a

rapidly disappearing phenomenon all over the world. Even in countries which are the strongholds of capitalism the large estates are being split up and given to the peasantry who work on them. In India also we have large areas where the system of peasant proprietorship prevails and we shall have to extend this all over the country." The Pandit has committed many fallacies here. Large estates owned by individuals do not necessarily resemble feudalism. In the U.S.A. large estates are owned by capitalists who cultivate them by employing hired land workers and with machines. In no way does this resemble feudalism. The characteristic of feudalism is not the largeness of an estate. Even an estate of 100 acres may be feudal. The difference is that under feudalism the cultivator may own his instruments of production. When he produces crops he is left with the minimum of the produce for his living and the whole surplus value or rent is appropriated by the landlord. The cultivator also lives under certain feudal obligations of giving free labour and gifts to the landlord which is not prevalent under capitalist agriculture, where the peasant does not own even the instruments, is a hired land worker and has no personal obligations of the feudal type. He is free to sell his labour power anywhere. In countries where thorough bourgeois revolutions took place, it is true that the feudal estates were split up and distributed. For a time the peasants thrived, but out of

them grew rich, middle and poor peasants. Land again became concentrated in the hands of agrarian capital and the peasantry was reduced to land workers. The extension of rayatwari may be said to be the middle stage in the above European process, but, as we have seen, it does not prevent the growth of rent exploiters. The Pandit did not care to know why even in countries which are the strongholds of capitalism, feudal agriculture is breaking down. Simply because its break up helps the growth of capitalism. The Pandit may welcome the big feudal land owners who, on his own proposition, are not required by rayatwari nor even by capitalism. So the welcome can be only from their own class fellows. The Pandit when he welcomes them thus becomes a feudal chieftain! He may say he wants them to break up their estates and welcomes them for that. A class cannot consent to break up its own bones. Either they must break the peasantry or the peasantry will break them. If the Pandit welcomes them, on which side then does he stand?

However, though not in deed, yet in theory the bourgeois intellectuals recognise the necessity of the breakup of feudal estates and handing them over to the peasantry. But what does the bourgeoisie itself propose to do with the peasantry, supposing the latter gets all those estates, is freed from the feudal burden and allowed to cultivate its own plot of land and help the building up of capitalism?

In the modern epoch, the whole of Indian agricultural production, whether on rayatwari or zamindari estates, is ruled by the capitalist exchange market through its prices. The value of wheat, cotton, rice etc. even in the remotest corners of India is subject to the changes in the markets as far away as New York. Whatever is left to the peasant, after his big leeches - the money-lender and the landlord or lessee are satisfied, is attacked and expropriated by the capitalist market. The process of exchange between the peasant and the capitalist trader is always an unequal exchange.

I.H.K.

1/12/31 (Morning Part II).

This is not only the Communist viewpoint. The Banking Inquiry Committee appointed by the Government of India in its report says the same thing. "The Bombay Committee point out that some of the practices in unorganised markets such as fixation of prices secretly and reduction of prices on the ground of alleged inferior quality act to the detriment of the agriculturist" In paragraph 261 of their report they (the U.P. Committee) refer to the practice in a novel form of the well known evils of cornering and dumping; they say that "there is some evidence to show that exporting firms are occasionally guilty of dumping agricultural produce to facilitate purchase at lower prices..... More than one Provincial Committees have adverted to the fact that the agricultural produce is forced on the market at certain periods in such a way that the farmers fail to obtain the best prices". (Pages 210, 211). This holds good not only for a backward peasantry but even in such countries as Canada, U.S.A., Germany, England etc. The inequality arises from the nature of the methods of production. Production of industrial goods, whether of consumption or of capital goods, is standardised, concentrated and centralised in huge international combines with a price policy that extends over continents and which is not subject to easy fluctuations.

The trader possesses an advantage of training, organising, literacy, the support of banks etc in his negotiations with the peasant. For example, if the exchange value of one seer of wheat represents, in a given period, a yard of cloth, in the actual process of exchange the peasant is bound to be mulcted off at least half a foot of cloth. In addition to this there comes to the help of the capitalist market, the highly deceptive medium of exchange, which is money. Money hides the real value relations. A token coin worth four annas serves to exchange commodities worth four times its real value. The currency system of every country is controlled by the bourgeoisie of that country and it is used by them as a whole for cheating the vast mass of peasantry in its own and other countries, and secondly by the various sections of the bourgeoisie against one another. The individual isolated peasant is no match for modern capitalism in the exchange process, and even when the productive forces cheapen consumption goods, the fullest advantage of it never comes to him.

Another handicap which the small peasant suffers against capitalism is the one which in industry is the difference between small scale and large scale production. The per acre production of a small peasant is far less than that of a capitalist farm and therefore its cost of production is higher. In industry the result of this would

be that the plant with bad and limited technique must invest more capital and work like that of the big plant or it goes into losses. In this process a levelling of technique takes place. Capitalist competition levels capitalist profits which constantly try to find their average. This does not take place in agriculture. Because there technique can not be introduced as easily. A small holding can not be made big easily. In industry one plant by reason of a secret process may get differential profits for a time. But such secrets do not remain so very long. In agriculture the land is limited. Therefore it exacts a monopoly price for the owner unless it is nationalised and made exchangeable like other commodities. The owner claims absolute rent whether you get profit or living thereby or not, he does not care. Since it is limited you can not defy him (by threatening to cultivate air or some such thing). The only alternative is to overthrow his monopoly ownership. Secondly its limitedness and the need of all available food stuffs for the world population, keep the small peasant going because the price of land-produce due to the above two factors is determined not by the cost of production on the best land (as in industry) but on the worst land. This does not mean that the small peasant rules the prices. There are times of crisis when capitalism leaves nothing to the vast mass of people to buy with and a fall in world prices occurs by what is

called overproduction. The small peasant then can not get even half his cost of production with the result that he sells below it and makes up the balance by starvation. The slow starvation and expropriation through which he passes in normal times becomes accentuated in crisis.

The bankruptcy of the nationalist bourgeoisie in finding a way out for the peasant from his expropriation by the capitalist market is best illustrated in times of crisis, which refutes the allegation that the application of Marxism to Indian conditions would be a hot house growth or unwarranted. The periodical recurring crises of capitalism lay bare all its contradictions which are then understood in their true perspective. The utter bankruptcy of the Congress bourgeois politicians and economists in solving the peasant problem by merely harping on reduction of rent and revenue is repeated over the whole of India from their own mouths, and our programme arises directly on the ruins of their programmes.

(99) Some utterances on the complete ruin of the peasantry and its inability to pay rent due to fall in prices - examples from U.P., Bengal, the Punjab and Karnatic.

The present crisis of world capitalism of which India is a part and contributory factor is expressed in the agrarian area in the fall of prices. The fall is not a

cause of the crisis, as the bourgeoisie wants the people to believe, but only a symptom. It is itself a result which in its turn produces its own cycle of results (which is very beautifully expressed by Marx in his manifesto P 21). Still let confine ourselves only to the prices problem, the unsaliability of goods on the capitalist market and the consequent question of the peasant's obligations as to rent and revenue, which are fixed charges in money. The Honorary Secretary of the U.P. Zemindars' Association, Mr. Hari Raj Saroop, who is not expected to exaggerate the losses of the peasantry, for fear of injuring the interests of his class, compares the cost of production and the proceeds realised from the produce per acre of wheat and sugarcane in Musaffarnagar district, which had the honour to send its District Magistrate to conduct the Inquiry into this case. He says, "The average produce of sugarcane in irrigated tracts in normal years is 15 maunds per acre which will at the most fetch Rs. 75/-. The tenant's minimum expenses in producing an acre of sugarcane will be somewhat as follows :-

	Rs. as. p.
Rent and Revenue	20- 0- 0
Manure	10- 0- 0
Ploughing, Harrowing, Weeding & Binding	25- 0- 0
Irrigation with labour for watering	12- 0- 0
Seed	15- 0- 0
Cutting and Collecting	7- 8- 0
Making Gur, with cartage to Market	<u>22- 8- 0</u>
Total	112- 0- 0

So the tenant gets in sugarcane, in spite of all his labours, about 35 per cent less than what he actually spends. The case of wheat is still worse because the tenant produces on an average of 12 maunds of wheat worth Rs. 30/- and spends about Rs. 62/- thus getting a return of less than half". From this account what would be the obvious conclusion so far as payment of rent and revenue is concerned? If the peasant refuses to pay the whole of the rent, revenue and water charges, Rs. 32/-, still his fixed cash liability on expenses remains at Rs. 80/-, a deficit of Rs. 5/- per acre on sugarcane. On an acre of wheat that loss being more than 50 per cent, if the peasant refuses the whole rental and water charge he will have a deficit of Rs. 15/- per acre. In such circumstances a demand to reduce the rent and revenue by half does not mean a demand to save the peasant from distress but to save Imperialism and landlordism, who are not entitled even to a pice of rent, granting for a moment that they are so in normal circumstances.

Two Congress leaders of Rai Bareli, Messrs. Sitla Sahai and Mata Pershad Misra in a statement on behalf of the Congress say, "Putting the rabi and kharif both together, we find that even in cases of gram and dhan which fetch good price, the tenant can not pay his rent and living, if he has sown barley or peas or jowar or wheat he has to borrow if he wants to pay." (Leader May 5, 1931). Such

a statement means that the British Dictatorship and feudal landlordism must renounce all their demands on the peasantry because if the peasant has to live he is not in a position to surrender any part of his produce in order to maintain the Dictatorship and the feudal class. The excellent gentlemen who made the statement realised this implication and three lines below they suddenly found that the peasant can pay 50 per cent "if Government themselves make any inquiry, they will also come to the same conclusion as we have viz. that it is economically impossible for the kisans to pay more than 50 per cent." Just three lines above they say, "if the kisan has to live he can not pay". That is their first conclusion. Then they forget their own conclusion and say that Government will arrive after inquiry at the same conclusion. And what is that same? That the kisan can not pay more than 50 per cent. Where from has sprung this sudden accretion of money to 50 per cent ability to pay rent? Obviously from the fear that no-payment means dissolution of all the existing production relations, of class rule and the Dictatorship. In his manifesto to the U.P. peasants and zamindars, Mahata Gandhi asked the peasants to pay 50 per cent or 75 per cent of their usual rent. While explaining this he said, "Indeed an inquiry made in over 300 villages in the eastern province show that the price of the produce at the present rate does not even cover the rents payable." This makes

no allowance for the cost of production. When the kisan can pay nothing, not even for his food, he is asked to pay for the maintenance of Imperialism and the feudal landholders. In the same article where he said the above, he says, "Congressmen on their part will see to it that kisans will scrupulously fulfil their obligations to the zamindars." (Young India May 1931). The expropriation of the peasant by capitalism is very well described by the Indian Chamber of Commerce on the question of relief to Bengal peasants, in their letter to the Government of India. "The consumers and shippers who keep the statistics of the world's demand and supply at their finger ends will only be too ready to secure supplies at as low a price as possible. With his appalling poverty, illiteracy, and submissiveness the Indian agriculturist is seriously handicapped for the purposes of bargaining and he always finds himself at a serious disadvantage, in his dealings with those who want the products of his labour." (Times of India 30/7/31). Please remember that this is not written in any Communist manifesto but by the Indian Merchants' Chamber. A committee of 20 zamindars of the Kisan Sabha of Shaikhpura in Punjab, in their report of inquiry said, "The Committee has most carefully studied the condition of the present rabi harvest, no acre produces more than 8 maunds of grain. This grain fetches in the market about to Rs. 8/- and the revenue and water rates in

this district range between Rs. 12/- and 14/- per acre. Not only is there a deficit of Rs. 4/- to 6/- but absolutely nothing is left to the peasant to enable him to maintain his family. It should be remembered that he has also left nothing to meet his expenses in connection with the next sowing for the kharif crop." The conclusion from the finding can only be one that if the peasant has to live he can not pay for the maintenance of the Dictatorship or the rentier parasite. He must dissolve the class rule over him. But the Committee does not say that. It says, "The Government should therefore either take 1/10 of the amount of produce in kind or charge 1/3 of the present revenue assessment charges." That is Government should add to the starvation and indebtedness of the peasant. The Dictatorship is obliged for such kindly advice and acts upon it, with the result that according to the Land Revenue Administration Report of the Punjab for the year ended in September 1930, the forces of the Dictatorship were let loose with greater vigour and the number of processes issued against the lambardars and owners rose to 19409 being an increase of nearly 30 per cent over 1929. At the Annual General Meeting of the Punjab Chamber of Commerce the Chairman said, (April 15, 1931) "The cost of production per acre is very much higher than the price it yields and the payment of land revenue by the samindar (in the Punjab sense) has become almost an impossibility, so much so that most of the

semindars have had to part with the ornaments of their women folk and in some cases undergo worse indignities for the purpose of paying land revenue". The learned loyal gentleman ended by asking Government to set up sales organisations as a remedy. From Gujrat where the peasantry is said to have won victories in their struggle against the ruin and starvation under the leadership of the Congress bourgeoisie, we get the same picture. An examination of 750 family budgets was made in the Matar Talluqa by Mr. Kumar Appa of the Gujrat National University and member of the Congress Experts' Committee on the question of adjustment of debts. The report says, "Before providing for the depreciation, land revenue, and unpaid interest, actual receipts in cash and in kind excluding all extraordinary expenses and capital items, the analysis shows the following:-

Deficits of Rs.	Families
1 to 100	139
101 to 300	334
301 to 500	145
501 to 1000	74
over 1000	9
Others	<u>49</u>
	750

Mr. S. D. Kalekar writing on this says, "Only 25 per cent of the peasants are feeding on their crops. The people will have nothing to eat even if they are to pay only half of

the revenue." And yet all the holy gentlemen of the Sabarmati Ashram were telling the peasants to borrow money and pay their tribute to Imperialism. Finally for those who would throw the blame on extravagance, inefficiency or dishonesty on the peasantry. Here are four figures of the cost of cultivation and price of yield on a Government farm in the Dharwar District.

	<u>Per Acre</u>	
	Expenditure	Yield
	Rs. as. p.	Rs. as. p.
Juwar	20-12- 2	34- 0- 0
Cotton	17- 9- 0	18- 0- 0
Peas	29- 3- 0	37- 0- 0
Wheat	7-12- 0	10- 0- 0

On an average of the four acres there is a surplus of Rs.5/- per acre. Why? Because it is a Government farm. It has best instruments, best bullocks, expert advice, and best manure. It is free from the demands of village workers like the sweepers, smiths, potters etc whose rights are traditionally fixed. It is free from the moneylenders. It can sell in the best market; so on and so forth. If all these burdens are put over the above accounts the normal surplus would soon become a deficit. The "Karmavir", which on the basis of the above facts wants to advocate the cause of the peasantry, is not, however, willing to tell the peasants to feed themselves first. It proposes to starve

the peasants and pay 1/3 to the State and demands for the peasants "the right to become insolvent like the money-lenders." (Quoted by "The Kesari", Poona City, 21/2/31). This champion of the peasantry fails to know that the right of the bourgeoisie to become insolvent is a mutual arrangement of the robber class to accommodate each other's failures and start again their career. Can the robber allow his victim when he is paying him a visit to declare that he is insolvent and therefore would like to be excused. That would mean suicide for the bourgeoisie. Moreover the workers and peasants as a class are creators of wealth. They are out to seize what is forcibly taken away from them. To tell them to fight for a right of insolvency is to show one's own insolvency of ideas.

(100) The bourgeois intellectual will object to deduce from this that the bourgeoisie through its prices machinery expropriates the peasant.

You may point to the fact that the crash of prices affects both agrarian and industrial prices. The answer to this is furnished by the Indian Chamber of Commerce. The fall in prices of agrarian products is greater than in the manufactures. "It is I suppose the usual order of things in a depression of this kind that the price of raw products falls more sharply than that of manufactured goods", said Lord Irwin in his address to the Associated Chambers of

Commerce in December 1930. The same thing was said by Lala Shri Ram in his presidential address to the Federation of Indian Chambers in March 1931. So, in the falling prices the centralised monopolistic organisation of the bourgeoisie reaps a differential gain as between the exchange of agricultural and manufactured goods. It may be said that this happens in very abnormal times and deductions and programmes of a party can not be made from such data. But the same thing appears even if we take the reverse case that of rising prices. The index numbers of wholesale prices in India before and after the war began, show the speed with which agrarian prices are outstripped.

Index number of Wholesale Prices - India.

1873 = 100

Year	Exported Articles.	Imported Articles.
1913	154	117
1916	163	236
1918	199	289

This shows that whether in rise or in fall the capitalist exchange market gains in relative speed either way. This relative difference is reduced in such countries as America, Canada and Germany where agrarian goods at their point of wholesale disposal are under the control of combines or banks. These both the agents of exchange being highly organised wings of capitalist finance cut down each other's differential gains. But this does not happen in countries

like India where the sale of agrarian goods from the big internal or external markets is very much scattered. That is why in Canada and U.S.A., the agrarian bourgeoisie could hold the wheat from the market for a year or two by assembling it under the credit banks. Such an action was impossible for the Indian or Chinese bourgeoisie and so it clamoured at the doors of the British Dictatorship for financial help in imitating the American Farm Board but it was naturally refused such help. In the first place because the Imperialist Dictatorship is not interested in protecting the Indian bourgeoisie against the British. Secondly because it was too insolvent to do this huge operation. However whether this is done or not the real cultivator gains nothing. If you say that the fall in prices is abnormal and hence the cultivator is hit and want to infer that in rising prices he is well off, it is a wrong conclusion. The Indian bourgeoisie in its fight against the 18d. ratio said that the fall in prices hit the cultivator. It was right; but when it said that the rise in prices that would follow on the 16d. exchange would benefit the cultivator, it was exaggerating the situation. The rise in prices fetched by his products never reaches the cultivator actually. The fall is passed on to him but not the rise. Similarly the rise in prices of manufactured goods, is rapidly passed on to him but not the fall. Exactly the reverse process takes place with regard to the workers.

The war boom in agriculture did not benefit the poor and the middle peasantry but only the rich peasants and landlords. The Indian bourgeoisie tells the peasantry in

Zemindari areas that the extension of Ryotwari will make it a master of its produce and hence gainer by good price movements. What do we find in Bardoli? The contradictions of the bourgeoisie when collected from the places and put together give good matter for laughter. Mr. Mahadev Desai says this about the abnormal rise in prices of food grains and of cotton. "Evidence was led every where to show that the cotton prices far from benefitting agriculturists had ruined them especially the tenants and the officers (of the Government Inquiry Committee) accepting it observe, 'that the cotton boom was by no means an unmixed blessing from the ryot's point of view; indeed on a consideration of all these circumstances it may be regarded as less a blessing than a curse.'" Where did the blessing of high prices vanish? It was pocketed by the holders of land who increased the rent charged to their sub-tenants and thus expropriated the cultivator of his gains. But this robbery is very clear in Zemindari areas. In the falling prices the cultivator has to meet his fixed rents in money; but in rising prices, the gains are very rapidly robbed by the landlord. The following table will show that feudal landlordism is worse than the Imperialist Dictatorship. The Congress Report on the U.P. agrarian distress gives the

following. "If we compare the prices of the food grains and the rent and revenue demand of 1898-99 with those of 1914-15 and 1930-31 we get the following numbers :-

Index Numbers

Year.	Price	Revenue	Rent
1898-99	100	100	100
1914-15	117	105	131
1930-31	80	113	160

"The figures show that while compared to those in 1898-99 prices have gone down by 20 per cent, the revenue has increased by 13 per cent and rents by 60 per cent."

D/2.12.31

Morning 1st Part.

That is the only conclusion of the learned committee. But there is another which we cannot fail to draw. That the rise in prices was snatched away from the peasant by rent and revenue. While prices increased by 17 per cent, rents increased by 31 per cent. A second conclusion is that between two exploiters the one belonging to the home is more ruthless than the foreign. The Zamindar, who is asked to become a Janaka or Omar Khalif and whom the Congress report calls "brother", while he was setting fire to villages and dishonouring peasant women (as in Pipri in U.P.) that class of robbers is shown by the table to be five times greater parasitic than the dictatorship. The question of the advantage from prices is a question of class and not a general question, as it is made out. The general conclusion applicable even in a land like the Punjab can be stated in the words of Mr. Darling, supported by Dr. Mann that "the large land owners have profited a lot by the rise in prices the small owners have suffered." ("The Punjab Peasant" pp;149, 244). Thus whether in rayatwari or zamindari, whether in times of high prices or low prices, the poor peasant cultivator enriches the capitalist class, landlords and generally the whole parasitic structure. Even if he is freed from landlordism, even if the feudal estates are broken up, the poor peasantry

will not prosper unless the capitalist social relations are overthrown and the workers and poor peasants directly govern production and distribution. The Socialist society, the Democratic Dictatorship of the Proletariat and peasantry alone can achieve the task of destroying the phenomena of poverty in plenty. The programme of the nationalist bourgeoisie, whether inside or outside the Congress does not aim at the destruction of rent but only its limitation; and even this limitation is not governed by the needs of the peasantry but by the needs of the bourgeoisie State if it is their or the Imperialist Dictatorship, if it makes a Pact with them. Without the abolition of rent the growth of parasitism, whether in zamindari or rayatwari, cannot be abolished. The programme of the bourgeoisie does not fight for abolition of feudal landlordism. Therefore it cannot develop the productive forces of the country even on capitalist lines. The bourgeoisie does not advocate cancellation of peasant debts but their transference to bourgeois agrarian banks, controlled from the industrial banking centres, or merely their "scrutiny". But the bourgeoisie has no resources for such a huge conversion of nine hundred crores of debts at not less than 25 per cent interest into one of 5 or 10 per cent, nor has it the strength to meet the opposition of the holders of these debts. The bourgeoisie cannot help the peasantry to receive even the exchange market price of its produce, nor is it in

a position to stop the expropriation of the peasant by the prices operations because capitalism itself is unable to control the anarchy of its social order. Therefore, the whole of the radical Congress programme resolves into one of reduction of land revenue. But the fixed money terms of land revenue even if they are reduced to suit the fallen prices, do not rule out the seizure of surplus values from the peasant; and before the reformist measure comes into operation a complete ruin and loot of the peasantry are carried out so that even the reform does not help. Thus the economic programme of reconstruction formulated by capitalism breaks against the rocks of class contradictions of Indian society. What then remains is only our programme. The feudal landlords and the moneylenders have necessarily to be deprived of their so-called dues; debts have to be repudiated, rent abolished and land handed over to the peasantry, if society in India is to live and progress. The big bourgeoisie with its stronghold on production and distribution demanding its tribute from the workers has to be removed. The carrying out of this social reconstruction is impossible without political power. Hence a struggle for independence becomes a necessity.

The mutual contradictions of the three parasitic groups in India, the Indian bourgeoisie, feudalism and British Imperialism, which have been shown so far, prove clearly that India is not in any way an exceptional country

from the other countries in the world, in the matter of its economic, social and political growth. It is within the grip of capitalist development, it is subject to all the laws of capitalist economy. It has given birth to all the modern classes that are usually found in any European capitalist country with exactly the same class characteristics. Not only has it got classes, economically and politically well marked from each other but it has got a fierce class war also. Class war exists where classes exist. In former India there were different classes, hence a different type of class war. Today the classes have changed under bourgeois economy, their content and form. But the one essential content - that of exploitation of surplus values by the exploiters from the exploited remains. Since the form and content of classes have changed, the form and content of the class war have changed. It also shows that those who say that we can and should postpone the class war among us till we have settled with our "national enemy" have failed to understand the warring trends in our economy. The facts given so far indicate clearly how one class is putting down the other and living on its pack. Does that process stop because we are engaged in the glorious struggle based on love and peace? It does not. Hence the proletariat and peasantry also cannot stop the class war. It inevitably arises from the economy of our day. That is the reason why the slogan of "Down with Imperialism" has to be simultaneously

joined with that of "Down with Capitalism". The national struggle is a part of the class struggle. In the present epoch of proletarian revolutions and in the Indian conditions where the bourgeoisie refuses to fight and where feudalism is all along against the national struggle, the class struggle is bound to become acute side by side with the national struggle also.

(101) The position of the petty bourgeoisie - incapable of revolutionary struggle - not being a class it uses caste - the bankruptcy of their programme with regard to the masses - gives way to our programme.

It has been stated so far that the conclusions of Marxism and Leninism with regard to the peasantry arise directly from real life in India as much correctly as they arise from that of other countries. It has also been shown that the material basis of the revolutionary struggle of the peasantry exists on the Indian soil and not in the chambers of the Comintern headquarters as is alleged. The same thing applies to the material basis of the national and class struggle as it affects the petty bourgeoisie and the industrial workers amongst whom we have also worked.

The petty bourgeois wage-earners, "salaried employees" as they call themselves, occupy an important position in production and distribution, in the management of capitalist

society. In India the British Dictatorship is one of their biggest employers. They manage the vast operations of the industrial plants in their separate minor and major functions. The office machinery of capitalism is worked by them. Capitalism uses them as teachers, priests, journalists, writers and poets to spread bourgeois culture and make sure that the masses become ideologically the supporters of its system even though they economically are exploited by it. The big mass of this intellectual proletariat is poverty-stricken and overworked. All their life they cherish the dreams of rising to the respectable heights of their bourgeois masters. Many of them desire to become 'independent' by starting small shops and trades and kicking indignantly at their office tables. But soon they are ruined by the mighty competition of Big Finance and return to their old post of slavery. Possessing literacy and culturally bourgeois they despise the workers and peasants. When hard pressed by capitalism they flirt with the revolutionary movement of the masses. When promised a prospect of good salaries and ambitious rise, they turn counter-revolutionaries and become the slave drivers of the bourgeoisie against the workers and peasants.

The largest part of this petty bourgeoisie does not get more than Rs. 2/- a day. Being unable to convert their women and young children into workers like those of the proletariat and peasantry, their income of one earning

member of the family becomes divided amongst several claimants. The family of the petty bourgeois in India is exceptionally large owing to the fact that he still holds to the prejudices of the pre-bourgeois culture and is thereby unable to divide the family. Holding fast to the reactionary prejudices of the old Hindu system, the Hindu petty bourgeoisie, which by far forms the majority in India, has to maintain in the single family unit a large number of widows, which too ordinarily would have been distributed over a section of earning members. Thus even where they can get better wages, they can never raise their standard of living.

A highly industrialised society requires a great deal of accounting to be done. The needs of modern production and distribution have to carry out the inventory of the world in all matters. Without the highly organised system of accounting modern large scale production and international exchange of goods would not be possible. This gives birth to a vast number of petty bourgeois intellectuals to run the machinery of bourgeois society. India being not highly industrialised it does not generate such a big class as other countries. But the supply of this class of salaried workers is far in excess of the demand. Thinking that industrialisation will feed them, they support all schemes of national industries and march with the bourgeoisie against the workers, when the latter strike for better

standard of living. Because they are taught that high wages and low hours for workers mean less profits, less industrialisation and therefore less employment for them. They look to the five thousand lucrative posts of the British bureaucracy and want Indianisation so that their problem may be solved. Growing sentimental they suffer heroic death in the name of nationalism, many a time without exactly knowing what they are doing for. But not possessing the creative power of labour, not possessing the confidence of the proletariat that wields the "key positions" of social life, they keep on yearning for some miracle that may change society on to a better track and Imperialism to a better heart.

Though they consider themselves as belonging to a superior class yet capitalism uses them as no better than the working class or even worse. The working class is a producer of wealth and hence a superior class power. Its strike stops creation of wealth and hence it is much dreaded. Have you ever seen the petty bourgeoisie striking and making the whole capitalist Imperialist machine tremble for life? On the contrary whenever capitalism has been threatened with dethronement, the petty bourgeois intellectuals have as a class always run to its help. In England, shoals of them rushed out of the universities to become blacklegs in the General Strike of 1926. They suffer from unemployment like the workers. New inventions of machines

for accounting, telegraphing, and telephoning displace them in an ever increasing degree from employment. Concentration and centralisation of capital, amalgamation of several houses and plants into big combines throw hundreds of them on the street. In an enquiry in Bombay more than half of them were found in debts. While reading their morning patriotic paper over the tea cup, they dream of their "motherland" being thoroughly "Indianised", which in plain language means they think of their own prospects wherein instead of the European boss they shall be commanding others. The patriotic Indian bourgeoisie having been compelled to pay high rates for imported technicians at first run up a huge propaganda for technical and scientific education for the young and promising sons of India. But when the young sons were found to be too many they were offered half the foreigners' salary and most of them returning from foreign countries with expectations of a glorious future in the motherland found that the motherly bourgeoisie that advised them to be technicians and scientists had no industries to employ them.

I.H.K.

2/12/31 (Morning Part II).

Or wherever they had, they were as bound up with foreign capital that even an Indian bourgeois like Sir Purshotandas was found rowing in the same boat with his European colleagues in defence of the Imperial Bank of India in the shareholders' meeting on the question of the employment of European staff when Mr. A. D. Shroff, President of the Bombay Stock Exchange, question, "why for the last six or seven years representatives of the same four English firms in Bombay should have occupied seats on the directorate." (Times of India, 26/8/31). After fifteen years of the most intense awakening of all classes, the "intellectual proletariat" in India is not yet convinced that after all capitalism, whether British or Indian, is not capable of solving their problems. They have not grasped that for all practical purposes foreign Imperialism and Indian capitalism treat them alike. In relation to them they are an exploited class just as the working class and peasantry are.

What does the most patriotic bourgeoisie offer them under their Swaraj or Ram Raj? The top heavy bureaucracy of the Dictatorship will be replaced by the cheaper one. But the removal of the highly paid bureaucracy is not automatically of any gain to the lower paid workers. There is no doubt that under Imperialism they are always victims

of retrenchment and wage cuts. But they have not fared better under the industries of the patriots. During the present crisis, there is not a single industry that has not retrenched its clerks or reduced their wages. There is not a single patriot who has not called upon the Government to carry out retrenchment. All those pseudo champions of Democracy in the Assembly have appreciated the example of the king and asked for equal sacrifices from all. A nawab offers his one month's salary as a "sacrifice" before Imperialism, while pocketing a 60 per cent enhanced rent from his tenants when prices have fallen by 50 per cent, and demands an "equal sacrifice" from his poor clerk who gets Rs. 50/- a month. Equal sacrifice on unequal incomes means more starvation to the poor clerks and no loss to the parasites. In times of crisis both Imperialism and Capitalism argue that the purchasing power has been reduced; so they must retrench their employees and cut wages. That adds to the unemployed number and leads to still more reduced purchasing power. Capitalism thus moves in a vicious circle. They kick them out of the offices and factories first and then come solemnly before the people with schemes of road development or ditch filling on which the bourgeoisie pompously announces that out of the millions of the unemployed who were once working for years in factories and offices, so many hundreds will be "fully employed" for so many months. What ambitious schemes for

overcoming the death of Capitalism! It is still a solace that they have not shown the humour of employing the unemployed on digging their own graves in advance or carrying out research work into the tombs of their forefathers.

The Indian bourgeoisie has nothing to offer to the vast mass of the intellectual proletariat. Whether under Imperialism or under Purna Swaraj his fate is to toil, to be unemployed in crisis and low paid in normal times - the same blind forces of capitalist parasitism are ruling them here in India just as they do in England. England is free, England is rich, England has adult suffrage and democracy and so on. Yet when the finances of its bourgeois State collapse, the axe of the Economy Committee under that ideal Purna Swaraj before whom the Pundits and Maulanas are humbly rubbing their foreheads "for a guidance from His Majesty's advisors", fell first on the unemployed (66.5 million pounds) and next in the list were the teachers (13.85 million pounds), that very section of the intellectual proletariat, which spends every minute of its life in strengthening the bourgeois system by culturally enslaving the children and youths to it. In short the petty bourgeois intellectual class has no future under capitalism, whether in India or elsewhere. Their only hope lies in alliance with the workers and the peasants. The source of the fulfilment of their ultimate ambitions at present lies in the development of Capitalism. When capitalism itself is

declining, when the source is being dried up how can they expect to flourish?

In the struggle for existence when pressed to the wall by the Imperialist Dictatorship and Capitalism, the petty bourgeois intellectuals grow desperate and a revolutionary fermentation begins in them. Imperialism and its State being their largest employers, the intellectual proletariat finds itself automatically ranged even in a small struggle for wages against the State. For them the defeat of their employer means a defeat of the Imperialist State, that is overthrow of Imperialism. The class struggle thus very easily and obviously becomes a political struggle.

But in this they find themselves incapable of any revolutionary action without the alliance of a class. The intellectual proletariat is no class, it is an amorphous growth. If it decides to withhold its labour, it is easily replaceable. It is incapable of a solid group action, as the working class is. Because it has no solidarity in the very basis of its economic position between the two classes - the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Its conditions of employment are not an interdependent absolutely necessary process of cooperative functioning of labour as in a factory. The result is that when the pay of the Accounts Department in a Government office at Delhi were cut, the intellectual proletariat there continued to work but humbly petitioned to Government and refused to draw the reduced salaries for

three months. In contrast to this may be witnessed the effect of the action of the workers in the Government workshops threatening to withhold their labour in case their wages were reduced or men retrenched. On one side there is submission and weakness arising from the weakness of their very social function. On the other, there is the revolutionary confidence of the creators of wealth and pillars of social economy. But the petty bourgeoisie must find some weapon to defend its interests. Failing to defend itself against the capitalist machinery it tries to fall back upon its extra economic attributes. Not being a class it uses its caste, community or province. It tries to preserve its economic standards by uniting on false basis. Brahmin and Non-Brahmin, Muslim and Hindu, Madrasi and Maratha, Gujrati and Deccani are the various brigades of the economic struggle of the petty bourgeois clerkdom. A fierce wage competition rages amongst them and the weaker groups form caste or communal alliances. The intellectual proletariat is one of the strongest forces behind communalism and the best proof of this is their claim of percentages in the services being reserved for each community or caste. There is perhaps not a single Legislative Council in India in which one or the other patriotic members has not asked the Dictatorship about the percentage strength of each community or caste in the Services and this claim is in some cases being pushed to the industrial and trade offices

also. The reservation of percentages is a stupid reformist tactic which weakens the petty bourgeoisie in the struggle for higher standards of living. Because for the petty bourgeoisie it results in a mere reshuffling and redistribution of the more or less fixed numbers of the salaried posts amongst their various communal groups. Reshuffling does not increase the gains of the petty bourgeoisie as a whole. A school teachers' group of 100 consisting of 60 Muslims and 40 Hindus earning Rs. 100/- a day does not add a single pie to its total earnings as such by reshuffling them into 40 Muslims, 40 Hindus and 20 Sikhs. It only serves to sidetrack the teachers' struggle for higher wages and more employment. Instead of fighting the capitalist system the displaced groups begin to fight the employed on the ground of communalism. However this artificial basis of struggle collapses under the pressure of capitalist onslaught. Capitalism breaks down all caste and communal barriers. You may say that it also sets them up very tenaciously as we find it in India. But the apparent contradiction belongs to two spheres. In the process of exploitation Capitalism recognises no caste, community, race, religion or sex. They always conform to the demands of capitalist service. Each must be in his own place running the capitalist machine according to discipline. When it comes to appropriation of the wealth produced, within the capitalist class as a whole, its internal

contradictions, its competing sections then begin to search all kinds of weapons to guard their individual share of the exploited wealth. The question of communalism, of minorities, is one of these weapons. The petty bourgeoisie trying to imitate its masters or falling a victim to the false propaganda forsakes its real task until a common capitalist attempt of retrenchment, extra work, cutting salaries, reminds it of its class position and draws it out of narrow circles. The salaried employees' union, clerks' union are such organisations trying to unite not on caste or communal basis but on crafted or trade units. Even then, not being in control of the key positions of the economic and social structure and its maintenance, their opposition, even if it becomes revolutionary, does not fructify, unless allied with that of the workers and peasants.

(102) The class of small traders and artisans - their programme of charkha revival - why we have disliked it?

There is another section of the petty bourgeoisie. It is formed of the artisans and petty traders in the villages and in small towns. The artisans are ruined by the cheap factory goods invading the villages and are thrown out of their employment. The dwarfed growth of the industries in towns is unable to absorb them as wage earners.

The small traders are also gradually displaced by the organised agencies of large export and import houses, who maintain millions of employees moving from place to place to make purchases of the raw products for export or internal industries. Any reference will show that the number of the artisan workers is falling and the share of the petty traders in the total trade volume is decreasing, (Ex. 290), even though, in India we have not yet evolved the complex and widely distributed machinery of stores, as in America, and the artisan class still exists on a large scale. But capitalism is attacking them steadily.

This section forms a big revolutionary force against Imperialism and capitalism. To it imported goods represent Imperialism and the industries of the towns springing within the country represent Indian capitalism. Both oppose its economic interests and make the ruined artisans and petty traders anti-imperialist and even sometimes anti-capitalist. Though they are thus objectively forced into the ranks of Imperialism, their subjective orientation is reactionary and utopian. Because their anti-capitalist ambitions do not look forwards but backwards. Their so-called socialism is not based on the utilisation of the vast production capacity of modern technique. They seek in it the cause of their ruin. Hence they want to return to their own self sufficing village economy, hand manufacture and small trade. This return to the pre-bourgeois period means

a return to the stagnation of feudalism, hence it is reactionary. Such a reversion is impossible. The whole world process of social evolution shows that bourgeois economy subverts feudalism and wherever feudal or primitive economy has been replaced by the capitalist a return to the previous mode has become impossible. Therefore the cry of "back to the golden age" is of utopian outlook. In Russia also the Populists had tried to go back but failed. The section of the Indian petty bourgeoisie which objectively is revolutionary, in its ideals represents a reactionary utopian tendency. (The problem is treated in Exs. P 296 & 297). The reactionary utopian programme of this section came to the forefront during the days of Non-Cooperation Movement in 1921. The whole of the economic programme of this school was summed up by the charkha and khaddar. The most revolutionary battalions roused for the battle of freedom, were marshalled under the reactionary outlook of the charkha. Vast amount of energy and money was spent on it and a perverted form of logic, facts and economics was carefully sown among the millions of workers and peasants. There is perhaps not a single industrial syndicate in the world that has spent so much men and money in advertising its wares.

It need not be told that those who are not specifically reactionary in psychology, those who follow the

process of social growth in a normal manner, are opposed to the charkha. No one can ever doubt that Communists are opposed to it at all times and on all grounds. Yet we find that the thing has seized the minds of thousands of people. In the early days of the charkha movement, its supporters still seriously put forward arguments to prove its economic value and also the possibility and necessity of reconstructing our society on the charkha basis. But that phase passed away when the revolutionary tide ebbed.

D/3.12.31

Morning 1st Part.

One at least of all the extant notions has been given up - that khaddar can compete with mill products. (The refutation of this notion has been at times made by us through the "Krantī"). One or two significant facts about the anti-social character of the charkha in relation to the development of the modern productive forces may be noted. Mr. Mahadeo Desai says, "Working at the rate of three to four spare hours a day it is easy to produce three pounds of 25 counts of yarn a month," and he puts the value of this at Rs. 3/-. (Young India, 16th July 1931, page 188). Three to four hours is a very loose figure for basing calculations upon. Still it may be taken at three hours for all the 30 days in the month. That gives three pounds production of 25s for 90 hours per spindle per head; that is 5.33 ounces for a ten hour working day. This looks an exaggerated figure. The results of a competition communicated to Mahatma Gandhi and published by him (Young India, September 3, 1931, page 246) show that out of four competitors the first spun, in 24 hours' continues spinning, 9360 yards of 16.6 counts. That would give us a weight of 10.74 ounces for 24 hours. I will add 15 per cent more efficiently on ten hours' spinning and we get 5.14 ounces of sixteens for a ten hour day. On a ring spindle in a mill, you get more than 7 ounces. Output on

lower counts must be larger in weight than on higher. So either the first figure is exaggerated or the second is a very low record. Even if the exaggerated result is taken as true we get the following output and wages on a charkha and a ring spindle for ten hour working.

1	2	3	4		
	Output per spindle for 10 hrs. on 25s ounces	Output per spinner for 10 hrs. on 25s ounces	Wages per day		
			Rs.	As.	Ps.
on Charkha	5.33	5.33	0	5	4
on one side of ring frame i.e. 180 spindles	4.90	408.00	1	1	7

(Note :- The result in column 2 on ring frame is arrived at by multiplying 4.90 by 180 spindles per spinner and then distributing it per head at the rate of 24 men per 1000 spindles.)

The spinning wages per pound of yarn on charkha at the above rate come to 192 pies and on the ring frame to 8.3 pies. I have taken the ring frame costs on the Bombay basis. An article in the evidence before the Fawcett Committee in Bombay (Vide Exh. D523, page 223) gives the spinning wages cost of one pound of yarn of 24½ counts at Ahmedabad at .98 pence, that is 10.45 pies. For simpler understanding, the ratios can be put down thus.

	Output per head	Wages per head	Spinning wages Cost per lb of yarn
On Charkha	1	1	20
Ring Frame	76	3	1

This table sums up the intensely wasteful nature of charkha production. The productivity per worker on a ring frame is 76 times that of the Khaddarite. His wages are three times more but wages cost only 128th. There is not the slightest chance by any means whatever for the charkha product to stand against the mill product. Whether in productivity or the total volume of earnings, the charkha is reactionary and wasteful. When human energy and brain have developed productive forces to such an extent that one spinner today is 76 times more productive than the mediaeval one, it is sheer waste of precious human lifetime to return to the Charkha society.

The same story is revealed in a handloom weaving and the same lesson is drawn. The weaving wages per sq.yard in the Gandhi Ashram at Meerut are quoted at 15 pies while in the mill they are 3 to 4 pies only. Though the rate appears to be so tempting in the former, the actual earnings of the Ashram weavers are Rs. 15 per month on all designs while in the Bombay mills they are Rs. 48.

There is one section of the advocates of the charkha, who do not want to destroy the development of machine production. They themselves are industrialists and financiers but they support the movement because they say it supplements the low incomes of the peasantry and offers it employment in "idle days". In this garb the charkha

appears as a method of increasing earnings. We look at this question both from the point of view of the ultimate and immediate results to evaluate which the very premises, from which the good results are claimed by the charkhaites, have to be examined. In the first place does the peasant have "idle days"? If he has, has he only this work to do or something else, apart from cultivation? If he has any other work, is it preferable for him to take to the charkha as his supplementary industry? If he takes, does he really get the relief himself or somebody else? An examination of the working days spent on cultivation on his allotment and the days during which outside employment is sought, by a number of tenants on certain farms in the Punjab about which accounts are published by the Board of Economic Inquiry, would show that where the allotted area is sufficiently big labour from outside has to be engaged to cope with the work. In such cases and where cultivation yields a living wage there is no incentive for taking to a meagrely paying supplementary work. From this point of view charkha can serve as a source of necessary supplementary income for the holders of uneconomic plots and landless workers only. For this section of the peasantry, the number of idle days is not so many as is stated by some. An attempt to work out some scientific data to determine the number of actual idle days has been made by Mr. Harihar Dayal in the book "Fields and Farmers in Oudh"

(pages 240 & 242). He considers the normal working day to be of 9 hours and sets up a table of 357 days in the year and the total number of hours of work put in by a landless worker which comes to 1572 hours. Then he makes the statement, "for about six months in the year he has practically no work to do in agriculture." The Royal Commission on agriculture says, "It may be assumed as a generalisation that by far the greater number of cultivators have at least from two to four months' absolute leisure in the year." The Central Banking Inquiry Committee agrees with this view (page 240) and so does the bourgeoisie. In the evidence before the Commission, however, the working day was suggested to be of more than ten hours. In making these competitions, nothing has been said about the necessary number of holidays which a peasant must have as an ordinary human worker. The whole year is not a working year at all. There are ordinary social holidays and festivals. Then you must be allowed rest days every week or fortnight. Provision must be made for what we call absenteeism in industry due to sickness and other causes. These three factors alone absorb at least $2\frac{1}{2}$ months in the year. (Ten per cent in absenteeism-days 35, plus 26 rest days fortnights, plus 10 social-religious holidays and festivals = 71 days). It may be that for certain sections of the peasants the work is very little, but then that is a case of unemployment and not one of an employed peasant

in need of supplementary income and passing "idle days". However supposing that the peasant has such days on such a large scale, the cottage industries or the charkha do not supplement his income. In the first place the cottage industries have no chance to survive against machine goods. Secondly their productivity and hence income are very low, absolutely disproportionate to the labour spent. Thirdly whatever is so earned does not supplement the peasant's bread at all. We know that generally the whole of the poor and middle peasantry as also the landless workers are in debt. 70 to 80 per cent of the whole peasantry is in debt. They cannot meet their debts and other charges every year and the burden piles up. For example the Punjab Provincial Banking Inquiry Report shows that the debts of the peasants rose from 90 crores in 1921 to 135 crores in 1929. (Page 56, Central Report). If a most intensive campaign of supplementing the incomes had produced, say, ten crores in this period, the result would have been that the debts would have mounted up to 125 crores, instead of 135. To the vast indebted peasantry the supplementary income from charkha or from any other source means only less percentage of arrears in the payment of interest and rent. If he earns more he does not add to his bread and butter but to the accounts of his creditor. Our final objection is that to lead the peasant into the channel of finding his salvation by more work on

a supplementary industry is to hide from him the fact that the real cause of his poverty is the robbery of his labour and not the want of labour or the means. The bourgeoisie is keen on the propaganda of supplementary cottage work because that reduces the incentive of the peasant to class struggle and keeps him off from attacking the whole system as such. Thus from immediate as well as ultimate results the programme of charkha reformism is a programme of reaction and of sabotaging the real struggle of the peasantry for a better life.

Amongst the petty bourgeoisie can also be put the large group of students who in all the bourgeois revolutions have carried the banner of idealism and who have contributed undaunted heroes to many a battle. But this section in spite of its heroism has no specific class theory or aims or objects. Their ideal is an independent bourgeois republic, but they differ from the Indian bourgeoisie in their programme of action. By their heroism they help the bourgeoisie but being continually pressed by impoverishment incline with the proletariat, many of them succeed in breaking away from their class moorings, accept the Socialist-Communist ideals and render the valuable services to the working class and peasant.

(103) The material conditions of the working class which force it into class struggle, economic and political.

The working class in India is comparatively of a small size being only 3 millions. The largest section is employed in the textiles and railways, which account for half the industrial factory workers, cotton and jute together employed 7 lakhs and the railways 776,042 in 1929. The Prosecution in this case points to the fact that we pushed up our trade union activity amongst the workers on the railways, textiles and docks especially. They read into it a sinister motive. But the real reason of the biggest and efficient trade unions being formed first in these branches is the fact that capitalism and therefore the working class in almost all countries began their development with these industries-transport and textiles. If an acute and more or less well-organised trade union class struggle is to be found in this section of the working class it is but a natural corollary to the way in which capital develops. Absence of statistics is one of the features of the British Administration in India. Hence it is difficult to determine the exact size of the working class. It is claimed to consist of 50 million persons, if we include agricultural, plantation and domestic workers (Exh: P 2580). This would in fact include anyone who sells his labour power for wages and produces surplus values for the capitalist class. But if we restrict ourselves to the remarks of Lenin and define the conception "worker" (Exh: P 2491, page 377 dated 12.4.29)

in such a manner that only those come under it who in reality, as a result of their position in life, had to acquire a proletarian psychology, which, however, is impossible for one who has not worked for many years in the factory, without any ulterior aims, merely on the basis of the general economic and social conditions of the person in question, the number of such workers in India will not be more than 2 millions.

I.H.K.

3/12/31 (Morning Part II).

Indian economists and social reformers have studied the peasant question to some extent but they have shut out the problems of the working-class from their literature because the peasant liberated by the bourgeoisie helps its growth, but the worker is directly the anti-thesis of the bourgeoisie. The colonial bourgeoisie becomes a dangerous competitor to the Imperialist by reason of the long hours of work and low wages of the colonial worker who is still only a pauperised peasant thrown out of the village. Therefore the intellectuals of the Imperialist bourgeoisie and also their trade unionists have studied and exposed the conditions of the Indian working-class. (For example the report of Purcell and Hallsworth and such other works). The Prosecution in this case say that we foment strikes, no matter whether the workers have or have not any grievances. But these reports will show that the Indian worker has to work in such inhuman conditions that for all times there is a permanent fund of grievances justifying a strike. The material conditions of the working-class on the admission of responsible Commissions are forcing them into class-struggle. While in capitalist Europe they secured the 8 hour day years ago and in Soviet Russia they are working even a 7 hour day, in India they have to work

for 10 hours and in the native states it extends to 14 hours also. Their right to form a trade union was recognised only five years back. It was only 8 years ago that it was discovered that the limbs and life of a worker have value and that he should be compensated for their loss if they are lost in creating wealth for the bourgeoisie. Still he has not the right of a full meal, as he has no right to a Minimum Living Wage. He has no right to fall sick and become old and if he does, he must starve and die. In India there is no insurance for him. The Prosecution have painted us as men who foment grievances where there are none. The Indian bourgeoisie says it is overflowing with great love for the brother Indian worker. It is only the foreign oppression that causes all the difficulty. It is a well known fact that in cotton industries and in other small factories, it is the brotherly Indian bourgeoisie that is dominant. British capital operates on a large scale in jute, tea, and mining. But the Royal Commission on Labour has the same sorry tale to tell about the working conditions in industries whether owned by the patriotic bourgeois or the wicked foreigners. The Prosecution have ad nauseum repeated that Communists destroy family life, the sweet pleasures of a home, smiling with children. But the Whitley Commission seems to betray them. Speaking about wool cleaning in the Punjab wherein women and children are employed, they say "the initial

process consists of tearing or beating with the hands and with iron rods lumps of dry mud, coagulated blood and other extraneous matter from the unsorted wool. This is a foul process and as no system of grides to remove the accumulated dust is provided, the air, the person surface and the ground quickly become covered with dirt and wool fluff. Very young children sleep along side their mothers on piles of wool, their faces and clothes covered with a fine layer of this germ-laden dust." Speaking about Shellac Factories in Bihar, Orissa and C.P. they quote the report of the Director of Public Health. "Washing pits, reservoirs and drains are not properly cleaned at regular intervals. The same water is used for washing over and over again for a week or more and is allowed to stagnate for a period before it is drained off. Due to putrefication of all the animal refuse from the sticklac along with myriads of crushed insects in this water, the stinking effluvia from the washing basins and drains are disgusting. But the persons employed on washing have to stand knee-deep in this water in the pits and carry on work for hours together." Children of 12 and 10 are employed in the molting room where even adult workers get exhausted due to excessive heat. In the Bidi factories in the Madras Presidency (those self same bidis which the patriotic bourgeois tells up to smoke in place of the foreign cigarettes), corporal punishments and other disciplinary

measures of a reprehensible kind are sometimes resorted to in the case of the smaller children. Workers as young as 5 years of age may be found in some of these places working without adequate meal intervals or weekly rest days and often for 10 or 12 hours daily for sums as low as 2 annas in the case of those of tenderest years. (Pages 95-96). In the Amritsar Carpet factories, "that national indigenous industry", the labour of young children is contracted out for years for a loan of money that in plain words children are sold to the moneylending manufacturers for a loan to the needy parents. In the mines 90 per cent of the workers are life long victims of the hook-worm and the percentage of infection of hook-work is a reliable guide to the degree of sanitary control. (Page 115). In the Khewra Salt Mines owned by the Government of India, "We were struck by the poor health of the miners and their families. Pneumonia is prevalent and it appears from a report made by Colonel Gill, Director of Public Health in the Punjab in 1922, that neither hook-worm nor malaria is responsible. Col. Gill also pointed out defects in diet and complete absence of sanitary arrangements". This was in 1922. Eight years later, when the Government of India were telling this Court that the wicked Communists foment strikes even if there are no grievances, the Royal Commission notes the tremendous progress of the Government of India thus: "At the time of our visit conditions seemed

to be much as this report (Colonel Gill's report of 1922) presented them and we have been unable to find that any action had been taken" (Page 109). If the Government is making lakhs of rupees over the mines and the workers suffer from anaemia, are the Communists wrong when they call the Government "the blood-suckers' Dictatorship", in this case, not metaphorically, but literally? Evidence has been led regarding an oil strike in Bombay in the Government Oil Company, while denouncing the strike, they took to themselves the credit of safeguarding the interests of workers. The Royal Commission speaking about the Burma Oil Company (whose workers were involved in the Bombay strike) say: "Of the 17,000 workers employed by this company on the actual oil fields about 12 per cent are subject to the Factories Act but the bulk of their workers and of those employed by other companies are subject to no statutory control in the matter of hours and health and to few statutory regulations in respect of safety In Burma, there is an Oil Fields Act which is directed to the preservation of the oil sands but is not designed for the protection of labour" (page 112). Let not the Prosecution mistake the sarcasm of His Majesty's Commissioners for that of a Communist manifesto.

The Imperialist capitalist order in India in the present epoch of the decline of world capitalism can not dupe the people into believing that it can give good wages,

employ increasing numbers, and provide better life for them. Hence both the Indian bourgeoisie and Imperialism admit that standards of living, wages, hours etc. have to be worsened. But they hold forth the hope that once the critical period is over the workers can agitate and demand better standards. The struggle of the world's working-class shown so far does not justify such a hope. The class conscious proletarian vanguard of the industrial countries is definitely convinced that a socialist society alone is their salvation, though sections of the proletariat may differ as to the method of bringing it about. But in India even the ideal of a socialist society is being attacked. The Indian bourgeoisie and the Government want the working-class here to strictly limit itself to seeking reforms within the capitalist structure and not to seek to replace it by a socialist structure. They do not want the working-class to raise the question of political power and some of the accused in this case, who call themselves workers agree with the bourgeoisie and the Government that the workers should not care to see whether MacDonal, Baldwin or Gandhi rules over them. The workers are told that they should mainly concern themselves with their bread, with their wages and working conditions. Even if you start from this premise - and Communism also starts exactly from a similar premise (that is the problem of maintenance and development

of society by extraction of useful things from nature with the aid of improved technology and the proper distribution of these things to the members of the society), - the question of political power, of class rule is forced on the workers in the struggle for bread and better life. For example in the matter of legislation affecting them, the working-class is at once confronted with the problem of class rule. Factory legislation in India began in 1881, but every law so far passed has had to be forced from the unwilling hands of the Imperialist State and the Indian bourgeoisie. Though some amount of legislation does exist, it does not mean that it is obeyed and given effect to by the employers. Vast areas and big companies employing large masses of workers are exempted from the application of the laws and the fact is mentioned by the Royal Commission in several places. If the working-class wants to improve its condition, without seizing political power, but by legislation; it has to express its grievances by strikes, without which the bourgeoisie and Government refuse even to consider their complaints. But strikes are controlled, attacked, suppressed and broken by the violence of the State, its police and military. That again forces on the workers' attention the question of political power. In fact wages, hours, the very existence of the workers is closely bound up with politics - because it is the State that fortifies the social relations in which he is to remain

a worker and produce wealth for the bourgeoisie. How the Indian workers are inevitably moved towards this question of class power by the experience of their daily struggle will be illustrated when I will deal with my Trade Union work in Bombay and other places.

It has been shown so far that contrary to the statements of our prosecutors and critics there exist, in Indian society, classes, class contradictions and class conflicts, and that all these are embedded in the economy of our society and fortified by the political power. That we do not arbitrarily divide society because Marx or Lenin said so. Even if you scrap out all what has been said or written by Marx, Lenin or the Comintern, the Indian bourgeoisie have to get rid of Imperialism and the workers and peasants have to abolish feudalism and capitalism. The constitutional struggle avails no class except the big bourgeoisie. So the national and class struggle gather strength on a mass scale throughout the country.

(104) Inciting class war - models of class war and other questions.

Granting that such conditions to exist, is it necessary and good to aggravate the situation by inciting class war instead of trying to heal the cracks by class peace. Historical experience shows that by class war alone, by its dialectical development does society progress.

If the worn out class that is the worn out economy and all its superstructure are not removed, the society will be stifled. Class war is a necessity for the rebirth in a healthier form.

Is it necessary that the forms of our class struggle should be modelled after that of the Russian or western experiences? Our warring classes have the same content and form, have the same actions and reactions as the classes in other countries. Our capitalists and workers have the same form, the same social actions and reactions as those of other countries. The only difference would lie in the degrees of development. Therefore the general form or method of our class struggle will be the same as in other countries. England has not to fight for national Independence but we have to. Therefore our class struggle will have to take account of this fact. France has no feudal class, but we have just as Russia has. So our class struggle will be composed of a national movement for Independence in which we have to join hands with the revolutionary sections of the petty bourgeoisie though they hold the ideals of capitalism against Imperialism. Our revolution will not be at once a socialist revolution as it will be in Germany or in England. Hence our forms of struggle will be modelled after the experience of all the countries and not particularly this one or that. But the Russian

experience is especially emphasised, because it is there that the struggle has reached a more or less successful stage in the rebuilding of a new and better society.

D/4.12.31

Morning 1st Part.

Is it necessary that the Indian workers must build up a Communist Party? In the first place in the modern epoch where the class differentiation of society has taken a very clear form, every class has a party of its own. The big bourgeoisie in India has the Liberal Federation. The petty bourgeoisie of traders, artisans and rich peasants are organised in the Congress, which stands avowedly for class peace and the retention of the existing property relations. All these class parties and organisations further their own class interest, but the working class has no party of its own. If the workers must conduct a class struggle, they must have their own class party. A class party of the workers with a revolutionary programme against capitalism and Imperialism can only be a Communist Party.

Is it absolutely necessary that all the Communist parties of the world should unite internationally and that such a union in the present period is represented by the Third Communist International? The modern bourgeoisie has broken down national boundaries and built up a world economy and world society, separate parts of which cannot function, without affecting the other parts. International actions in all phases of life are now so common that the question would appear superfluous. The bourgeoisie of the

world unites internationally whenever any section of it is challenged by the working class, which also then has to cooperate on an International scale to guard its interests. Hence the Communist parties of the world unite internationally. Such a union has been formed three times since 1864, each time conforming to and produced by the needs of the times.

(105) "Outside connection" - the unnecessary part of the indictment.

I have stated so far, in brief outlines, some of the principles of Marxism-Leninism which, I am convinced, will save society from destruction and will carry it on to a better stage. Leninism alone can give freedom to India, can give freedom to the masses. The late Mr. Langford James while explaining his cases said, "By their creed, by their convictions, by their constitution itself they are inexorably bound to work intensively and unceasingly for the overthrow of the British monarchy in England, in India and in the dominions." In another place referring to our advocacy of the Soviet system, he says, "If you find these people saying that and if you find them working to do that, then indeed it is not possible in the nature of things that they should do anything else than plotting, planning and conspiring to smash His Majesty's Government to pieces." The first extract states what I am bound to do "intensively

and unceasingly" and the second asserts that I did what I was bound to do, i.e. "plotting, planning and conspiring." It is then claimed that I am guilty of the charge and should be convicted. Thus the offence is clearly stated to consist of two parts, one the holding of Communist principles and second acting up to those principles.

There seems to be some difference of opinion between our prosecutors and the Court as to what exactly is the most important thing in the second part of the alleged offence. A considerable indication of the opinion of this Court is available in its bail order of 7th May 1931. Referring to the point as to what constitutes "the seriousness of the conspiracy," the order observes, "what the summary (i.e. the Committal Order), 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 and therefore of a much more serious nature." And later on "it is from this outside connection that the seriousness of the case to a considerable extent arises." (Pages 11 & 12). The questions framed by the Court also begin with "what may be described as foreign correspondence." In contrast to this I may quote Mr. Langford James. After explaining to the Court all that he could or understood about Leninism and

and the Comintern, he told what was necessary to convict us of the offence under this section. "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 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 it is quite an unnecessary part of the indictment." And in the same paragraph for the third time he said, "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." Thus according to the original brain that "could link up these people with the Third International" and conceived the conspiracy of this Conspiracy Case, "the outside connection" is not really necessary. It is quite an unnecessary part of the indictment, while for this Court it gives seriousness to that case to a considerable extent. It has been our experience that the opinion of the Prosecution holds good in this Court and I believe that Mr. James knew the mind of his Imperialism better. Imperialism is not concerned whether we had or had not foreign connection or affiliation with the C.I. It wants to suppress the revolutionary proletariat and peasantry in India and the holding of principles of Communism. They do

not want anyone to subscribe to any revolutionary system of thought. So it can be stated that the questions and answers about foreign correspondence, the Communist Party etc. are 'really unnecessary', 'quite an unnecessary part of the indictment' and hence of the defence also. According to Mr. James "incomparably the most important of our activities that which was taking the most of our time and attention were the strikes which raged in Calcutta and Bombay". So I will now turn to this incomparably the most important of our activities and if by that time the Court still would disagree with Mr. James and think that outside connection and explanation about it are "really necessary" I will try to reply.

Q. The following is (E & O.E.) the rest of the evidence against you grouped under its main heads :-

I. W.P.P. of Bombay :- P 1373(6), 2137P, 230, 1015, 1358, 2311, 1685, 1375 Kranti of 3.9.27; 835, 1348(41), 993, 1353, 1343, 1348(16)(18)(19)(15)(24)(14)(7)1373(11), 1348(2), 1624, 1373(13), 984, 981, 1492, 930 Kranti of 30.6.28, 986 Kranti of 5.7.28, 23.8.28 & 30.8.28, 930 Kranti of 12.7.28 & 2.8.28, 1602, 1344, 1365, P.W.'s 244 and 245, P 2242, P 1690, 1261, 1207(4),(3), 1170 & 431 Krantikari of 28.1.29, 1211, 1002D, 1207(5); Kranti 9.8.28/23.8.28/20.8/28/2.9.28/20.9.28/27.9.28/5.10.28/13.1.29/3.3.29 and 17.3.29 (to be found in different Kranti exhibits numbers). P 987, 988, 1205, 990, 983.

II. W.P.P. of Bengal etc.:- Bengal: P 52, 526(41), 1615 and 1855.

U.P.: P1619P, 1621P, 311 & 433
526(6).

Punjab: P.526(24), 1408, 1409,
1393, 1608, 2051C, 1626,
1641 & P.W. 179.

III. A.I.W.P.P.:- P.1373(2), 1613, 2024C, 1348(22), 1373(3)
1323, 1617, 1373(5), 1654P, 1611P, 1797P, 1348(35), 468(2),
978, 977 & 669.

IV. A.I.T.U.C.:- P.W. 119, P 10, 1965, 1966, 1967, 2138P,
2141C, 1878C, 1863P, 545(1), 1614, 1848C, 479, 526(34),
545(3), 545(8), 999, 1206(1), & P.W. 123.

V. T.U.s & strikes:- P819, 1625, P.W.s 273, 276, 278 &
245, P 958, 944, 966, 967, 929, 985, 959, 949, 787, 786,
790, 792, 954, 1628P, 395(2),(1), 396, 955(1), 964 & 986
Krantī of 12.8.28.

VI. Connections & Miscellaneous:- P.W.s 244 & 218, P1972,
1973, 1966, 2067(1), P.1637, 995, 996, 1639, 2022C, 957,
146, 525(1), 645, 980, 991, 997, 1000, 1001, 1220, 1003,
1299, 1819, 1822, 1885, 2213, 1207(2)(6), 1208(2), 1796(),
2512, 975 & 1175.

Have you anything to say in explanation of this
evidence?